

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE IV.

THE REFORMATION OF CRIMINALS.

BY HASTINGS H. HART, SECRETARY OF THE MINNESOTA STATE BOARD OF
CORRECTIONS AND CHARITIES.

THE Reformation of Criminals is a subject which to-day engages the attention of some of the best thinkers and some of the most efficient workers in the world. It is important because of its relation to the public welfare. There are about 75,000 persons in prison in the United States.¹ There are at least as many more persons, out of prison, who belong to the criminal class, making 150,000 criminals, or one for every four hundred inhabitants. This army is recruited partly from the importation of vicious foreigners, partly from the dregs of our own society, but largely from the better elements of our population. A careful inquiry in the Minnesota State Reform School, some time ago, revealed the fact that the majority of the boys committed for crime had attended Sunday-school until near the time of their commitment. Forty per cent of them came directly from homes; forty-eight per cent more had lived at home within one year of their commitment; and only twelve per cent were entirely homeless. The assistant superintendent of the new Minnesota Reformatory for young men, an experienced prison officer, remarked recently that he had never seen so intelligent and fine looking a body of convicts as the thirty-five young men who had been committed to the Reformatory by the courts.

¹ See Tenth Census, Vol. xxii. p. 479, which shows 58,609 prisoners in 1880.

Crime is a contagious disease, and its spread is not confined to the debased classes. All authorities agree that crime is increasing in the United States faster than the population is increasing. It is manifest that popular education and the existing moral and religious agencies are not sufficient protection. If we are to check its spread, there must be improvement both in our preventive and remedial agencies. While crime is increasing here, there has been an extraordinary decrease in Great Britain; the number of convicts serving sentence of penal servitude having decreased ¹ from 10,500 in 1883 to 6,400 in 1889, a decrease of forty per cent in six years. It is claimed ² that this decrease represents a great diminution of crime, and is due largely to improved and reformatory methods of dealing with criminals. If this claim be true, the English prison system merits our careful study.

In addition to the interest which belongs to this subject as a study in social science and because of its relation to public morals and public economy, it has doubtless a personal interest to some of you who read, because you yourselves have at one time or another of your lives belonged to the criminal class. What is a criminal? According to Webster, it is "a person who has committed an offence against law." We are accustomed to apply the term to those who have been shown to be guilty of crime; but it is applicable to all violaters of the law, whether they have been publicly recognized as law-breakers or not. What is reformation? It is the reclaiming of a criminal so that he becomes established as a law-abiding member of society. It involves a correction of the outward conduct, but not, necessarily, a change of inward character: a bad man may reform and yet remain bad at heart.

¹ Report of the Directors of Convict Prisons for 1888-89, Part I. p. vi.

² Special report of Charleton T. Lewis and Richard A. McCurdy. See Report of New York Prison Association for 1885, p. 89.

Probably it would be safe to assert that more than three-fourths of the men who will read this article have at some time committed some act (perhaps long since forgotten) which, on a strict construction of the law, would have been recognized by the courts as a crime.

If you never robbed an orchard, or pilfered peanuts when the grocer's back was turned, you may have mailed written matter unlawfully with a newspaper, or experimented secretly in a gambling den. Perhaps, at some time, you appropriated money unlawfully from your employer's funds and restored it without being discovered. You may have made affidavit carelessly to untrue statements, or you may have made returns to the assessor contrary to the facts. Any one of these acts, or others similar, would make you, for the time being, a criminal, gross or petty as the case may be; and for just such crimes hundreds of your fellow-criminals are in prison at this moment, having been so unfortunate as to be found out and suffer prosecution. You who have had such experiences are living witnesses to the fact that the reformation of criminals is a possibility.

The subject is one of practical interest because the work of reforming criminals is liable to fall to any one. Many seem to think that this is a question of prison discipline. When we speak of the reformation of criminals, there arises a vision of prison walls, punishment cells, chapels with hard, straight-backed benches, armed guards, stern wardens, and venerable chaplains of severe aspect, dispensing solemn warnings and admonitions. The truth is that five criminals are reformed outside prison walls for every one reformed in prison. Prison discipline is a final resort, to be tried when better remedies have failed.

Every parent, every employer, every lawyer, every minister, every physician, every college officer, is liable any day to be brought face to face with a crime and to be called to act in the case. The future of the criminal, if it be a first of-

fence, will depend largely upon the wisdom with which this responsibility is met. The youthful wrong-doer—for he is generally a youth—is shocked and frightened at the abyss that opens before him. A harsh word, an unjust judgment, a repellant look, may drive him into that deep sullenness that is like an inaccessible pit. A flippant remark, a little maudlin sympathy, a plausible excuse, may convert penitence into effrontery. If he is sent to jail, he may be corrupted by his associates and disheartened by the disgrace. If he goes scot-free, he may be tempted to repeat the offence. It is a crisis in the life of that youth, in which the wisest mentor is perplexed.

The subject is worthy of attention, again, because it is being considered by the legislatures of the several states, and wise legislation is impossible unless the educated and intelligent portion of the community are informed with reference to it. Legislators are willing to act wisely if some one will direct them; but few of them have the time or disposition to study closely for themselves. Experience proves that a few intelligent citizens who know what is needed, can do much to promote good legislation or prevent impracticable measures.

A few citizens of Minnesota, with clear ideas of what needed to be done, called a public meeting of representative men, at which a report was presented by a leading lawyer of the State;¹ the result was that a proposed second state prison, which was not needed, was transformed into a state reformatory for young men, which is likely to prove of great value. In most cases where reformatory legislation has been secured, it has been due to the intelligent, persevering efforts of a few citizens.

Society may deal with the criminal for the purpose of accomplishing either of two ends. We may aim at retribution,

¹ Report of the Minnesota State Board of Corrections and Charities, 1886, pp. 288-310.

that is, to make the law-breaker suffer as nearly as possible in proportion to his guilt—to give him “his just deserts;” or we may aim at the protection of society from the injury to which it is exposed from law-breakers.

The question arises, Which of these possible ends is most important? Shall we seek first to give the criminal his due or to protect his fellows from his ravages?

Our Saviour said: “Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,” and our criminal codes at the present day are largely based upon the same idea of retribution. The attempt has been made to make penalties agree as nearly as may be with the desert of the criminal. Criminals have fallen in with this idea, and seem to feel that having “served their time” they have discharged their debt to society.

