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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile delinquency is a perennial problem of increasing concern not only to parents, educators and social agencies, but also to the law-enforcement agencies of the nation. On the basis of criminal statistics and studies of the etiology of criminal behavior, it has become axiomatic that crime is primarily a problem of youth. During World War II the problem of juvenile delinquency reached its highest peak, so that references to it constantly appeared in newspapers and periodicals. Administrators, supervisors, teachers, parents and other citizens may well be concerned about the present prevalence of this sort of aberrational conduct. In November, 1946, Attorney General Tom Clark called a National Conference for the Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency which brought together in Washington, D.C. more than seven hundred of the leading authorities on the subject in the United States. These leaders recognized that this type of deviating behavior is not just an accident. It depends upon many complex factors and is usually socially conditioned. The problem of juvenile delinquency is not new, and it represents but one of many aspects of the problem of child welfare.
The Historical Perspective on the Problem of Juvenile Delinquency

Even in colonial days it was recognized that some young people were more vulnerable to delinquency than others, and "wayward, vicious, and criminal children" constituted a serious problem. Prolonged economic depression early in the nineteenth century brought serious destitution in the eastern cities. This condition became even more intensified by the influx of impoverished immigrants, therefore efforts were made to prevent pauperism and crime. Activities relating to child welfare were set in motion, yet the march of events in the history of social services for children did not proceed in a conveniently logical order.

However, one progressive step in the methods of care for unfortunate children was urged, especially upon Children's Aid Societies and agencies of similar character, by the Charity Organization Movement which began in this country in Buffalo and Boston in the late 1870's. Changing social conditions and awareness of urgent problems necessitated a new approach in the usual policy for public assistance and protection. This led to greater centralization of control under departments of public welfare. As a consequence welfare programs, which a few generations ago were hardly more than the dreams of a few theorists, gradually became an accepted part of our way of life.

In spite of this advance, there were still unmistakable signs that considerably more had to be accomplished if the
best interests of youth were to be served. On this basis, since early in the present century and running through the four decades, decennial White House Conferences on Children, called by Presidents of the United States, have kept the needs of children before the public and have developed statements of standards held to constitute objectives for states and localities during the decade following each conference.

The first White House Conference was held in 1909. A major outgrowth of this, known as the Funds to Parents Act, occurred in 1911 when maintenance of children in their own homes was accepted as a public responsibility. This act was fostered mainly as a child welfare measure, for at that time juvenile courts were the agencies which came most closely in contact with conditions which mothers' aid was designed to correct. Eventually this principle was developed on a federal-state basis and incorporated into the Social Security Act of 1935 as Aid to Dependent Children.

In 1912 the concern of the Federal Government for the well-being of children was recognized again through the
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creation of the United States Children's Bureau. The function of this central agency was to investigate and report upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children among all classes of people.

A wider range of interests was covered in 1919, the year designated by President Wilson as Children's Year. Actuated by the faith that the scientific method is the most useful of the tools possessed by the modern world, the organizers brought men and women together whose sole purpose was to apply to the service of the American child what has been proved to be incontestably true. Emphasis was placed on a study of standards for the "protection of children in need of special care."

In harmony with the plan of having a conference every decade, the White House Conference on child health and protection was held in 1930. Reports presented showed that the standards built up through the years were finding their expression in legislation and practice. A Children's Charter with nineteen points embodying the rights of all children was adopted at the closing session. One of the points emphasized that every child in conflict with society has the right to be dealt with intelligently as society's charge, not society's outcast. In advocating safeguards, the participants of the

1930 White House Conference stressed the fact that services to children can be provided by the community, the state or the nation since many of these needed services are beyond the reach of individual parents. Moreover, one generation of properly-born, trained, educated and healthy children would make a thousand other problems of government vanish, for one good community nurse would save a dozen policemen. The Conference on Children in a Democracy called in 1940 by President Roosevelt took for its theme "Our Concern Every Child."

At the present time child-welfare services carried on by the states with federal grants are directed toward approximately 2,400,000 needy children. This includes children born out of wedlock as well as those with special behavior problems and those children who are in danger of becoming delinquent.

In all the proceedings of the earlier conferences which were concerned with the methods of care and treatment of children, and prior to the juvenile court movement, the scholarly and authoritative leaders of government and national agencies realized that the whole range of problems had to be considered if such an infection as juvenile delinquency
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were to be avoided. They asked themselves what they were actually doing to safeguard the needs of helpless youth. Were dependent children getting the correct start in life in their right to all factors pertaining to health, security and education which are the gateway to democracy's strength? The major issue considered was how various handicaps—physical, mental, economic, and other—affect the social participation of individuals. From the very magnitude of the problem it was clear that a specific agency which would embrace the composite features of the social problem in its entirety had to be established.

The Juvenile Court

Origin of the Juvenile Court: The source of the juvenile court movement may be traced to early rules of law in the past. Under ancient Saxon law, at least in capital offenses, a child less than twelve years could not be guilty "in will" of crime; but from twelve to fourteen the question of guilt was dependent upon capacity. Any child who had reached his fourteenth birthday could not be presumed innocent because of age. At common law by the latter part of the thirteenth century children were privileged from criminal prosecution by reason of infancy, or nonage, which is a defect of the understanding. During the stage of childhood from ten and a half to fourteen years children were punishable if found to be doli capaces, or capable of mischief, but with many mitigations and not with the utmost rigor of the law;
enforcement was not rigid. At the age of puberty and thereafter, minors were liable to punishment, capitally and otherwise. Under fourteen, although a child might be *prima facie* adjudged *doli incapax*, yet if it appeared to the court and jury that he was *doli capax* and could discern between good and evil, he could be convicted and suffer death.

Thus a girl of fourteen had been burnt for killing her mistress; and one boy of ten and another of nine years old, who had killed their companions, have been sentenced to death, and he of ten years actually hanged; because it appeared upon their trials, that the one hid himself, and the other hid the body he had killed, while hiding manifested a consciousness of guilt and a discretion to discern between good and evil.\(^6\)

It was in response to the excessive rigidity of the common-law system and the need for more humane justice that the chancellor’s power developed of granting relief under his "prerogative of grace" to those who might otherwise suffer hardship at the hands of the common-law courts. In the fifteenth century a distinct court and jurisdiction of chancery emerged, more flexible and administrative in its character than the common-law courts and providing a more affirmative, remedial assistance in equity. Through this equity jurisprudence the Crown exerted a power of *pares patriae*.

---

Special common-law and chancery provisions withal, the incorrigible child was generally treated with some punitive severity into the nineteenth century. Records show that shipping, branding, and mutilation of children were resorted to in the days before jail imprisonment was adopted as a form of punishment.

In America the precedents of a punitive common-law were carried over. Plymouth Colony, for example, provided capital punishment for sixteen different offenses, including a course of conduct that closely resembles modern "incorrigibility" statutes. Even as late as 1818, at the time when Illinois was admitted to the Union, the age of criminal responsibility was seven years, but a later criminal code in 1827 raised

7. "If any Childe or Children above sixteen years old, and of competent understanding shall Curse or Smite their Natural Father or Mother; he or they shall be put to Death, unless it can be sufficiently testified that the Parents have been very Unchristianly negligent in the Education of such Children, or so provoked them by extreme and cruel Correction, that they have been forced thereunto, to preserve themselves from Death or Maiming. If a Man have a Stubborn or Rebellious Son, of sufficient years and understanding (viz.) sixteen years of age, which shall not obey the voice of his Father, or the voice of his Mother, and that when they have chastened him, will not harken unto them; then shall his Father and Mother, being his natural parents, lay hold on him, and bring him before the Magistrates assembled in Court and testify unto them, that their Son is Stubborn and Rebellious, and will not obey their voice and Chastisement, but lives in sundry notorious crimes; such a Son shall be put to Death or otherwise severely punished." New Plymouth General Laws, Chap. II, Secs. 13, 14; quoted in Paul W. Tappan, Juvenile Delinquency (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1949), p. 171.
the age to ten.

Judge Merritt W. Pinckney, one of the early judges of the juvenile court in Chicago, describes the proceedings prior to the enactment of juvenile-court laws:

When a law of the state was violated the state demanded vindication, the same vindication from a lad of twelve years as from an adult of twenty-five. Punishment, not reformation, was the fundamental thought of our criminal jurisprudence; punishment as an expiation for the wrong and as a warning to other possible wrong-doers. The lad of twelve was arrested, put in jail, indicted by the grand jury, tried by a petit jury, with all the formality of the criminal law.

The only point at which the treatment of the juvenile criminal differed from that of the adult was in the form of the punishment administered. Though laws were amended from time to time until the enactment of the juvenile court law in 1899, the delinquent child between ten and sixteen was subject to all the criminal processes applied to adults. A child's violation of an act or ordinance culminated in apprehension, arrest, detention and trial; at the discretion of the court he could be committed to a house of correction or to a county jail, except for more serious offenses for

8. "An infant under the age of ten years shall not be found guilty of any crime or misdemeanor." Revised Laws of Illinois, 1827, Sec. 4, p. 124; quoted in Helen Rankin Jeter, The Chicago Juvenile Court (Washington: Children's Bureau, 1922), Bureau Publ. No. 104, p. 1.

which he was committed to a state reformatory.

As is so frequently the case when radical changes take place, fires smoldered and criticism was raised against this retributive justice, so that even before many of the beneficent measures for child welfare, cited previously, were carried out there were plans for the drafting of a juvenile court. Leaders recognized the interdependence and the necessity for a closer union of such interests and activities as health, education and social welfare. Consequently, one of the most significant patterns woven into the complex mosaic of child welfare was the establishment on July 1, 1899 of the first juvenile court in Chicago.

Many organizations concerned with the protection of children (including the State Board of Public Charities, the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs, the Chicago Bar Association, the Chicago Board of Education, and the Illinois State Conference of Charities) interested themselves in the passage of the legislation entitled "An act to regulate the treatment and control of dependent, neglected, and delinquent children." The law provided for the separate hearing of children's cases in a court having chancery rather than


11. Helen Rankin Jeter, op. cit., p. 5.

12. Laws of Illinois, 1899, p. 131; quoted in Helen Rankin Jeter, op. cit., p. 5.
criminal jurisdiction; it also provided for the detention of children apart from adults and for the probation system. The seed sown by this Illinois legislation was almost immediately transplanted to Colorado; the result was the juvenile court of Denver. The Illinois law in modified forms became the pattern and led to development of similar courts in other states, so that by 1925 only Maine and Wyoming were without such legislation.

It is axiomatic that the juvenile court is not a court of equity or a common-law court, but rather a statutory body. A juvenile court may be broadly defined as one having special jurisdiction of a parental nature over delinquent and neglected children.

When Illinois in 1899 provided for the first juvenile court in the world, it enacted a social institution whose crescive roots had been growing slowly over a long period. Essentially this law was designed to replace judicial by educational authority, an objective that some leaders in the field of child care have advocated ever since. It was a significant achievement in juridical integration, providing the basis for independent handling under a distinct philosophy and method. At the start it established no new court or agency, merely providing a special jurisdiction to county and circuit courts, but it did create the status of

juvenile delinquency as something less than crime to be treated correctively rather than by punishment as such.

Principles of Juvenile Court Legislation: A brief explanation of the sociolegal aspects of the juvenile court is necessary at this point if adequate clarity is to be given to the reader. The forms employed in children's court "hearings" have derived from those traditionally established in criminal courts. Through experimentation in adjudicative technique, some changes have developed based upon the contrasting objectives and ideology of the juvenile court.

Part of the methodology of children's courts--particularly the unofficial and administrative phases--represents the adoption of techniques from social and administrative agencies rather than from the judicial system, but much of the over-all procedure is a direct borrowing from other branches of the court system. For the most part, the tendency has been to make too much of small differences in terminology employed by juvenile and criminal courts. From the viewpoint of institutional evolution, the similarities to ordinary court procedure that have been preserved are merely natural survivals. As a matter of fact, it is desirable that these similarities persist, since a similar basic purpose is served by both children's and adults' courts. Essentially they perform a judicial function of

determining the issue of statutory violation and the status of the alleged offender; they protect his constitutional rights and investigate his need for treatment. Paul W. Alexander, one of the country's outstanding children's court judges, expressed the need for retaining the judicial character of such courts in these words:

Now, if the juvenile court be so much more like a hospital or clinic than like the conventional conception of a court, if its application of the principles of social science appears to be more in keeping with the practice of medical science than of legal science, then why bother to have a judge?

Let me make it perfectly clear that a legally trained judicial officer is an utterly indispensable part of the picture. In those rare instances where an issue of fact develops, there must be a judge to decide it, to determine whether the child did commit the offense. Who but a judge should decide the occasional issues of law, e.g., determine questions of jurisdiction of persons or of subject matter, questions of procedure, service, interpretation of statutes, etc., pass upon the validity of pleadings, entries, and other countless details of practice?

Always there is need of a judge to safeguard the constitutional guaranties of our Federal and state bills of rights; to make sure no child is deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process; that every child and necessary adult party has his day in court.

In case records as well as in hearings it takes a judge to detect and discount, or better, eliminate incompetent witnesses; to guard against subjective as distinguished from objective attitudes on the part of officers and referees; to see that facts prevail over fancies; that science does not overstep the bounds of law or common sense in administering treatment.

There must be a judge to weight such seeming imponderables as the child's best interest over
against general security or protection of society; a judge to act as arbiter when scientists can't agree; to serve as a check and balance upon the legalistic demands of the attorneys, on the one hand, and the idealistic demands of the theorists, on the other.  

Concerning the important philosophy, however, it has already been inferred that the basic principle of juvenile court legislation is that children under the jurisdiction of the court are wards of the state; consequently they are subject to its discipline and protection, which shall approximate as nearly as possible that which should be given by their parents. The authority of the state is to serve, to safeguard them from neglect or injury, and to enforce the obligations of parents or guardians if necessary. The court therefore does not limit its concern to the deed or situation immediately responsible for the child's predicament but gives attention primarily to the causative factors and the child's needs. Inquiry into physical and mental characteristics, home conditions and environmental factors is a necessary preliminary to determining what should be done for a child.

At this point it should be made clear that there is nothing uniform about the operation of various juvenile courts of the United States. It may be easier to understand the procedures of these courts by comparing them to the more familiar methods employed in the ordinary criminal court system, pointing up similarities and contrasts and indicating

15. Ibid., p. 178.
some phases in which there is considerable variation among different jurisdictions. There is a common inclination to picture optimum practices (or at least procedures conceived as ideal by the analyst) as though they were characteristic. This is not so.

The main contrast between juvenile court and criminal court procedures is that the vast majority of children's courts are distinct from the ordinary court system only in having separate hearings; that in fact, their judges and other personnel are engaged in criminal, civil, equity, probate and other ordinary legal business most of the time. Their methods and attitudes quite naturally perseverere from one juridical area to another. In addition, among the relatively few children's courts that are either wholly autonomous or part of a domestic-relations court system there is a wide disparity in methods that reflects statutory variation somewhat but, more important still, is the relative strength of competing sociolegal values fostered by the proponents of differing legal and administrative points of view in the particular jurisdiction.

Except for the relative privacy of the proceedings and the fact that more weight is attached to the allegations of the complaining parent or police officer and to their common demands for the commitment of the young offender, children's cases are handled much like any others. This diversity is a reflection of the failure thus far to develop any consensus as to desirable goals and methods for dealing with children.
The main procedures of the juvenile court may be summarized briefly in the following phases:

1. Petition
2. Appearance, arraignment, and adjournment
3. Parole or remand
4. Social investigation
5. Hearing and adjudication
6. Disposition

As to statistics, juvenile courts number approximately three thousand. Data collected by the Children's Bureau, Federal Security Agency, give some indication of the volume with whom these courts deal, although complete statistics are not available. According to these records, at least 275,000 come yearly to the attention of the juvenile courts of the country as delinquents. During 1946 there were 97,416 children's cases disposed of by three hundred courts in nineteen states (including the District of Columbia), of which seventy per cent were delinquency cases.

Dr. Martha M. Eliot of the United States Children's Bureau states that recorded delinquency cases are never more than an unknown fraction of the maladjustment existing at any given time. For each child who passes through a juvenile court there are probably ten others who are hampered in their
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normal personality development by the same causal factors.
Chance, the economic resources of the family, and the social
resources of the community often determine whether or not a
child gets into juvenile court. Cases of girls always
constitute a smaller proportion of the total cases reported
to the Children's Bureau than do those of boys.

Definition of Delinquency: From a strictly scientific
viewpoint, a clear-cut answer to the question of what
constitutes "delinquency" is absent. A cursory examination
of literature dealing with the concept reveals considerable
confusion and disagreement. Legally, delinquency is a term
applied to minors. However, the various states and the
Federal Government have their own specific interpretations
for law-enforcement agencies. Sometimes that which consti-
tutes delinquency in one juvenile-court law is included in
the definition of neglect by another. It is obvious,
therefore, that the norm in each instance depends upon the
particular frame of reference. In spite of this, there is
common agreement among all the courts that delinquency is
defined as a violation of those acts which if committed by
an adult would be considered criminal. The term "delinquency"
also includes certain patterns of behavior which are peculiar
to the status of childhood such as mere mischievousness.

Foundation, 1946), IX, p. 262. Testimony of Dr. Martha M.
Elliot in Hearings on S. 1160 (National Mental Health Act),
U. S. Senate, 79th Cong., March 8, 1946. Also see Juvenile
Court Statistics of U. S. Children's Bureau for 1945.
truancy, waywardness, and incorrigibility.

Statement of the Problem: Dr. Healy's studies of atypical children offers a comprehensive, realistic approach to the problem of juvenile delinquency. The chief quest of his research was how to cure delinquent tendencies, thus diminishing delinquency and subsequent adult criminalism. In order to determine the roots of criminal behavior it was necessary for him to draw information from many independent branches of science, chief among which were medicine, psychology, sociology, law, education, anthropology, and neurology.

The purpose of this thesis is to attempt an understanding of Healy's contribution to a relevant, clear-sighted and unsentimental analysis of the problem of juvenile delinquency. What were the factors to which Healy attributed this deteriorating phenomenon? What forces underlie the fact that some children are at a disadvantage from birth or from an early age so that under the pressure of life their little world crumbles? What is the pathway which has brought certain children, normally motivated, into the domain of what we call the court, and what is the major recruiting ground for the army of ne'er-do-wells and criminals? What methods did Healy use in his analysis of the contributory factors in juvenile delinquency? Did he find the answer, as did the Frenchman Binet earlier, by summarizing the individual's score on all his separate measurable mental functions; or did he find it necessary to devise new and more
comprehensive methods of analysis?

These questions are but part of the whole field of inquiry and will be dealt with wherever they appropriately apply throughout the subject matter of this paper. No attempt will be made to limit each of these particular points to a distinct and separate area.
CHAPTER II

SOME CHANGES IN APPROACH IN THE METHODS OF TREATMENT OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

As indicated in Chapter I, the need for better methods in dealing with juvenile delinquents had become apparent by the turn of the century. In view of past failures to deal effectively with anti-social conduct and in the light of the enormous expense of criminality, standing in striking contrast to progress in many other fields of human endeavor, there seemed the utmost justification for further experimentation and deeper delving into the problem if success were to be attained in curbing juvenile delinquency.

