servants.—(3) I have estimated the number of married Moslems alive in Egypt in 1920 to have amounted to 4,823,000. The ratio of divorces to married persons thus becomes 20·7 per 1,000 per annum, or more than one in every 50 married persons was divorced during the year, or one out of every 25 marriages became dissolved during the year; at which rate, if no other factors were at work, all Mohammedans would be divorced people in 25 years' time!—(4) The proportion in another hot and dusty country, Australia, is 7 blind persons per 10,000 of the population.—(5) More valuable indeed than the political services for which so many beer and whisky makers have received peerages!—(6) The present European population of Egypt being 181,500, the number of beds allowed would be about 7 per 10,000. In England 25 per 10,000 are provided.—(7) To obtain which I have contributed 6 *per cent.* of my salary, *i.e.*, an average of L.E. 60 per annum.

Clinical Notes and Cases.

Two Cases illustrating the Conception of Moral Imbecility. By Ian D. Suttie, M.B., F.R.F.P.Glas.

Case 1.—R— is of working-class parentage. His father is said to have taken alcohol, but there is no evidence of excess. He is one of the younger ones in a family of fourteen, of whom three died young, and three in adult life. The remaining members of the family are all married or working, and have no psychopathic history. R— himself was not very robust, but was intelligent and ambitious; he had a good school record, but had to leave at 14 to earn his living. After a short service as a shopboy, he became a *colporteur*, and later—probably by the assistance of friends—he managed to put in a certain amount of training at a University, studying for the ministry. He was appointed a collector and organizer for Church charities (?); this brought him into touch with the "good and the great," and in a short time he obtained an appointment as a sort of lay assistant missionary.

Prior to this time we have no record of wrong-doing. He now, however, attempted to combine the pursuit of material interests with the Church work he professed and was paid for. He retailed tea as a sort of side-line, though, having no shop, he seems to have relied at first upon personal interviews with the members of the congregation to do business. He soon became more enterprising and carried on trade by post. He recognized the necessity for advertisement, and also showed his intelligence by circulating a leaflet and by issuing numbered coupons with his wares. In connection with these there was a regular "drawing"—money prizes—and the names of winners were advertised. There is no evidence that he did not run this lottery fairly (even though it was illegal), but one might conjecture that the distribution of prizes was such as to increase business. Then came rumours about the condition of a lady in the neighbourhood, and the Church, fearing worse scandal, decided to dispense with his services. He was told that he was a whole-time employee, and was expected to be this or resign. R— was loth to lose the prestige of his semi-ecclesiastical status, and determined not to give up the prospects held out

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.70.291.612 Published online by Cambridge University Press

by his growing tea business. He met the difficulty in a bold and adroit manner, which showed at once his originality and ability to influence others. He seceded from the Church and set up a congregation of his own. I am convinced that the pleasure of preaching and the dignity of "being a minister" were quite as dear to him as the "credit" it gave him in his business transactions.

Things seem to have been going to his satisfaction when his wife (the lady referred to above) had a baby untimeously. R— bolted and disappeared. Whether this panic was due to a correct estimate of public opinion in a Scottish parish or to a wholly unfounded and unreasonable dread of *material* punishment, I cannot say. I should not feel inclined to credit the man with the grace to be ashamed of anything, while I *know* that he has *now* a very shrewd understanding of the limitations of the law. Whatever the cause of his flight he recovered his confidence almost immediately, and reappeared with a plan of campaign. He issued the circular, appended at the end of this article, to all his congregation.

Note first the supposed "medical certificate." If I dared to publish it *in extenso*, its spuriousness would be obvious to every medical man. It purported to be signed by a highly respected local physician, who would have had a fit if he could have seen the "qualifications" appended to his name. Note also the clause about bringing the circular to serve as a ticket of admission. By this ruse he recovered *all but three* of these compromising documents. Indeed the wonder is that any remain extant if it involved their possessors' absence from the meeting. Here again, if he does not show a real appreciation for the feelings and ideals of others, at least he has a practical acquaintance with some aspects of human nature, and the ability to turn this to account. At any rate he actually managed to preserve a following.

He next appears as the champion of the oppressed in the law courts, and by his acuteness and energy wins a large inheritance for two of his "adherents." These old ladies, from gratitude (though other reasons are also hinted at), take R— and his wife to live with them. R— is now a capitalist and does business as a money-lender; he also begins to drink, and is known to be sexually immoral. His wife divorces him. He marries again and has children, but treats his second wife very badly. Friends rally round, however, and a very eminent person is interested. R— once more gets into the thick of religious and humanitarian movements, and even seems to have been worthy of his hire.