The attempt to proportion punishment to desert can be shown in many ways to be impracticable. The infliction of penalties by different judges, juries, and law-officers is unavoidably full of contradictions and inequalities. These inequalities are notorious and are noticed by every prison officer. Many escape entirely, through lack of evidence or legal technicalities. It is a common thing to find two men serving sentence in the same prison for like crimes, without perceptible difference of guilt, one sentenced for ten years, the other for two. The directors of the convict prisons of England, in their official report for 1888,¹ call attention to the fact “that the criminal courts are prevented from awarding any sentence between two years and five years;” so that the difference of a shilling in the value of the articles stolen by two criminals would make it the duty of the judge to sentence one man for not more than two years and the other for not less than five years.

The difficulty of adjusting punishment to guilt is increased by the fact that the same penalty weighs very differently

¹ Report of the Directors of Convict Prisons for 1887–88, Part I. p. viii.

upon different individuals. The habitual criminal, steeped in vice and used to ignominy, cares very little for disgrace and accepts punishment as an incident in his career; but the man of character, guilty of his first offence, suffers more from a simple arrest with its accompanying publicity than the other in serving a long prison sentence. Imprisonment, notwithstanding its disgrace and servitude, shields him, for the most part, from the public gaze; but his real penalty begins when he issues from the prison gate to face the world anew. The averted faces of former friends are a constant reminder of his degradation, while the overtures of those who attempt to befriend him seem to his sensitive imagination to be tainted with a hateful condescension.

The conviction is becoming general among students of the subject that the retributive method of dealing with criminals should be abandoned. Dr. E. C. Wines says, in his great work on the "State of Prisons," "Experience has shown that it is impossible to adjust penalties to degrees of guilt, and that standards of punishment are more easy to imagine than to realize."¹ Superintendent Z. R. Brockway, of the Elmira Reformatory, says: "The attempt to retribute to a criminal what is proportional to his offence either by imprisonment or by imposing fines, produces a pernicious effect, both upon him and upon all who are his interested observers, because the penalty must seem inadequate—either insufficient, in which case the effect is to encourage crime, if it exerts any influence whatever; or exaggerated, tending to exasperation and depression; or, if by any possibility the penalty imposed should seem to be just, it is then estimated absolutory."

I believe that careful study of the subject will justify the conclusion reached by Dr. Wines and Mr. Brockway. The springs of human action lie too deep for observation. External acts are but the indices to those supreme choices that

¹ *The State of Prisons and of Child-Saving Institutions*, p. 620.

determine character; and the ill-desert which belongs to wrong character is increased or diminished by many things that cannot be measured—heredity, environment, opportunity, education, capability. Some criminals are undoubtedly irresponsible because of defects in their mental and moral nature. Authorities differ as to the number of such cases, but the present tendency is to enlarge the estimate.

Human justice is, at best, a crude and clumsy instrument. Only the eternal scales of God can rightly weigh the choices of the soul. As President Finney says in his "Theology," "Guilt cannot be measured by the particular course of life pursued by the agent. This will appear," he says, "if we consider that moral obligation has *directly* nothing to do with the outward life. It *directly* respects the ultimate intention only, and that decides the course of outward action or life. The guilt of any outward action cannot be decided by reference to the kind of action, without regard to the intention: for the moral character of the act must be found in the intention, and not in the outward act. . . . The degree of the guilt of disobedience cannot be properly estimated by reference to the nature of the intention without respect to the degree of knowledge of the agent."¹ These statements are just as true in penology as in theology.

President Fairchild says in his "Moral Philosophy": "The satisfactory reason for punishment is that it is necessary to the general good. . . . The existence of ill-desert is necessary to punishment, but of itself is no satisfactory reason for punishment. Ill-desert exists even after pardon has been bestowed, but it is not a reason for punishment. In regard to the extent of penalty, its degree and duration, we have no natural intuitive rule. To the human understanding, there is no common measure of guilt and evil by which we can balance a given degree of guilt by its equivalent of

¹ Finney's Lectures on Systematic Theology, edited by President James H. Fairchild, p. 204.

pain; and, again, if there were such a standard, it is not self-evident that the penalty should in every case reach the exact desert of the transgression" (p. 151). President Fairchild, however, believes that "there should be some general correspondence between the penalty and the sin" (p. 152), and says that "the right to punish should be maintained against the sentimentalism which would substitute reformation for punishment" (p. 170). ●

Professor Park of Andover has long taught the principle which is advocated by Mr. Brockway and Dr. Wines. He says: "Civil punishment cannot be exactly proportioned to ill-desert, for it is impossible to estimate ill-desert. We cannot tell whether a man deserves more punishment for swearing than stealing. Therefore civil punishment must be grounded on the utility of it. Hence if at any time there is great danger of committing a certain act of theft, then the penalty must be greater. The sin may be greater of the lightly punished sin than that of the severely punished sin."¹

Since the punishment of criminals in proportion to their desert is impossible, and since the attempt to do so results in injury to the criminal and is a hindrance to reformation, it would appear that the principle should be discarded. The true principle seems to be this: Ill-desert is an essential condition to the punishment of criminals, but it is not, of itself, a sufficient ground for punishment. Punishment should only be inflicted in such forms and to such degree as will benefit either the individual himself or the rest of the community. Civil punishment for its own sake is worse than useless.²

¹ Lectures on Systematic Theology delivered at Andover Theological Seminary.

² President James H. Fairchild states the case as follows: "A distinction is to be made between discipline and penalty. These are often confounded.

Abandoning the idea of "getting even" with the criminal by retributive punishment, we may deal with him, for the protection of society, in either of three ways: by deterrence, by repression, or by reformation.