As evident in other trial and error procedures, so difficulties arose in this particular issue. An acute problem was the setting up of new policies when the actual practices and inherent limitations of the court made it impossible to obtain new objectives. Such confusion points up what has been described as the contest of legal and administrative approaches in courts over the welfare interests of the child, which were being stressed by welfare leaders. The children's court, to be sure, does have important and inescapable legal functions in adjudication of the delinquent status. Helen L. Witmer has stressed the judicial role of the court in these words:
What changes would logically follow from the recognition that even in juvenile cases the court's function is judicial and that the disposition determined upon is usually felt as punishment? For such really is the case. In the organized group which is the state, the rules governing the relation of members to each other are enforced through courts, which have the task, first of all, of deciding whether the charge is well founded, and second, of arriving at decisions which are designed to prevent the recurrence of the forbidden behavior. The juvenile court plan grew out of recognition of the fact that the current deterrent measures were unsuccessful and a belief that delinquents would alter their behavior only if the causes of their misconduct were removed. Granted that when the juvenile courts were set up these causes were believed to be largely external to the delinquent (a swing away from the old belief in individual responsibility in moral issues), nevertheless the court plan was not so much designed to relieve the individual of responsibility for his acts as to find a way of keeping him from repeating them which would be beneficial to both himself and others.\footnote{1\textsuperscript{1} Paul W. Tappan, Juvenile Delinquency (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1949), p. 196.}

In brief, the whole court and probation process centered around and found its reason for being in the fact of delinquency. Fundamental was the fact that no matter how socialized may be the court's procedure, how socially-minded its judge or how well trained its probation staff, the juvenile court still remained a court.

This dual function of the juvenile court led to much serious dispute as to the proper goals and methods and theories that should guide the court's efforts. Critics were
adamant in urging reformation of the system for a decade after the first juvenile court began its work in Chicago. It became very evident that out of the vast number of children coming before the court, many needed a type of professional help not then available. In fact, Julia C. Lathrop, former Chief of the Children's Bureau and previously closely associated with Dr. Healy's early work in Chicago, once remarked that the outstanding contribution of the juvenile court was that it "made the child visible." Consequently public-spirited leaders with their ever-emerging sense of social justice, which is the basis for the modern concept of service as a right, again sought for remedial means of saving children in preference to punishing them.

As a consequence the Juvenile Psychopathic Institute was established in 1909 in Chicago with the inspirational and financial aid of Mrs. W. F. Dummer who donated a five-year grant to the work. The Institute was organized and conducted by Dr. William Healy, and scientific diagnostic study of the individual child became a regular service for delinquents brought before the court. After five years the Institute was taken over as a department of the juvenile court. Since the Institute was the first clinic for children in which the psychiatric, psychological and social approaches were combined, Healy received the heartiest welcome from jurists and others who cherished the vision of rational treatment for delinquents.
Facts About William Healy

Dr. Healy was born in Buckinghamshire, England on January 20, 1869. The following brief personal history describes the evolution of his experience as well as his early training which particularly qualified him for clinical work. As a matter of fact, his vast accumulation of knowledge regarding human behavior eventually resulted in his being recognized as one of the foremost psychiatrists in the United States.

In 1899 Healy received an A. B. degree from Harvard University, and a year later obtained an M. D. degree at Rush Medical College in Chicago. From 1900-1901 he was a physician at Wisconsin State Hospital. As an educator he instructed in gynecology at Northwestern University from 1901-1903. During an interim in the first years of his medical career his interest in psychology led to studies of neurology and psychiatry in this country and in Europe. His many other interests extended to such fields as mental tests, social offenders, causation of delinquency, psychology of testimony, educational and personality problems. Healy came to the Juvenile Psychopathic Institute from private practice and remained as director until 1917 when he and his co-worker, Dr. Augusta F. Bronner, resigned to direct the Judge Baker Foundation of Boston, now known as the Judge Baker Guidance Center.
In spite of the almost overwhelming magnitude of his duties at the Juvenile Psychopathic Institute and the Judge Baker Guidance Center, Dr. Healy did not become single-minded. Solicitous concern for general improvement in all matters pertaining to his chosen field is shown by the scope of his participation in other responsible programs and diverse institutions where his experience and knowledge undoubtedly proved most valuable assets. Evidently he still enjoyed teaching because for two summers, 1912-1914, he instructed at Harvard; later he again lectured at Harvard and at Boston University. From 1929-1933 he was a professor and research associate at the Institute of Human Relations, Yale University. In addition he was a member of certain welfare organizations such as the Chicago Vice Commission. He was either a member of or held an office of distinction in a wide variety of scientific and professional groups as indicated by the following list:

Psychiatrist, American Law Institute, Youth Justice Commission, 1938-1940
Pioneer in U. S. in establishing clinics for problem children and young people
Fellow, American Academy Arts and Sciences
Member: American Medical Association
American Psychiatric Association
Massachusetts Medical and Psychiatric Societies

American Institute Criminal Law and Criminology
Ethical Culture Society (honorary)
St. Louis Medical Society
American Neurological Association
Boston Society of Psychiatry and Neurology (President)
American Orthopsychiatric Association (President)
American Psychopathological Association (President).

As an author he has written extensively on the subject of juvenile delinquency. Some of his publications were made with collaborators, and the names of co-workers are connected with their special contributions. In 1912 he wrote a research document, *Case Studies of Mentally and Morally Abnormal Types*, for the Harvard University Press. Healy's case histories of children who were the subjects of medico-psychological study in the early years of the Chicago Juvenile Court clinic are graphically described in *The Individual Delinquent*, *A Text-book of Diagnosis and Prognosis* published in 1915. This epoch-making book aroused considerable interest here and abroad in the scientific study and treatment of behavior problems. With Mary Tenney Healy, his first wife, he wrote *Pathological Lying, Accusations and Swindling* in 1915. As a criminal science monograph it was a study in forensic psychology. Shortly after in 1917 *Mental Conflicts and Misconduct* went to press. In 1922 Dr. Healy prepared a monograph, *The Practical Value of Scientific Study of*
Juvenile Delinquency, which was one of a series of publications for the Children's Bureau on diverse aspects of juvenile court work. In 1923 with Augusta F. Bronner (who became the second Mrs. Healy in 1932), Dr. Healy published the Judge Baker Foundation Case Studies, twenty case studies which have been used extensively by schools of social work and related agencies. In 1926 both of them wrote the composite work Delinquents and Criminals, Their Making and Unmaking; and, with others, a Manual of Individual Mental Tests was published in 1927. They also collaborated in 1929 on a book called Reconstructing Behavior in Youth, a study of cases cooperatively treated by the Boston clinic and social welfare agencies, with J. Prentice Murphy and Mrs. Edith M. H. Baylor of the Boston Children's Aid Association.

The Structure and Meaning of Psychoanalysis is another composite work written in 1930 by Dr. Healy, A. F. Bronner and others. Still another work, Roots of Crime, shows the relationship between personality, attitudes and behavior to criminality as formulated by Dr. Healy and Dr. Franz Alexander from psychoanalytical studies of prisoners. Within the last fifteen years two other books were written jointly with A. F. Bronner, New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment in 1936, and Treatment and What Happened Afterward in 1940. Dr. Healy and B. S. Alper published Criminal Youth and the Borstal System in 1941. In addition to various other monographs which he put forth from time to time, the book Honesty was
written in 1945.

It is evident from the foregoing facts that when Dr. Healy became affiliated with the Juvenile Psychopathic Institute his work was largely of an incubatory nature, for at that time all he possessed were the basic rudiments of the scientific field he had entered. Yet because his specific knowledge interacted with the day-to-day experience at the Institute, he was able to reason from the particular to the general and vice versa. As he groped around his vision expanded, and, as a result, he gained perspective and coherence which ultimately rounded out his point of view. In May 1946, Dr. Healy retired as Director of the Judge Baker Guidance Center, and he is now Director Emeritus of that organization.

Healy's Main Points of View

Extension of Diagnostic Service: A new human approach was initiated with Dr. Healy's directorship of the Juvenile Psychopathic Institute, thereby terminating the period of haphazard experimentation. Above all, he became aware that there was a cultural lag in the current penological thinking, in striking contrast to general twentieth century scientific progress. At the very beginning he perceived that the work would have a much wider range of usefulness than the

diagnosis of merely psychopathic individuals. Cases of quite normal offenders justify as much or even more study, if effective understanding is to be given them, for he gradually recognized that the problems of the child accounted for the "problem child." Consequently, the deliberate plan of his work was to ascertain from life portraits the basic factors of disordered social conduct. Although the juvenile court opened the way to intelligent social treatment, it was not until Healy became associated with it that better methods of analysis were instituted.

The next step was the discovery of a vantage ground from which to gain accurate information concerning the forces that drive toward delinquency. As he and his co-workers penetrated deeper into available material ranging from descriptive histories to biographical sketches, it became clear that the anecdotal nature of the literature offered almost nothing in the way of studies of delinquents which met the requirements of the developing science. The only alternative was to gain actual facts from real life through field work.

**Practical View of the Scientific and Social Values of his Studies:** Such an all-around program naturally involved considerable expense. Healy recognized that it would take time, energy, and a great deal of effort to do satisfactory

---

work, especially in certain cases where a deep-rooted mental conflict existed. Even leaving out the tremendous human side, which really should give the first impulsion toward activity in the field, it was clear that the saving to society by averting criminal careers would be immense; he also showed that findings of concrete studies at the clinic gave evidence that the handling of a delinquent should be entrusted to intelligent people who, in addition to being capable of understanding a human individual, are most conscientious in regard to public duty. Many a judge has insisted that the problem of crime must hark back to parental guardianship; though many teachers, pastors and physicians to whom the laity go so frequently for advice on mental and moral questions also fail to understand the foundations on which delinquent careers are built. Unfortunately, cases are seen too late to educate parents; and, of course, many parents, because of innate defects or other circumstances, have never been educable in this matter.

Numerous other practical angles by Healy might be cited, one of which merits special attention. In 1914 an article on "Medicopsychological Work in Courts" by Dr. Healy was published in the Illinois Medical Journal, wherein he explained the importance of social diagnosis and treatment in conjunction with medical and psychological study.
Medicopsychological work in courts is founded on the common sense necessity for accurate diagnosis and prognosis, preceding rational treatment. Misconduct may sometimes imply aberrational mental life or primary mental defect, but there are a thousand and one influences, environmental or directly physical, which may give the impulse toward delinquency. The medicopsychologist in court work who studies the cases by longitudinal as well as cross-section methods comes to see the vast intricacies of causation. Accordingly, it practically always requires the effect of environmental influences to create a criminal out of even a mental defective.

Significantly, he stressed the fact that judgments of courts should be ruled by reason, for then the science which explains the springs of conduct will play a large part in rendering more efficient the whole legal and penal procedure.

From an objective point of view, Healy's conception of the significance of delinquency is that it is one form of human behavior. This appears in great contrast to the subjective point of view which is the attitude of those who dwell only upon the negative or destructive aspects of delinquency. These individuals see delinquency merely as behavior which injures society. Consequently they are concerned with nothing more than utilizing some means to put a stop to this social injury.

Above all, throughout his works Healy emphatically conveys the opinion that the dynamic center of the whole problem of delinquency and crime will ever be the individual offender.

Because of this, he believes it is impossible to get away from the fact that no general theories of crime, however well founded, are of much service when the concrete issue—namely, the particular offense and the individual delinquent—is before those who have to deal with it practically. He points out that in order to understand the delinquent, it is necessary to have information concerning characteristic variations of physical and psychical equipment. Also, one must understand mental mechanisms and the influence of various forms of experience on different types of mankind. Thus, according to Healy, clear comprehension of the offender and his actions can be gained only from scientific and common sense appreciation of the relation of antecedent to consequent behavior in his life history.
CHAPTER III

HEALY'S METHODOLOGY

Data for Delimiting the Field of Study

In orienting his field of study, Healy perceived certain distinct possibilities and certain insurmountable barriers. Following is a list of these points in their relation to delinquency:

1. Recidivists and all that makes them what they are have the greatest significance for society because of their number and the seriousness of their offenses.

2. Statistics show that age is an etiological factor in crime. Findings were established from observable trends in young offenders, and through life histories of older delinquents, that practically all confirmed criminals begin their careers in childhood or early youth.

3. A corollary from findings set forth in the preceding statement is that the determinants of delinquent careers are the conditions of youth. These early causes may be either internal or external.

4. Such principal causal factors as effects of alcoholism, morphinism, years of social degradation, the evil results of imprisonment, and the never-to-be forgotten inflexible laws of mental habit render difficult the later application of beginnings.

5. Important knowledge of developmental conditions such as early illnesses and other untoward circumstances is rarely to be obtained except during the youth of the offender.

6. Both for positive and negative values, data about early family traits, early characteristics
and environment may be worth much for explanation of the offender's tendencies.

7. The offender, unless approached during the years of his naiveté, has developed reserve and self-containment characteristic of the adult. Because of mental conflicts and other influences, this serves as a barrier to an adequate case history.

8. The best rewards of therapeutic efforts are from working with youth, for at that age a hopeful view is taken of the situation and consequently more intelligent aid is rendered by relatives, state agencies and other organizations.

With these general considerations in mind, Healy tried to see more specifically what made the child a delinquent. Certain conclusions emerged. Of these, the most important was that behavior is a highly complex resultant of interrelated factors. Elaborate investigations gave conclusive evidence that there was no single predisposing factor leading inevitably to delinquent behavior. On the other hand, the delinquent child is generally a child handicapped not by one or two, but usually by seven or eight counts. Healy's aim, therefore, was to get a composite picture of this complex child, and to find out how he rated physically, mentally and morally, as well as what our rapidly-changing civilization was doing to make or mar him. Another puzzling block was to determine where our social, educational, and governmental machinery was at fault in training him to his utmost capacities and where it may be strengthened. Out of this morass

of data, Healy looked for a solution. How to develop adequate methods to cope with this difficult problem was a challenging task.

**Plan of Approach in Development of Working Methods**

Healy's conception of working methods started from the premise that a sound procedure for understanding and treatment of delinquency was to be found only in a well-rounded survey of the individual delinquent and the driving forces of his career. To this end it proved necessary for him to make, first, a cross-section study of the offender just as complete as practicable, including data derived from the standpoints of social, medical and psychological investigations. From such a cross-section, the diagnosis he arrived at was by thoughtful consideration, and the prognosis or predictabilities were carefully rendered. A logical sequence of this was the valuable checking on predictions as set over against results.

In the establishment of scientific principles, follow-up work was a fundamental requisite. To say that here is a given human equipment with certain powers and with such-and-such background of experience was hardly a scientific diagnosis according to Dr. Healy. One had to venture a prognosis under various possible social circumstances, and then follow up year by year to see if what was said about this given type or case needed revision as the result of changed conditions.
His experience proved many times that both self-criticism and prolonged observation were vital if any contributions to the principles of the science of delinquency were to be made. This procedure required that, as far as possible, there should be no doubt concerning either the validity or reliability of the studies in question.

Such follow-up work was often of great benefit, first of all, to the offender whose treatment was supervised and who was aware of the interest taken in him as an individual; secondly, it was valuable for the examiner and observers, who grew by the accumulation of their own data and judgments. However, the success of the investigations also depended upon certain practical considerations. For example, it was vital that the observer have the special temperamental and technical qualifications to undertake this oftentimes difficult research. It was simply a matter of common sense observation, Healy reasoned, that some persons were better equipped in spirit to bring out the best in others, and this particular trait was a prime necessity in such research work.

All along Healy stressed that an examiner—unlike a detective who, according to classic account, prefaced his interrogation with, "You know that anything you say can be used against you"—was to survey all facts and be sympathetic but should avoid being guided by any bias in his conclusions. The answer to unearth was the cause of misbehavior in a person or in his experience, and then to determine how that...
individual might be adjusted. Seldom was the investigation merely objective psychological or medical testing. The approach was similar to that of the psychoneurologist who uses both psychological and physiological inquiry in his study of patients. In the course of time it became increasingly apparent that as soon as the offender and his relatives realized there was someone to whom they could divulge their secret troubles, the case frequently underwent the most remarkable transformation from the fighting aspect observed in the court room. Healy's friendly opening interview usually began with some reasonable statement, such as: "Well, you people do seem to have a difficult affair on your hands with this boy. Let's sit down and talk it all over, study it out together--how it all began and what's going to happen. I'm at your service," and so on.

Nearly always the response was gratifying and, in addition, accounts of characteristics, environment and forebears, and even histories of offenses unknown to the authorities were often given. Through all this Healy gained new light on what to do for the offender. Occasionally it had to be made clear that information revealed by the family or the offender was not a matter of court record. A great deal that was most valuable in this work could never have been done if the attitude and obligations of a family physician were not assumed by the observer.

The examiner's personal equipment was not to be
relegated to secondary importance. Adequate efficiency required a combination of medical, clinical training, instruction in normal psychology, and actual experience in studying abnormal mental types. The studies of neurotic and borderline cases by the psychoneurologists had developed such understanding of mental mechanisms that their methods were absolutely essential in the equipment of all who dealt with certain of the most interesting and hopeful phases of delinquent tendencies.

In the new methods set forth by Healy at the Juvenile Psychopathic Institute it was found that, even under good conditions for getting at the essentials, the path of preconceived etiology and classification was beset with difficulties. The intricacies of causations appeared manifold. Pigeon-holes and categories should remain unused, Healy advised the clinical staff, if they had to damage their facts to fit them. On that basis, he resolved to classify etiologic or diagnostic facts only according to what should be found so that early he ascertained that the facts needed one classification of mental findings, another of physical conditions, another of environmental background, and so on. Snapshot diagnosis was thereafter to be avoided. No longer were individuals to be categorized as belonging to some type, without adequate study of the make-up or possibilities of that individual. Healy insisted that such antiquated methods could lead only to immature decisions and interference with
the development of a science of adjustment.

Starting without any criminal theory, he attempted to obtain all the available facts by a combination of all methods which held some promise of offering explanatory results. Also, critical analysis of data pointed out that more recent conceptions of study of the individual carried one far beyond statistics of seasons, races, head measurements, alcoholism and so on. While there were some relationships in these "general causation" inferences, such as that between alcoholism and crime, still these suggested correlations contained only half-truths. To illustrate a couple of these "general causation" inferences Healy cited the failure of the treatment of drunkards under the English Inebriate Acts. It was soon found that many of the great army of topers were such because of their feeble-mindedness, and it was this condition, rather than the ingestion of alcohol, which was fundamentally to be reckoned with. Another illustration was that sex assault and violence were notably more frequent during hot weather. This condition Healy felt might be traced to a lowering of moral inhibitions through the excess of alcoholic beverages ingested during that season.

To get back to the role of the observer, it has been mentioned that both the sciences of medicine and psychiatry were necessary background equipment, for the discovery of pathological conditions often led to differential knowledge of normal structure and conditions. This proved true where
mental structure and functions were thrown into new light during the investigatory progress of psycho-analysis or during the progress of a psychosis. For example, if physiologically the sex organs were mature or precocious while mental development was immature or arrested, this condition (along with other undesirable factors) might lead to sex delinquency.

Consequently a matter of grave consideration concerns the difference between the adult and child type of mind. Experience indicated to Healy that this difference should be counted on when giving various tests. In passing social judgment on the offender's capacity, the examiner was not to take it for granted that experience with one type of individual could safely be applied to another without modification. The same theory is true of different social conditions or classes.

