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THE recognition of character as a major mental function in personality study is validated by the citation of a few simple psychologic considerations. Observation of the familiar but inscrutable phenomena of healthy mental functioning discloses the two essential, interdependent, inextricable components of mentality to be intelligence and character (moral force, stamina). Clouston says, “Above all it (psychology) must aim at providing a full and accurate account of those most fundamental elements of our constitution, the innate tendencies to thought and action that constitute the native basis of mind.” (Italics are ours.) These are the essential means of expression for different, though blended or interacting, mental functions.

The next step in analysis refers these constituents to their respective functions in the “native basis of mind” and finds them to be intelligence and character. What logical conclusions may be drawn from the premise that intelligence is the primary function of thought and that character stands in the same relationship to action? The subjoined, tentative, categorical arrangement of some of the principal mental functions may assist in answering this question.

OUTLINE OF MENTALITY STUDY†

Mental Integrity
Mental Disorders
   Mental Functioning in
      Mental Health
      Mental Diseases } (manifest in symptoms)

*Read before the Boston Society of Psychiatry and Neurology, March 21, 1918.
† In devising and adapting this tentative working scheme, grateful acknowledgment is accorded Major A. J. Rosanoff of Kings Park Hospital for his “Classification of Mental Diseases” and Dr. Walter E. Fernald, Superintendent and Director of the Psychopathic Clinic of the Massachusetts School for the Feebleminded, for his “Fields of Inquiry” under Intelligence Deficiency.
For the purposes of mentality study, intelligence may be conceived as the thinking, inventing, selecting, combining, planning, deciding function of mentality and character as the complementary mental function. Character then, is the emotivating, feel-
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ing, sentimental, instinctive, sustaining, energizing, executing or vetoing function of mentality, and as such it is integral. Intelligence being the directing factor is responsible for its own product—decision; and character being the energizing force is responsible for its own product—action. Habit is a factor in both these functions, but a controlled factor i.e. it may be influenced by the will. Volition and inhibition, though under direction of intelligence, owe their force to character. Sentiment, emotion and conscience are related to character rather than to intelligence, and both the latter are inseparable parts of one whole—mentality. If intelligence be regarded as the judicial department of the mind, then character is as truly the executive.

An appeal to a person who exhibits inordinate emotionality to exercise control is sometimes, though mistakenly, made in a way to indicate that the intellect is at fault. In reality the appeal is made to the power of control—character, not to the knowledge of the importance of control—intellect. Appreciation of the importance of control is swept aside, if involved, by the action of the emotional force—character, counteracted more or less effectively by the power of control—character, again. Intellect apprehends and connotes the ideas rousing emotional reaction and suggests control of expression; but character yields expression or inhibits it. One in pain stoically refrains from screaming not because he knows it will do no good to scream, but because his character enables him to repress his screams consciously—or allows him uncontrolled expression in spite of his knowledge. Intelligence is not responsibly involved in either the triumph or defeat of the scream impulse.

Character force makes for efficiency of personality not less than does intelligence superiority. In fact, of the two, character is the valid determinant of personality behavior; since what is done is more potent than what is planned. A mentality able to plan well but in which execution fails or is faulty, is inefficient or maleficient and may be regarded as showing character deviation or anomaly. The soldier ordered into an imminently fatal action may have a superior intellectual equipment which appreciates both the command and the sacrifice involved in obedience; but that in his mental make-up which enables the sacrifice and energizes obedience—or inhibits it—is something other than intellect; namely, his character, the resultant of his innate endowment plus his training.
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The reference of responsibility for decision and action to intelligence and character respectively is not an exclusive dogmatic division outlining distinct provinces, but a categorical reference for clarity of thinking and is comparable with other psychologic distinctions and references. That this reference is practically demonstrable is seen when the trusted bank employee embezzles. His character deviation is the occasion of his failure notwithstanding his repeated decisions not to steal; and his character deviation is blamed by his own intelligence and character and that of the court for the act. That the actual cause of failure is to be found in intelligence does not relieve character of the burden of responsibility. The cause of a gunshot is the powder ignition of which the indirect cause or occasion is the trigger pull. But responsibility is referred to the trigger pull, the occasion of the explosion.