It is generally conceded that the treatment of criminals should be deterrent; that is, that it should be such as to prevent others from committing a like offence, and to inspire in the mind of the individual himself a wholesome dread of the consequences of a repetition of the offence. This consideration may sometimes require the punishment of those who might otherwise be spared, and may sometimes necessitate a severity of prison discipline which might otherwise be relaxed. But deterrence is not inconsistent with reformation. On the contrary, the severity needed for deterrence, if justly and kindly administered, tends to promote reformation. It is only through hard experience that character is regained. "No chastening for the present seemeth and it sustains no certain relation to guilt. Discipline may exist without guilt, punishment cannot. Discipline is not always an expression of moral disapprobation; it always indicates a want, for which the discipline is offered as a remedy. Punishment, on the other hand, respects the public good. The criminal has forfeited his own good by his crime, and the government is required to remedy, as far as may be, the mischief of the crime by punishment. The good of the community, and not of the offender, is the measure of the punishment. If it can be made to subserve his good, at the same time, all the better; it serves then the double purpose of discipline and punishment. Such a combination often exists, especially in family and school government; but, even in the family, the idea of good to the offender must sometimes be relinquished, and punishment must be inflicted for the good of the family alone. It is not true, then, that punishment contemplates, primarily, or even at all, the reformation of the offender, nor is it necessary that, in form, it should be adapted to this end. The first point to be secured is the protection of society; and whatever can be done for the offender, consistently with this, benevolence requires should be done. Punishment aims to prevent crime by its effects upon the subjects of the government at large, and not chiefly by its effects upon the criminal himself. The term penitentiary is an inadequate name for the state prison. It should be first a prison and afterward a school of reform; and it cannot be a successful school of reform, without being distinctly a prison."—*Moral Philosophy*, p. 153.

to be joyous, but grievous ; but afterwards it worketh out the peaceable fruits of righteousness."

The second method of protecting society is by the repression of the criminal—holding him forcibly where he can do no harm. This plan has decided advantages; since it not only prevents mischievous activity, but it checks the contagion of crime. It also has a strong deterrent effect.

Many penologists maintain that all habitual criminals should be permanently imprisoned, unless they give evidence of genuine reformation. This measure is defended by analogy. An insane patient who has committed no crime is committed to an institution and is held for life, unless he gives evidence of recovery. It would be thought preposterous to send an insane patient to a hospital for a term of six months or five years. He is committed until cured. Why should not the same treatment be extended to criminals?

This treatment has been prescribed by the laws of Ohio,¹ and Massachusetts.² In Ohio the law provides that any person convicted the third time of a felony "shall be deemed to be an habitual criminal and shall be detained during life;" but he may be released by the Board of Managers after serving a designated time, provided they are satisfied that he will become an upright, law-abiding citizen. It is claimed that this system offers the most prospect of reforming such criminals; since their only hope lies in not only obeying the prison rules, but also in so conducting themselves as to convince the prison managers that they have reformed. In Massachusetts the law requires that habitual criminals shall be sentenced for twenty-five years; in Illinois, for twenty-

human character to become fixed in certain lines has long been noted as a fact by theologians, but it is only recently that it has been so clearly recognized in the public statutes.

The third method of protecting the public is by reformation. As we have seen, it is not inconsistent with deterrence and repression, but it is as much superior to them as mind to matter. Deterrence checks the current, repression dams the stream, reformation stops the spring. Deterrence makes cowards, repression makes slaves, but reformation makes men.

We come now to consider the rationale of reformation. It follows from what has been said, that those who undertake this work should study criminals, not crimes; that the treatment should be adapted, as far as possible, to the needs of the individual. While certain general principles may be laid down in theory, their application must be constantly varied in practice.

Criminals are of many kinds: there are juvenile criminals, not old enough to realize the nature of their offence; there are moral imbeciles, born without any clear perception of right and wrong; there are hereditary criminals, who follow naturally in the path which their parents trod before them; there are accidental criminals, who have been led by circumstances, without deliberate intention, into wrong-doing. There are deliberate criminals, who have chosen to break the laws from laziness or avarice or sloth; there are habitual criminals, who have made crime a trade and have no purpose and no desire for any honest pursuit. Some are petty criminals, without sufficient courage or sufficient malice to commit great crimes; while others aspire to distinguish themselves in villainy. Some criminals are desperately wicked, filled with malice and hatred, eager to do all the mischief possible; others are not especially vicious, and are distinguished from ordinary sinners only by the fact that their particular vice or folly happens to be forbidden by law

while that of their neighbor is not. Reformatory methods must take these differences into account, or failure is certain.

In every attempt at the reformation of criminals, whatever system is followed, whatever agencies are employed, the point of endeavor must be to gain the will of the subject. Unless this is done, nothing is done. There is no such thing as involuntary reformation; and it is a fair test to apply to any proposed plan for reformation, whether it will tend to enlist the will of the criminal who is to be reformed. This is a difficult task. Many criminals have little will power: they were born with feeble minds or their will power has been weakened by persistence in wrong-doing; they desire to do better, and they make good resolutions, but they have no fixed purpose and are easily discouraged. Others are embittered by real or fancied injustice or by repeated failures, and can hardly be aroused to new efforts; while others, still, have their will firmly set against every good influence.

The problem is similar to the religious problem of converting men from sin, but it is more difficult; because, on the average, the wills of criminals are weaker, and the divergence from right lines is greater with criminals than with ordinary sinners.

While the enlistment of the will is the first step, and the most important step, in reformation, it is only the beginning of the work. The weak will must be strengthened in every way possible,—by the influences of religion, by the power of friendliness, by a vigorous course of discipline, by the application of motives adapted to the individual. Natural tendencies must be counteracted: old habits of idleness, sloth.

external difficulties to be surmounted. The reformed man must find his place in the world. He must work; he must live. He must encounter and live down the distrust and hostility of the outside world. Society is quick to extend temporary sympathy, but slow to give continued encouragement. Old associates pursue him with temptations; ex-convicts blackmail him; the police threaten him; the saloon, the gambling house, and the brothel entice him. Those who endeavor to aid him often fail for want of wisdom, and become discouraged through frequent failures. The work is difficult and often disheartening. A clergyman who is engaged in educational work, some time ago refused a call to the chaplaincy of a great reformatory for young men. He said, "I can save five young men who have never gone into crime easier than I can reclaim one who has gone to prison." He did not reflect, perhaps, that in saving the one prisoner he might prevent the corruption of five other young men.

Having seen what reformation is; why it should be undertaken, and what difficulties are to be encountered, we may now inquire what has been done by governments in the way of developing what may be called the science of reformation. We shall observe at the outset that very little attempt was made by governments to reform criminals before the beginning of this century. There were no convict prisons such as we now have. Prisons were chiefly used for the detention of persons accused of crimes pending trial. Debtors and political offenders formed the larger body of permanent prisoners.

An intelligent but vicious convict, now serving a twenty years' sentence in the Illinois Penitentiary, said some years ago, "I think that when society catches a criminal, it should either reform him or kill him." A hundred years ago, society accepted the second horn of the dilemma. It made no systematic effort to reform criminals. Only seventy years

ago there were two hundred and twenty-two offences punishable by death in England and, in the United States, similar laws prevailed in the early part of this century.