Whatever the reason, R— was now promoted so rapidly from one job to another that he had not time to show his incompetence or to make any place too hot to hold him—until he got to the very top of his particular tree. There his way of enjoying the fruits, and of carrying out the duties of his office, led to his summary dismissal in nine months. The job was one requiring not only intelligence and organizing power, ability to influence others and some knowledge of the world—. R— had these—it required also diligence and a sincere interest in the work, a personality which would stand the scrutiny of really intelligent men, and above all,

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.70.291.612 Published online by Cambridge University Press

an understanding of the real functions and mechanism of social life. In these he was grossly defective.

Eight months after dismissal he is known to have obtained drink and money on false pretences, and to have evaded payment of an hotel debt. Almost immediately after this he got in touch with a well-to-do man, to whom he represented himself as a high official in the Ministry of Munitions. He professed a great interest in the career of this gentleman's son and posed as able and willing to procure him good employment (this was a "lay" he had worked before). Later, being as he said short of ready cash, he borrowed twenty-five pounds without giving a receipt.

Three days afterwards he called again on this gentleman and borrowed another fifty pounds on the strength of the same "patter." This time, however, R— appears to have felt that some formalities were necessary, so he wrote out a cheque on a piece of paper. This cheque was drawn on Cox's Bank, London, and R— drew the recipient's attention to the magic letters M/M (Ministry of Munitions) after his signature. In recognition of his obligation in the matter of the loan, and in token of his interest in the lender's son, R— drew the cheque for a hundred pounds, the extra twenty-five pounds being a "present" for the young man. Whether R— felt that he had been too generous in this or whether he blamed himself for neglecting golden opportunities, he was back again at his victim the next day. This time he swopped cheques for twenty-five pounds. R— cashed what he held at once before his own "London" cheques could be collected, and when in due course the latter were dishonoured ("drawer not identified"), and the man whom he owed a hundred pounds came round to see him about it, R— met him in the friendliest manner. He certainly managed to reassure his victim as to his *bonâ fides*, and to turn the conversation to the young man's prospects. R— made definite offers, but required in turn certain signed particulars. In this way he got his man to sign across two stamps on a blank sheet of paper; the details, as R— said, could be filled in when he had more time.

So far as this story has gone, the intellectual defect, if any, seems to have been on the side of the honest population. R— now, however, seems to have overlooked the possibility that his victim's trustfulness and tolerance might not last after his own soothing glamour had been withdrawn. Perhaps he relied on the stamped receipt; in any case he took no precautions to cover his tracks, and merely moved into the next parish before settling down to drink his plunder. There he was arrested almost immediately in an extremely alcoholic condition with fifty pounds still on him.

A few days after arrest he smashed up his cell and was then lodged in a lunatic asylum because of his acute excitement, not because any suspicion of a permanent abnormality had been aroused. Even two months later on appearing before Court he is recorded to have behaved in an insane fashion. His condition was said to have been one of mania or delirium tremens or general paralysis, and Dr. Watson, now of the Board of Control, who saw

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.70.291.612 Published online by Cambridge University Press

him shortly afterwards, reports that he was depressed and hallucinated, grandiose, offering cheques for two hundred and fifty pounds, and saying that he would be alive at the end of a thousand years. He was terrified of the hangman, of a wild beast at his heart about to suck his blood, and was restless and emotional. This quickly cleared up, however, and he became his normal self. There can be no doubt that alcohol played an important part in this psychotic episode, though it lasted far too long to be diagnosed as delirium tremens. Quite possibly arrest and imprisonment may have had something to do with this acute confusional condition.

As an inmate of the C.L.D. (Criminal Lunatic Department) detained during H.M.P. (His Majesty's pleasure) he quickly and accurately grasped the situation, and, while making the best of it for the sake of present comfort, at once began to shape the most comprehensive plans to get out, and once again to get into "a position of trust and responsibility, not overworked, but with adequate remuneration." He "had buried the past," and it "shamed and grieved" him so much that he "could never again refer to it." Having "repented on his knees and made his peace with Christ," he did not see why his fellow mortals should be less forgiving. In order that he should understand the public point of view and not acquire an anti-social grudge, I pointed out that his detention here was not retributive for the past, but precautionary for the future—in fact that the public had a practical interest in the matter and could not afford to forgive too lightly.

His religiosity disgusted most people, who thought him a canting hypocrite. Though it was impossible for his intimates to doubt the spurious nature of his piety, yet for my own part I am convinced that he did experience, and intensely enjoy, the religious emotions. The sentimental good nature, the expansive feelings of benevolence, the generous and lofty intentions that most people experience only in special circumstances or under the influence of alcohol, this man could evoke, one might almost say, at will. Not merely a deliberate, fraudulent *mimicry* of the *expression* of emotion, but the thing itself was at his call. He really took pleasure in sentimentalizing and in pious talk; it cost him no effort to keep it up; it was not a pose of which he tired or out of which he could be surprised. He was a real actor, not a simulator, and it was this that caused a difference of opinion about his character. He was, however, a phenomenal liar, knew very well the advantage of religious and moral pretensions, and had no scruple about deliberately turning them to account. The sincerity I attribute to him amounts merely to this—a sincere hope for a happy life after death, a genuine pleasure in emotional religious exercises, and perhaps a real interest in the speculative metaphysics called Theology. He also (and this is important) appeared to value his status as a professed christian because of the company with which it identified him; it was a sort of class pride, much as "being a sportsman," or "being a gentleman" is—it gave him a sense of dignity. He did not, however, act as if it laid him under any obligation.

