

Children, Youth, “Idiots,” and the “Underground”

1. *Item*: CHILDREN—MANAGEMENT (p. 220; Sears, p. 143–44)

We live in a land which has declared war on its own children,
on the future. . . . *To be young is a crime.*

—Jerry Rubin¹

It can hardly be denied that to adults, especially parents, children often seem difficult, intractable, an irritation. Yet they are *not* mere objects or barnyard animals. As the LC list itself admits in a long series of *sa* referents (p. 774–75), political campaigns, credit, factories, farms, offices, schools, and industries are fit *things* to be *managed*. Strangely, it does not also refer to “Children” although it elsewhere applies the self-same term to them. By now it should be commonly understood that, despite their age, children are *people*. Surely this is the cardinal conclusion to be distilled from the work and writing of pioneer psychologists, teachers, and educational reformers like Sylvia Ashton-Warner, A. S. Neill, Erich Fromm, John Holt, George Dennison, E. Z. Friedenberg, Herbert Kohl, Jonathan Kozol, Paul Goodman, and the groups associated with both *This Magazine Is About Schools* and the Teachers and Writers Collaborative.² It is a fundamental recognition that in recent years has produced the “free school” movement.³ Of course, “children,” by definition, are not as mature, independent, or fully-developed—biologically and otherwise—as grown-ups. Certainly, they require guidance and

special care. But "guidance" and "care" do not equal "management," a term dear to manipulators and repugnant to anyone who refuses to class *people*, including the young, with *things*.⁴

Remedy: (a) Cancel the subhead —MANAGEMENT.

(b) Establish a new subhead, —GUIDANCE AND DEVELOPMENT, with cross-references from and to CHILDREN—CARE AND HYGIENE and EDUCATION OF CHILDREN.⁵

Notes (Item 1)

1. *Do It! Scenarios of the Revolution* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1970), p. 242. Emphasis in original.

2. For a cross-section of this literature, cf. Paul Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd* (New York: Random House, 1960) and *Compulsory Mis-Education* (New York: Horizon); Alexander Sutherland Neill, *Summerhill; A Radical Approach to Child Rearing* (with a foreword by Erich Fromm; New York: Hart, 1960); Sylvia Ashton-Warner, *Teacher* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1963); Edgar Z. Friedenberg, *Dignity of Youth and Other Atavisms* (Boston: Beacon, 1965), *Coming of Age in America* (New York: Random House, 1965), and *Vanishing Adolescent* (Boston: Beacon, 1959); Herbert Kohl, *36 Children* (New York: New American Library, 1967), *Teaching the Unteachable; The Story of an Experiment in Children's Writing* (New York: New York Review, 1967), and "Up Against It," *New York Review of Books*, v. 13, no. 6 (Oct. 9, 1969), p. 57-9; Jonathan Kozol, *Death at an Early Age; The Destruction of the Heart and Minds of Negro Children in the Boston Public Schools* (New York: Houghton, 1967); George Dennison, *The Lives of Children* (New York: Random House, 1969); John Holt, *How Children Fail, How Children Learn*, and *The Underachieving School* (all New York: Pitman); and on children's legal status: David N. Ellhorn, "Kids Are People," *Civil Liberties*, no. 261 (April 1969), p. 1+. Also: the June 1969 issue of *Theory into Practice* (v. 8, no. 3), dedicated to "A fresh look at the child." *This Magazine* (56 Esplanade Street East, Suite 301, Toronto 215, Ontario, Canada) appears quarterly. The Collaborative issues an instructive, invigorating *Newsletter* from the Pratt Center for Community Improvement (244 Vanderbilt Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11205).

3. As a continuing source of data, cf. the *New Schools Exchange Newsletter*, issued by the New Schools Exchange (2840 Hidden Valley Lane, Santa Barbara, California 93103).

4. The RG form is CHILDREN—MANAGEMENT AND TRAINING, a marginal—if any—improvement over the LC head. Cf., e.g., v. 69, no. 4 (April 10, 1969), p. 30.

5. P. 219, 403.

Index Medicus uses CHILD GUIDANCE and CHILD REARING. Cf., e.g., v. 11, no. 4. (April 1970), p. 139.

2. *Item*: DISCIPLINE OF CHILDREN (p. 373)¹

If any doubt lingers regarding the headmaster-, warden- or first sergeant-mentality that infuses the headings related to children, this form should end it. With whom are youngsters thus lumped as appropriate candidates for discipline? Industrial workers, soldiers, sailors, and prisoners.² Granted, they may frequently be disobedient, naughty, unruly. Still, the term—particularly in view of its other applications—reduces children as a class to something like a chain gang, a well drilled, spit-and-polish Army platoon, or rank of unthinking, unfeeling, instantly obedient automatons. Were that sort of image of our young translated into reality, it would not be hysteric in the least to speak of an impending dystopia, an unwanted but self-germinated "Brave New World."

Remedy: Delete, using the above recommended subhead—GUIDANCE AND DEVELOPMENT to encompass material formerly subsumed under the "Discipline" rubric.