The result was most demoralizing. The law was not sustained by public sentiment. Only a small proportion of those sentenced to death were executed, and crimes were greatly multiplied. The substitution of transportation to penal colonies instead of the death penalty benefited the mother country by removing the vicious, but brought incalculable evil in the colonies.

Juvenile criminals were seen very early to present the most hopeful and the most important material for reformation. The first systematic attempt so far as I have been able to learn, was made by Pope Clement XI.¹ in 1704 at Rome in the juvenile prison of San Michael. Upon the wall was this inscription: "*Parum est improbos coercere poena nisi bonos effecias disciplina,*"—"It is little use to restrain criminals by punishment, unless you reform them by education." The inmates were kept in separate cells by night, and worked together by day, and every effort was made to fit them for honest lives.

John Howard found in this prison one of the few hopeful signs in his search of the prisons of the world. In Howard's day it had already been in operation nearly seventy years.

In England, the Philanthropic Society² organized an asylum for poor children in 1788, which in 1806 was incorporated by act of Parliament, with a prison school for young convicts as one of its departments. This institution was es-

stitutions has grown up, by a rapid process of development, the vast system of juvenile reformatories. Great Britain, Germany, France, Switzerland, Holland, and the United States have contributed most to this development.

Some of the earlier reform schools were miniature prisons, with narrow windows, high walls, and prison cells. The discipline was harsh and rigid. Some of them grew into vast institutions like the houses of refuge in New York and Philadelphia, where the individuality of the child was lost in a great mass of humanity, and sometimes numbers took the place of names.

Little by little, as new institutions grew up, the prison features disappeared. Large windows let in the light of day; cheerful dormitories replaced the cells; window gratings and iron doors disappeared. High walls were lowered and in many cases removed. Generous playgrounds took the place of narrow, dusty yards. Great prison-like buildings gave way to groups of pleasant "cottages," accommodating from twenty to fifty children each.

With these changes has come a corresponding improvement in the discipline, and indeed the whole spirit, of reform schools. There is a general effort to make the conditions as natural and homelike as possible. The children are grouped in families—each with its matron and house father. Good manners, cleanliness, and neatness are cultivated. A sense of honor is aroused, and trust is reposed as far as possible. Harsh punishments are largely disused, and deprivation of privileges take their place. A system of marks and honors is used in many schools, and in some cases conduct grades have been established. The time of pupils is divided between work or industrial training, three to seven hours; school, three to six hours; sleep, meals, and recreation, thirteen to sixteen hours. The industries are domestic labor, gardening, farming, and light manufacturing. A few reform schools, increasing in number, are introducing technological training.

The schools teach the ordinary English branches. They are graded as far as practicable. The pupils are not equal, on the average, to those in the public schools, but make good progress in the rudiments of a common school training.

The recreations are largely out-door sports, which give an outlet to the energies of the pupils. Reformatories for girls are in some states combined with those for boys, but the present tendency is toward the complete separation of the sexes.

Reform schools differ in their efficiency. Some are organized under bad laws, as in San Francisco, where the superintendent is a purely political appointee. Some are badly managed, and fail to do good work. But as a general rule the juvenile reformatories are efficient. Their inmates improve in manners and morals, and are saved from a criminal life. A careful investigation in the Minnesota State Prison, some time ago, showed that only one or two of the four hundred inmates had ever been in the State reform school, while hundreds of reform-school children have become reputable citizens of the State.

The great lack of the reform-school system is an agency for placing children in suitable homes upon their discharge. Many go back to the same influences from which they came and their last state is worse than the first. Others are retained longer than they should be, for lack of a proper home to which they can be sent.

Recently the fact has been recognized that institutional treatment is not always the best method of reforming juvenile criminals. The State of Massachusetts has a law¹ whereby, in every case where a boy or girl, under the age of sixteen, is accused of crime, the magistrate must give notice to the State Board of Charities, "which shall have an opportunity to investigate the case, attend the trial, and protect

¹ Public Statutes of Massachusetts, 1882, Chap. lxxv, sect. 20-22

the interests of, or otherwise provide for, the child." Under this law the magistrate may allow the State Board of Charities to find a suitable home for him, or care for him in some other way than by sending him to the reform school. Thus children who are not vicious may be saved from the contamination which is inevitable to some degree even in the best reform schools. The State of Michigan has a similar law, which has proved very efficient.¹

One of the hindrances to the reformation of juvenile offenders is the corruption to which they are exposed in county jails. The laws of most states require the separation of adult and juvenile prisoners where practicable; but in many jails there is no provision for separation, and in others the law is neglected. Many adult prisoners take delight in corrupting children in every possible way, and the child, through even brief association, is tainted for life. Every jail where prisoners associate freely is a moral pest-house, and it would be far better for a child to spend an equal period in a small-pox hospital than in such a jail. The State of Massachusetts in 1882 passed a law² forbidding the commitment of any child under twelve years of age to a county jail. Such children, if unable to furnish bail, are committed to the State Board of Charities for safe keeping until the time of trial.

It would doubtless have been an advantage if governmental efforts to reform adult criminals had formed in some sense a logical sequence to the system of treating juvenile criminals; but the two systems have grown up side by side, with but little relation to each other. Within the past few years, however, there has been an effort to establish a complete reformatory system in several of the states of the Union, but as yet the work is incomplete.

It would appear from existing methods as if we believed

¹ Public Acts of Michigan, 1885, No. 168, sect. 2.

² Laws and Resolves of Massachusetts, 1882, Chap. cxxvii.

that when a boy passed the age of sixteen years he became an entirely different being. There could hardly be more difference between reform-school methods and state-prison methods if they were intended for a different race of beings.

The reformation of adult criminals has been attempted by government chiefly, though not exclusively, through the agency of prison discipline. These attempts have been much less successful than the attempts to reclaim juvenile offenders; partly because the material to be wrought upon is more intractable; partly because the work appeals less powerfully to the sympathies of legislators and the public generally; partly because the methods employed have been less efficient.

In discussing the relation of prison discipline to reformation, it will be helpful to remember that prison reform and the reformation of prisoners are not necessarily the same thing. You may reform a prison by abolishing cruel punishments, renovating its sanitary condition, giving better diet, erecting better buildings, improving its force of employes, economizing its expenditures, and so forth, without doing anything for the reformation of the inmates; and, on the other hand, the reformation of convicts may be carried on with considerable efficiency without reforming the prison at all, except in its spirit and its disciplinary methods. As a matter of fact, there has been a great deal of prison reform in the United States during the past fifty years, but comparatively little reformation of prisoners.