Not but that he was prepared to lay his piety aside temporarily

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.70.291.612 Published online by Cambridge University Press

now and then in order to be "all things to all men." My own receptive attitude towards him, neither critical nor commendatory, puzzled him. He could not quite place my detached interest. At times I could see he suspected me of being a worldling, perhaps even a scoffer, although in point of fact no other competent observer really credited him with as much sincerity as I did. He showed a broadminded desire to adapt himself to whatever might be my attitude in these matters, and from time to time he experimented in the *rôle* of "man of the world." Finding that even this could not "draw" me—did not produce any favourable or unfavourable response from which he could learn my "personal" attitude—he gave it up. These manœuvres, however, compelled him ever afterwards to discuss his ambitions, etc., more frankly with me. Whether he felt that, not having been "choked off" to begin with, he might safely show an interest in his own material prospects, or whether he felt the necessity of maintaining, for the sake of consistency, the broad-minded and practical attitude he had once adopted, at any rate he never again camouflaged himself quite so completely behind moralizations. Not that he gave up the endeavour to size me up, but he never again risked allowing me to think him inconsistent or hypocritical.

The intelligence here displayed might be stigmatized as cunning so as to imply that the case shows a defect in the cognitive function, and is not a true example of "moral imbecility." To my mind this would be to use a word of uncertain meaning—cunning—to convey a false impression. Cunning is no other than intelligence used in the pursuit of narrow, shortsighted or unworthy purposes, or directed against fellow citizens; just as wisdom means intelligence with good sense, breadth of outlook and socially commendable. A man with sufficient cunning cannot be claimed as intellectually defective. In my opinion this man showed no intellectual defect which could account for his moral lapses. On the contrary there is evidence that his ability to think and to express his thought has steadily improved *during his adult life*, in spite of alcoholism. He now writes an excellent letter, not merely well-expressed, but well-arranged, so that his topics are dealt with systematically. He neglects no conceivable source of help in his present predicament. He humbles and reconciles himself to his relations, makes interest with half a dozen philanthropic and evangelical agencies, moulds his conduct so as to secure the favour of the prison authorities, at the same time corresponding with his lawyer with a view to compounding with the complainant so as to have the charge withdrawn. To a lawyer this last scheme might appear stupid, but it must be remembered that R— has had no experience of criminal law. Also as he is untried (insane in bar of trial), it is quite natural for him to imagine that restitution and the appeasing of the plaintiff will at least weaken the prosecution—in point of fact it would tend to have this effect in a jury trial. Again, when I pointed out to him the futility of this course as a legal procedure, he at once grasped the situation and concentrated all his efforts on other plans. Churches, Freemasons, Salvation Army, Prisoners' Aid Societies

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.70.291.612 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and other social and charitable agencies, and various influential people with whom he had come into contact, were all canvassed and considered with a view to their possible usefulness in securing liberation and employment for himself.

When finally he knew that he was to be liberated, his active mind at once attacked the new situation. None of his material interests were overlooked, from a spare collar-stud upwards. Teeth were put in order, eyeglasses were obtained, D.P.A.S. was laid under contribution for collars, handkerchiefs, etc., and his friends and relations were touched for small presents in kind or specie. New toothbrush and powder, spare elastic bandage—his outfit, though meagre, was considered as carefully and systematically as if he were going to the South Pole. He could say with perfect justice that he had no prospect of being able to replace it; that he could not afford to neglect any chances. At the same time I think a normal man who was being liberated ostensibly and professedly that he might morally rehabilitate himself, would have been a little shy of showing quite such enthusiasm and loving care over his kit.

This typical indifference to the *impression* his conduct might make upon others will be referred to again. Before liberation he freely questioned the motives of the Society that was going to take over the responsibility of looking after him. He suspected them of the intention of exploiting him, and he tried very hard to arrange fixed terms with a definite period of probation. As the Society agreed to accept the responsibility as guardians and employers only at his earnest and importunate entreaties, he not only shows himself unreasonable, but again betrays his disregard for, or incapacity to appreciate, the niceties of social feeling—what is sometimes called "common decency." No sooner were the arrangements made for conditional liberation than he was inquiring and scheming about the removal of all conditions. The influential friends he could get at, the societies whose good offices he could enlist for employment, etc.—the old game of intrigue was on foot again. Even after he was out he was "touching" his friends for money, etc., writing the Prison Commissioners and the Medical Superintendent, complaining of the condition of his kit, etc., and trying to fasten upon them the responsibility for the loss of his baggage, which had gone amissing during his drunken spree prior to arrest. Every effort had been made to recover this, and he had professed himself satisfied that no more could be done. Apparently he actually reckoned that his letter to the Commissioners would procure him sympathy, and perhaps a little cash or a lightening of conditions. Yet it contained several demonstrable mis-statements into which he must have supposed no inquiry would be made. Another typical act was to "raise the wind" by "writing up" his prison experiences. This has not been admitted by him nor by the editor, but it is morally certain that R—was the correspondent.