Whether rightly or wrongly the fact remains that the fundamental idea of punishment and amenability to the administration of justice is that of teaching the importance not essentially of selecting behavior wisely but of wise performance. No attempt has ever been made to enforce better thinking and deciding, only to induce it as a means to the end of better behavior. The enforcement of acceptable behavior, however, is and always has been the fundamental purpose of civil and criminal jurisprudence. This places behavior under control of volition, i.e., acting or executive volition rather than selective or judicial. Instinct and reason have always taught that responsibility rests proximately with the acting province of mentality and with the thinking province only remotely. In actual daily usage one may think whatever he pleases, so long as his acts do not contravene established legal or social forms. When an offender is of demonstrably limited responsibility because of intelligence defect, there may be judicial clemency; but when he is demonstrably deviate in character only, there is no clemency, only the more sternness. The law imputes responsibility then, not for the selection of acts, but for their performance and in so doing tacitly recognizes something which we have termed character deviations as susceptible of improvement, in effect, demanding an approach in behavior to that emanating from character rectitude.

Current popular evaluation of personality is not confined to an estimation of intelligence only. Character is consciously or unconsciously regarded not less consistently, as the measure of
excellence and efficiency. We actually demand certain character standards or at least social behavior standards in the personalities selected for various activities; in employees, soldiers, business and professional men and especially in all teachers, statesmen and moulders of public opinion. To illustrate the distinction between these two functions in our thinking: we respect the loyalty of the feebleminded mother to her children when it is exhibited; but we deplore her inevitable neglect of their welfare. It is not the intellect but the character of our efficient enemy in Germany, that we despise. And to carry our illustration one step further: while it is our own intelligence that dictates our instinctive contempt for the Kaiser’s principles, the dictation would be void without our character to express and enforce it.

No demonstration of the fact is needed that character development and deviation progress far beyond the close of the formative period of normal intelligence development. Thus the two are not coextensive. This is true also to a limited extent in cases of arrested intelligence development. In these cases character development or deviation is not wholly circumscribed by the deficient intelligence; though by no means independent thereof. Character modifications continue to be reflected in behavior after intelligence development ceases. Furthermore, it is to be observed that in the earlier years of the formative period which we have been accustomed to regard as terminating at about the age of twenty, character formation lags behind the normal development of intelligence; while in the later years of the period the developmental progress of character is much more pronounced and significant, outstripping and overshadowing the progress of intelligence in the evolutionary years at and after the close of the formative period. Studies of feeblemindedness in physical childhood are concerned with intelligence rather than with character. Personality studies of adolescents and adults on the other hand find the more potent and significant factors to be character or social behavior deviations. The child is not held to strict accountability for behavior since character is not yet sufficiently developed; while the adult is responsible unless the intellect can be arraigned. The reason for the observed failure of “Mental tests,” adapted to childhood mental ages, to prove adequate to the classification of adult feeblemindedness, doubtless lies in the transcendent potentiality of character factors in the later developmental period.
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It is conceivable that cases of a physical age well within the formative period of an intelligence capacity not far short of integral could largely overcome the effect of certain character deviations and build up a more nearly ideal character. In fact, our sometimes well founded confidence in the reformation of certain criminal cases finds herein its justification. And it may be found that the inexplicable economic success of certain cases apparently hopelessly handicapped by feeblemindedness becomes clear on the appropriate distribution of the handicapping factors between the rudimentary intelligence and the still developing character.

Character anomalies or social behavior deviations have been recognized as within the purview of psychiatric observation in personality studies; though they are not yet susceptible of measurement ("behavior disorders," "character defects" and "asymmetries"). Both intelligence defects and social behavior anomalies, however, lend themselves to recognition, classification, description and treatment. That which is clearly recognized and differentiated as an integral factor, though a complex one is the more readily outlined, described and measured. Many attempts have been made to discover a metric treatment for certain mental forces or elements, some of which we have included under character as a major mental function. Should the recognition of character as a major mentality function contribute to hasten the discovery indicated, that alone would be a sufficient raison d'etre.