It is universally admitted that criminality, like insanity, is most curable in its early stages. If this be true, the best time for the application of reformatory influences by the State ought to be when the criminal first comes into the hands of the State, in the lock-up or the county jail. At this time the prisoner realizes most keenly his guilt and its consequences, and is most easily affected by wise reclaiming forces. An hour of wise work at this point may accomplish more than a year's discipline in prison.

What do we do at this moment of opportunity? We commit this youth, who needs the wisest treatment, into the hands of an ignorant jailer, whose highest ideal of his duty is good feeding and safe keeping. The jailer leads him by a dark passage-way, through double iron doors, into a large cell-room, and turns him loose in a cage of iron and steel, in the centre of the room. The prisoner, worn out with anxiety and excitement, and heart-sick with shame and remorse, would gladly be alone; but he finds himself in forced association with the other prisoners. They throng about him to ask the news, solicit tobacco, and learn whether he has any money. They ply him with questions as to his offence, ridicule his scruples, inveigh against his prosecutors, and envelop him in an atmosphere of vile language and malice.

He is placed on exhibition like a wild beast; he is kept in enforced idleness; he is inoculated with the virus of crime. His fellow-prisoners fasten to him like leeches, they claim him as one of themselves. In a few days his shame has vanished. He is indifferent to his surroundings. His ears have become accustomed to vile conversation. It is but a short step to the brazen effrontery which characterizes the jail-bird.

In the county jails of Great Britain, and in a few county jails of the United States, like those in Boston, in Mansfield, Ohio, and Fergus Falls, Minnesota, the promiscuous association of prisoners is prohibited, and some effort is made at a reformatory discipline; but even in these jails there is little attempt to use the special advantages of the occasion for reformation.

In many county jails religious meetings are held weekly, and weekly visits are made by benevolent visitors. These efforts doubtless accomplish something; but they are apt to be more zealous than discreet. What is wanted, is thorough, scientific work by men who make the work a special study.

Reformatory work in convict prisons has followed several different lines, not always distinct. We may mention the Philadelphia system, the Auburn system, the Elmira system, and the English system. Some systems do not pretend to any reformatory efficacy; such as the lease system of the Southern States, the exile system of Russia, and the penal transportation system of France.

The Philadelphia system takes its name from the Eastern penitentiary built at Philadelphia early in the present century, although the system did not originate there. This prison was built with the intention of keeping each prisoner separate from every other. The prisoner ate, slept, and worked in his own cell, with daily exercise in a small adjoining yard. While separated from other prisoners, he had free intercourse with prison officers and other visitors. It is claimed for this system, that it is the true system for deterrence and reformation; since it prevents contamination, necessitates reflection, and affords opportunity for dealing with the prisoner according to his special and individual needs. The system was adopted in the state prisons of New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Western Pennsylvania, but was long since discarded in those prisons, on the ground that it was expensive, unnatural, injurious to health, and deficient in the reformatory character claimed for it.

The separate system is generally advocated by penologists in this country for prisons of detention (lock-ups and jails); but few now advocate it for state prisons. The system has been partially maintained at Philadelphia, though there are about eleven hundred prisoners in seven hundred cells, and

While the separate system has found little favor in this country, it has made considerable progress in some parts of Europe. In parts of Germany and in Belgium it prevails, and excellent reformatory results are claimed for it.¹ The system prevails also in Holland, but is not so strongly favored there.²

The present drift of opinion seems to be toward a partial application of the separate plan, which will be considered under the English system.

The second reformatory system is known as the Auburn system, because it was first practised in this country at Auburn, New York, though it had previously been in use in European prisons.

The principal features of this system are separate cells by night and associated silent labor by day. This system prevails in the state prisons of the Northern United States and in many European prisons. It is a great advance upon the system of promiscuous association which prevails in the Southern States. When it is combined with a suitable labor system, that is, a system of productive labor such as will train men to earn their way outside, it affords opportunity for reformation, though the system has little reformatory power in itself. In most cases the system has been supplemented by "good time laws," under which prisoners earn a reduction of their sentence by good conduct, and in some states prisoners are allowed a portion of their earnings on condition of good conduct. These laws promote good discipline, but do not insure reformation. The worst men often make the best convicts, earn all of their good time, and go straight back into crime.

Many go out of our state prisons reformed men, but their reformation is not generally due to anything inherent in the system. The reformation of state-prison convicts is depend-

¹ Tallack's Penological and Preventive Principles, p. 111 ff.

² Wines' State of Prisons and Child-Saving Institutions, p. 392.

ent largely upon the personality of the officers of the prison. A warden who cares nothing about his men, a tyrannical, heartless deputy warden, or a perfunctory chaplain stands directly in the way of every renovating influence.

In some state prisons, as in Ohio,¹ New York,² and Wisconsin,³ the parole system has been introduced, with a system of marks and grades. The results have been very encouraging. The laws of New York and Wisconsin have gone into effect within the past two years, and are not yet fairly in operation.

The Ohio law has been in operation since 1885. The convicts are divided into three grades, as at the Elmira Reformatory, and are marked on their conduct, their labor, and on "school or normal progress," and those who have not been previously convicted of any felony may be discharged on expiration of the minimum sentence provided by law for their offence, subject to a return without trial to serve out their term if the parole is violated. Under the operation of this law, it is claimed that the *morale* of the prison has greatly improved, and the population has diminished. About six hundred prisoners have been paroled, and the Board of Managers report the most encouraging results in the way of reformation.

In the state prison at Jackson, Michigan, a very important and useful experiment is in progress⁴ under the direction of Warden H. F. Hatch and Chaplain Geo. H. Hickox. The following remarks are based on personal observations of the writer during a visit of thirty-six hours.

There has been no special legislation, except a law requiring

¹ Laws of Ohio, 1885, p. 237. ² Laws of New York, 1889, pp. 522-523.

³ Laws of Wisconsin, 1889, Chap. cccxc.

that all of the convicts be sent to school; but the modifications in the system have been made with the concurrence of the Board of Inspectors, under existing laws.

Warden Hatch, who was formerly a prison contractor, holds the view that prison discipline has but one legitimate object, namely, the protection of society; and that the most effective way to protect society is to reform the prisoner. He holds that any means which have proved efficient to reform men outside are legitimate in prison.