And all this time his real, rational objective is unconditional liberation. He knows it, and knows, too, that it depends upon the

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.70.291.612 Published online by Cambridge University Press

judgment of men who are observing these actions. He neglects no pains to secure their favourable opinion of him—his overt actions and particularly his professions are laboriously saintly. Yet he spoils the whole effect through failure to appreciate the importance of so-called "intuitive" or "sympathetic" judgments of character. He takes the same trouble to present a uniform attitude towards things before me, though there is some difficulty in synthetizing a broad-minded and practical "man of the world" point of view with extreme and even extravagant piety. Still, such characters do exist, blameless themselves, yet tolerant and even humorous. His conscious pose is consistent, not merely as a habit, but by deliberate intention. Yet he cannot see the inconsistency of his solicitude for all the trifles of his personal comfort. Perhaps no one but a psychologist could *perceive* it, but any normal man would *feel* it. Though there is no *logical* inconsistency, and though there is nothing wrong in his attention to personal interests, yet it is out of the part that he has set himself to play. Everywhere R— shows himself utterly lacking in *tact*; he has a certain knowledge of human nature which he can turn to account in dealing with his fellows, but the natural, unstudied facility for getting on or remaining in harmony with them he has not. He is like a man laboriously speaking a foreign tongue; all the idioms, the nuances of meaning escape him, and he is in consequence quite unconvincing. His adaptation to social life is an *intellectual* one; for him his fellow beings are *objects* whose reactions have to be laboriously calculated, and who require to be controlled by constant watchfulness and dexterity. Where he is inattentive, excited, or out of his depths psychologically, his defect—his inability to deal *naturally* with his fellows—becomes obvious.

It is no wonder that at times he shows the most startling clumsiness in his social relations, a disregard for, or ignorance of, the consequences of behaviour which is not legally forbidden, but is prevented by custom. Unconscious tradition intuitively recognizes many details of conduct and expression too subtle for the ordinary person to distinguish cognitively. Besides unwritten laws there are unspoken conventions and manners which are learned without ever being put into words. These R— has *not* learned, and his emotional relation to his fellows is now such that he cannot learn them. This *is* his defect, and certainly it is not dependent upon any inability to think logically, or to understand and use highly abstract conceptions. He cannot "put himself in another's place," and this is an operation which requires not so much high intelligence as sympathetic imagination, in which R— is totally lacking. In consequence he cannot "see himself as others see him," and has no feeling for the delicacies and niceties of social intercourse. I do not refer to class mannerisms. Actually his manners are superior, while the lower classes whose experience of the raw facts of life induces in them a corresponding bluntness of speech, are in no way characterized by the insensitiveness I have tried to describe. R— has the intelligence not to be obtrusive in his piety to the extent of annoying others, but he has not the flair

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.70.291.612 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to avoid disgusting some by his ostentation. He has no sense of shame, and once, when detected by my predecessor in a petty breach of trust, he lied magnificently; finding this useless, he waited some days and then apologized—for the breach of trust!

With this goes naturally an utter lack of self-consciousness, and it is largely to this I fancy that he owes his power of convincing others. Those who would not be deceived by his plausible stories or dazzled by his affected learning and semi-genuine piety might well be taken in by his assurance. It is noteworthy that R—'s mental condition came in question only because of an alcoholic psychosis; defect was never suspected.

If we take it that his abnormality consists primarily and essentially in a defective social *rapport*, the question of origin arises—whether it is germinal or acquired, whether it is due to physical or psychical agents. This question can only be answered after full consideration of the nature of this *rapport* from all possible points of view.