For the purposes of a community survey, mental functioning in character deviations may be treated as on a parity with both that in intelligence deficiency and that in mental diseases as fields of mentality investigation, since each in its own province contributes to defeat and accelerates the tendency to dependency, though not necessarily equally. Neither bears a part-to-the-whole or inclusive relationship to the other. By neither character rectitude alone nor intelligence integrity alone may the personality achieve entire efficiency. The juxtaposition and contrast of these two of the three fields of personality study enable ready consideration and correlation of decision and behavior, essential indices in their respective fields of intelligence and character. Moreover, the ready categorizing is possible of instincts, clearly not an intelligence function with other contributory and subsidiary fields of inquiry: e. g., selective inhibitions, initiative, reason, etc.
This conception of mentality and its inherent nomenclature makes for simplicity and clarity, since it enables the more clear definition or elimination of certain "ill-defined terms," e.g., psychopathic personality, constitutional inferiority, etc., which we have used while deprecating the necessity. The reason these have been unsatisfying is that they represent a symptom complex made up of factors from more than a single entity. These hitherto convenient and indispensable concepts may be replaced in case reports of healthy mental functioning by measurements of intelligence deficiency and by citing character deviations with their observed varieties and degrees. This procedure is conducive to a more searching analysis and a more incisive discrimination, since the essential functions of thought and action are categorically separated, and therefore hardly to be confused in case studies.

Innate intelligence defects are not remediable, though subjects of such make some slight improvement under favorable conditions and are in many cases capable of acquiring a certain proficiency in simple occupations under efficient direction. Character deviations on the contrary are at least susceptible of improvement under the direction of intelligence. Consequently, the recognition of certain fields of mental functioning, e.g., honesty, veracity, fortitude, as belonging in the province of character broadens the outlook for the substantial advance of certain cases toward character rectitude.

Psychiatry in a narrower sense deals primarily with mental diseases; but psychiatrists are daily distinguishing between cases of mental disease and cases of intelligence defect and are noting character anomalies. In these activities they are promoting social and mental hygiene as a definite aim. The suggestion is that this broad sociologic purpose of psychiatry as well as the intrinsic considerations of scientific accuracy will be better realized by recognizing character and its subsidiary mental functions as an integral field for investigation. The psychiatrist finds in behavior an indispensable element in the estimation of the sociologic menace of feeblemindedness in adult cases. In fact, whether from the viewpoint of legal status, sociologic efficiency, medical classification or popular evaluation, the determination of feeblemindedness in physical ages above childhood considers character, categorically or otherwise, not less certainly than intelligence.

Fields of inquiry which we have placed under character have been distorted occasionally into the province of intelligence, since
they could not be ignored. Psychiatric case summaries almost universally contain notations of character deviations, but hitherto these have seldom been made on their own merits. The point is that, since social behavior deviations are noted, clarity is more certainly secured by treating them as subsidiary to their appropriate major function. It is not the study of behavior and the notations thereon which have been neglected, but the recognition of character as an integral mentality function.

Certain cases reported in the following pages show intelligence to have been at least integral or of adult level in which character deviations stand out conspicuously as the predominant, if not the sole, cause of failure.

Healthy mental functioning has two products or forms of expression—thought and behavior. Reference of these expression forms to their respective sources reveals intellect and character to be the mental functions involved.

Citations:

"Innate tendencies to thought and action... constitute the native basis of mind."

Responsibility is referred to behavior rather than to intention or planning. This tacitly recognizes that which we have called character as integral.

Character as the immediate determinant of adult behavior makes for personality efficiency not less than does intellect.

Instincts, emotions, conscience and sentiments are subsidiary mental functions referable to character rather than to intellect.

The intellect dictates control of emotional expression while character exerts such control—effectually or ineffectually.

Intellect and character are synchronous in mentality development, but are neither coincident nor coextensive in either time or rate of development. Their relative importance is inconstant at any age level.

Personality studies of those of childhood physical ages are concerned less with character than with intellect since the former is then relatively rudimentary; but personality studies of adolescents and adults consider character the more intently as its dynamics increases.

Innate intelligence deficiency is stationary and irremediable, while character deviations are theoretically susceptible of correction while plasticity remains.

The recognition of character as a primary mentality function makes for clarity in psychiatric case study and terminology, and may perhaps hasten the discovery of methods of metric treatment.

Sociologically, a personality is more inimical whose character deviations are grave than is one which exhibits a grave intelligence deficiency.

In psychiatry and sociology as well as in legal and popular usage character with its subsidiary fields is immanent in personality evaluation both objectively and subjectively.
The eugenic and sociologic aspects of a population survey are more intimately seen, more clearly apprehended and recorded and more transparently represented when character deviations are recognized as an integral categorical entity.