To this end, a mark system has been introduced: and every man is marked on a scale of 10 on his studies and his conduct (which includes his efficiency in work). Every man who earns 7 in studies and 9 in conduct enjoys certain privileges, among which are the following: he substitutes a gray suit for stripes at the end of his first three months (this privilege is highly valued); he has the privilege of newspapers, letters, a weekly literary society, religious meetings three or four times a week, and an hour or two of liberty in the prison yard two afternoons in the week. Men who fail to earn these marks and men who break the rules are deprived of these privileges. Those who join the literary societies must pledge themselves to use their influence in favor of good discipline and good morals.

The religious work of the prison is carried on by a chaplain and assistant chaplain, who give their whole time to the work, and a Catholic chaplain, who officiates regularly. There is a Sunday-morning preaching service (attendance compulsory), Sunday-school, five afternoon prayer-meetings, and two evening prayer-meetings. The attendance on the evening prayer-meetings was over 300 out of 700 men. There is an extraordinary sobriety in these meetings—no excitement, no whining, no relation of criminal experiences, very little cant. The prayers and remarks are brief and pertinent. Every moment of time is occupied. There is an appearance of close attention and interest. Hypocrisy,

if it exists, is veiled under a most skilful pretence of sincerity. The prison officers assert that no favors are shown convicts who interest themselves in religious matters, and that this is well understood by the convicts.

The labor is on the contract system and is arduous—probably as much work is required as at any prison in the country. The food is wholesome, but less liberal than in some other prisons,—the daily cost of food being less than ten cents per prisoner.

The visible results of the Jackson prison discipline are as follows: 1. *Better work.* Several of the contractor's foremen testified that the men worked better than formerly, though one or two regarded the present *régime* with disfavor on general principles. The contractors have recently consented voluntarily to a reduction of an hour per day in the hours of labor; the tasks, however, remaining undiminished. 2. *Better order.* It is the general testimony that the great body of the convicts show a cordial disposition to sustain the discipline of the prison, which did not formerly exist. The writer was a witness of an incipient fight between two convicts in the dining-room at the dinner hour. The men attacked each other savagely, but were instantly separated forcibly by their companions, without a word being spoken. The assistant deputy warden stated that there had not been a fight in the prison in the past three years which had not been stopped by the convicts before an officer could reach the spot. 3. *An intellectual improvement.* The men who attend the literary societies and religious meetings showed in their faces that they were interested in something else besides their own broodings. There were few dull, morose, or dogged countenances.

vists under the old order, and they sustain this claim by statistics showing a great diminution of re-commitments.

The Jackson discipline is severely criticised by some prison men and ridiculed by others. It is claimed that the convicts are pampered and coddled to the destruction of good discipline and all deterrent effect; that hypocrisy is encouraged, and the prison officers are wheedled by cunning rascals; that the worst men get the ear of the officers and have things their own way; and that the result will be the utter demoralization of the prison, if not a destructive outbreak. It is claimed that this policy tends to do away with the terrors of the prison and to encourage crime.

On the other hand, those state officers and citizens who know most about it seem to regard the present order with favor. The Board of Prison Inspectors, who are not sentimentalists, endorse it. The plan is unique in some of its features, and the results will be watched with interest by penologists. Whether any permanent effect is produced upon the prison system of the country or not, the effort is a valuable and interesting contribution to the list of experiments in prison discipline.

The Elmira system of adult reformation has its origin in what is known as the Irish, or Crofton system.

Captain Alexander Maconochie, being in charge of the British convicts at Norfolk Island in 1834, introduced what is now called the system of progressive classification. This system was subsequently taken in principle by Sir Walter Crofton and was incorporated by him into the Irish prison system.

This principle, still further modified, has been introduced into the new reformatory prisons of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Minnesota. The reformatory at Elmira, New York, is the oldest and best organized, and will serve to illustrate the new system.¹

¹ See annual reports of the State Reformatory, at Elmira, N. Y.

The Elmira Reformatory is intended to fill a place between the reform school and the state prison. It receives only young men, between the ages of sixteen and twenty-six, who have never before been sentenced for a felony. This provision is a public recognition of the tendency of bad character to become fixed with increasing age and repeated offences.

Criminals are not sent to the Reformatory for a fixed time, but for an indefinite period, not to exceed the maximum period fixed by law for the punishment of that offence. Inmates may be released on parole by the Board of Managers at any time previous to the expiration of this maximum period, subject, however, to being retaken and returned to the Reformatory without trial in case of misconduct.

The inmates are divided into three grades. Every new convict enters the second grade and goes up or down according to his record.

Second-grade men wear citizen's clothing, and have limited privileges of correspondence and visits from friends. If the convict makes a bad record, he is degraded to the third grade, where he wears a prison suit, is under rigid discipline, and has almost no privileges, but he can earn his way back to the second grade in thirty days. If this record is satisfactory, he goes to the first grade in six months. First-grade men wear a neat uniform similar to a fireman's uniform, have the privilege of correspondence, visits from friends, and a reading-room. They have better cells and an improved diet, and dine with their fellows in a common dining-hall.

Every man is marked rigidly upon his conduct, his labor, and his studies: for all advancement in grade depends upon

man may earn all of his marks without any real purpose of reform. Superintendent Brockway on one occasion pointed out a prisoner who was acting as an under-keeper. He said, "That man has earned all of his marks, and his record here is clear; but he is a 'bunco steerer' from New York City, and we are sure that if discharged he would immediately return to his old practices."

No man is paroled until employment is obtained for him with some one who knows his record. Every paroled man reports monthly to some designated person. Failure to report, intemperance, bad company, or dishonesty is sufficient ground for abrogating the parole. When the man has proved his stability, his discharge is made absolute, usually in six months.

In the Elmira Reformatory every effort is made to stimulate the criminal to activity in his own behalf. He is made to feel that everything depends upon his exertions. The discipline is severe and often distasteful, but the men take hold with a will. I have never seen prisoners work with such activity as at Elmira.

The central force of the institution is the personality of the superintendent. He establishes a personal relation with every inmate, and any inmate, whatever his standing, can obtain an interview with the superintendent for any good reason. Inmates have the right of appeal to the superintendent in case of unjust marking or reports.