All that can be inferred from this case is that a man of average, or more than average, intelligence and power of attention, who earnestly and consistently applies his abilities to the task of making an impression on his fellows, may fail in his purpose because he is affectively out of harmony with them. While he has a measure of success with strangers and inferiors, he is utterly unconvincing to intimates and equals, who have no hesitation in calling him an arrant humbug. I submit that the curious obtuseness displayed by this man cannot be accounted as the ignorance and stupidity of the congenital defective. It is not facts, relations or logical consequences that he overlooked, but merely the feelings and point of view of others; their insight (even where intellectually subnormal) into human motive, and their intuitive appreciation of sincerity and consistency. The suggestion is that R— is defective in organic sympathy, or the power of identifying himself with others and seeing himself and seeing things with their eyes. Again, I do not think that we explain the case by calling him a hypocrite—apart altogether from the fact that hypocrisy on this scale itself bespeaks an abnormality of the social *rapport*. R—'s pose is certainly largely assumed, and he spares no care nor effort to make it convincing; but he spoils his effects repeatedly, blindly, gratuitously, in a way that a person of ordinary social sensibility would not do. An accomplished hypocrite like Mr. Pecksniff habitually exploits subtleties of expression to which R—, equally intelligent, is totally blind. R—'s defect, though certainly not defined by the data here given, does show with significant conspicuousness in his social reactions.

Besides what is here recorded, R— is known to have been twice convicted of fraud and false pretences, to have had two dramatic "conversions" of a type more familiar in American camp revival meetings than here, to have had several illegitimate children, to have practically deserted his second wife, though in a position to support her, to have importuned the wife who divorced him for money, though she was then married to another man, to have set

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.70.291.612 Published online by Cambridge University Press

up a trade in "druggists' sundries" on the proceeds, and to have sold cures which he manufactured in his back kitchen.

CASE 2.—N— was a youngest son. He was brought up by his grandparents, and, by his own admission, was thoroughly spoiled, though religious observances were scrupulously insisted on. He was neither "wild" nor specially studious, but appears to have been a normal youngster, very keen on boating and fishing. He had an average education, but left school (against his parents' wishes) at the age of fourteen, "to see the world and earn some money." There is no evidence of early delinquency, his companions were respectable, his grandparents were affectionate and supplied his wants generously. He learned to express himself well, to "know right from wrong," and could have had a trade or a training if he had had the patience to wait for it.

He seems to have avoided sex difficulties, to have got through adolescence contentedly enough with a minimum of information. Even now he is "refined," in no way hyper-erotic, and though not prudish, he never formed the habit of obscene speech. There is quite probably an element of self-righteousness in his contempt for his former Borstal companions, but his remarks about their inability either to think or talk about other than sex matters and without garnishing their language are quite just, and far too moderate to be mere cant. His attitude is not so much one of disgust and horror as of amused contempt. He regards obscenity as a stupidity.

This healthy, energetic, well-brought-up youngster gets home-sick within the year at his first job on leaving school. When his employer refuses him leave and arrears of wages, M— deserts, stealing his employer's bicycle "to get home on," and caps the matter by selling the bicycle. Although he is only fifteen he gets ten days' imprisonment. Thereafter he worked for six months, then idled at home for five months, and then went to work again. Almost immediately he injured his hand, and consequently was out of work for a week. He did not get the compensation he wanted, and could not meet his lodgings bill. As he puts it now, "so as not to defraud her (his landlady) and get jailed anyhow," he stole five pounds from a workmate. He actually used one pound to pay his debt and banked the rest, which was recovered and returned to its owner.

His action in this situation is really very extraordinary. He could have got the money by writing home for it; there is no evidence that his landlady suspected his *bonâ fides* or dunned or threatened him in any way; his inability to pay was clearly accidental and temporary, while the probabilities of detection of the theft appear to have been very high indeed. Altogether this was a very abnormal reaction, and was met by sixty days' imprisonment.

After three months' work and three months at home, he took a situation at which he was hard-worked, but which allowed him a certain amount of rabbit shooting, which he keenly enjoyed. He was now nearly seventeen when a middle-aged woman seduced him. This *liaison* was in no way of his seeking, and he broke it off immediately in disgust and disillusionment. (The facts of the affair

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.70.291.612 Published online by Cambridge University Press

are fairly well ascertained, and the details of his story are of a character and consistence that make falsehood very improbable.)

M—, now gets "fed up" with his situation, breaks his engagement, though by so doing he forfeits his wages, and joins the army. He appears to have been in a very bad temper, and to have had a strong grudge at something, for he threw his civilian kit into the sea. This kit consisted of two good suits, and was for him quite valuable property; his present-day explanations of this act (which were only obtained under cross-examination) are obviously rationalizations; he "had no use for them," "no place to keep them," "never thought of sending them home," and "did not like to sell them."

It must be noticed that in view of the charge subsequently brought against him this action will bear a more sinister interpretation. He may have been getting rid of clothing that might help to identify him. But the police never knew or inquired about this jettison, and there was no reason for him to tell me about it if it was meant to conceal guilt. It was told in a context and with the expression of grievance—bitterness against his employer because M— had lost his wages and was dissatisfied anyway. Judging from his manner and expressions, etc., I formed a fairly confident opinion that this was a primitive reaction to a sense of injury. This self-hurting reaction is common in people of low culture, Celts particularly, and children, and of course it greatly reinforces the pleasing sense of injury.