What are the actual medical and sociologic results in the study and treatment of cases to be occasioned by the recognition of character and its deviations or anomalies as a major field of investigation in personality study?

Thus far our presentation has been an attempt to recognize psychonosologically the capacity for improved behavior observed to characterize certain groups of antisocial or dependent personalities. These groups will, apparently, comprise those of a sufficiently well equipped intellect to respond to an appeal to reason and self interest and to judicious training, i.e., those whose character is not beyond amendment. Such groups would include roughly, adolescent and young adult offenders, and dependents not mentally diseased nor deficient of the mental level of moronity. Most of these are not now in public institutions and none are to be found in schools for the feebleminded, e.g., young hoodlums and thieves, prostitutes, shiftlings, those of school age but neither in school nor at work. Some are in institutions, of course, such as orphanages, industrial schools, children's homes, reformatories, etc. Most members of these groups have missed a good or even fair home training, often because of disorganization of the home by death or divorce or desertion of parents or by parental neglect due to feeblemindedness. Each of these children has an individual sociologic problem that will hardly be solved without psychiatric help. They are our potential criminals, prostitutes, malcontents and vagrants. The points to be noted are two: that these cases are savable to economic productivity before character formation is complete and that propaganda for restoration would best be directed to character reformation.

That this vitally important sociologic need has been recognized by students, by public opinion and by legislation, and that the possibility of meeting the need has been popularly felt, is amply attested by the establishment of reformatories and special schools for such of the group as have become offenders. The methods and means hitherto applied have not been adequate for the task, however, partly because of delayed diagnosis and partly because of delayed remedial measures; but recognition of this fact and also of the allied facts that character deviations exist and that the possibility of correction of remediable character deviations, at least,
rests on a sound scientific basis will go far toward pointing out effective means and methods. Psychopathic laboratories would not be needed inside penal and eleemosynary institutions if they were available outside thereof, where ready access might be had under favorable conditions through field investigators to the rather large numbers of potential offenders who might be not only prevented from actually offending but who, by the same process, might become productive social units. A very real need for authoritative psychiatric differentiations and determinations is keenly felt by charitable associations, childhelping agencies and public school teachers dealing at first hand with defective delinquents and backward children in all the many states without such an organized scientific institution.

The same urgent demand for mental hygiene which prompts the scientific organization of existing psychiatric agencies for the elimination of psychopathic menaces from among recruits and for the induction back into industrial activity of our returned veterans surely suggests the salvage of the salvageable portion of these groups of potential dependents. The exigencies of the war have advanced by many years the time when this comparatively young country would have urgent need economically for methods of diminishing her dependents. But we of this generation find this onus suddenly thrust upon us. The relative numbers of dependents at home and at the front stands far differently from the ratio of even one year ago. It is idle to speculate with no basis of facts; but if each family head were a producer for four dependents public and private before the raising of our army, we may think of him as called upon to provide for at least three times as many now, counting the immense cost of maintenance at the front and the sums we contribute to the relief of our war sufferers. Such of the salvage suggested as is undertaken in this generation must obviously be in the hands of those remaining at home.

The need for psychiatric laboratories and for psychiatric staffs in states and municipalities where public institution heads may avail themselves of expert advice and correct diagnosis on cases urgently needing judicious social and economic disposal and characterologic treatment is now keenly felt not only by physicians, but by laymen also. The field so admirably covered by our Boston Psychopathic Hospital and other Massachusetts psychopathic clinics has been of inestimable value in educating public
opinion to this need and to the availability of a scientific means of supplying it. Massachusetts is the leading state to act on definitely formulated plans to assist responsible deviates and the mentally disordered, as well as diseased, back to usefulness. Maine and other states look to the Psychopathic Clinic at Waltham and to other Massachusetts clinics as models, and are already canvassing the possibilities of establishing like institutions.

This field is open to psychiatrists pre-eminently since they are competent to differentiate mental disorders from the mental diseases encountered. Furthermore, they, especially are well equipped in methods, experience and trained personality to interpret and treat remediable character deviations. The community needs the nice discrimination, the exquisite psychiatric skill which distinguishes psychoesthetic and psychoesthetic states, but it needs also and especially in these days of war stress and necessity for conserving man-power, the devotion of our trained energies at home to the practical and not less scientifically worthy endeavor to relieve the next and succeeding generations of that part of the burden of dependency which is preventable.