Outside of features relating to a satisfactory approach in examination, the issue of the optimum moment for observation of the offender was relevant. In this matter experience again led the way. It was found that the precise time for gathering information from many sources and for securing voluntary cooperation was after the delinquent was caught and before he was sentenced. During that interim the delinquent felt himself to be a problem; his relatives felt it, and all of them welcomed a promising solution of the difficulty.
Time, although in a different sense, came in again as an element when the question of study for the fullest scientific determination of the possibilities of efficient treatment was considered. With the help of intelligent relatives, it required about an hour or so for Healy to determine the fact of the simpler forms of feeble-mindedness caused through a history of heredity or development. But when it came to digging out the very essential facts in borderline cases or in normal individuals where certain mental or environmental experiences were paramount causative factors, the length of time varied considerably. The outcome of all this was to give the observer sufficient time to do good work in order to carry out satisfactory scientific achievement. Unless the observer's approach was tactful, it was difficult to get the participants to understand and cooperate in a study of their problem. In fact, over and over the answer to an observer's inquiry was, "There's nothing the matter with me. I know what I'm doing." So a collateral explanation was offered. "We want you to go to see the doctor to find out if you are healthy," or "We want to find out what you are best fitted for." The question of vocational diagnosis is really a part of almost every young person's thoughts; so when a young man or boy was studied, one of the best ways for interview, or to get him to come at all, was to state that a study of his special abilities was to be made, which was true.
If the vocational approach was made, then tests for various abilities were given. From these the observer branched off either into the medical examination or the tests for general intelligence, or into the story of the life career and its influences. Primarily it was necessary to get interest and attention. Experience showed that even the child preferred being alone with the "doctor" when telling his troubles. Some observers (for example, Binet) suggested that a stenographer be present to take down the subject's remarks during his work with tests. Healy did not approve of this, for even when he himself took notes people looked askance, knowing that word-for-word of what they said was going down on record. Of course, for future reference it was vital to make some sort of memorandum in the presence of the subject, but this had to be a kind of individual shorthand and could not be too obvious. Immediately after the interview, full and accurate statements of facts, collateral circumstances, and accounts of results of introspection on the part of the offender had to be recorded. The formulation of case study methods by Dr. Adolf Meyer was a previous step that served the needs of the clinic. A good illustration of the value of an understanding attitude and a rational technique is given in the following report of

2. Adolf Meyer, Scheme for Examination of Cases; quoted by Healy, op. cit., p. 50.
an actual occurrence at Healy's clinic:

A young woman of 18 being studied by a certain psychologist said after several tests had been performed well, "Isn't it funny, I'm not a bit afraid with you, and I was so frightened the other day with that other lady." It then appeared that she had already been examined and the verdict given that she was defective. She went on to say, "Well, the doctor sat there first and stared at me. That made me nervous. I got so embarrassed. I guess I really did act like a fool. I don't know what I did say to them. Then two ladies came in, and once when I answered some question, I saw the lady that was talking to me look at them and laugh. After that I got mad and I did not try. I just felt like I did not want to say anything."

In the course of the Binet-Series the free association test was given, which calls for 60 words in 3 minutes. The girl gave the 60 words in about 2 minutes, and when comments on her good record were made she said, "I'm glad you think I can do something, because I gave only 25 words the other day. Oh, I know because I saw her write it down. She had the paper right there where I could see it. My probation officer told me I did wrong because I had the mind of a little child."

The story of this girl, who by Binet and other tests was found positively not to grade now as a defective, contained a great lesson for us. We saw the unfavorable bearings which suspicious scrutiny, others being present, and a visible record of tests may have on results. 3

In building up his new science Healy felt that the golden mean was to preserve the essential, such as complete accounts of results of introspection on the part of the offenders, while avoiding trivialities. He therefore maintained that the best method of recording information was

3. Healy, op. cit., p. 49.
merely a typewritten sheet, but the form of inquiry should exist in the observer's mind. However, to facilitate matters, he drew up the following items of information:

1. Family history—especially all aspects of heredity
2. Developmental history—including antenatal conditions
3. Environment
4. Mental and moral development
5. Anthropometry—including photography
6. Medical examination—particularly from a neurologic and psychiatric standpoint
7. Psychological—mental testing and psychological analysis
8. Delinquency
9. Diagnostic and prognostic summary
10. Follow-up records
11. Subsidiary records

Although he listed anthropometry in the above items, Healy lacked faith in this element as a measure for valid scientific information on conduct. He was aware that the detailed work to be done in this field with the prospects of valuable results was decidedly limited according to the best authorities. However, he considered that it would be a mistake to overlook certain anthropometric data, for example, developmental anomalies in adolescence which are sometimes

---

4. Ibid., p. 53.
of utmost importance for the estimation of the primary causes of delinquency. This consideration, in addition to other general factors involving physical functions and defects, made a comprehensive medical examination vital. The complete record covering this approach was outlined under these sections:

Family history

Personal history: special attention to convulsions, epilepsy, petit mal, sexual habits and diseases, alcoholism, excess of tobacco, drug taking, sleep

Present ailments

Examination (complete record down to the minutest detail).

Healy's Version of the Mental Basis of Delinquency

This general medical investigation, as outlined by Healy, always included study of the offender's mental status which properly belongs to the field of abnormal psychology. In order to determine the existence of any aberrant mental manifestations, Healy resorted to psychological tests and analysis of mental workings as evidenced in conversation and conduct. Consideration of the scientific exactness of results led him to demand criticism of the procedure and response, two phenomena of vital importance for the discovery

5. Ibid., p. 58.
of causative factors of the anti-social conduct. General difficulties were caused mainly by the extreme emotional conditions presented by those under study. It was therefore of the gravest necessity that the examining psychologist should be able to sympathetically sink his own personality for the needs of the inquiry. Healy believed that much worthy consideration was merited in Partridge's quotation:

The study of the emotional life is probably the most important chapter in the study of individuality, for not only are the emotions the foundation of all the practical life, but they enter into the abstract intellectual functions in various ways.

Since Healy was primarily a student of personality, whatever light the mental history of the individual threw on his present personality was highly welcomed. To him, the most serviceable aspect in understanding the delinquent was the conception of the individual as the product of conditions and forces which had actively been forming him from the earliest moment of unicellular life. The interpretations that were derived from acquaintance with the facts of ancestry, antenatal life, childhood development, illnesses and injuries, social experiences, and the vast field of mental life led to invaluable understanding of the individual and to some idea of that wonderful complex of results which is

termed personality.

Since all conduct is directly an expression of mental life, immediately back of the action is the idea, the wish, or the impulse existing as mental content. A great deal of an individual's conduct is subconscious, and a great deal of conduct which appears for the moment uncontrolled nevertheless is directly dependent on subconscious mental activity. To illustrate: The assault followed upon the mental reaction of anger to the displeasing pictures which the spoken word brought up; the temptation was followed because the idea of immediate satisfaction was not counterbalanced just then by conscious representation of consequences.

Even conduct in the pathological mental states which supervene during the varied conditions of epilepsy or insanity, Healy maintains, is just as truly the direct outcome of mental activity, although not controlled by the conscious will and frequently not in the least representable at any time in consciousness. The anti-social actions of such periods are the fault of the disordered mental mechanism which at the time precludes normal conscious mental life. Disordered though the higher mentality may then be, some parts of the mind are actively at work creating conduct.

Much was learned by Healy and his associates through giving mental tests about the individual's capacity to meet certain situations, but many sections of the emotional life were not even tapped in the process. Over and over again
case studies showed that it was just those emotional reactions toward conditions which had the greatest significance. Hoch offered the best guide to such a study. The main headings give an indication of the scope of his carefully formulated inquiry:

1. Traits relating essentially to the intelligence, the capacity for acquiring knowledge, the judgment, etc.

2. Traits relating essentially to the output of energy.

3. Traits relating essentially to the subject's estimation of himself

4. Adaptability toward the environment
   
   (a) The more striking traits which on their abnormal side interfere in a rather general and striking way with contact with the environment

   (b) Traits which in a more specific but in a less obvious way interfere with contact with the environment

   (c) Traits which show to what extent the subject lays bare to others his real self

   (d) Traits which in normal proportions are useful qualities, but in exaggerated form interfere with efficiency

   (e) Traits which show a tendency to actively shaping situations, or the reverse

   (f) Traits showing the attitude toward reality

5. Mood

6. Instinctive demands, traits which are more or less clearly related to the sexual instinct
   
   (a) Friendship

   (b) Attachment to members of the family
(c) Attitude toward the other sex
   (1) General
   (2) Specific sexual demands
   (3) General traits derived from sexual instinct or reactions against its assertions

7. General interests
8. Pathological traits.7

**The Psychogram**

The immediate rational background of Healy's psychological method was that prior to making a selection or undertaking the production of any tests, the definition of the problem was formulated carefully and critically. No findings were to be passed upon lightly as indicating discovery of the causative agents of delinquency, but with the realization of the intimate relationship between mind and deed, his investigation of causes turned to those phenomena which lie obviously linked together. The construction of a psychogram of the offender, namely, a studied estimate of his mental qualities and conditions including both the strengths and weaknesses, was therefore of prime importance. From the start it was necessary to select studies of such mental structure and function as offered the greatest return in the way of direct explanation of anti-social conduct. With this

---

close reasoning in mind, Healy sought evidence from the following formulated plan of psychological inquiry:

1. What is the subject's mental ability, independent, so far as ascertainable, of the results of formal education? This should be estimated in terms of strength or weakness of:
   
   (a) The subject's general ability or general intelligence (if such a thing as general intelligence there be)

   (b) The subject's special abilities--selecting for investigation here those abilities or functions which, since we are dealing with social conduct, seem most likely to be related to social action, success, or failure.

2. What has been the result of formal education, interpreted in the light of its conditions and extent?

3. Does the individual suffer from aberrational mental functionings, whether borderline or fully-developed psychoses?

4. What are the individual's preponderating mental interests, as stated in terms of mental content, imagery, ideation and the like?

5. Has the individual suffered earlier experiences, mental or environmental, which have, through the arousal of inner conflicts, complexes, inhibitions or resistances, interfered with the satisfactory, smooth and healthy working of mental life? This is peculiarly, in modern terminology, a study of mental mechanisms.  

Under the foregoing headings the field of inquiry was henceforth plotted; answers to these propounded problems, which formed the psychogram, gave the first psychological impressions to the observational work done.

In spite of all the effort put forth, Healy's initial investigation showed the important fact that no set of mental tests existed which was at all adequate to give the desired information about capabilities of delinquents. At the clinic it was soon found that offenders range in mental capacity all the way from imbeciles to those who seem to excel the ordinary person of their age in ability and information. Within well-defined limits, in tests for levels of general intelligence Healy found the so-called Measuring Scale of Intelligence by Binet of great value. The gist of the method is its application of the idea that mental development, like bodily growth, shows distinct accretions from year to year. By application of this system to older mental defectives, they were able to be gauged by the age standards of young children and spoken of in terms of so many years of mental growth or of retardation.

Healy asserts that for children under ten and for defectives who range as low as ten, there was no doubt that this scheme of gauging intelligence by age levels was of the utmost practical usefulness: Also it was one of the greatest contributions made to the science of psychography. To be able to say to the judge, or to anyone with the power to take action, that the offender of twenty-three years chronologically is mentally an individual of ten years, puts the

---

whole matter in an entirely new light. However, Healy points out, this kind of psychogram tells little about the many other conditions of mental structure and function which should be known. Although objective standardized tests were used extensively, he always insisted that mental diagnosis and even mental testing for practical purposes involve much more than establishing a mental age or quotient.

Testing the results of formal education had a certain amount of value, for there was logic in the notion that if a child had been going to school but failed to learn and advance with his class, it might be an indication of personal defect. However, in the light of various objectionable possibilities ranging all the way from poor teaching to other hidden troubles, Healy asked for an indulgent attitude in this matter. While the use of language is of course the most important of all human activities in the development of civilization, yet there are many other abilities which had to be studied in their relation to needs and opportunities that the social order presents. Healy's case histories present in strong light and shade the variations in language ability; also they point out the curious misinterpretations and unfortunate results which developed from not understanding the whole mental make-up of the offender.

In every test offered at the clinic the powers of memory and recall, conscious and subconscious, were involved. The
task is one that everyone is called on to do in practical life without knowledge of the component parts of the mental process; for example, the so-called "Aussage" or Testimony Test—the ability of the observer to recall, immediately or at a future time, a scene or action that has been presented. All through the process of testing, part of the examiner's report was also observation of the ability of the subject to attend to the given assignment.

At the laboratory it was considered worthwhile to test motor coordinating abilities in each individual, for when disturbances were found they were important from neurological, vocational, and educational standpoints. Associative processes, too, could not be overlooked in giving tests, since all the separate items of an individual's total mental content are connected in a stream of thought by links of association. Several tests on ability to profit by experience, involving the manipulation of a task, Healy felt concerned particularly recidivists. This ability to profit by experience in social situations implied not only learning powers but also the elements of attention, memory, appreciation, and what not which make it possible consciously to represent a situation in the light of past related ideas and experiences.

Another group of tests showed the ability of a delinquent to represent in terms of various imageries a given situation to one's self, to revolve it over in his mind and see its component parts. A social situation involving moral
sanctions was orally presented and an analysis was required. Some curious results were observed from many offenders who were not feebleminded.

Still another trait worthy of note is foresight. In this connection Healy voiced Thorndike's words:

If weakness in any one particular ability were, a priori, to be selected as most likely to stand often at the root of criminalism, it would be the lack of foresight.10

In the laboratory it appeared very difficult for Healy and his associates to check with accuracy the powers of foresight; however, this trait has much to do with planfulness, which the clinical staff was able to test partially in various ways.

A review of Healy's works will show that in building up a norm for his new science, he measured and observed a great many behavior patterns, but these are too numerous to be mentioned in this thesis. However, since the layman commonly either infers or implies that misconduct results from "lack of will power," this trait cannot very well be eliminated. In this respect Healy explains: "No test has been devised that has yet received sufficient trial of its validity for discernment of types and comparative strength of will." 11

Notwithstanding this assertion, he cites what he terms a most commendable effort in this direction in the simple but

ingenious test of Guy C. Fernald. In this test there is an attempt to measure will power through making observations of conscious, long-continued muscular effort, namely, standing easily on the toes. The important distinction which Fernald makes between this and erographic work is that the latter is primarily a measure of fatigue, the muscles giving out long before the will does; while in his test the strength of the muscles involved is so great that the discontinuance of the task is always brought about by the breaking down of the will. This Achievement Capacity Test, as it is called, in Healy's opinion deserves much trial in suitable laboratories such as in reformatories, in its original form or in modification.

In all tests when ability was not shown, in order to be fair Healy had to be certain that effort was made for, after all, scientific measurement depended upon the personal interest and good intention of the subject. The many variabilities possible in the performance of an individual as seen, for instance, in court work, with all the complications of life bearing on the given result, as well as the variations depending on social opportunities, made the entire problem of testing a very difficult matter. Healy enumerates some of the disturbing conditions which produce a performance in the test leading to error in diagnosis of ability. These are:

1. The various peculiar mental states supervening in cases which later proved to be epileptic.

2. The irregular mental states of hystericals.

3. Choreic mental conditions, especially when the symptoms are confined, as they occasionally are, to the psychical sphere.

4. Any of the tremendously varying mental conditions seen in mild manic-depressive conditions.

5. Deliberate deception (very rare).

6. Sheer laziness, as occasionally seen.

7. Complete recalcitrancy, sometimes combined with deception.

8. Temporary dullness on account of excessive sex practices.

9. Bashfulness or other inhibitory emotions.

10. Environmental conditions, for example effect of a warm afternoon or a close room.

11. Fatigue on the part of the examinee.

12. Fatigue on the part of the examiner.

13. Dullness from narcotics or aberration from stimulants.

14. Dullness from general physical conditions such as anemia, exhaustion from recent illness, over-exercise.

15. The effects of special sensory defects; these are too obvious to need detailed mention.

16. Emotional conditions resulting from incrimination, from being charged--whether rightly or not--with offense.\[13\]

From the foregoing it is obvious that under the

circumstances interpretation of answers, types and times of performance could only be made, at the clinic, within wide limits.

Before proceeding, it is well to remember that Healy considers a test in itself meaningless. According to him, an offender would not offend if he lived in a social vacuum. All mental classification, therefore, is social classification; even the insane man is first noticed for not doing as others do. Consequently Healy kept constantly in view the developing of a fair psychogram of the individual for the purpose of actually doing something for him. To facilitate matters he worked out a list whereby cases were classified, rather roughly, in a scale of mental ability and peculiarity. This was based on an accumulation of data from 250 offenders. These results of psychological tests were sorted by the method of allowing them to fall into classes. The standard of norms was formulated on the basis of the rough averages of the prevailing social situation.

Time rendered some modifications necessary; the scheme of classification therefore stands as follows:

A. Considerably above ordinary in ability and information— the latter estimated with reference to age and social advantages

B. Ordinary in ability and information— the latter estimated with reference to age and social advantages
C. Native ability fair and formal educational advantages fair or good, but very poorly informed

D. Native ability fair and formal educational advantages fair or good

E. Native ability distinctly good, but formal educational advantages poor

F. Native ability fair and formal educational advantages poor

G. Native ability poor and formal educational advantages poor

H. Native ability poor and formal educational advantages poor or fair

I. Dull, perhaps from ascertained physical causes, including some cases of epilepsy

J. Subnormal mentality—considerably more educability than the feebleminded

K. Moron

L. Imbecile

M. Psychoses.

Healy calls attention to Class B which consisted of individuals who did not make an exceptionally good or bad performance and who had been able to keep up to their school grade, if they had the social opportunity to do so. In this respect he remarks that some individuals grouped in this class, if gauged by certain exceptional family and social standards, might be considered almost subnormal individuals. By way of illustration he cites the case of a boy who was up to the average in his group, but when measured by the usual

mental performances of his exceedingly brilliant family he was designated a subnormal individual. According to Healy, the study of any person by a mere process of classification and registering results on tests, without reference to the relationship of abilities or disabilities to environment, lacks in the common-sense elements which must be introduced into any investigation.

One need not have a scientific mind to realize that in the routine of everyday living many traits naturally are utilized. Much space might be occupied by naming and discussing the various psychological and physical tests which were given at the clinics Healy directed and supervised. In his book, The Individual Delinquent, he explains and covers the different activities and their workings in some detail; the issue is both weighty and lengthy, hence quite beyond the scope of this chapter. This survey on tests, though brief, nevertheless may convey to readers an understanding of the clinical methods Healy applied to offenders in the hope of determining the contributory causal factors of juvenile delinquency.
CHAPTER IV

HEALY'S ANALYSIS OF THE CAUSATIVE FACTORS IN JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Nearly everyone who studies juvenile delinquency scientifically accepts the fact, these days, that the contributory factors which make a child delinquent are numerous and varied. In 1915 when Healy wrote *The Individual Delinquent*, an average of three and one-half causative factors were found to be operative in the hundreds of cases studied. Now when so much more is known about the extensive role of the emotional life, Healy believes a similar study would undoubtedly reveal many more strands interwoven in the fabric that forms the background of behavior. In spite of his experience with thousands of youngsters for almost forty years, he still discovered new combinations of details in individual make-up and life history. This made the meaning of all delinquency a challenge to him. Often it seemed an incomprehensible mystery to be solved only by finding clues, much as in a detective story.

As a matter of fact, that was the approach Healy and his co-workers often used with delinquents themselves in trying to understand them and have them understand themselves. When

an offender said, as he sometimes did, "I don't know what makes me do it," it was logical to respond, "Then let's see if we can work it out together, like a detective story."

Human behavior is never a simple matter to analyze. It cannot be thrown on a screen or separated into its component parts in test tubes. When a child's conduct is adjudged "anti-social," his behavior differs from acceptable behavior chiefly in the group's definition of the situation. In the final analysis, every delinquent act involves a situation and a social definition of that situation, even though the situation itself often is beyond the offender's control. Several times in the foregoing pages either the inference or the statement has been made that it would be a "particularistic fallacy" to ascribe delinquency to a single predominating factor such as an atavistic type, mental conflicts, feeblemindedness, the product of a broken home, bad companions, and various other items of relative weight.

Although the preceding chapter dealt with methods, they cannot very well be divorced from causes; the topic of this chapter, if the material presented is to be adequately understood. In view of this, a simple preview of Healy's discussion on the intricacies of psychoanalysis in its application to misconduct will suffice here. From information based upon a voluminous amount of literature, he learned that the whole structure of the psychoanalytic method rests upon one foundation—that the explanation of all human
behavior tendencies must be sought in the mental and environ-
mental experiences of early life. First and foremost, it in-
vokes retracing the steps which progressively formed the
whole character.