M— now joined the army, and seems to have got along very well for a few months. A scandal, however, came to light in regard to a weak-minded girl, and M— was arrested on suspicion. He did not communicate with his people, had no agent, did not apply for bail, but the prosecuting authorities satisfied themselves that he was innocent of the charge. I was not allowed to see the precognitions, but am satisfied from his account and from other circumstances that this is true. He had, however, been in prison nearly three months and was discharged without a trial, and these circumstances and the nature of the charge "turned all his folks against him." With his accumulated pay, however, he easily found less particular companions in town, got drunk and had a serious accident. After recovery he still found his situation intolerable, and after trying for a transfer he left the army.

In his next place M— met a girl whose people were respectable and fairly well-to-do. He became very intimate with her, and it was practically arranged that they were to get married, when his story came out. (He says the local police told the father, and there is no reason to doubt this.) The girl did not change her mind, and he is still quite confident that she was willing to elope with him as he intended before her parents could make any effective opposition. He had at that time twenty pounds, but reckoned that all that would be needed for honeymoon expenses. At any rate, though he needed a rig-out he resolved not to trench upon capital, and got what he wanted "on tick." To procure this he found it necessary to give his employer's name, and did so, though he had

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.70.291.612 Published online by Cambridge University Press

no authority for this. He now appears to have had an excellent opportunity to achieve his purpose, and celebrated his success by a drink, and another one, etc. In a week's time he found himself without money, without a job, and consequently without means to get married or to repay his debt and conceal his illegal use of his employer's name, or even to escape. Three months' imprisonment followed. The abnormality of this reaction consists in that the clothes were not really necessary, that he could have got them by writing home, that there was no desperate hurry, that he did not carry out his own plan.

On release he fell in with a widow (middle-aged and with a family) whom he had known formerly. He lived with her for a week, and entertained her copiously with liquor obtained by forging orders in the name of a former employer against whom he had a grudge. He then cleared out and went to meet his sweetheart, whose attachment seems to have been undiminished. She gave him two pounds and asked him if he was going to go straight. She found a photograph of the lady he had just left holding one of her children. Her jealousy was quieted by M— explaining that this was a picture of his mother and himself when a child. To lull her suspicions he resumed relations with her and managed to persuade her he had come straight from prison. It was no time, however, till the liquor fraud was discovered and traced to him, and he got five months' imprisonment. His first letter from prison was to his sweetheart, asking her to wait for him, and when she did not (or was not allowed to) reply, he was bitterly aggrieved. He could understand that she must have discovered his untruthfulness and infidelity, but this did not diminish his resentment. His mind turned at once to the other lady, the widow, whose good-nature he praised; she certainly did not neglect him in his adversity. He remarked of her, "I could love that woman as my mother."

Almost immediately after his release M— got into trouble again, and he is now—at the age of twenty—in prison for the sixth time ("fraud and false pretences," six months). He is of medium height, stoutly built, healthy and good-looking, without any physical abnormality whatever. Unaffected and refined in speech, he expresses himself well, his manners are good, he has a quiet dignified bearing with no trace of self-consciousness or self-assertiveness. Pleasant to talk to, sometimes witty and even humorous, he never becomes "loud" or tries to make an impression. He neither truckles to authority nor becomes familiar, nor fastens his anti-social grudge upon his custodians. He has all the Celtic gentleness and charm of manner, and generally speaking he has the "presence" of a man of culture.

M—'s intelligence is not defective, and this is confirmed by two other observers to whom I specially referred the matter. His information is just what could have been expected from his history and circumstances; he perfectly appreciates his position and prospects. His ethical *knowledge and judgment* are fully up to the average. There is no emotional dulling; his interests are fairly wide and lively. As regards his feelings for others, he is in no way callous,

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.70.291.612 Published online by Cambridge University Press

though not excessively sociable. He keenly regrets the loss of his "pals" in his regiment, and apparently got on very well in this society. He has a strong attachment to his grandfather, who is now a cripple, and to whom he used to read. In general he shows a strong craving for affection, and would, to judge from letters and remarks, be demonstrative. In his affections, however, like an infant, he takes all and gives nothing. Apart altogether from his reckless, impulsive lawlessness, his utter disregard for public opinion and the will and well-being of the community, he shows himself extraordinarily unjust and ungenerous to his intimates. He is apt to find a grievance and prone to cling to it—I mean beyond even what is commonly found in Celts and children. He speaks warmly and gratefully of any kindness shown to him, yet paradoxically has no sense of obligation. That is to say he has social emotions, but no organized sentiments which can influence conduct and persist through change of mood. Yet his plan to elope with his girl (when his story had "got out") was not really a triumph of self-interest over regard for others. When was he ever regardful of his own interests, and why, if this was the dominant motive, did it not achieve its object? Certainly M— himself now puts the worst construction on his intentions: "If I had once got married to her they could have done nothing"—"they" being the parents-in-law, meddling policemen, and a hostile environment generally, who would, had things gone according to plan, have been satisfactorily bested. To my mind he does not well fill the part of ruthless fortune-hunter.