Psychiatrists have a certain popular misconception to correct. The public is irked by the burden of dependency. Avoidable dependency is almost wholly due to intelligence defects, preventable largely in one generation and for those that follow, and to character deviations, partly remediable in this generation. These two classes are included among those popularly called feebleminded; but the popular mental picture is that of the idiot and imbecile. Our field of remediable cases includes none of these, of course, but is made up of those of a mental level no lower than that of moronity. The public has a right to know that a part of what has been hitherto called feeblemindedness, and not incorrectly so named, is in the higher grades preventable and remediable.

When it is understood that a considerable fraction of our dependents are really improvable in behavior and savable by character training, the public will be ready to provide for such training. The cases to be included do not appear at hospital clinics and do not generally regard themselves as cases; but such could be found in numbers by the field workers who would form an essential part of such a psychiatric organization as would be competent in each state or municipality to deal with this class. The two mentally hygienic purposes to be realized then are (1) to deny
parenthood to the unfit and (2) to assist our high-grade dependents to build a more worthy character and become economically successful. Provision for these measures would also adjust that rather anomalous position in which society is still placed when intellectually incompetent persons are sentenced to a reformatory or other penal institution without a psychiatric examination. The question now being worked out in some states, e. g., Ohio, of maintaining a central clearing house of entrants to public custodial institutions would be automatically taken care of also, since the state psychiatric staff would perform that function.

Appendix

Two abstracts of cases are submitted, illustrative of the wider-angled presentation form of summation, enabled by the recognition of character as a categorical entity in mentality study.

Case No. —

H. is a fairly well developed girl of 15.9 years, definitely ascertained. She consistently maintained that her age was thirteen. Skin shows fine superficial acne and lacks good color. Her mental attitude is rather listless and lacking in spontaneity and responsiveness. Of her father she apparently knows nothing. Of her mother she reports her death when H. was three. Of her siblings and collateral relatives she apparently knows nothing and conveys the impression that she lacks interest. She was cared for as a state charge or in a family in childhood till she began school at about the age of seven. In school in Oakland she repeated no grades but was regularly advanced till she attended a high school for a year. She left school on her own initiative to begin housework, having worked for her board while attending school. During this experience she was discharged for theft.

This fact she was very slow to admit and would have allowed an incorrect reason for this change of residence to be recorded. No place was held by her more than a few days after this, and she became dependent on the Maine Children's Home Society, at Augusta, an institution that had several times placed her, apparently favorably.

Menstruation began at the age of eleven. She denies transgression, but admits understanding the meaning of sex intercourse. She admits being out evenings with girls and boys and that sometimes a boy and girl went off by themselves, but adds that she never did this.

On the day of the examination it is learned from her guardian that she begged for permission to answer a letter to a boy in Waterville, ten miles away, saying she must answer it; but she would give no valid reason. Refused, she canvassed the possibility of walking to Waterville to see
him. The snow of an exceptionally severe winter was piled impassably high. Then she sought permission to write to a girl friend whose reputation in sex matters is bad. This being reluctantly given on her representation that she must write her; she apparently prepared the letter. As the rural delivery man appeared she slipped out to the country road through the deep snow and gave him a letter reporting on her return that she had posted the letter to her girl friend. This roused suspicion and her effects were searched revealing an unfinished letter to the girl. In the letter was found about a foot of gold chain recognized by the guardian as her own (the guardian's).

Under H.'s pillow that morning had been found too, a piece of black lace that the guardian identified as her own (the guardian's) and which must have been taken from the depths of a trunk in the attic to which H. was not supposed to have access. Furthermore, a dime which H. had seen left in a vest had been missed. When inquiry was made of H. anent these items she vehemently denied one after the other, "Honest to God" she had not seen the dime, knew naught of the lace, etc.