According to the subject matter in The Individual De-
linquent, the term psychogenesis is used frequently in dis-
cussion of tendencies traceable by psychoanalytic methods.
This expression implies that the given tendency spoken of as
originating in the mind sprang from reactions which were es-
sentially mental activities. The important facts of psycho-
genesis are to be learned only through knowledge of the
dynamics, the laws of mental activity, which condition con-
scious and subconscious reactions. The exponents of psycho-
analysis alleged that original reaction to experience was
determined partly by structural conditions derived from he-
reditary or congenital sources. A brief exposition on
psychical genetics referred to as plausible by Healy follows:

From early environmental experiences, re-
acting on the original organism, arose a reactive
tendency, a character. From now on all future
behavior reactions must have a threefold parent-
age—the new experience opportunity Healy called
it in thinking of his offenders, the innate func-
tional potentialities of the individual, and the
reactive tendency or character already formed.
Which one of these mainly engenders any given act
of conduct it may be very hard to determine, but
two things are sure—innate conditions are un-
alterable, and new experiences are always crowd-
ing in. Concerning the reactive tendency, that
is the business of psychoanalysis. 2

2. Ibid., p. 117.
The principal method of psychoanalysis is induced introspection. The main discoveries revealed by the use of this method had considerable meaning for Healy. He found that much which is formative of character does not appear above the surface. Active interactions of mental elements may be all unconsciously the motive forces of conduct. Experiences such as come to the individual with a great deal of emotional context are likely to cause the greatest amount of reaction. Experiences, either inner or outer, related to sex life show the strongest and subtlest reactions. Mental shock, psychic trauma, is produced frequently by experiences unknown to relatives. Mostly these traumata are experienced in young childhood. At ages so early as to be unsuspected, mental conflicts occur on the basis of either outward experiences, physical sensations, or pure ideation; these conflicts may be entirely repressed, but they do not thereby lose their force and significance for the formation of character tendencies. Repressing that which naturally needs expression is followed by reaction that may vent itself mostly in the individual or show deviations of conduct. The cause of habit formations of many sorts is deeper than appears on the surface. Many of them are vicarious expressions of hidden and even unconscious impulses to action.3

3. Ibid., pp. 119-120.
While the preceding general points indicate the scope of the findings of psychoanalysis, Healy adds that early mental experiences and strange, altogether hidden mental conflicts have arranged the destinies of many a chronic offender.

In *Roots of Crime*, Alexander's and Healy's etiological study of delinquency and crime, the two doctors made careful investigations of a limited number of careers. By the method of psychoanalysis, they retraced actual steps of these offenders, and they considered their character formation in the light of their life histories while pointing out the result of a causally-connected chain of psychological processes. What is of even greater significance is the fact that these doctors demonstrated that those items universally regarded as major determinants of crime (such as slums, poverty, and unfavorable environmental conditions) are factors which become effective only in a special setting and in combination with the reactive tendencies determined by the personality characteristics, congenital or acquired, of the offender. Besides these tangible factors, less obvious ones such as ideological trends are of equal importance. These trends determine and individual's evaluations and ideals. For

---


example, if material success is considered the highest value of a civilization, all members of such a society who accept this attitude will be inclined to sacrifice certain other values, such as respect for law, if law interferes with their ideology.

**Healy's Case Studies**

In projecting their research, Alexander and Healy agreed to take some exceedingly difficult cases. Some of them were treated for as long as eight or more years at the Judge Baker Guidance Center and were known as being failures under police and court procedures, probations, and the regime of correctional institutions. Results of the analysts' exploration are summed up in Healy's words:

> Nothing can better illustrate the complexity of the causes leading to criminality than cases where continued criminal behavior appears to be entirely irrational and cannot be explained by the motives which ordinarily induce individuals to violate the law.

One conclusion from all this is that science still has not provided scientific techniques for determining motivations. The futility of legal and penal treatment where deep psychological issues are not uncovered is illustrated in this brief history:


7. Ibid., pp. 8-12.
An intelligent, mannerly boy of sixteen who had been held in jail for three weeks on account of stealing a suit-case which he had pawned was seen for a day at the clinic. In court he first lied about his age, but admitted that he was on parole from a correctional institution. He told the judge of the juvenile court that two correctional institutions had failed to cure him, and that he needed more severe punishment and desired to go to the reformatory for adults, whereupon his wish was granted.

According to his history, which was verified, he began to steal when he was eight years old. When he was ten he told his father there was something, he could not tell what, that drove him to steal. Before he was even seen at the clinic he had a record of four or five commitments to correctional institutions. Everywhere he made friends easily and was found well-behaved and industrious. Confronted with his delinquencies, he stated that his behavior was a puzzle to himself. This boy came from a fairly well-to-do family where he had all normal advantages. Apparently there were no peculiarities in his upbringing and, on the surface, his home and school satisfactions seem to have equalled the rest of his family, four nondelinquent siblings.

Paroled from the reformatory, he speedily got into more trouble but then he settled down again for a year or so, living at home and being advanced in a certain business concern on account of his good working qualities. After his
period of doing well, he married and was very proud of his young wife. Soon after his first child was born, and though he was successful in business, his unreasonable delinquencies began again. In fact, even the birth of his third child did not deter him from continuing this misbehavior. He stole from his father and other people, and repeatedly took automobiles, traveling long distances in them. He entered the Navy under an alias and soon deserted. In the course of time he was arrested again for theft and placed in a disciplinary institution from which he escaped, only to get into more trouble. During this interim he wrote affectionate letters to his wife begging for forgiveness and, at the same time, explaining that he acted under some strange impulse which he could not understand. His father and his wife's parents spent a great deal of time and money getting him out of various difficulties and trying to reform him.

Then he began more serious affairs. He was arrested in a western state for stealing cheap jewelry from apartments. This time he was given a long sentence in the penitentiary, where he was always a hard-working inmate. On the occasion of some catastrophe, he proved himself a hero and as a consequence was permitted to work on the outside until his pardon, which was forthcoming, arrived. His wife went to be near him. A few days before the pardon was to become effective and after he had joyously sent word to his parents, he ran away from his wife and pardon. This episode broke up a new business
arranged especially for him. A series of burglaries traced to him in another state resulted in a still longer sentence. A psychiatrist who studied him felt, as had one who saw him earlier in the other penitentiary, that here was a case of a man not of the usual criminal type, but rather one who seemed criminal through compulsion. Unfortunately, all attempts to have him placed where he could be studied by psychoanalytic methods were frustrated.

While working under atrocious conditions in a road gang, he escaped and established himself in an eastern city under an alias. With a reputable woman who was earning well he contracted a bigamous marriage; she knew him only under his alias and thought him well-to-do. He entered into other crimes, taking automobiles and engaging in bizarre thefts. Also he did such foolish things as having a collar with pendants of gold pieces made for the lady's dog. Dozens of stolen clocks adorned their apartment. Unknown to the woman as a criminal and for months undetected by the police, he finally was caught in another state where he had committed several burglaries.

Careful examinations of this offender by psychiatrists and neurologists failed to disclose either a mental deviation or a disease of the central nervous system. Besides, he always abstained from alcohol and had no deleterious habits. This case is an extreme example of the dynamic power of irrational and unconscious motives which often have a
permanent determining influence on behavior.

The behavior activities of another offender, whose case is very informative because of the lengthy follow-up procedure, are illustrated in "the victim of loyalty." At the age of eight, Richard Vorland was brought by his mother, who lived in an industrial center, to the Judge Baker Guidance Center. Richard's father, although a member of a Southern family of good standing and a graduate of a Southern college, was a periodic alcoholic, disagreeable when drunk, and at all times took very little interest in his family. Richard, the youngest of five children, was brought North at the age of six after his father died in an accident. His mother said that in the year before her husband died he frequently accused her of immorality, and the children had heard this. Richard was much concerned about these inner thoughts, and at the earlier interviews demonstrated his practice of crossing his fingers in order to prevent ideas on sex subjects from coming up in his mind--a curious application of a children's game of denial. Several times he told the clinicians that he often felt queer because of the words he had learned. His actual statement was, "Those things make me feel rotten and queer. It makes me think of getting into places and taking things, and then sometimes I dream at night of breaking in." He also went on to say

that he wished he could dream about playing ball.

Richard Vorland was twenty years old when his analysis was begun in the prison to which he had been transferred from a jail in another part of the state. The analysis lasted seven months; five months of this time he was in jail and the last two months he was free. He was a medium-sized, slender fellow, quiet and polite, and usually spoke in a low, rather indistinct voice.

In sketching his life he explained that his brother Wilbur, the one chronologically nearest him, and he were inseparable and almost entirely uncontrolled. At the age of seven he committed his first theft, stealing a hundred dollars from a factory office to buy candy, with his brother and the latter's close companion. After their home was broken up and from the time he was taken by the child-placing agency, his outstanding memories were all of work and work, which he hated. He was transferred from one foster home to another, and once during the Christmas holidays he worked for the school janitor the entire period. He stole from the school. When he was twelve years old, he tried to assault a girl. At times while going to school, he worked on the farms of the different foster homes. Once in a rage he attacked his foster father with a pitchfork.

At seventeen he obtained his first job, with a swindling brokerage firm, and earned ten dollars per week. At the same time he stole twenty dollars or more weekly from this.
company. After five or six months' employment, he signed up on a fruit boat but, due to a mishap, he did not go. At various times he worked either as a bell-hop or as an elevator boy in different hotels, remaining at one hotel for a year.

During the analysis he completed this history while telling of his delinquencies with innumerable data of minor and major thefts which had never come to the attention of the police, such as breaking into stores, entering office buildings, opening draws with great technical skill, which apparently he had learned from his brother. He showed some pleasure in telling about his criminal accomplishments and about certain tricks played on the police. At all times he called attention to his bravery, skill and cynicism, but always insisted that his brother was the smarter one. In fact, if his brother would go straight, maybe he would too. However, he intimated in a cocky manner that if it were not for his mother, he would become an expert at stealing; consideration for her inhibited him from taking chances. Above all, he conveyed the idea that what he primarily disliked was accepting help and being under obligation. For hours he spoke of new criminal plans he hoped to put into effect after his release. Emphatically he stated he had no conscience. The one and only thing he resented was betrayal, for he himself was loyal to his friends. Richard gave the impression of boasting of his toughness, denying any
sentimentality and decency.

In the course of the third interview while he related one of his dreams, the analysts obtained deeper insight into his central problem which showed that Richard was suffering from a pronounced neurotic conflict. Another dream pointed out clearly that behind the surface attitude of emphasized courage there was a deep uncertainty linked with the feeling of sexual inadequacy. Still another dream, relating to the joy of shooting, showed compensatory reactions for his deeply-rooted inferiority feelings in relation to his brother. They also served as a vent for the patient's aggressive tendencies. After that the most traumatic episode of his life was disclosed. Both he and his brother had several fights with a boarder when they were living at home. He showed three false teeth which were replaced because the boarder, who was over-friendly with his mother, kicked out his original ones. Recalling this episode, he showed extreme emotion and expostulated, "Why doesn't the boarder marry her?" The patient went on to say that, but for his mother's love for this man, he would have killed him.

As an epilogue to this account, Roots of Crime relates that Richard was again put in prison. The police searched his home and found stolen money belonging to his brother. On the day Wilbur committed the crime for which the house was searched, Richard was in bed all day with a broken jaw suffered during a fight with a taxicab driver, but he thought
he could help his brother by making a false confession. In a later interview when Richard was again out of prison, he told the analyst he would be happy to find a job on a farm, but such a job was not readily found. A few months later the analysts were informed that Richard and his brother Wilbur had gone to Ohio. There one or both of them robbed a jewelry store. Because of Richard’s state of mind after he finished his analysis, Alexander and Healy doubted that their patient had actively participated in the crime. Yet, as had often happened before, Richard was the one who was arrested when, because of his loyalty to Wilbur, he gave him some help, even if indirectly. In a raid on the room of Wilbur’s girl some of the stolen jewelry was discovered. Richard was sentenced in Ohio. In the meantime Wilbur also was arrested in another state and sentenced to a short term, but for another crime. When Roots of Crime was written, the eldest of all the brothers was already serving a long sentence.

In summarizing the case, the analysts offer the following information. Richard was a criminal, externally similar to thousands and thousands of others. The investigation showed that his stealing was determined chiefly by irrational, emotional and unconscious motives rather than by the rational motive of gain. Stealing was a reaction to a strong sense of inferiority, whereby he felt brave and tough. This sense of inferiority was itself a reaction to a strong, dependent, receptive wish expressed by a desire to manipulate
property without working. In Richard's receptive attitude the analysts differentiated between two sources; (1) a strong parasitic (oral receptive) attachment to the mother, and (2) an intense admiration and leaning on the stronger brother. This was built up on a distinctively passive female attitude in the unconscious.

Stealing was a compensatory reaction toward the guilt feelings he had for his brother. By exposing himself to danger and a possible jail sentence, his guilt feelings were relieved. Another version formulated by Alexander and Healy was that stealing was a spite reaction toward his mother, having this unconscious significance. "If you give your affection to the boarder instead of me, then I'll disgrace you; also, I will manipulate by force and robbery whatever I need unless you give me both your love and material support."

Finally the two doctors saw the paradoxical motive expressed in many of his dreams. It was that the road to jail, where he could indulge in a carefree vegetative existence, gratifying his infantile, parasitic wishes, was by means of criminal behavior.

The analysts were also convinced that from his eighth year on Richard was undernourished in his receptive demands. His oral regression had its origin in the lack of those sublimated gratifications which boys enjoy under normal conditions in family life. The lack of real interest and love on the part of the environment threw him back to the original
claims of being fed by the mother. The atmosphere of his new environment was hardly the place to display any emotion which even remotely resembled sentimentality. Nothing had to be more concealed in this environment than softness and thirst for dependence. As a result of the instinctive conflict between pregenital receptive and passive female longings on the one hand and masculine aggressiveness on the other, Richard displayed exaggerated toughness, independence, courage, generosity and loyalty to his comrades. To the two doctors, the most fascinating element in the analytical investigation was to detect in the depths of this young bandit's personality the desperate little-boy crying for his mother and seeking help from his older and stronger brother.

In comparing the analytic material with the early records, Alexander and Healy felt certain that, though the foster homes were carefully selected and probably the best available, they did not substitute emotionally for the home which was broken up after the father's death. Richard often spoke of how he was "kicked around" as a youngster from one home to another. He was continued in foster-home placements until he was sixteen, and educated to the level of the second year of high school. On account of his early retardation in school, a special tutor was employed at times and paid by the child-welfare agency. This procedure enabled him to catch up in school work, and afterwards for
the most part he received good grades. At the age of eleven Richard's I.Q. was 109; at fourteen it had increased to 124. He then rated high in language and apperceptive abilities as well as in tests for mechanical ability.

From the first, at the foster homes it was notable that Richard's bad temper, surly behavior, and stealing greatly increased or began again after visits to or from his mother or after having seen his brother. One of his worst periods occurred after his mother came to see him with her man friend. With intermissions Richard's dishonest proclivities were shown in almost every foster home. In spite of his good appetite at all meals and a normal supply of sweet foods and candy, he spent much of the stolen money for candy, often generously giving some of it away. The record showed a striking variability in Richard's emotional attitudes and conduct trends. At times he was unquestionably happy and entered into family life and other social activities with normal zest. At other times, without any obvious cause, he appeared desperately unhappy, tense, miserable, and pitiful to the extent that it almost amounted to a depression. The possibility of a developing psychosis was even entertained. Earlier when faced with his misdeeds, his features would become drawn and white. It was only later that he grew belligerently callous and greatly embittered about the world. By degrees he became more sophisticated and sarcastic, and spoke about the influence of criminal
These case histories from *Roots of Crime* serve to reinforce Healy's original point of view that there are certain offenders, not classifiable in the usual psychiatric pigeon-holes though they may be neurotic personalities, who are most certainly driven to engage in anti-social conduct by the dynamics of their unconscious mental lives.

**Views of Healy and Bronner on Common Denominators of Delinquency**

In spite of the complexities which have been presented, there are certain general considerations leading to delinquent behavior which Healy and Bronner found worth keeping in mind:

1. Behavior, whether socially acceptable or unacceptable, is the product of the interplay of the following: (a) a given personality made up, as it always is, of many diverse components; (b) the influence of earlier and current experiences, particularly those connected with family relationships, school life, companionships, the church, and other agencies; and (c) the larger social scene—by this they mean the activities and standards characteristic of our American culture.

2. Though in outward appearance the delinquent may be carefree, he most frequently turns out to be somehow unsatisfied with himself or with his life situation. The more serious cases very generally show either strong dissatisfaction about something or well-defined unhappiness.

3. Though the delinquent himself may be

unaware of the true significance of his delinquent act, still it is meaningful to him. It is the expression of some urge within him; he is trying to meet some personal need.

4. Every human being is born with certain drives, out of which needs evolve; if these are not met in wholesome ways, they may find outlets in unsocial activities.

5. Research shows that the great majority of delinquents are normal individuals, though they are often more active and restless than the average run of nondelinquents.10

Besides these general orienting data, it is pertinent to consider at this point, a major topic, the first primary group in its relation to the genetics of delinquency.

Healy's Criteria on Family Relationships
As More or Less Directly Causative of Delinquency

More pages have been written on the family as a factor in delinquency than on any other single influence. This is appropriate because of the vital significance of the family as "the cradle of the personality." The most formative influences upon the developing child originate within the family. It is in this midst that the basic reaction patterns of thinking and feeling, the norms and values that assert a durable, persisting influence upon the individual's subsequent life history are established. To whom, then, should

responsibility for delinquent behavior and delinquent attitudes be assigned? In one way or another the parents have been unequal to the task. Because of certain inadequacies (poor relationships among the various members of the family circle, methods of training and discipline, standards and interests of the home) a confusion and subsequent distortion have affected the soil in which the growth of personality and character are rooted. Of prime importance, agree Healy and Bronner, are the motivations to delinquency which spring from these sources. Often they are difficult to discover and to evaluate properly. Usually the child excludes from his conscious thinking elements especially painful.

Before launching into further discussion on the subject, Healy's opinion, already given, must again be emphasized. First in importance, even directly following birth, is the love life. The feeling of being loved gives a sense of security that forms a bulwark against the manifold difficulties of life. As a matter of fact, Healy and Bronner declare that the failure of parents to provide adequate emotional security for their children is even more important than economic and social advantage. The child may commit delinquencies by way of retaliation when parents are unduly


critical, when they taunt children with their imperfections, when they reject a child and "wish he had never been born." In order to satisfy the strivings of his thwarted ego, he may do something to attract attention. Perhaps his behavior is an escape mechanism and a release from boredom. Many may believe that all parents, especially mothers, love their children, but Healy and Bronner refute this generally accepted opinion. They contend that students of "problem" children know from experience that an astonishingly large number were unwanted and unloved. Often unconsciously the rejected child turns on society for revenge. Frustrated in his desire to receive and give affection, he may become bitter, mean, hostile and aggressive. In such cases the child himself does not understand the source of his misbehavior. The oft-proclaimed "practical" issues involved in dealing with the delinquent naturally lead to attempts to explain such behavior in the simplest possible terms.

Speaking of easy explanations, Healy and Bronner question what one can say when confronted by this fairly typical set of facts: Stanley, who is a product of a miserable neighborhood where gangs abound, steals, plays truant and is defiant. His mother scrubs office buildings; his father, who was once better off, now drinks. Surely Stanley's

delinquency is easily understood. Or is it? Under exactly the same circumstances Stanley's brother, Joe, who is close in age, is a model of virtue. On this basis Healy and Bronner felt their first judgment had been superficial. The crux of the difference between the boys lay in their relationships with their father. Even when Stanley, the elder, was a baby his father showed an extreme jealousy of him. This dislike exhibited itself in a great many ways such as in harshness, punishment even for trifles, so that before long the boy reacted with equally hostile feelings. He neither loved nor respected his father. Perhaps he was aggressive and self-willed by nature as well as by conditioning. Whatever the source, he expressed his resentment by active delinquency. He developed a "chip on the shoulder" attitude and displayed it to all but the gang from whom he obtained recognition. Joe, on the other hand, had a different start in life. His father centered affection, accepted and approved of him and allotted to him the favored place in the household.