Undoubtedly, however, he did treat his girl very badly, but the point is that it was for no corresponding gain to himself. Angry at not getting any reply to his letter, he now grumbles that she did not give him much chance to pull himself together "after only two simple charges." "She was my ruination." I suggest that she has learned all about his faithlessness and how ruthlessly he has treated her. He says, "I am not one of those sorrowful, pitying kind. I am sorry for no one, and no one is sorry for me." Again I say he has nothing to reproach her with; all the wrong-doing is on his side; he has been a thoroughly "bad hat" to her. He answers, "She has been to me—wasting a stamp and a letter." Again I suggest that after his last arrest she had found him out. He says, "When I have forgiven her (for having a child), could she not have forgiven me?" and apparently fails to appreciate the significance of the fact that her *liaison* came before her acquaintance with M—, while his philandering had been continuous up till now. He admits also casting up her previous lapse to her whenever he was drunk or angry.

If these responses and his explanations of his acts of dishonesty truly represent his mentality; if his motives are not more social than this would indicate, more consistent with each other and with his own interests; even if we consider that he is unable to give, *truly or falsely*, a more plausible consistent *account* of his desires and intentions, we must consider him an imbecile. Taken seriously, his autobiography would indicate in his character a naïve ruthless

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.70.291.612 Published online by Cambridge University Press

selfishness which unfits him for social life, and which is yet so unintelligent that he does not form purposes, foresee difficulties, or shape his conduct with any consistence towards an end. It would be easy to diagnose in him gross *intellectual* and moral defect on the strength of his own admissions, and to infer that social censure is not apprehended by him, and merely provokes in him sulkiness, defiance and malice, and that consequently segregation is the only way of dealing with this case.

M—'s ridiculously unjust reproaches against his *fiancée* are not, however, stated by him as fixed opinions. In making them he does not express the assurance that comes from a sincere sense of injury (real or delusional). There is no vehemence of anger, but rather a sulky, bitter grumble which, though directed against her, is apparently inspired by a resentment at things in general. It is very difficult and tedious to record observations of the shades of emotional expression. The impression conveyed by tone, manner, etc., suggested a very complex feeling reaction: a masochistic, self-pitying satisfaction in the irretrievable breach with his girl, and the ruin of his own prospects; an attitude of sour grapes; an assertion of his independence and self-sufficiency as if to say, "I don't care what she does, and I let her see it"—all these and other compatible interpretations of his story are suggested by his demeanour in recounting it.

Though he is never coarse nor loud nor really boastful, I am satisfied that he has not presented his conduct in an unduly favourable light, but rather the reverse. Milton is not unique in idealizing Lucifer, and the situation where the hero misunderstands, and violently upbraids the heroine, has a very strong and wide-spread fantasy appeal. This sado-masochistic attitude and the splendid isolation ideal are consistent with each other and with his childish nature and Celtic temperament. They probably played a considerable part in his bad conduct, and certainly contribute to his present attitude, for it is certain that he is dwelling on his wrongdoing in the spirit of an Ishmael; and that to some extent his account of his motives and intentions and the blame he throws upon the girl is rather a reflex of his present *mood* than a true index to his character, intelligence and understanding of right and wrong. At most times he recognizes enthusiastically her kindness and generosity, her loyalty and unsuspiciousness, and admits the recklessness and stupidity of his own actions.

Though quite frank and of rather an introspective habit of mind, this boy has really very little insight into his own motives. He is quite unable to supply any explanation for his erratic conduct. I will not presume to decide how far this may indicate a definitely pathological (unconscious) motive as responsible for his offences, or how far the unformed, volatile nature of his mind makes it impossible for him to remember and describe his experiences. Certainly this character—the absence of fixed interests, purposes, sentiments, etc.—must also have the effect of rendering him particularly subject to the influence of any sudden impulse.

I am adducing this case merely to show how gross disorder in

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.70.291.612 Published online by Cambridge University Press

social reactions can occur in the absence of rational motive, intellectual defect or other definite psychopathy and even in a person affectionate and otherwise well-disposed, even where none of the reputed causes of crime are present, psychopathic inheritance, delinquent companionship, poverty and slum life, parental neglect and alcoholism, vice, ill-health, idleness or gambling—even in the absence of all these traumata, development need not run on social lines. This at least is certain—that in this case affection for others and pleasure in their society has never developed into a sense of reciprocal obligation, nor has intelligence and self-interest been able to supply its place. I suggest the conclusion that it is possible for the development of the social *rapport* to be arrested at certain levels.

I have to thank Mr. Wallace, of the Scottish Central Association, for supplying particulars in this case.