A variety of industries was established in order to fit the men for honest self-support, but the industries were broken up by demagogical legislation. The men thus being left idle, military discipline was introduced to keep them employed. A regiment was organized, of which every officer from the colonel down is a convict. The men are marked on the West Point schedule, and their proficiency is equal to that of regular soldiers. Trade schools were established to take the place of the industries; but the work produced had

to be destroyed, as the law forbade its sale. Industries are now being re-established under a new law; but the military organization is to be retained, having been found helpful to the system.

The schools are graded from the primary up, so as to be adapted to every intellect. The advanced classes receive instruction from competent lecturers, and take notes. Rigid examinations are held. Superintendent Brockway maintains that it is necessary to dig new channels of thought, and re-occupy the mind, in order to reform men.

The effort is made to reach every case in some way. Recently a thorough system of physical treatment by Turkish baths and severe gymnastic training has been introduced to fit men of low mentality and sluggish temperament for reformatory treatment.

The Elmira Reformatory has been much praised¹ and severely criticised.² No observer can fail to admire its thorough organization, and the skill and ingenuity with which its ends are sought. It is criticised in some quarters, especially in England, on the ground that it furnishes too great advantages and is not calculated to deter. This criticism seems hardly justified, since it is a matter of record that young criminals dread to be sent to Elmira, because they will be forced to exert all their powers and subjected to a vigorous discipline. This is especially true of those who are not disposed to reform. An officer of the Sing Sing prison told the writer that former inmates of Elmira who were committed to Sing Sing were all exceedingly bitter against the Elmira Reformatory, on account of the severity of their experiences there.

Elmira is criticised, with some justice, perhaps, for making too little of religious influence. There is no stated

chaplain. Religious services are conducted by different men from Sunday to Sunday, and there is very little personal religious work. Undoubtedly a religious conversation is the best possible means of reformation. One of the most efficient prison officers in the United States, not himself a professing Christian, said recently, "I believe that when a criminal is reformed, God Almighty has to take a hand in it."

There are great difficulties in applying religion to the hearts of convicts. No class of men is under so great temptation to play the hypocrite and at the same time so free from scruples in so doing. A convict said to a clergyman sometime ago, "I feel that I have found my Saviour here in this prison, and he is precious to my soul, and I want you to help me to get a pardon." The clergyman did not help him; but he obtained a pardon, and in a few weeks was back at his old vicious practices.

The chaplain of the Ohio Penitentiary used to say when men came to him and wanted to make a public profession of religion, "I am glad to hear that you are trying to be a Christian. Hold on, and live it as faithfully as you can, and I will help you all I can; but do not be in haste about making a public profession."

No convict ought to be allowed to feel for a moment that he can make a gain of godliness; but in every prison—especially in every reformatory, there should be a wise, patient, large-hearted chaplain, bearing witness by his life to the truth and the power of the Christian religion; quick to recognize and to fan into a living flame every spark of genuine religion, but too wise a student of human nature to be fooled by hypocritical professions and made a tool by men who are scheming for a pardon.

It is claimed with a good show of truth that eighty per cent of the men discharged from Elmira become law-abiding citizens. It is difficult to prove that claim, because many who go wrong find their way to other states, but if it is even

approximately correct, it forms a notable record. Whatever modifications may prove necessary as the system grows, it is undoubtedly one of the most important advances ever made in the direction of a reformatory system.

The Massachusetts State Reformatory, at Concord, differs in several particulars from the Elmira Reformatory. There is no age limit, many of the prisoners being of middle age. Prisoners are admitted who have been sentenced more than once, and petty offenders, as well as felons, are received; many being sentenced for drunkenness. Petty offenders cannot be kept more than two years, others, not more than five years. As a result, the leverage upon the prisoners is weaker, and the discipline is much less vigorous. Outside employment is not a requisite to discharge. Religious agencies are extensively employed.¹ There is an active chaplain, a Young Men's Christian Association, prayer-meetings, and religious societies. In fact, Concord is as often criticised for making religious influences too prominent as is Elmira for making too little of them. The officers of the Concord Reformatory do not attempt to estimate the number of prisoners reformed.

The Pennsylvania Industrial Reformatory, at Huntingdon, and the Minnesota State Reformatory at St. Cloud, on the Elmira plan, were opened in 1889. Buildings for similar reformatories are being erected at Mansfield, Ohio, and at Hutchinson, Kansas.

The fourth reformatory system is the British system.² By the new laws of 1863 and 1878, the system of dealing with convicts was revolutionized. The control of the jails and convict prisons was vested in one board of commissioners.

on the "separate plan," in a "local prison." He may wear his own clothing, provide his own food, and communicate freely with his friends, but has no association with his fellow-prisoners. If convicted of a petty offence, he may be sentenced to "imprisonment," not more than two years, in the local prison. During his sentence he is kept separate from other prisoners. At first he has a plank bed, hard labor, and very plain fare. By good conduct he can gain promotion through four stages or grades, gaining milder treatment and additional privileges with each stage. These local prisons correspond to our county jails, and are a great improvement upon them. If convicted of a serious crime, he may be sentenced to "penal servitude," in a convict prison, for a sentence ranging from five years to life. The first nine months is spent in separate confinement, in rigorous punishment, at hard labor. The rest of his confinement is spent in a public-works prison, with associated labor by day and separation by night. The mark system is employed, and convicts can shorten their sentence one-fourth by earning good marks. Convicts who earn this diminution of sentence are released on a parole or license, and violation of its conditions sends them back to prison. There is a stringent system of police supervision over discharged convicts.

The British system is much more rigorous than ours, both in the severity of its prison discipline and in its treatment of the criminal subsequent to discharge; but it is a serious question, whether a modification of the discipline of some of our prisons, in the direction of the British system, would not be, on the whole, beneficial both to the prisoners and to society. The warden of a state prison said to a visitor, "You may talk with any of the convicts; you will find them contented and well pleased." Experiment proved this true. The convicts lauded their warden, and expressed their satisfaction with the discipline. "But," said the visitor, "I question, whether prison discipline ought to be such that the

prisoners will like it; it seems to me that it should be such that the great body of them would not like it."

The British prison system is supplemented by a large number of discharged prisoners' aid societies, organized by private benevolence, but aided by the government. The governmental gratuities to discharged convicts are paid through these societies, which assist the men to find work, and watch over them after discharge. They also assist a portion of discharged convicts to emigrate to other countries.