While an affectionate relationship with a good parent has played a major role in the destiny of many, says Healy, unfortunately when a loved parent is himself a misdoer, such an affectional response sometimes tends to produce misbehavior.

15. Loc. cit.
The growth of the child's ethical concepts may then unconsciously be stifled in the effort to prevent criticism from destroying love. During the course of their research Healy and Bronner dealt with offenders whose misbehavior was the direct result of definitely aligning themselves with the attitudes of the parent toward some form of unsocial behavior. Others, because of identification, followed in the footsteps of fathers who were either gamblers, racketeers or just generally dishonest. The same principles applied to some girls who lived with affectionate but immoral mothers and who later became sex offenders themselves.

Distinct from the above but still related are the effects of parental management and control. No child can renounce without a struggle what he instinctively wants to do, for this inevitably involves frustration. Even a baby has to be trained in socially-acceptable patterns of behavior. The process of learning to control instinctive demands may be tolerable or intolerable, depending on the emotional concomitants of the process. This viewpoint may well imply a question on what constitutes emotional concomitants. In their article on this topic in the Yearbook, the authors explain that the kind of upbringing which is unreasonable and inconsistent leads to resentment, hostility, and unwillingness to conform. This resentment, first directed by means of rebellion

16. _Loc. cit._
against the law of the home, carries over at times either against school authority or the dictates of society, sometimes both. Their article states that, considering the multitude of sins committed against children, it is not surprising that many are mischievous, defiant or definitely delinquent. Confusion results when a child is cuffed and yanked for indulging in quite normal play; screamed at and scolded on one day and ignored or even smiled at on another for identical behavior; treated with violent abuse or with too easy indulgence; and generally subjected to various other contrary patterns of behavior. Often in terms of acute dissatisfaction the youngsters explained that they turned to delinquency because, for the moment, it was an exciting and satisfying activity. "Nothing to do at home." "No fun there." "No things of my own." "I can't make things there." "Only sissy games." "She won't let me have my friends in." These unfavorable conditions were evident not only in many families who live on the wrong side of the tracks, and whose meager incomes necessitate cramped and bare quarters, but they are found also among those in comfortable circumstances. They denote unintelligent upbringing and lack of concern for the child's needs.

Certain situations produce deep emotional upsets. According to Healy and Bronner, the overloved or overprotected

17. Loc. cit.
child may also be a problem, remain immature, poorly adjusted socially and neurotic, but on the whole he is less likely to be delinquent. On the other hand, the most difficult delinquents are those who, inadvertently or from outside sources, discovered that they had been either adopted or illegitimate. Healy and Bronner knew adolescents whose world crumbled at this information. As a result they readily resorted to anti-social conduct, vowing that since they had been so lied to all their lives, they would trust no one in the future; they would fend for themselves and do as they pleased. One boy after he learned that the kind people who had brought him up were not his parents, ran away, stoned the house, slept in a stable, burglarized other places and boldly announced in court that he would never live in his former home or in any other home.

Numerous other intrafamilial studies of dominant etiologies among delinquents stress the relationship between the internal and external, for example, the emotional distress suffered by the child as a result of his subjective response to circumstances in his immediate primary groups. This phase is particularly exemplified in one of the studies of their composite works. In this book the authors expounded
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a theory of delinquent behavior based upon the most scientific casework investigation. The sample selected, 153 delinquents, constituted an excellent group for the purpose of their research since it represented offenders in three cities--Boston, New Haven, and Detroit. These individuals were studied clinically by psychiatrists, psychologists, and psychiatric case workers who pursued their analyses far more intensively and extensively than is customary in ordinary studies of causation. All the deviants had nondelinquent siblings who made up the control group. Scientifically this was a feasible method of approach for backgrounds, in a sense, were similar. New light could thus be gained more readily on the conduct motives in offenders when they were compared with the nondelinquents.

In the main Healy and Bronner hoped to discover why two or more children in the same family behaved so differently. Contrary to their usual procedure of working solely with the offender, they proposed to learn what could be accomplished by considering the family as a unit. This point of departure was based on present scientific experience. Attempts at modification of behavior of biological units in other fields proceed from the standpoint that tendencies cannot be altered without taking into account environmental influences and the prior conditionings of experiences. Since, as has already been stated, the most immediate, the most influential and the
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most conditioning environment of young human beings is that of family life and its relationships, is it sensible, question the investigators, to expect that behavior tendencies can be reconstructed without modifying the family interrelationships that must be actively playing a part in creating the experiences and attitudes which left the young individual susceptible to the growth of delinquent ideation and behavior? The research attributed an important significance to the deleterious social factors that appeared in many of the cases. In only twenty-two instances of their 153 delinquents did they find the child living in a favorable situation based on the following criteria:

1. Reasonably good home conditions from the standpoint of stability, living conditions, normal recreational opportunities.

2. Reasonably good family attitudes from the standpoint of avoidance of friction, rational treatment of children, and being law abiding.

3. Neighborhood not distinctly bad from the standpoint of inimical influences.  

Two of these categories of influence were favorable in only nineteen additional cases. When the family and neighborhood conditions were favorable, the workers found evidence of the importance of these situational variables in the fact that there were fewer cases. They also attempted an enumeration of facts which may approximate a

---
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characterization of the parents. They therefore thought it worthwhile to list some obvious deviations from figures for the general population. In most cases the personality attributes of the parents were quite well enough known for this purpose by two or more members of the staff.

The table of facts procured by the clinicians showed clearly that in many of the families, the opportunities ordinarily regarded as necessary for absorption of good ideals from parental example or for the development of respectful attitudes toward parental personality and authority were decidedly lacking. However, the comparison of delinquents and nondelinquents in the study pointed out that statistics of surface facts do not tell the real story.

As to the question of heredity in its relation to the origin of delinquency, the child behaviorists agree that though they know the inaccuracy of the popular concept regarding this phenomenon, yet an account of findings on the heredity of the delinquents in their series seems in order. Perhaps alcoholism, psychosis, epilepsy, and criminalism as they appear in the forebears will be regarded as important. For these the figures as known for the 153 families run as follows:
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Outside of mental abnormality, they contend, there was no reliable proof of the inheritance of such behavior characteristics as delinquency and criminality. In two cases (one an epileptic with a probable epileptic personality who had an epileptic father, and one whose assaultive delinquent behavior was maniacal in type and whose father was a manic-depressive) the significance of the inheritance was clear. But it was interesting to note that this latter boy had a twin and seven other siblings, all of whom appeared to be normal mentally. The fact of the matter is that unless one really knows what the chromosomes and genes carry over, he can never be in the position to evaluate heredity. Nondelinquents as well as delinquents in the same families give evidence that very differently behaving individuals may come from the same stock. On this basis the investigators argue that it appears hazardous to offer any conclusion concerning the possible relationship of

---


heredity to delinquency. Difficulty of interpretation lies in the fact that often youth is surrounded by bad social situations, the effects of which are not those of biological inheritance.

The workers also investigated the subjective personality factors and obtained outstanding data on developmental history, psychological deviations, and physical habits in contrasts drawn between the delinquents and controls. These data gave rather clear evidence of the relevance of constitutional and psychological factors in the making of the delinquent. It was found there was a much higher frequency of defect and disorder among delinquents.

Healy and Bronner's Survey of Their Data

In surveying their data, Healy and Bronner's remarks on some points are interesting, for they show the strength and weakness of a few dogmatic assertions ordinarily taken for granted as a de facto relationship by the laity. For the most part the health history had very little direct meaning in relation to the causation of conduct trends. However, an obvious exception was found in cases of damage to the brain. A reliable account of severe head injury was obtained in nine instances. Judgment on the severity of the injury was based

27. Ibid., pp. 73-77.
on hospital reports or histories of a considerable period of unconsciousness following the accident. While every case had to be interpreted for itself, in general the after-effects of such injuries in producing behavior instabilities are well known.

Very thorough biochemical studies were also made of a number of cases which were considered to be possibly suffering from endocrinopathy. The clear diagnosis of glandular dysfunction was made in six instances, and four others were suspicious cases. Only very indirect relationship of their physical trouble to delinquency was evident. In every case, causations were complex. Healy and Bronner therefore reiterate that many individuals with the same physical malfunctioning do not become delinquent.

Contrary to accepted belief, the research did not show that delinquents have more ability for manual tasks and occupations; more ability to work with concrete material, than they demonstrate for the more intellectual work that is demanded in tests used for intelligence rating.

Likewise, the physical status of the delinquent at the time of the study could be shown to have meaning for producing delinquency only in rare cases where it was related to emotional and social life— for instance, in producing inferiority situations and dissatisfactions. Here again, non-delinquents often were faced with the same situation.

Consensus of opinion did not hold true on this next
point either. Though extreme school dissatisfaction was expressed by many delinquents, the workers were surprised to find that careful psychological testing failed to reveal in this series any clear-cut cases of such special disability for school subjects as reading disability.

Healy's Analysis of the School Situation as a Factor Leading to Delinquency

While on the subject of school, though this forthcoming material is distinct from the above, Healy and Bronner in their article "What Makes a Child Delinquent" raise the question of whether school life plays any part in making a child delinquent. They contend that a great proportion of delinquents say, in one way or another, that they hate school. Here, then, is the main issue.

The school claims for many years a share of the child's time second only to that spent at home. Evidently in many instances where a child becomes delinquent, his school has not afforded him an atmosphere that has made him happy. Healy recognizes that the school is often confronted with great difficulties when children come handicapped by distorted personalities and attitudes. Also, the school may give the child valuable or harmful new experiences, and it may be the means of combatting or preventing tendencies to misconduct. Unwittingly it may even create deviating behavior.

Because the teacher has authority, Healy holds that he
may be likened to a parent and thus have a tremendously constructive influence. On the contrary, the teacher may adopt unfortunate attitudes similar to those some children experience at home. He may seem unreasonable in demands, harsh, dictatorial and discriminating. Slurs, taunts, cutting remarks, evidences of social and racial prejudice may arouse or accentuate feelings of inferiority, which in turn are reflected in reckless, anti-social behavior. To a child who has suffered from parental faults, the reinforcement of emotional damage begun at home tends to have a further destructive influence on character development and consequently the youngster is not easily managed.

Besides the personal relationships between teacher and pupil which may produce disturbing elements, another point stressed is that the school may or may not satisfy the fundamental need of the child to feel adequate. Because in the classroom and on the playground each child finds himself among his peers, there are naturally comparisons and competition. Feelings of inadequacy or adequacy are bound to arise. From the former grows the so-called inferiority complex which is expressed in withdrawal and discouragement or in compensatory activities. Unconsciously aimed endeavors to compensate for inferiority sometimes result in delinquency. A few life situations demonstrating how inferiority feelings

develop from several types of handicaps are illustrated be-

Some of the toughest and most defiant behavior encountered by the analysts was largely reaction to the jibes encountered in school life by youngsters with clubfeet, strabismus (cross-eyes), severe acne, undersize or other physical conditions. Less seldom observed but sometimes very clear in its import was wayward behavior on the part of a girl with a physical deformity.

Since the ego is the most vulnerable part of the personality, inferiority feelings are frequently caused when a child is handicapped in mental equipment. The feebleminded child who has bright siblings or is wrongly placed in school, the dull but hardly feebleminded child who finds himself among the normal or superior is usually unhappy, senses his inferiority, seeks and finds satisfaction in delinquency. As a whole the definitely defective do not form a very large percentage of the deviants, yet the number of defectives among delinquents is four or five times as great as among the general population of their age groups. Since classes more commonly exist for the feebleminded child than for merely the dull and retarded, the latter commonly are badly placed academically and socially and constitute a real hazard as potential misdoers.

One clever but dishonest boy of fourteen, retarded in school and incapable of first-grade reading, felt thwarted by inferiority so much that it was impossible to induce him to accept remedial tutoring. The harm that had been done was practically past remedy. He felt, and even said, that the best thing for him was to go on with his shady pursuits, for which he had been sent to the court in the first place. Through an unfortunate school situation, this boy acquired knowledge of illegal activities in fields where he could use his good general intelligence to advantage.

These illustrations, showing how certain disturbing elements lead to anti-social conduct, coincide with data obtained from studies of the series in New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment. The workers observed that ninety-one percent of the delinquents suffered from major emotional disturbances, seventy-five percent displayed a marked antipathy to parents or to school. In great contrast it was found that of the nondelinquents, only thirteen percent had such profound emotion-provoking experiences. Among the 153 offenders, the principal maladjustments found were the following:
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Cases

45 - Deep feelings of being thwarted in self-expression and other self-satisfactions

53 - Feelings of being rejected, unloved or insecure in affectional relationships

62 - Marked feelings of inadequacy or inferiority in some situations or activities

43 - Emotional disturbances about family disharmonies, discipline, and other related things

43 - Great persisting sibling jealousy or rivalry

19 - Deep-set internal emotional conflicts

11 - An unconscious sense of guilt and feeling of need for punishment.

Comparison and analysis of the two series by Healy and Bronner revealed that since the control group experienced emotional discomfort less often, they expressed their needs in socially-acceptable ways without escape techniques in the form of anti-social activity. Moreover, the workers observed that the greater docility and lesser gregariousness of the nondelinquents facilitated outlets and reactive manifestations of their needs which were both moral and legal from a social standpoint. On the contrary, the delinquents, more often thwarted, rejected and disturbed, found substitute outlets for their psychological needs in activity that led to delinquency. Such case histories exemplify Healy's.
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theory that delinquency is a channel for misdirected drives.

In the series there were eight pairs of non-identical twins. Optimistically the clinicians believed that through this select group they might uncover factors that would permit scientific prognostication of delinquency because the differences significant for delinquency might be segregated. They reasoned that better evaluation could be made of the causes of differences in twins than was possible in the case of siblings, for many variables would be eliminated. Twins were the same chronological age, their order of birth was practically identical, and all factors such as health, age, economic and social situation which accounted for the attitudes of the parents would apply to one as it did to the other.

In the analysis of certain items of factual material bearing on the behavior patterns of the delinquent twin and on the nondelinquent twin, the investigators found that except for the combination of abnormal personality plus deeply-felt thwartings and dissatisfaction in addition to injurious family conditions (a combination applicable to only a few cases), there was no semblance of a clear-cut composite of factors which prognosticate delinquency. Further, they felt it was hazardous to predict such
inevitable behavior from even this combination of traits.

Personnal Inventory of One Pair of Healy's
Comparative Study of Dizygotic Twins

Although nothing really tangible was derived from the above conclusions which would result in a workable formula for the prevention of delinquency, Healy and Bronner believed that deeply felt emotional discomfort during babyhood might possibly be a sign of conditioning of the personality, the effect of which would eventually be delinquency. The following brief narrative sets forth the family situation, the reciprocal relationship of the parents and children, and reveals the conditioning experiences as well as the reactive tendencies of the delinquent and the control. The authors focus attention on the association of factors which serve to show how basic and far-reaching all these elements and indoctrinating behavior patterns may be for the production or prevention of delinquency.

This study of a seventeen-year-old boy and a girl, twins, living near New Haven points out the contrast in constitutional make-up, probably of a congenital nature rather than hereditary. The girl appeared to be an unaffected, healthy-minded, normal individual. On the other hand, while physical examination of the boy did not show any apparent

deviation of the sex organs, yet there was no mistaking the type. He was immaculately dressed, had exaggerated feminine mannerisms, plucked eyebrows, and even at the clinic took out a pocket mirror and tried to improve his fair complexion.

The one older brother, a well-adjusted individual, was born ten years before the twins, so that the mother looked forward to a second child with great joy and hoped for a girl. However, both parents were disappointed because of the birth of twins. At birth the boy was the healthier of the two, while the girl cried a good deal in addition to having spells of holding her breath. Contrary to usual expected patterns of behavior in the control, she had to be trained to be right-handed and had numerous nervous habits such as biting her nails or picking at a piece of paper. The boy was naturally right-handed and free of any nervous habits.

In tracing the delinquent's history at the clinic, to which he was referred because as a homosexual he was soliciting men in a park, his story showed that his delinquent activities began at the age of ten when he made his first appearance at the juvenile court. Factual data of violations started with such deviations as truancy, staying out over night in parked cars, and running away from home. Later he was apprehended by the police and placed in detention homes. Thereafter from distant cities the police
communicated with his parents to send funds for his return home. On several occasions he stole money, but this kind of law breaking was limited to his own family. His first theft was at the age of ten, when he stole ten dollars and ran away from home.

Still deeper probing of his history in relation to tendencies toward homosexuality revealed that his mother wanted him to "look nice" and thought it much better for him when little to play with "nice little girls" rather than with bad boys. Questioned further, the mother stated that beginning when he was about four years old the boy wanted clothes of the same color and material as his sister and to wear her beads and other ornaments. At a later age he frequently stole silk underclothes from his mother and sister. As a small boy he was afraid of other boys; he played with dolls and other games with his sister's friends. In the boy's record when he appeared before the court at ten years of age, the mother's statement was that he had played so much with girls that boys did not like him. This was evidently given in explanation of his truancy and running away. The mother also attributed his early misbehavior to his having been influenced by the movies. In fact, he was still extremely fond of the movies and theater, and through correspondence and contacts he accumulated quite a collection of pictures and autographs of actors and actresses. One of his pet hopes was that some day he would
appear on the stage.

At times he paraded on the street in girl's clothes. He must have had much mental conflict about his first homosexual experience at the age of twelve, because he was careful to conceal this fact. By the time he was sixteen, when away from home he lived with men for immoral purposes and received money from them. The men with whom he consorted were of superior type; and many were celebrated.

The twins showed ability in school. The boy's I.Q. was 107, six points lower than his sister's. He failed in the tenth grade, while she continued and made a good record. At the clinic he appeared thoroughly nonchalant, and vowed he had no intention whatever of relinquishing his homosexual life. Toward his parents he was aggressively defiant and impudent. He hated them, felt he had been greatly injured, misunderstood and mismanaged, and as a result was thwarted in normal masculine development. He stated it was not his fault that he was either born or brought up that way. His mother had never given him opportunity to play with boys. He always had to play with his sister and had never played baseball.

In analyzing this case the investigators were of the opinion that the boy's attempt at revenge was shown by repeated stealing from his parents and his vindictive behavior toward them. This running away from good home circumstances and normally affectionate parents was unusual because it was
done by an effeminate boy so largely unable to meet the world. His later attempt to resolve the conflict was by the method of giving way to instinctive urges. All this undoubtedly helped compensate somehow for his inferiority complex. At ten years of age he had evinced his emotional discomfort, for he had an immense feeling of inadequacy in his relationship with boys.

In this instance the father admitted to the clinicians partiality toward the girl. Subconsciously the boy must have had a feeling of being rejected or deprived of parental affection. This accounted for his frustration and subsequent manifestations in rebellious reactions. He insisted that he did not want to go home, and asked the judge to send him to a correctional school.

As a final commentary on the two series, Healy and Bronner raise the question: Can there be any doubt, from the above contrasts in the emotional experiences and attitudes of the delinquents and controls, that a new outlook upon causes is imperative? If knowledge of causes is essential for development of the best methods of treatment, as it is elsewhere in science, then an entirely new orientation in this field of genetics is indispensable. Above all, they emphasize that there are more fundamental considerations than the mere objective data which are revealed by the
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delinquent's life. As a guiding principle, in dealing with the problem of juvenile delinquency, they suggest shifting the emphasis of various supposedly causal factors in past studies to the deleterious effects caused by emotional implications of human relationships.

Healy's Opinion on the Effects of Detention

Among all environmental conditions which tend to create anti-social conduct, none are better known than those which surround offenders during custody. The very person whom society desires to reform is often made much worse by experiences forced upon him. The feelings that prevail during custody of the delinquent are that he is a punishable individual and therefore no special pains should be taken for his comfort. According to Healy, as ordinarily carried out the whole custodial procedure has little sanity in it.

