

kleptomania. That is all it comes to. But kleptomania should be a much wider term than this, and should include thieving as a profession, for that is only another form of what is really a disease in either case. The rich man steals without any apparent necessity. The thief also steals without any *apparent* necessity in a vast number of cases. *Apparently*, he could earn a better living in a hundred pleasanter, more honorable, and even less arduous ways. But the choice is only apparent. He can't help himself. He *must* steal. Like the enthusiastic sportsman who shot his own retriever, he can't resist the temptation: "I would shoot my own grandmother if she rustled among the bushes like that," said the sportsman on that occasion. We don't understand it. The overmastering necessity of the thief to steal, of the sportsman to let fly at anything that moves, are almost incredible to us. "If they had exercised a little self-control!" we say. But they can't. When a leading barrister was pleading kleptomania on behalf of his client, the judge replied grimly, "That's what I'm sent here to cure." The reply just. Instinctive theft is a disease. It should be the duty of the judge and jury, and warders, and the law generally to cure it. "Punishment" in this regard is a misnomer. It is the same with the burglar and the violent ruffian, who are again and again committed to prison for the same offences. The judges are there to cure them. Only, they don't do it, because they don't know how, and they don't realize either the extent or the nature of the disease with which they have to cope. Perhaps a little more knowledge, and a little more humility, would enable them to do both somewhat better.

The criminal can be treated in two ways, from the mental and from the physical side. He is often weakly in

body, badly nourished, undeveloped. Again, he is often hopelessly dull, uneducated, untrained. In the case of those who are defective physically, it is found that good moral results can be obtained by exercise and careful bodily training. For there is no doubt that bodily health reacts on *morale*, and that certain states of the blood are likely to produce certain kinds of crime. In the case of those who are untrained intellectually, a great deal can be done by careful mental discipline, often in conjunction with more strictly medical treatment, physical exercise, baths, etc. For the habitual criminal is a creature apart. He is abnormal just as the lunatic is abnormal. He is idle, incapable of sustained effort, incapable of regular work. He must be trained carefully if those inherent faults are to be corrected. To put him in prison, as we do at present, is to court failure. You may as well keep his cell vacant and ready for him with his plate on the door. He will return with absolute certainty. Possibly, even if you attempted his reformation all your labor would be wasted, and he would be found to be incurable; but we do not give up all efforts to treat lunatics scientifically, because many never recover the use of their faculties.

There are two ways in which prison affects the criminal adversely. One has been mentioned already. The solitude and the confinement prey on the mind of the weaker sort, and not infrequently reduce them to melancholia or imbecility. This is comparatively subtle. The other way is more obvious to the lay mind. If you take an irresponsible, helpless being and place him under strict discipline, map out his way for him, rigidly arrange his hours, his meals, his exercise, you may make him an excellent automaton; *but you will never let him for looking after his own affairs, and regulating his own living.*