When tested she showed very good scholastic ability, computing interest mentally. Her general information was rather remarkably good. She could attend well and showed quick penetration and grasp and readily drew correct academic conclusions; but she became silent whenever a disagreeable admission was called for. Her reluctant admission could be at length elicited; but not so long as she could see any escape by evasion. She volunteered nothing except in excuse or extenuation, e.g., after several specific admissions of theft had been won from her she volunteered "I can't help stealing," and again, "I steal things I don't want." "Have you ever been tempted to steal something when you have decided not to steal and have walked away leaving it?" "Yes I have." "Well, does not that show that you can avoid stealing when you really try your best?" She hesitated long before answering in the affirmative, meanwhile admitting and showing she understood the logic of the situation. "Would you not blame anyone who steals from you?" "Yes." "Does the law hold anyone who steals punishable?" "Yes." "Well, aren't you to blame if you steal then?" Again she very reluctantly admitted her responsibility. At one point she volunteered that she never had stolen money. When she was told that the examiner probably ought not to believe that, as it was so unlikely that anyone who had stolen as she had done would refrain from taking money, she at length admitted she could not blame the examiner for declining to believe that statement. The distinction between telling her she could not be believed in a certain statement and calling her a liar was appreciated and admitted readily.

She resisted the suggestion for sometime that her life was one of failure more than success because of her thefts and lying, but at length admitted it. Then she resisted the suggestion that she could change all
that and live a happy and successful life if she would try hard enough. No satisfactory reaction could be elicited to this, no smile or hopeful attitude, though at the time this suggestion was made her admissions were all in, her fencing had ceased and she was quite at ease and thinking clearly on the subjects suggested.

Findings:

Mental disease: none.

Intelligence: mental age level, 15; I. Q., 1.; category, normal or adult. Capacity for abstract reasoning poor even for her age, but when stimulated her conclusions are valid. Foresight and planning are very illy developed.

Character rectitude or deviations: principally in the emotional sphere and exhibited in habitual theft and lying. Reactions to altruistic, patriotic and filial regard stimuli lack development. Reaction to considerations of self-interest is weak. Insight is poor. Impulse is the principal guide to action and capacity, for self-denial is small. Voluntary control of expression is habitually that of dissembling and, impulsive egotistic sang froid is consistently maintained.

Sociologic maladjustment: criminal tendency, dependent child.

CASE No. —

American-born, age 21–3, of naturalized German parentage. Attended Bridgeport schools from 7 to 15, more than half time, repeating four grades, one of them twice. Was out for sickness; heart trouble of which he has none now. Truancy not a large factor. Father died of paralysis five or six years ago. Mother is living. She was at a sanitarium three months on account of being "run down." Lost her memory and could not care for her household. History of collaterals is negative for institution residence and dependency. Sister is a widow at home with mother and brother who is a carpenter—a family with no margin of safety.

S. was married soon after the age of twenty-one to an imbecile after having been balked in several attempts. He admits gonorrhea while in the army four months whence he was honorably discharged as mentally unfit. He handled fractions well and denominate numbers and knew how to attack simple interest. His general information was good. His answers were prompt and though at times tending to be flippant and evasive he readily adjusted his attitude on a warning. He uses tobacco, but denies the use of drugs and alcoholics. Physically, he is well nourished but musculature is soft. There is a mild conjunctivitis. Forehead is both low and narrow; teeth are crowded and irregular. Clothes are dirty. House is poorly furnished and is unpainted and illy repaired, but is swept and fairly orderly. S. was found sitting in house idle with
wife and her eight-year-old sister. He resisted the suggestion that these are remarkably favorable times for working men and would have loquaciously taken over the interview at this point, at others also. His chief interest was in excusing, exculpating and inveighing against those who extended no help and sympathy. He claimed to have walked three miles and back in an unsuccessful hunt for work on the preceding day. He resisted the suggestion that he made a mistake in leaving school and neglecting a trade, also the suggestion that he would have done better to stick to the $2.50 a day he was getting before he joined the army. A search for motives for joining the army elicited no suggestion of anything more worthy than self-interest and the stress was on his feeling "he wanted to go." To the suggestion that he now had the responsibility and burden of a wife, he again took the superficial view, saying she was as well off as before her marriage. He was a little disturbed but not resentful that the army examiners had found him "deficient mentally."

Denies arrests.

Mental disease: none.

Intelligence: mental age, level, 15; I. Q., 90; category, adult, but judgment is poor.

Character rectitude or deviations: shows various anomalies, e.g., lack of action for self-support, due in part to lack of appreciation of the worthy motives for so doing. Capacity for self-denial is small. Altruism and patriotism are not in evidence. Ambition is undeveloped. Love of ease and gratification are too ascendent.

Sociologic maladjustment: potential dependent.