Authoritative testimony on the frequently injurious influence of experiences under detention is abundant. In his chapter on the etiology of crime, Lombroso states that "one of the greatest factors in crime is the prison." Healy agrees with Lombroso that the pickpocket and the cutthroat often have learned in prison, at the expense of the state, skilled methods of committing all sorts of
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violations against law and order. And Holmes asks:

Why is it that a man's facial expression changes during a long detention? Why is it that his voice becomes hard and unnatural? Why is it that his eyes become shifty, cunning and wild? It is not because of hard work—it is the institution that does it, the long-continued soul-and-mind-destroying monotony ....

Based on valid facts, Healy declares that the detention experiences were often the worst in the delinquent's whole life. The most untoward effects of incarceration, those which always impressed him greatly in his study of causes, were in the realm of psychic contagion. Often during custody there was a spread of pernicious ideas about sexual affairs, both through verbal communication and actual experience with others. This was a subject of great import. The most convincing aspect of the seriousness of this matter was revealed in case histories proving that undermining of moral regard for the natural and social laws concerning sex affairs was provocative of other criminalism. There was much more significance to the fact than the mere learning of sex knowledge seemed to imply. A wide range of new anti-social impulses often followed. It was acknowledged on every hand that contagion of this sort took place with great frequency in all kinds of custodial institutions. Where old offenders were mixed with young ones, as in many jails, the results were intolerably bad. Healy felt that

if there were more appreciation of the psychological ramifications of this psychic infection, more justice would be done in this matter.

Professional criminals have stated that the enforced congregating of offenders was a significant causative factor in delinquency. During imprisonment the older man was on the lookout for future partners, and he tried to enlist those who had intelligence and nerve. Another baneful effect of detention was the development of mental content which led to criminalism. All sorts of undesirable forms of imagery were apt to fill the prolonged vacuities of mental life during custody. There was the constant suggestion toward misconduct which came from thinking of one's self as an offender. There were all the sex imageries which came from deprivation. There was the inner restlessness resulting from lack of physical activity. Healy emphasized that it was plain that if absolutely innocent individuals were put under prison conditions, they would tend to develop anti-social conceptions of conduct.

Discussing further the danger of detention, he bemoans the fact that society is ignorant regarding the efficacy of correctional institutions. He believes there is a strongly-developed notion in modern times that such institutions are really correctional and reformative. Frequently

there are several reasons in the minds of those in authority that form the basis of decision to commit an offender. Too often the inclination of a commission may be to serve the interest of the department rather than the needs of the individual offender. The reasons for this are that it satisfies the injured; it gets the offender out of the way for the time being; it may be regarded as retribution; it supposedly deters others from committing offenses; it offers some chance for reformation; and quite often it appears to be the easiest solution of the case. Also, as in other life situations, the judge is very humanly influenced by his moods, notions and prejudices and has to make, without aid from science, many decisions which involve errors if outcomes are the criteria. Nevertheless where there is so much at stake, the great need is for proof rather than for belief, and for knowledge rather than mere guesswork. Only from accumulated data showing the significance of original situations and later careers can there be built up knowledge fundamental to intelligent effort in any field where there is an attempt to control or modify material and situations.

Remedies for all this are matters of the deepest concern to Healy. As the new science develops, he hopes there will be a better understanding of all the hazards and evil

influences which custodial conditions have upon human beings. While his wish in this respect is far from being realized, still with the aid of Augusta F. Bronner he has made an attempt in this direction. They evaluated the effects of various treatments of offenders in the light of thorough studies of outcomes on the basis of success and failure. The careers of 420 youths, of whom 311 had been committed to institutions, were followed. The findings were seventy percent of failures for the committed cases while only thirty-four percent of those who had not been committed failed.

In the search for causes it is difficult to avoid a certain amount of overlapping evident in Delinquents and Criminals, Their Making and Unmaking. This work was written earlier than New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment; the two books are similar in that they present studies of series of delinquents, yet the subject matter is different. The research of Delinquents and Criminals sketches the nature and extent of behavior processing in criminal careers and was based on material gathered on recidivists in Chicago and Boston with a follow-up study of their after careers. The three juvenile groups utilized for study were: (a) a series of 920 studied by the Chicago clinic between 1909-1914 and followed up as a special research in 1921-1923; (b) a series of four hundred young male offenders who

appeared in the Boston Juvenile Court in the years 1909-1914 and whose careers were studied in 1923 in relation to further delinquency; (c) a series of four hundred boys who were originally studied at the Boston clinic from 1918-1919 and whose careers were also followed.

For statistical analysis Healy and Bronner used four thousand cases consisting of two thousand offenders studied by them in Chicago between 1909-1915, and two thousand studied in Boston from 1917-1923. These larger series represented no selection except that they were juvenile recidivists. Outcomes in the Chicago series were investigated only in cases originally well enough known as to physical condition, mental make-up, background characteristics, and probable causes of delinquency. The purpose of studying outcomes was an attempt by the analysts to discover what had become of these delinquents in order to determine success or failure of the types of treatment given to juveniles. The unselected cases had to meet the following requirements:

(a) The individual at the time of the initial study was not above juvenile court age, so that treatment, the effects of which they studied, was administered through the juvenile court itself or through agencies dealing with juveniles.

---

(b) The individual was old enough at the time of study to be well above the juvenile age at the time when the last follow-up report was made, so that there was a chance to judge the outcome in the career of the individual. Since most cases were fourteen years or over when first seen at the clinic, the average age of the group at the time of the follow-up was approximately twenty-five years.

(c) All cases had been actually dealt with by the juvenile court. A very few came from Illinois juvenile courts other than Chicago.

(d) No cases were included that were dealt with by the court for only short periods, such as those of runaway boys returned to their own homes in other cities or states.42

In the original studies the records included findings relative to physical examination, psychological test results, family and personal history, sociological facts, and mental analysis. A summary on probable direct causations was made for each case. Only 920 cases fulfilled requirements for inclusion in the group. When follow-up was sought, a certain number of these could not be found. Some were dead, and some were held in institutions as mentally abnormal. The 675 cases who remained for study were those individuals whose careers in young adult life could be ascertained reliably enough to permit evaluation in some measure.

At the time Healy and Bronner planned this study it was recognized that it would be impossible to make fine discriminations in evaluating success or failure. In the

---
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outcomes of girls' cases where marriage had occurred, it was difficult to ascertain in many instances the subtler facts of marital life. Only rough measurements of findings were possible, but even these offered opportunity for learning much that was of value. Outcome was to be counted as success when the individual was living in the community without known detriment to the community and had engaged in no criminality. Conversely, failure denoted actual delinquency. All individuals having adult court records and adjudged guilty as well as those committed to adult correctional institutions were regarded as failures. Others regarded as failures were vagrants, excessive drinkers, extreme loafers, those grossly immoral and, as a consequence, indirectly costly to society. There were twenty-nine who were found to be irregular workers or non-contributors to their families even in time of great need; some were victims of bad habits. This last group was designated as being "indifferent" outcomes.

For comparison with the Chicago series, Healy and Bronner took male recidivists who appeared in the Boston Juvenile Court during 1909-1914, the same years that the above group was studied in Chicago. The clinicians desired to compare a group equal in number and as similar as possible in the offenses committed. Only four hundred offenders met the required standards. In order to make a fair comparison, the investigators were limited to those of an age that would, at
the time of their follow-up research, be at least two years above juvenile court age. Complete objective court records in Boston facilitated comparison with the Chicago series, but since the analysts had not studied this group earlier, important data pertaining to physical condition, mental make-up and backgrounds were lacking. From comparable studies of two thousand cases in each city, the child behaviorists were optimistic about determining significant differences between delinquents and their backgrounds in those two cities. 43

The later careers were traced through the central recording system of the Massachusetts Probation Commission. This registry of information concerning delinquents was more complete than similar information found elsewhere. In contrast, follow-up work in Chicago required difficult searching by field workers.

A second comparable group of four hundred Boston juvenile recidivists was taken from the clinicians' own case records of 1918-1919. Follow-up work was carried on as usual, and facts known were much more thorough than those of the earlier series.

For girl delinquents the clinicians made no attempt at inquiry concerning outcomes in a Boston series because very few of the failures reach court in adult life, and field inquiry would have been a difficult task. In the years
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covered by Healy and Bronner's series, the ratio of girls seen in the court in Chicago was about four times that in Boston.

While data on success and failure in this research are interesting from a statistical standpoint, a neat etiological problem at this point would be to determine why some offenders continue on the assembly line of crime production whereas others drop off before processing goes very far. One may well ask whether these comparative studies will lend themselves to a better solution of the mystery. That is indeed a moot question.

Before proceeding further, a few words relating to the careers of the young repeated offenders studied in Chicago beginning with 1909 will here suffice. At the time the study was made, most of them were beyond the great crime period of life, the ages between eighteen and twenty-three. Enough time had therefore elapsed for judgment on the following question: How effective was the legalistic and social treatment accorded them? Outcomes of the 675 Chicago cases are enlightening as revealed by the following figures:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>164 (39%)</td>
<td>138 (34%)</td>
<td>302 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>256 (61%)</td>
<td>117 (26%)</td>
<td>373 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>420 (100%)</td>
<td>255 (100%)</td>
<td>675 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While much of the relevant factors relating to a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon of delinquency, as set forth in *Delinquents and Criminals, Their Making and Unmaking*, has to be eliminated because this paper cannot be exhaustive, the essential causes of deviant behavior will be enlarged upon in the next few paragraphs. Although the reader may be bored by the repetition, the fact is that a scientific perspective of the problem can be gained only if one does not lose sight of Healy's frequent admonition to bear in mind the multiple-cause theory of causation and the various combinations of causes from individual to individual. Some important statistical points drawn from Healy and Bronner's criteria are summarized below.

Even though the companions frequently were not worse and perhaps were not so much to blame as the offender, yet in many cases if it had not been for bad companionship the offense would not have been committed. This element appeared in sixty-two percent of three thousand cases, thereby making it safe to regard it as a causative factor. This figure varies little for the sexes and is practically the same for the two cities.

It was also decided that among three thousand cases
the instabilities and impulses of adolescence were directly causative in eighteen percent. With girls this cause was more active and figured in twenty-five percent of the cases. No one who studies juvenile delinquents with emphasis on the genesis of their misbehavior can doubt that physiological changes during adolescence play a considerable part in this phenomenon.

Another important factor was unfortunate, early, improper sex experience which was encountered in many instances before the child was ten years of age. In the total four thousand cases, the clinicians learned of such unfortunate experiences as dynamic forces in a total of 12.5 percent; among girls this percentage was eighteen. Often the delinquencies produced were not sex affairs at all. Misconduct tendencies in other directions may be largely the result of this experience.

Though the subject of mental conflicts has been covered before, it seems pertinent to emphasize that Healy considers this phase of the problem of the most vital significance. In their composite book Augusta F. Bronner joins him in saying that those who would know criminalistic beginnings even of some of the most marked careers reaching far into adult life should be acquainted with the phenomenon of mental conflict. There are forces and urges in the mental life, sometimes
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termed mental mechanisms, which when functioning unsatisfactorily and at cross-purposes lead to the most definite and deep-set delinquent tendencies. Such conflicts were found in 6.5 percent of the four thousand cases, and it is likely many conflicts were not discovered. A curious fact is that the percentages have remained closely similar for all the four series. The existence of mental conflicts to this extent is one of the findings that demonstrate the absolute necessity for special studies of the dynamic mental life of delinquents, if prevention of further misbehavior is to be accomplished.

Extreme social suggestibility is a personality characteristic which must be reckoned with in treatment of offenders. In four percent of the cases it was a well-marked characteristic.

An individual who craves and loves adventure sometimes finds outlet in misconduct of a severe sort. Enumerating cases where an inordinate love of adventure and excitement led to delinquency, they found about 2.5 percent. As might be expected, the girls showed this causation less frequently than the boys.

In addition to the above factors, the research showed many other direct causations. The Boston series of two thousand cases was studied after considerable experience had been gained from discussion and analysis of possible causations. The chief purpose of the closer scientific inquiry
was to try to orient the aggressor toward better living. Healy and Bronner's thorough investigation and statistical treatment disclosed the following facts: School dissatisfaction appeared as a major cause in nine percent, the girls showing only two percent. Poor recreation (which the clinicians specified meant a conglomeration of all kinds of poor amusements such as clubs with bad practices, frequenting low resorts and dances of a bad sort, cheap movies in excess) was found in twenty percent of the cases. Street life in excess appeared as a very harmful feature in fifteen percent of the boys but in only two percent of the girls. In about three percent, vocational dissatisfaction was a cause.

Formation of a habit of delinquency appeared in six percent. It is only recently that the workers have become aware of the real meaning of this cause, and of certain other features in the offender's mental life which are productive of delinquency. Here they tabulated sudden impulse, particularly shoplifting, in seven percent, and recurrent or obsessive ideation or mental imagery in six percent.

Considering physical conditions of all types as apparent, actual, and direct causes of individual misbehavior (though never the sole cause), they discovered such criteria in 5.6 percent of two thousand delinquents, and premature puberty in three percent of the cases.

Under former procedures, Healy and his collaborators
found very few attempts at evaluation of success and failure, certainly none whatever according to critical and scientific methods. Although in dealing with offenders the principal interest was in the individual, his peculiarities, his background and his needs, still it was vitally important to have studies and analyses of statistics in order to adopt effective policies and procedures. Only those factors common to whole groups of individuals or conditions are safe generalizations. In this way, the analysts contend, the newer criminology can build a better technique for deriving the facts underlying behavior in individual instances.

Healy's Views on Physical Make-up in Its Relation to Delinquency

In the history of criminology there was a period of firm belief in the close causal relationship between physical make-up and tendency to misbehavior. Even today this idea is maintained occasionally though the statistical findings of Healy and Bronner negated such an antiquated idea. In general, so far as standards for comparison exist, they found a close similarity between the delinquent and the nondelinquent group of young people whether it was enlarged tonsils, bad teeth, goitre, sensory defects, nose, throat and ear ailments. Notwithstanding the implications of

48. Ibid., pp. 179-182.
their findings for the conditions just cited, the clinicians believed over-development of sex characteristics in girls to be a matter of considerable importance. Such maturity often led girls either to be unusually attractive to the opposite sex or produced early awareness of sex affairs. In regard to boys, their data suggested a causal relationship between physical overgrowth and the tendency to adventurous delinquency. Restlessness, poor adjustment in and out of school, needs for larger physical self-expression, all frequently followed upon early rapid growth. And any of these may have led directly to delinquency as a form of activity affording outlets.

Less than four percent of the four thousand cases showed evidence of disease of the nervous system other than epilepsy and head injury. Hysteria was surprisingly rare in this large group, and the nervous disease found most often was chorea. The problem of head injury has been discussed in the review of New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment. In this comparative study, as in the other, evidence obtained from the developmental history and examination at the clinic showed a striking amount of severe head injury among delinquents, especially among some of the worst cases of conduct disorder. Healy and Bronner found that out of eighteen cases of individuals with severe head injury, seven were able to refrain from delinquency as they passed
through adolescence into adult life.

Since comparatively few of the Boston young recidivists had been immoral with girls, only one percent had either syphilis or gonorrhea. On the other hand, immorality was the most common complaint against the girls, and fourteen percent had one of the two diseases. As to stigmata of degeneracy (the word made so popular by Lombroso, Nordau and others), in spite of the extreme assertions of some earlier criminologists, only about seven percent showed the well-defined physical signs. Marked stigmata were observed in twenty-three boys who were followed-up for outcome; seventy-four percent were found failing. Since stigmata are much more apt to be found among the mentally defective, they explained, it may well have been such defect which stood more directly in relationship to failure. Probable congenital syphilis was evident in about four percent of three thousand cases, and in nearly every instance the teeth constituted the distinguishing signs. Follow-up work showed about an equal number of males and females failing. Physically the delinquents neither formed a separate group nor was there any particular physical condition found to be significant in relation to the later career of the offender.

It was found that harmful physical habits constituted

49. Ibid., pp. 132-145.
50. Ibid., p. 143.
quite a problem in relation to delinquency. Where mastur-
bation had been indulged in to excess, the breakdown of morale
was sometimes obvious. In other instances, even if the habit
itself was not so severe, undue thinking about it and over-
conviction of its bad effects often led to an attitude con-
ducive to misbehavior. While twenty-two percent of the total
four series smoked to an extent considered excessive for
their years, Healy and Bronner could not offer any opinion on
this practice as a causal relation to delinquency, for many
nondelinquents also smoke to excess.

Other bad habits found were consumption of tea and coffee
to excess, and in some instances even alcohol. For this
latter item there was great variation. For example, among
some Italians in Boston, it was common to give wine to
children. The research disclosed that the use of drugs was
very rare during juvenile court age.

Healy's Views on Mental Aspects in
Relation to Delinquency

In appraising their data on the total four thousand cases
of recidivists, Healy and Bronner were surprised to find that
the percentages of mental defects were similar for the differ-
ent series. On the one hand, the figures obtained showed
clearly that the mentally abnormal constituted a much greater
proportion among delinquents than was found among the general
population. On the other hand, those who have stressed the
part played either by feeblemindedness or mental disease in misbehavior will obtain from their findings small support for their extreme statements. Of the total group 72.5 percent were diagnosed as normal. Sex differences would seem of considerable interest because of the emphasis placed upon the feebleminded girl as a potential sex offender. While a greater percentage of girls appeared in each series, the differences were small. The statement has been made before in this paper that feeblemindedness appears among serious delinquents from five to ten times more often than in the general population. Of the large group of offenders, only 9.1 percent were classed as subnormal or borderline mentality.

There was a considerable difference between the total suffering from psychoses in the two cities—Chicago, 5.6 percent; Boston, one percent. Since 1912 Boston has had a fine psychopathic hospital. This institution may account for the lesser frequency of psychosis found in the Boston series. Healy and Bronner contend that those who hold that a strong causal relationship exists between mental disease and delinquency or crime will have to meet the challenge of these figures. Their findings tend to show that the mentally diseased in any considerable number do not become delinquent unless environmental conditions are morally unfavorable.

Psychopathic personalities totaled 2.8 percent, but these were enumerated only for the Boston series. Healy and Bronner refer to them as a class of poorly-balanced individuals who
are most difficult when they show delinquent tendencies. Two groups are included in the above totals—the constitutional inferiors and the epileptics. The former are great weaklings from the standpoint of character because of a faulty biological make-up. These formed two percent of the series. Of the latter, 5.5 percent were found in Chicago while Boston had only 1.6 percent in their series of offenders. The reason for this difference between the two cities is that Massachusetts has special state institutions to care for epileptic children.

Healy cautions that epilepsy may be correlated with anything from super-normality to idiocy and insanity, and that sometimes an apparent mental defect may clear up under successful treatment for this disease. Space does not permit enumeration of many of the mental characteristics exhibited in epileptics. However, Healy reflects that some of the best students state that, without signs of gradual mental deterioration, diagnosis of true epilepsy is doubtful. Amongst the numerous signs manifested by this condition are that perceptions and will are affected; the finer ethical discriminations are lost; and the moral inhibitory powers are lowered. Because of these facts, Healy found the epileptic frequently becoming an offender, but he is adamant that making a confirmed criminal out of an epileptic is partly the result of his own innate mental and physical tendencies, partly of the formation of mental habits.

according to the laws of mental life, and partly due to social conditions.

Speaking of social conditions, the question arises which is often heard at a social forum concerned with the problem of juvenile delinquency. What about the ideas children derive from the movies, radio programs, and sensational types of newspapers? Healy asserts it is impossible to answer this question categorically or in statistical terms for here again the individual finds more or less what he is looking for, however unconsciously.

One thing is plain, the investigations point out clearly that only about one-fifth of all delinquents commit their offenses alone. It is also indicated that once children have embarked on unsocialized activities, organized group-welfare programs do not attract them. Such children do not fit in. Either they feel inferior or, more often, the settlement house or club seems tame and monotonous. Restless and active as these youngsters usually are, they chafe at the regulations of organized play. Such clubs may act as preventive agencies for some, but by and large settlement-house workers, and club leaders have complained that they cannot lure into their orbits or keep steadily in attendance those children who most definitely are headed for delinquent careers.