Appendix to Case 1 : *R—'s manifesto to his congregation.*

My Dear Brethren,—Doubtless you will be aware of the present very serious illness of Mrs. R—. It is only my duty to my Church and work which compels me to write this letter.

Mrs. R— gave birth to a premature child last thursday. The child is dead and was buried a few days later, in the presence of Mr. ———.

On account of the illness of my wife I was forced to deny myself the pleasure of attending our Saturday night and Sabbath services, and this is the first opportunity I have had of referring to above matter. I am eager to meet you all and state what I cannot here write. In a word I desire to thank all who have extended to us on this trying occasion their sympathy and assistance.

I am led to understand that others have misunderstood misjudged and said hard, cruel, and unchristlike things about the illness of Mrs. R—. With whom I have the utmost sympathy for, for had they the true facts of the case before them, their opinion, I venture to say, would change. I make no comment, but invite the earnest, wise and prayerful consideration of the following certificate from Mrs. R—'s Medical Adviser :

> I certify that Mrs. R— was delivered of a premature child on the 27th inst., the child is small and feeble and doubtful whether it will live. Mrs. R—, while standing upon a chair cleaning or reaching for something, fell to the floor, which I believe was the cause of bringing on premature labour.
>
> *Later.*
>
> From the appearance of the child when born, although it lived three days, nothing can be brought against Mr. R—'s moral or Christian character in connection with the affair.
>
> (*Signed*) X. Z.,
> Physician and Surgeon.'

This matter will be dealt with fully on Thursday night first at 8 p.m. in above Church and you are specially invited to be present.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.70.291.612 Published online by Cambridge University Press

On entering, kindly hand this letter over to the person in charge at the door, it acts as your ticket of admission to meeting.

I purpose at this meeting, giving once and for all an authoritative statement regarding this matter. It is expected that addresses will also be given by the Rev. Y. Y., Mr. X. X., Mr. Q. Q., Registrar of Births and Deaths, etc.

Mr. X. X. will preach on Sabbath forenoon and I propose delivering a special sermon on Sabbath evening first, when I do trust all shall be in their usual places at both diets of worship. It is easier to face the cannon's mouth than to expose oneself to the slings and arrows of a scandal-loving and uncomprehending public, therefore I ask all the Lord's People and friends on this occasion, to assist me with their prayers.

Yours sincerely in Christ's service,
(*Signed*) R—,
Minister in Christ's service.

A Case of Melancholia accompanied by Urethral Stricture with Retention of Urine.

By Louis Minski, M.B., B.S., Assistant Medical Officer, Bootham Park Mental Hospital, York.

The patient, A. B—, male, æt. 58, was admitted as a voluntary boarder to Bootham Park Mental Hospital on November 10, 1923. Patient had had two previous attacks of melancholia, one in 1910, when he was ill for a few months, the other in 1915, lasting about four years, and from each illness he made an excellent recovery after treatment in mental hospitals.

There was evidence of mental disease in the family, his mother having died of senile insanity; otherwise the family history was unimportant. Patient's natural disposition was not conducive to the maintenance of robust health. He was sensitive and highly strung, retiring, self-depreciative, moody and dull, and he led a very solitary life.

History of illness.—Patient made a good recovery from his last attack, and remained well for some years until about three months ago, when he began to feel ill physically. He became very worried over his health, and especially because he was suffering from severe frequency of micturition at nights, and this caused insomnia. Becoming rather depressed he decided to place himself under care. On admission to hospital patient was very depressed and apprehensive. His expression was dull, listless and anxious. He did not express any actual delusions, but was morbidly anxious about his health. Physically he looked pale and anæmic. His heart and lungs were normal.

Alimentary system: Tongue furred and breath foul-smelling. Bowels irregular. Examination of the rectum and abdomen revealed nothing abnormal.

Genito-urinary system: Complained of having to get up frequently during the night to pass urine, but could only pass a few drops. He also complained of pain in the rectum and penis on micturition.

Urine: Acid, specific gravity 1030, small deposit of pus, heavy deposit of phosphates. No sugar, blood or albumen.

Progress of the case.—Patient was ordered rest in bed in the open air and given light diet. Aperients in the form of cascara and calomel were given to empty the rectum and colon, and then a course of high Plombiére lavage. This treatment was continued until November 20, 1923, when it was noticed that the patient's abdomen had suddenly become distended, and on examination it was found to be hard and tympanitic. No definite "lump" could be felt, nor was peristalsis visible. Rectal examination revealed nothing abnormal. Patient looked drawn and anxious; he was complaining of slight pain in the abdomen, his pulse was rapid, temperature subnormal and tongue dirty. Hot fomentations were applied to the abdomen, sips of water given and 5 c.c. pituitrin injected hypodermically. A large tube was passed *per rectum*, but was obstructed about 8 in. from the anus.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.70.291.612 Published online by Cambridge University Press