Statistics are wanting as to the proportion of the prisoners who actually reform, but it is inferred that a large portion of them do, from the fact that the number of prisoners under sentence of penal servitude has decreased rapidly. This decrease is doubtless due in part to the deterrent and reformatory effect of the improved system; but it is due in part to the shortening of sentences by the parole system, and partly to the emigration of discharged convicts. A careful study made by the writer shows that in the states of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, the non-English-speaking foreigners furnish 9.8 per cent of the total population and 10 per cent of the state-prison convicts,—just their share. The English-speaking countries, Ireland, England, Scotland, and Canada, furnish 9.2 per cent of the total population, and 12.8 per cent of the state-prison population, which is one and a third times their share. In the city workhouses of Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, and St. Paul, the non-English-speaking foreigners furnish 25 per cent of the total population and only 19 per cent of the convicts, or four-fifths of their share, while the English-speaking foreigners furnish 13 per cent of the whole population and 29 per cent of the convicts, or two and a quarter times their share. It is true that comparisons of

and if we compared foreign adults with American adults we should find that Americans furnish more than their share; yet, evidently, the English-speaking races contribute more criminals in proportion than other foreigners, and there is a remarkable coincidence between this fact, and the fact of the reduced number of criminals in Great Britain. In fact, many of the discharged prisoners' aid societies of Great Britain distinctly declare that one of their objects is to assist convicts who desire to emigrate.

In recent years the State has made important efforts to reform criminals by other agencies than prison discipline: first, by the use of the parole system; second, by encouraging the work of voluntary societies for aiding discharged convicts; and, third, by a system of "probation." The State of Massachusetts in 1880 provided for the appointment in each city or town of "probation officers,"¹ who "shall inquire into the character and offence of every person arrested for crime, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the accused may reasonably be expected to reform without punishment; and the court may permit the accused to be placed upon probation, upon such terms as it may deem best, having regard to his reformation. The probation officer shall as far as practicable visit offenders, and render such assistance and encouragement as will tend to prevent their again offending." Such offenders may be re-arrested without trial, if they do not do well. The operation of this system has been very encouraging, and has resulted in the passage of a similar law in Great Britain,² which went into effect in 1887.

It remains to speak briefly of those personal and unofficial efforts to reform criminals to which reference was made at the outset. We will suppose that a parishioner or a client or a patient comes to you in great distress for help and coun-

¹ General Statutes of Massachusetts, 1882, Chap. ccxii. sect. 74-81.

² Tallack's Penological and Preventive Principles, pp. 285, 312.

sel with reference to a case of theft or forgery or violence. Discovery is imminent, with consequent disgrace and punishment. You will first ascertain as accurately as possible what kind of a case it is: What is the culprit's age? What is his record? Is it his first criminal offence? Has he ever been in prison? What are his habits? his associations? his home influences? You will then have an interview with the offender, and you will endeavor to discover his moral situation. Is he penitent or only frightened? Has he a real purpose of amendment or only a desire to escape consequences? What will be the effect upon him if he is allowed to escape? If the offender is a child, and under eight years of age or not decidedly vicious, you will use your best endeavors to keep him out of the reform school; for, as a bad boy who has had experience said recently, "The reform school is a pretty good place for a very bad boy, but a very bad place for a pretty good boy." But if he is over eight or nine years of age and is evidently confirmed in vice, you will urge his commitment to a reform school, however much he or his parents may object. If he does not appear to be confirmed in vice, but only to be homeless or neglected, you will endeavor to have him placed in a good Christian family, in preference to any institution, however good. If the child appears to be deficient in ordinary moral perceptions, an expert examination may be needed, to ascertain whether he is a fit subject for an institution for feeble-minded children. If hereditary criminal tendencies are clearly marked, reformatory treatment is probably needed.

With young men, the course to be followed is not much

for it is the general testimony of experienced observers that the county jails, almost without exception, are schools of vice, where the inexperienced are speedily initiated into the ways of experienced criminals. Unless the crime is very serious, or the offender is considered very unreliable, bail can probably be secured. Great tact is necessary to make your sympathy felt, without weakening the remorse and penitence of the offender. Nothing is so important in such a case as what some one has called "sanctified common sense" adapted to the particular emergency. In a New England church, there once arose a very difficult case of discipline. The pastor and the standing committee held a long discussion, but could decide upon no course of action. So they appointed a meeting to pray over the case, but still they were in doubt. A second meeting for prayer was appointed, and after a long session, as a good brother afterward related, "We seemed to hear a voice from Heaven, sayin', 'Jest do the best you kin.'"

The offender should be made to realize that your object is not to protect him from the consequences of his sin, but to keep him from sinning again. He should not be made to feel that his wrong-doing makes him especially interesting and entitled to special consideration, but only that you will do all in your power to help him to redeem himself. He should understand that he is on probation, and that his future depends upon his record, but this fact should not be pressed to the point of discouragement. In such a case exhortation counts for little, and moralizing is worse than useless. It is of little use to exact promises; they are easily made, and likely to be broken. He should understand that

prove not to belong to the hopeful class. The culprit, though young in years, has chosen a criminal course deliberately. He is brazen, vicious, unrepentant, or he assumes a hypocritical penitence, worthy of Uriah Heep. He snivels, weeps, promises, begs, laughing in his sleeve the while, if he discovers signs of credulity. Many criminals seem lost to all sense of honor, gratitude, or truthfulness. They delight in wickedness, for its own sake, and they take special pleasure in imposing upon the credulity of benevolent people. When you are convinced that the culprit is of this sort or has had repeated criminal experiences, you will do best to turn him over to those whose special duty it is, to deal with such cases.

Considerable caution and knowledge of criminal character is necessary in order to distinguish the superficial bravado of an inexperienced criminal who is ready to break down, but is trying to keep up a brave show, from the cool effrontery of the hardened rascal. Very little reliance can be placed upon first impressions and outward appearance, for the worst rascals often present a guileless aspect, while men of good intentions look like deep-dyed scoundrels. "Who is that villainous-looking convict?" said a lady to the prison usher, "I should know him for a criminal anywhere." "That, madam," said the usher, "is the prison chaplain, and he is not so bad as he looks." Whoever undertakes this work must be prepared for many discouragements and many disappointments. If you succeed in half the cases which you undertake, you will do well. But if you can save one or two who would otherwise go down into the depths of a criminal life, it will be a source of life-long satisfaction.

[NOTE.—In addition to the authorities mentioned, the writer has made use of the annual proceedings of the National Prison Association and the National Conference of Charities and Correction, the annual reports of the