Before leaving the topic of causes to consider conclusions, Healy's chief point might well be repeated. This is that an exact evaluation of the pressure exerted by any one causative factor in producing delinquency is well-nigh impossible, except as a clinician makes a thorough study of each case. To one individual, poverty may be the stimulus to ambition and increased effort; to another, it may bring more frustration than he can bear.

CHAPTER V

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In the statement of the problem of this thesis, the point was made that the chief quest of Dr. Healy's research was how to cure delinquent tendencies, thus diminishing delinquency and subsequent crime. Common sense dictates that this same principle was the motive underlying all criminological research. On this basis one may question what differentiates Healy's studies from the others. Consequently at this stage of the report an attempt will be made in the following material to evaluate his contributions to the study of the etiology of juvenile delinquency as compared with other studies in the field.

An Evaluation and Review of Previous Studies

Three schools of criminology which have been called "typological" or "bio-typological" have developed. All of them were based on a postulate that criminals differed from non-criminals in certain traits of personality. These traits accounted for their tendencies to commit crimes. Neither social situations nor social processes were taken into account in the explanation or control of their behavior.

The pioneer in all efforts to define a criminal or
delinquent type was Cesare Lombroso, the famous Italian criminologist who founded the Positive School of Criminology. About 1875 he completed a study of about six thousand Italian convicts. As a result of this work, he characterized criminals as possessed of certain very definite physical stigmata and formulated the famous, though now somewhat mythical, theories "that criminals are by birth a distinct type." This type can be recognized by stigmata or anomalies such as asymmetrical cranium, long lower jaw, flattened nose, scanty beard, squinty eyes, and low sensitivity to pain. The criminal type is clearly represented by three to five, and not necessarily indicated by less than three, such stigmata. These physical anomalies do not in themselves cause crime; rather they identify the personality which is predisposed to criminal behavior and this personality is either a reversion to the savage type, an atavism, or else a degeneration, especially akin to epilepsy. Because of their personal natures, such individuals cannot refrain from crime unless the circumstances of life are unusually favorable. Some of Lombroso's followers believed that criminals such as thieves, murderers, or sex offenders could be classified and differentiated from one another by physical stigmata. The school lost its

1. The belief that criminals have unique physical characteristics appeared long before Lombroso. See C. Bernalso de Quiros, Modern Theories of Criminality, pp. 2-4; quoted in Edwin H. Sutherland, Principles of Criminology (Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1947), p. 53.
clear-cut characteristics as a result of controversies and subsequent modifications, first by Lombroso then by his followers—Garofalo, Ferri, and others.

It remained for Goring, an English criminologist working about 1910, to change the conception of Lombroso's study. On the basis of the measurement of three thousand English prisoners, he proved beyond doubt the absence of any definite physical criminal type. Goring's research concerning the physical characteristics of criminals remains a model of scientific thoroughness. However, when he departed into the realm of mental characteristics, he used unsound estimates of mental capacity based upon the judgment of observers. This largely invalidated his conclusion that mental deficiency was overwhelmingly related to criminality.

After the arguments and methods that Dr. Goring used to stress the hereditary factors in criminality, the next step was mental testing. Henry Herbert Goddard in the United States was one of the earliest investigators of the relationship of feeblemindedness to delinquency. His statement, which is true to a certain extent depending upon many other circumstances, unfortunately has been taken up by the laity as if it were prima facie evidence that "every

2. Sutherland, op. cit., pp. 52-54.

feebleminded person is a potential criminal." Feeblemindedness, he theorized, is inherited as a Mendelian unit. It causes crime for the reason that the feebleminded person is unable to differentiate "right from wrong" and does not really appreciate moral issues or understand the meaning of law. As a result he deviates from the normal pattern of behavior, for he is just as likely to do the wrong thing as the right. Even if he is of sufficient intelligence and has the necessary training so that he does know, since he lacks the power of control he is unable to resist the natural impulse. Goddard further asserted that almost all criminals were feebleminded and that all feebleminded were criminals. The importance attributed to feeblemindedness in the causation of crime decreased greatly as mental tests became standardized.

Next to be ferreted out as a fruitful approach to the problem were family trees. This latter criterion has been used extensively by certain scholars in the effort to prove that criminality is inherited. Dugdale and Estabrook's

---


5. Loc. cit.

6. Estabrook found that criminality was decreasing in the Jukes family; 11 percent of the members of the family were criminals when studied by Dugdale, 6 percent when studied by Estabrook thirty years later. See A. H. Estabrook, The Jukes in 1915, p. 240; quoted in Sutherland, op. cit., p. 83.
study of the Jukes family showed 140 were criminals, seven of whom were convicted of murder, sixty of theft, and fifty of prostitution. Another delinquent family, the Kallikaks, out of 480 descendants from an illegitimate union of a Revolutionary soldier and a feebleminded woman had three convicted of felonies, twenty-four of confirmed alcoholism, and thirty-three of sexual immorality. This same soldier and a normal wife had no known criminal offspring. The Zero family was another law-breaking group which was traced for six generations.

An Evaluation and Review of Contemporary Studies

In reviewing the definite contributions to an analysis of the causal factors of criminal behavior, the work of Walter C. Reckless should be mentioned. He believes it is possible to discern three periods or phases: "(1) the period of particularistic theories, (2) the period of first-hand research and segmented studies, and (3) the period of reformulation."

The first period really contains the classical era of criminology which was brought to a close by Healy. Theories explaining crime and criminals were spun and announced,

7. Sutherland, op. cit., p. 83.
usually based on speculation and inadequate data. Most of the particularistic theories with their shortcomings, like those studies cited above by Lombroso and others, were in opposition to one another and were not easily reconcilable. Some were abstracts of selected parts of several theories. True as all these explanations of misfits appeared, investigation of individual case histories forced Healy to conclude that the "facts were too much for general theories." He affirmed the principle of multiple causation in individual cases in contrast to single causation for crime or criminals in general. The clinical director factorized by case analysis and enumerated the various causative factors found to be present in every offender. The tabulation of the proportional occurrence of the causative elements in several hundred individuals gave the clue as to what traits might be more or less frequent, and consequently important, in the etiology of crime and delinquency.

The second period Reckless refers to as the fact-finding stage. In the drive for first-hand data, he believes, the studies became segmented and disjoined although they served to liquidate many of the earlier pronouncements.


regarding the causes of crime and to discount many current claims. Burt's study of a small sample of London delinquents followed the pattern of enumeration of causative factors by case analysis and therefore is the principal example which shows duplication of Healy's original approach. Progress at this second stage was more negative than positive because of the attempt to discover the relation of a certain factor to crime and delinquency.

Reckless maintains that the present is the emergence of the dawn of the third period which he sees as the opportune time for a reformulation of ideas about criminal behavior as based on insights obtained from the research of the second period. While most of the research is still of the segmented type, there are signs that studies are emanating from reformulated theories of anti-social activity and are endeavoring to become more systematic.

Even before degenerated family trees such as the Jukes and the Kallikaks were investigated, European criminologists and biologists made general efforts to find the causes of anti-social behavior in the constitution of man. Though

---


12. Reckless, op. cit., p. 3.

the study by Spaulding and Healy was unable to support the claim that there is a direct inheritance of criminality or criminal tendency, many authorities were not convinced that the ghost pertaining to that particular aspect was laid low.

Johannes Lange tried to prove the inheritance of criminal behavior in his signal application of the twin technique to criminological research. By investigating the prisons and records of affiliated institutes of Bavaria for criminals who had a twin, he discovered thirty sets of twins; thirteen monozygotic (identical) and seventeen dizygotic (fraternal). Of the thirteen sets of identical, ten were found to have a criminal record for each twin and were classed as concordant. The remaining three sets of monozygotics had one twin criminal and one non-criminal and therefore were classified as discordant. These results were taken to imply that criminality was inherited; otherwise the monozygotics would not be predominantly concordant and the dizygotics discordant. According to R. A. Fisher,


the case was proven beyond chance statistically.

Along with other efforts to find the criteria of criminal behavior in the organism was the attempt to blame this phenomenon on the factors of subnormal intelligence. Both Goring's and Goddard's theories on this aspect have been covered in this report. The information was also submitted that their results were not substantiated by other authorities, among whom was Healy. He gave the Stanford-Binet intelligence test to young repeated offenders in Boston and found that the apex of the curve on the clinical chart was similar to that for American citizens in general. He further clarified this statement by pointing out that the army found the average age level of the general population to be fourteen years. On this basis the norm for the I.Q. is 90, instead of sixteen years and an I.Q. of 100 which is the median on the Stanford-Binet scale. In short, the scatter was similar to nondelinquents at this numerical rating on the clinical chart.

Murchison compared prisoners' ratings on the Army

---


Alpha and Beta tests with those of the draft army. He was unable to establish the claim that offenders were inferior to nonoffenders. His results showed that prisoners made a slightly better grade in the upper brackets than the draft army, and repeaters made a better showing than first offenders.

Another dogma, next in the ladder to win recognition as the long-looked-for answer to the problem, was the theory that the functioning of ductless glands determined an individual's behavior. The Italian criminologists felt that they now had the causal nexus between body, mind, and behavior which Lombroso's theory lacked. Studies called attention to the relationship between glandular dysfunction and anti-social activity and observations on glandular types among prisoners were made. In the United States an extreme view on the endocrinological lore was made by E. H. Smith and Dr. M. G. Schlapp. These behaviorists, in explaining that criminality operated as the result of abnormal behavior, turned back to the original postulate of the Italians that the human body and brain acted as a mechanism in reacting automatically to physical and chemical forces.

---


As noted in the foregoing comparable study of 153 delinquents and their nondelinquent siblings, Healy also found a number of cases suffering from endocrinopathy. Regardless of this, he was very conservative in his judgment, for he termed the relationship of this criterion to delinquency "very indirect." It is obvious that Reckless does not completely commit himself either in this argument, for he states that the enumerations of glandular disorders among prisoners were not validated by studies of glandular disorders among comparable nonoffenders. As a consequence there has been no way to tell whether dysfunctions are more prevalent among criminal than non-criminal individuals.

Constant efforts to establish significant criteria in the development of delinquency brought forth various pathfinders by hopeful participants. Kretschmer claimed he had isolated three major and several minor and mixed types of body builds which were more basic than racial types. According to his theory, characteristic temperaments were associated with these types of physique: athletic-schizothymic and asthenic-schizothymic offenders who were more


serious and unimprovable; pyknic-cyclothymic offenders who were less serious and improvable.

One of the more recent efforts to demonstrate the relationship between criminality and physical type was made by Hooton. Based on statistical aspects, he claimed he found a reliable difference between types of offenders in physical measurements, morphological traits (mainly inspectional), and types of body build. These differences were not due to chance, age change, personal equation of the field investigators and selective composition of the individual state prisons. He avowed that criminals represent a biologically as well as sociologically inferior aggregate although there was no more unity of type in criminals than there was in the population in general. With much detail he propounded conclusions that criminality was the impact of bad environment on "low grade" human organisms.

In evaluating Kretschmer's and Hooton's findings, many critics found weak points in both theories. It is notable that Healy also expresses doubt on the scientific value of such theories. In one of his studies he states that it appears hazardous to offer any conclusions concerning the possible relationship of heredity to delinquency. Among the difficulties of interpretation is the fact that there are


often bad social conditions surrounding youth created by socially unfit parents, the effects of which are not those of biological inheritance.

Aside from probing to find the determinants of criminal behavior in the constitution of man, there was an attempt to uncover the motivating forces of human conduct. Psychoanalysis has studied psychodynamics and has developed explanations based on unconscious motives for all kinds of behavior, including crime. The overview of the workings in the psychoanalytic theory is illustrated in the case histories of Roots of Crime, two of which were reviewed in this thesis. In Reckless's opinion, these personal inventories pictured the "typical criminal" as a sort of psychoneurotic person who was inadequate in the sense of making normal adjustments to life situations. He differs from the ordinary neurotic, not in his failure to find satisfying solutions, but in the way his solutions are resolved. These are symbolic behavior in the case of the ordinary neurotic, predatory behavior in the case of the criminal. Most non-psychoanalytic workers in behavior studies, contends Reckless critically, would agree that such a formulation has only


limited application.

Apparently Sutherland also agrees with Reckless's contention, for he denounces the fact that many cases of criminal behavior have been interpreted by psychiatrists as symbolic expressions of an incest drive or some other hidden drive. He also implies that analysts such as Alexander and Healy pay practically no attention to the person's association with criminal patterns for a review of published cases, exemplified in Roots of Crime, shows that with the meager evidence provided in some instances it is possible to make an adequate explanation of the criminality of the behavior in terms of differential association. Sutherland believes his theory would carry considerable weight if new studies were initiated to test the relationship between personal traits and associational patterns in such cases.

While applying the psychoanalytic principles to criminal

30. Reckless, op. cit., p. 17. In commenting on the point, Richard L. Jenkins submits the observation: "It is not sufficiently recognized that, neglecting a relatively small group of delinquents whose delinquency may be regarded as neurotic symptom, the neurotic and the delinquent are contrasting types. The neurotic typically has strong internalized prohibitions and is in conflict within himself. The delinquent has weak internal prohibitions and consequently is in conflict with the police."


32. Edwin H. Sutherland, "The Relations between Personal Traits and Associational Patterns"; quoted in Reckless, op. cit., pp. 131-137.

behavior, Franz Alexander found that the neurotic criminal of psychological etiology is just one of three types of chronic criminals. The other two are the normal criminal of sociological etiology and the pathological criminal of biological etiology. In addition to the three varieties of chronic criminals, there are acute criminals who are produced by special circumstances and are not likely to commit further offenses.

In evaluating this process, Reckless proclaims that psychoanalysis through its various authorities has made an important contribution to behavior study, especially in terms of psychic conflict and psychodynamics. Nevertheless, he criticizes the method on the ground that, except for the contrast between neurotic and criminal, the psychoanalysts have not been able to isolate a fundamentally different type of behavior dynamics for criminal behavior as contrasted with other forms of conduct. However, he believes Alexander's psychoanalytic explanations are best applied to cases of offenders who appear quite irrational and baffling in their behavior. For the most comprehensive version of this latter suggestion, it is necessary to call the reader's attention again to the case histories of the two prisoners described.

34. F. Alexander and H. Staub, The Criminal, the Judge and the Public, pp. 53-54; quoted in Reckless, op. cit., p. 17.
above from *Roots of Crime*.

Turning from this first phase to certain studies enumerated by Reckless as indicative of the second period of criminological research, there were a few outstanding efforts to bolster up the relation of factors in the physical environment to crime. Hence attention narrowed to the influence of the more immediate social environment. The findings of the physical environmentalists were not so much undone by research data as they were logically discounted. This discounting took place in several fields of study closely allied to criminology. As a result, Reckless informs us, research in criminology became concentrated on the social rather than on the physical environment.

Delving still deeper into the problem, there was some disposition on the part of social scientists to discount the effect of an immediate external social environment. Some American sociologists came to the conclusion that a family and neighborhood environment is not the same thing for any two persons living in it. The sort of environment which was held to merit studies on conduct was that which affects the individual and to which he responds. This basic stimulus-response pattern alone appeared to be the criterion explaining why some children (such as exemplified in Healy's

35. Alexander and Staub, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-12, 16-76.
comparative study) become delinquent and others remain nondelinquent in the same family or in the same local community.

It was proposed that the effective environment was the person's social world which is composed of the objects, persons, and relationships to which the person responds according to his attitudes. Shaw's detailed life histories were advocated as supplying the optimum means by which to capture the person's social world and to determine what items in his world provoked anti-social activity.

According to Reckless, there was insufficient follow-through in the approach to indicate characteristic situational differences between offenders and nonoffenders, or differential working of situational factors on delinquents and nondelinquents.

In the chapter of this thesis on causes, it was indicated that one of the most important situational factors investigated by social scientists was the family. Reckless, in analyzing this categorical phenomenon, comments that investigators are impressed by the fact that delinquent children come from broken homes in considerable numbers and so hastily conclude that this is an outstanding cause of


Shaw and McKay attempted to get at the matter by comparing the percentage of broken homes among male delinquents and male school children in various areas in Chicago. This procedure showed only a slight correlation between rate of juvenile delinquency and percentage of broken homes.

In appraising the intrafamily tensions as a situational factor in the etiology of delinquency and crime, Reckless submits the opinion that ferreting out the influence of the family is complicated by the fact that any given family situation is not the same for the siblings living in it. This point was well illustrated in Healy's comparative study of the siblings which has been considered several times in this paper because of its comprehensive analysis and pertinent material bearing on so many factors in this social problem. Enlarging upon this issue, Reckless concludes that the family of the delinquent may be found to be a much more strife-ridden group than that of the nondelinquent, even when the latter is a member of the same family. The delinquent child may be partly responsible for this condition,


40. Healy and Bronner, New Light on Delinquency, pp. 49-51.
as borne out by the personal inventories of the New Haven twins in Healy's clinical study.

As to critical interpersonal relationships within the home, Reckless does not put too much weight on that issue as an excuse for misconduct. He believes it reasonable that the presence of immoral, vicious, and criminal individuals who are carriers of patterns represent an exposure to which only some persons succumb. Here again the problem is to isolate those persons who do not have immunity to such social infection.

Healy accounts for the companionship factor as a weighty element in the etiology of delinquency, but Reckless is evasive. In trying to render a justifiable evaluation, he several times raises the question of whether some children are more susceptible than others to corrupting influences of associates, and the question about the difference in association of social and anti-social children. Answers to such questions are needed before one can measure scientifically the companionship element in causing initial delinquency.

---
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The third phase of etiological research in criminology Reckless calls the period of reformulation because it is based on efforts to become systematic. The volume of documents on criminology increased considerably from the research of the second period, but valid knowledge of causes did not increase proportionately. The studies lacked systematic attack and were disconnected.

In explaining the shift, Reckless says that the so-called European school of criminal biology, begun by Theodore Viernstein and Lenz, launched an important consolidated attack on the etiology of crime. The school utilized all the approaches of the constitutionalists from hereditarians to psychoanalysts. In evaluating this method, Reckless points out that criminal biology sought to develop a total personality approach, more clinical than statistical.

The questionnaire used in criminal biological research on social deviants, under the direction of Viernstein in Bavaria, includes the following items: father's ancestral lineage, mother's ancestral lineage, marital status of parents, personal data on the subject (developmental history, disease history, work experience, education and habits); mental examination (blemishes, expression, intelligence, temperament, activities and interests); clinical psychiatric type, characterological type, social prognosis,
biometric examination and endocrine symptoms.

Amplifying his impression of the work of representa­
tives of the school of criminal biology, Reckless advances
the view that the search is not to uncover concrete causal
relationships but to uncover the signs--the clinical symp­
toms--of criminality such as hereditary blemishes in family
lineage, inferiorities of personality and character, marked
disharmonic growth, insufficient function of glands as well
as other problems such as susceptibility to diseases and
maladies. Vervaeck feels certain that habitual criminals
have inferior biological, physical, and mental consitutions;
however he and others who subscribe to the school of crim­
inal biology are careful not to insist that there is just one
type of criminal make-up or one set of clinical signs de­
scribing this type. Apparently the criminal biologists are
more interested in typology than in establishing causal re­
lationships.

Analyzing this dogma still further, Reckless ventures
the opinion that perhaps the greatest emphasis in typing of­
fenders by the disciples of criminal biology has occurred in
the realm of prognosis. This concept is thought of in terms

45. Adolph Lenz, et al., Morder: die Untersunchung der
Personalickeit als Beitrag Zur Kriminalbiologischen Kautistik
and Methodik, pp. 3-33; quoted in Reckless, op. cit., pp.
53-54. The Viernstein schedule is given in detail in von
Rohden (see footnote 47, post).

46. Reckless, op. cit., pp. 53-54.
of improbability and unimprovability. Offenders typed by traits (which range from kind of offense, previous criminality, endogenic-exogenic etiology, and so forth are sub-typed by prognostic types.

In this country two American researchers, after seeking causal relationships, have arrived at results which are similar to the claims of the criminal biologist. These social scientists are Healy and Bronner and the Gluecks. The former group their cases according to classes or types of dominant etiology and then classify these types on the basis of observed outcome. According to dominant etiology their types are individuals with abnormal deviations of personality, individuals with extreme social pathology within and without the family, and individuals not included under either. Of the three groups, the first was discovered to be the most unimprovable; the second, less unimprovable and more improvable; and the third, the most improvable. It is obvious, Reckless iners, that there is a close relationship between Healy's types as described by dominant etiology and

---

47. See the excellent coverage given by Friederick von Rohden, "Methoden der Kriminalbiologie" in Emil Abderhalden, Handbuch der biologischen Arbeitsmethoden, pp. 740-756; quoted in Reckless, op. cit., p. 56.
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the European classification of criminals based on endogenic and exogenic causal factors.

Before concluding with the material on the consistent and systematic approach of criminal research in the third period, a concise evaluation giving a consolidated picture of Healy and Bronner's prognosis may be taken from Reckless's own words:

While there are questions as to the reliability of Healy's data and the validity of conclusions drawn therefrom, the delimitation of offenders according to types of causation and outcome resulted from a search for causal connections rather than from clinical characterization of the symptoms of etiological and prognostic types.

To go back to the earlier phase suggested by Reckless as the first of the three periods, a few more words on the part played by motivating forces in human conduct are in order. As the statement implies, the theory has been covered but on another aspect of the problem.

One of the outstanding systems of motivation which was applied to anti-social conduct was W. I. Thomas's formulation of the four wishes. For the most part these wishes were conscious, and in their specific concrete form acted upon social values as well as upon organic needs. According to

---
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Thomas's formulation, individuals turned to delinquency as a means of compensation when satisfaction of wishes was blocked in ordinary channels. Expression of wishes was influenced by the regulations and control of society.

Reckless seems impressed with these criteria, for he comments that while Thomas did not have data to indicate to what extent wish satisfaction could be used in explaining anti-social behavior, Healy supplied a tentative answer to this question. In the latter's comparative study of the delinquents and their nondelinquent siblings, he indicated that the controls were better able to find substitute satisfactions in socially approved channels. Since this comparative study was taken up elsewhere in this thesis, only a few relevant remarks by Reckless in relation to the theory will be forthcoming here.

Previously it was stated that Healy and Bronner's research showed that the delinquents were unable to maintain satisfying relationships under adverse conditions of family life. They were more lacking in restraining social ties and ideals; their feelings about anti-social activity were not strong enough to check misbehavior. The delinquents were therefore characteristically more distressed and disturbed than their siblings, a condition which provided the


undercurrent for seeking substitute satisfaction of wishes in channels that led to deviating behavior patterns.

In evaluating this comparative study, Reckless states that there is grave doubt about Healy's findings for in case analysis it is a relatively simple matter to discover emotional disturbances and other related shortcomings much more prevalent in delinquency than in nondelinquency cases. The examiner-psychiatrist in this instance knew beforehand which case was delinquent and which was not.

Reckless also points out that it is possible to explain differences both in emotional disturbances and in subsequent deviating conduct by sibling rivalry. By this he means that Healy's results can not be generalized beyond the type of cases upon which his study was based. On the other hand, if by the use of better controls a similar research would confirm Healy's data, there would be good reason to believe that the motivational differentials between delinquents and nondelinquents were in part solved.

This same study has been criticized by Sutherland on the ground that, although Healy and Bronner report a high degree of association between emotional disturbance and misbehavior in comparison with a control group, they fail to establish a universal relationship. He therefore discerns
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it as merely part of an answer. Instead of this partial relationship as a causal explanation of delinquency, Sutherland suggests further delving into the problem in order to determine the ways in which personal traits and associational patterns are organized in the genesis of criminal behavior. In order to point out the strength of his own conviction, he calls attention to the fact that delinquents were found to be more sociable, more athletic, and more active than the siblings, but no use was made of this information. He wonders whether the data could be organized to show that, because of their greater activity and sociability, delinquents came into contact with delinquent patterns with greater frequency, intimacy and other variables than did the controls; that they were isolated from anti-delinquent influences to a greater extent; and that differential association consequently was the cause of their delinquency.

This concept of "differential association" which Sutherland stresses as the cause of delinquency and crime is the process of reaction of the individual to his associates. A better understanding of the theory is embodied in his explanation:

Systematic criminal behavior is determined in a process of association with those who commit crimes, just as systematic lawful behavior is determined in a process of association with those who are law-abiding. Differential association is the specific causal process in the development of systematic criminal behavior.\(^5\)

As a final analysis of this particular research by Healy and Bronner, Tappan's viewpoint is most significant for it contains considerable food for thought not only for this investigation, but also for its general inferences pertaining to scientific explanation of other studies by Healy. In his review Tappan criticizes *New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment* on the ground that "emotional disturbances" are too vaguely defined and too easy to discover in or attribute to a sample of individuals known to be deviates. He points out that specialists have agreed that a science of normal behavior is prerequisite to the analysis of problem conduct. The lack of this criterion he considers a major handicap and contends that man does not yet possess a well-systematized science of human behavior. He has varied intuitive interpretations, guesses about behavior dynamics, descriptions of observed behavior and personality, and even some incipient efforts at systematic frames of reference for the interpretation of conduct. Tappan asserts it is evident that a given conduct symptom such as theft or insubordination may possibly spring

---
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from various roots. Since no measuring stick has been devised to date for similarities of motivation, which often may lead to differing consequences, judgment on these is mere guess-work. The essential elements—how they interact, what part they play separately or in configuration—these escape analysis to a great extent. The critic explains that on this basis, one is reduced to the weak hypothesis that social diagnosis is made from the more easily observable, recognizable and specific evidence. Judgment of the nature of the underlying problems is based on the imperfect observations of investigators. Significantly Tappan impresses upon his readers that this comparative study focuses attention on subtle variables of feeling and relationship that do not lend themselves to easy or exact measurement. He says no student of behavior can overlook the fact that while clinicians do operate with such intangibles and undoubtedly with certain biases implicit in their frames of reference, yet this study must be accredited with an unusual amount of care in the analysis and comparison of the delinquents and their controls. Here the expertly trained investigators were looking for no single factor or set of factors. They sought widely, intensively, and empirically for any deficiencies and advantages that might be discovered as significant in distinguishing the causes of delinquent and nondelinquent. It is recognized that statistical validity is limited because of the small size and definite selection of their group,
though the study was concerned primarily with the dynamics of the individual offender, not description of the mass. However, the conducting of this research in more than one city with investigation by several independent authorities lends additional weight to the Healy and Bronner conclusions.

It is unlikely, the critic explains in his work, that their observations could be the product of similar consistently erroneous diagnoses by a series of trained psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, and psychiatric social workers. Such a procedure provides a check of internal consistency, although the authors did not exploit it in proof of their findings. Conclusions drawn from the study have exposed the fallacy of former simplified and particularistic explanations that still permeate thinking on causation. However, the skepticism of situationalists about the accuracy of psychological observation will not be changed either by this research or other investigations. Tappan also calls attention to the fact that no matter how one counts (broken homes, unemployed fathers, slum dwellings, I. Q.'s, grade retardation and so forth), in anti-social description, the fact still remains that the subjective reaction states

associated with the environment are less tangible. The critical reader, Tappan cautions, should therefore be aware of the many limitations that still inhere in the causation research of the social scientist. For the most part the studies that have been made do not prove causal relations. The too-easy conclusion that it is the precise measurable phenomena to which cause must be attributed is a pervasive but naive force in criminological research. It comes closer to partial truths. Perhaps in the future students of etiological research will come to attribute more significance to the subtle and complex variables that motivate behavior and will attempt to discover new methods for their diagnosis and measurement.


61. Loc. cit. The potential utility of the Healy and Bronner study is increased by their emphasis upon the treatment aspects of the problem. After intensive therapy in all their cases (considerably beyond the efforts that could ordinarily be given to delinquents through a court clinic and its probation department because of the problem of budget and personnel in the latter), they discovered very different degrees of success in their cases according to the major etiological influences. They found (1) cases with extreme personality deviation, (2) cases with gross abnormality of social situation within and without the family, and (3) cases, not included under these categories, showing no very extreme deviations. The last group was found to be most amenable to rehabilitative treatment (seventy-two per cent not being delinquent in the follow-up period), the second group being considerably more difficult (thirty-eight per cent avoided further delinquency in a period of two or more years), and the first group was most unresponsive to treatment, with only one individual out of twenty-six overcoming his delinquent tendencies by the end of the treatment period.
An Evaluation of Clinical Procedures and Results by Healy and Others

Much as this critical view by Tappan is to be lauded, for it shows up the trial and error procedure in the methodology used to gain accurate knowledge on "what makes delinquency tick," considerable progress has been made. Contemporary clinical criminology is largely a product of the developments in Freudian psychology, psychiatry, clinical psychology, and the mental hygiene movements. Primarily through the example set by Dr. Healy in the Juvenile Psychopathic Institute in connection with the Juvenile Court of Cook County, Illinois, the importance of such services was organized and similar clinics were established in other cities. In 1920 the Commonwealth Fund enabled the National Committee for Mental Hygiene to institute a ten-year demonstration project. During that time juvenile courts were supplied with clinical service as a necessary adjunct. Over a period of years the emphasis in clinical work has been away from the chief problem of delinquency. Helen Witmer in her book *Psychiatric Clinics for Children* states:


It soon became apparent that there were serious disadvantages to working wholly through the courts and that the most effective preventive work was to be done with children whose misconduct had not yet been accounted legal delinquency.

In the same work she goes on to explain that since the clinic is able to obtain the combined skills of the physician, the social worker, the psychologist and psychiatrist, it is in a dominant position to carry on research projects on behavior activities. The parole and probation officer as well as the community at large should have the privilege of turning to the clinic for aid in coping with individuals who display anti-social behavior. If one accepts the modern psychiatric point of view that every human being is a unique personality, then it follows that research and treatment are correlated entities. On that score she suggests that clinics dealing with misbehavior problems should be primarily treatment centers and not merely diagnostic centers. The most that can be secured in the diagnostic centers, she amplifies, is the compiling of statistics. While this has some value, on the whole it is rather sterile and fruitless.

Many other social scientists were equally as adamant as Helen Witmer in voicing their disapproval and pointing out the futility of mere diagnostic services. In fact the

Judge Baker Guidance Center has been the brunt of considerable debate regarding the value of clinical work. The controversy was the result of criticism directed against this specific clinic by Dr. Sheldon and Mrs. Eleanor T. Glueck. In their study, One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, the Guecks found that of approximately one thousand cases (actually 905) dealt with by the Boston juvenile court and the Judge Baker Foundation, 798 (88.2 per cent) had committed additional delinquencies during the subsequent five years. Of the 905 boys, two-thirds were actually arrested on serious charges. The average number of arrests for each of the group who recidivated was 3.6. On the strength of this data the investigators reached the conclusion that "the treatment which was given by the clinic, the court, and the associated community facilities had very little effect in preventing recidivism."

Critics of the child guidance clinic and the juvenile court rely on this careful study for proof to bolster up their prejudice that youngsters are being coddled by the prevailing treatment techniques advocated and utilized by Healy and others. A wave of vociferous discussion was stimulated by the publication of the Guecks' findings


which finally simmered down so that definite results could be more adequately determined.

Viewing the gravity of such unjust inferences friends of the court and the clinic pointed out in defense of the system that the Judge Baker Foundation, at that earlier date, was still only a diagnostic agency and had not as yet embarked on a program of treatment. As a matter of fact they alleged that if these boys had been sent to a reform school or prison the outcome would have been even more serious. To be sure in numerous cases the clinical treatment of the Judge Baker Foundation failed to get very far because Healy and others could not control the total situation to which the delinquent reacted. In some instances while the problems were solved, adjustments were still limited because of intellectual handicaps or unmodifiable life situations. In other cases the futility of the clinicians' efforts is best revealed in the words of this old-trite but self-explanatory anecdote: "You can lead a horse to water, but you can't make him drink."

The conclusions of this study stimulated a determination on the part of advocates of both court and clinic to
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investigate the methods of these social agencies and to integrate the work involved in the two systems more closely. In spite of all the clamoring the Gluecks themselves asserted that both the court and the clinic must be retained since they made the treatment of anti-social behavior much more satisfactory than the old criminal court procedure of an earlier day. The clinic "furnished not only a scientifically valid attitude and a source of needed adult education but also very tangible immediate assistance to the Court."  

In contradistinction to the debatable issue just reviewed on the adequacy or inadequacy of clinical accomplishments the following study, Treatment and What Happened Afterward, by Healy and Bronner is presented here because it points out the fallacy of the critical evaluations perpetrated by individuals opposed to the system.  

In the four hundred cases embraced in this study of 280 boys and 120 girls, treatment by the clinic's facilities was carried on for two years and nine months. Two hundred and seven of the group were classed as "Personality and Behavior Problems." In Dr. Healy's words, they were distributed as indicated:

(a) Severe personality problems................. 47
   Besides 20 of the abnormal and psychotic personalities, this group includes those, for example, exhibiting extremely rebellious, headstrong, irritable, impulsive, oversensitive, obstinate, eccentric, reckless types of behavior. Combinations of these and of other manifestations often led us to consider the case as a severe problem.

(b) Milder personality problems............... 45
   In addition to less serious forms of the above we placed in this category milder and simpler patterns of high-strung, distractible, "sissified," cowardly, immature, demanding, domineering, ambitionless, and other undesirable behavior.

(c) Definite neurotic manifestations.......... 45
   Besides 9 extremely neurotic cases listed in another (category) here we have included those showing neurotic habits, fears, tantrums, physical symptoms, self-starvation, etc.

(d) Undesirable behavior in direct reaction to life situations......................... 54
   Without specifying the life situations it may be stated that under this head clearly belong certain problems of defiance, temper tantrums, special hatreds, compensatory excessive daydreaming or fabricating, various inferiority reactions, asocial tendencies, quarreling, "spoiled child" wilfulness and irresponsibility, mild depressions, etc.

(e) Conduct expressing exaggerated sexual interests................................. 6
   Non-delinquent unwholesome sexually biased infatuation, sexual obsessions, fetishism, homosexual tendencies, etc.

(f) Educational maladjustments.............. 10
   Reading disabilities, school failure in spite of high I.Q., dissatisfaction with academic course, etc.

In addition some of the cases displayed habits such as enuresis, thumb-sucking, stammering, food dislikes,
masturbatory practices, many of which were discovered in combinations.

Since the above study comprises cases from the community, it also serves to present a picture of the work of a child guidance clinic. None was sent from the court. Aside from these two hundred and seven deviants, one hundred and thirty-seven were labeled "noncourt delinquents." They had either committed a wide variety of offenses or had been guilty of anti-social behavior at one time. The more serious delinquencies included long record of stealing, breaking and entering into places, larceny, automobile stealing, serious running away, excessive truancy, malicious fire-setting, forgery, serious sexual misconduct, exhibitionism, blackmail, and extreme waywardness. Fifty-six of those cases referred by the court had committed delinquencies similar to those mentioned for the noncourt cases.

Since the laity usually questions the extent of the intellectual factor in its relation to delinquency, Barnes and Teeter say that the most interesting feature of the analysis was that a large number scored high in intelligence; only two were labeled morons by Healy.

70. Healy and Bronner, Treatment and What Happened Afterwards, p. 17; quoted in Barnes and Teeters, op. cit., pp. 933-935.

Commenting further on the above 1939 study of the four hundred delinquents, Healy shows that 323 (eighty-one per cent) established favorable careers after treatment by court and clinic. As to the Gluecks' research made in 1934, he remarks:

On account of the well-merited wide reading that the Gluecks' One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents has received, a statement is warranted concerning the treatment aspects of the cases they analyzed and followed up—especially since the original source of their facts was our own clinical records of certain cases studied by us for diagnosis and advice during the years 1917 to 1922. With all the splendid values that this work presents, its picturing of treatment is necessarily very inadequate, since so little thorough-going and well-oriented treatment of these delinquents was carried out by anyone. It is unfortunate that the title page implies that these 1,000 delinquents received clinical treatment—even though the text indicates the opposite—because this had led to misunderstandings and erroneous statements.72

In addition to the above statement, Healy points out the workings at the clinic still more in order to convey a better understanding of the program he instituted. He amplifies that from the very beginning of the work in Boston, certain individuals have been seen and treatment undertaken in cooperation with social agencies. Psychograms and other relevant data of these individuals, some not court delinquents, have subsequently been developed. Gradually more and more cases, sometimes serious offenders,

have been referred to the Center from families. Within recent years, over one-half of the referrals came directly from families of various social strata. Considerable material is therefore available for the study of preventive treatment not involving the legal process. For the purpose of research, comparison is possible between what may be called "treated cases" in which all kind of efforts have been made, such as medical, psychotherapeutic, educational adjustment, change of environment, attempted alteration of family attitudes, and control cases. The latter remained untreated except by court and probationary methods.

Since 1929 much more treatment was undertaken. The result is that now there are hundreds of voluminous case histories which include details of various items with particular emphasis upon personal interrelationships. These tend to show what can or can not be accomplished by attempting to change various aspects of the life situation. It should also be noted, Healy asserts, that since the establishment in 1930 of a definite treatment unit in the Judge Baker Guidance Center many diverse types of problems have been seen. The maladjustments ranged from educational and personality problems to cases of neurotic and emotional difficulties. At present there is an accumulation of hundreds of such cases from varied sorts of family and environmental backgrounds. While many of these cases may be regarded as possibly incipient, though prevented, cases of delinquency,
Healy believes, it would be of interest to compare these records with those of offenders.

According to him, fairly comprehensible data can also be obtained on another important piece of research. This pertains to the work of abnormal personalities that he began in 1926 with Dr. Clark and Dr. Kasanin. The purpose of this study, first reported at the International Congress of Mental Hygiene in 1930, was to further knowledge on criteria of diagnosis and etiology. Despite all sorts of treatment for a considerable number of the earlier cases, the individuals show many remarkable criminal careers. However, Barnes and Teeters believe that in view of the progress made since the turn of the century by the child-guidance clinics it is self-evident that scientific knowledge of various ramifications of the etiology of maladjustment in children is essential.

In surveying Healy's literature, one is impressed by his constant admonition that no technique in the end will prove intrinsically meritorious in the absence of skilled personnel and adequate facilities to deal with the varied problems of delinquents. Perhaps that is why he was so


74. Barnes and Teeters, op. cit., p. 937.
enthused with the Borstal system in England. He suggested that research should be undertaken in this country to see whether the system might not prove equally as successful here.

A generalized view, taken from studies formulated by Healy and others, of the forces shaping behavior has been attempted here, from which a thesis on delinquency causation is derived. This paper has touched only a few of the high spots of this challenging theoretical problem. Healy has made delinquent conduct his life study. Through his research, it has been recognized that delinquents and criminals possess practically the same individual characteristics as the nondelinquent population, for within an individual's own personality nature and nurture are inextricably related.

In pursuing this arduous task Healy tracked down all the roads as exemplified in his multiple-factor theory. The information he expounded has been the result of hard-won facts. Above all, excursions into the realm of fancy were avoided. His analysis marked a significant advance in the sociological study of personal disorganization. While pioneering has stimulated deepest endeavor, Healy states, pleasure in it was tempered by the realization that fewer

---

mistakes might have been made if there had been more scientific foundations upon which to build. Perhaps the most useful aspect of Dr. Healy's undertaking was that he extended the clinical activities dealing with children. This service was most helpful in decreasing the number who by mishap and chance, or by sheer adventure, were drawn into the network that ultimately led to the bleak prison and sometimes the hangman's noose.
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