Notes (Item 2)

1. Sears refers directly from "Children—Discipline" to CHILDREN—MANAGEMENT, p. 143.

2. Cf. the referents "Discipline, Industrial," "Discipline, Military," etc., p. 373.

3. *Items*: IDIOCY, IDIOT ASYLUMS (p. 618)

Were this a subject list published in the last century and never revised since, such terms might pass unremarked, the assumption being that at that distant time people didn't know any better and that on no account would any library still employ such a collection of

antique absurdities as a cataloging tool. (Instead, it would be classed among "curiosa," a souvenir of a long-past folkways and follies.) It boggles the imagination to stumble upon them not in some dusty relic, but boldface-printed by LC in 1966. To compound the puzzle: below the psychiatrically laughable term IDIOCY appears "Epilepsy" as an *sa* referent. Must these people, who suffer enough with the malady itself, be further burdened with stupid reproaches, with superstition rooted slander?¹

Remedy: (a) Discard both "idiot" forms completely. If a work deals with "Mental deficiency," "Brain-damaged children," the "Mentally handicapped," "Psychiatric hospitals," or "Asylums," these terms already exist as primary heads, though "Mental retardation" might better express the ongoing *condition* of subnormality than "Mental deficiency," while INSTITUTIONS (FOR ALCOHOLICS, THE BLIND, DEAF, etc.) would mark an improvement over the Dickensian ASYLUMS.²

(b) It should be standard procedure once "a" is accomplished, but nonetheless worth underscoring, that "Idiocy" will be cleanly amputated from the "××'s" under EPILEPSY (p. 439).

Notes (Item 3)

1. It may be objected that "Idiocy" continues to figure in standard medical and psychiatric nomenclature, and that *Webster's Third* endows it with a fairly specific "scientific" meaning: "a feeble-minded person that has a mental age not exceeding two years and accordingly requires complete custodial care" (p. 1224). There can be little doubt, however, that popular usage assigns the word an *unscientific*, derogatory significance. The very definition just cited is surrounded by two others: "*obs*: an ignorant or un-schooled person: a simple unlearned person: CLOWN" and "a silly simple person: SIMPLETON, BLOCKHEAD . . ." Moreover, Karl F. Heiser and Benjamin B. Wolman attest that "In the history of man, there have always been individuals with a limited capacity for comprehending and reasoning, who fell behind intellectually and could not participate successfully in the economic, cultural, and social life. These individuals were labelled as dumb, stupid, imbeciles, and *idiots* and were utterly neglected, often ridiculed and exploited but never helped." Cf. their "Mental Deficiencies," in Wolman, ed., *Handbook of Clinical Psychology* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965), p. 838.

Emphasis added. That the term has been recognized by specialists as laden with opprobrium as well as being inexact is implicit in the metamorphosis undergone by a leading professional association: In 1876, a number of institution officials formed the Association of Medical Officers of American Institutions for Idiots and Feeble-minded Persons. In 1906 this society became the American Association for the Study of the Feeble-minded, and in 1933 changed its name to the American Association on Mental Deficiency. Cf. Albert Deutsch, *The Mentally Ill in America*, 2nd ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), p. 347. Halbert B. and Nancy M. Robinson furnish even more conclusive evidence in their *Mentally Retarded Child: A Psychological Approach* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965):

For many years, the terms, *idiot*, *imbecile*, and *moron* were used in the United States to denote abilities roughly in the IQ ranges 0 to 30, 30 to 50, and 50 to 70, respectively. In Great Britain, the term *feeble-minded* replaced the term *moron*, and similar terms were used in other countries, but by and large all of these terms are now quite out of vogue. In 1954, a special subcommittee of WHO [the World Health Organization] proposed a system of nomenclature based on British, American, French, and German usage in which the terms *mild subnormality*, *moderate subnormality*, and *severe subnormality* were recommended. These terms do not carry the opprobrious connotations of the older nomenclature, and by their similarity to each other they accentuate the continuous nature of mental ability. . . .

Emphasis in original, p. 49. For a detailed discussion, cf. the whole chapter, "Problems of Definition and Current Status of the Field of Mental Retardation," p. 27-58.

Prof. Gunnar Dybwad, former Director of the Mental Retardation Project of the International Union for Child Welfare, reinforces the Robinsons' contention in his statement that "Twenty years ago, anybody who had taken a course in psychology 'knew' that the mentally retarded consisted of morons, imbeciles, and idiots. . . . Later, as increasing opposition was expressed in regard to these particular terms, 'mild,' 'moderate,' and 'severe' were substituted as more appropriate and were adopted by the WHO in its 1954 report." Cf. "Who Are the Mentally Retarded?," *Children*, v. 15, no. 2 (March-April 1968), p. 45. The WHO document itself, no. 75 in the organization's Technical Report Series, is titled *The Mentally Subnormal Child; Report of a Joint Expert Committee* (Geneva).

A leading academic publication in this field, it should be noted, does not bear the title *Journal of Idiocy, Moronity, and Imbecility*, but rather the title

Journal of Mental Subnormality. Cf. Dybwad, *op. cit.*, p. 46, and *Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory*, 12th ed. (New York: Bowker, 1967), v. 1, p. 290.

Sears wisely refers from "Idiocy" to MENTALLY HANDICAPPED (p. 318). The next edition, however, could well improve on this advance by canceling the referent altogether.

2. As LC precedents, cf. INSTITUTION LIBRARIES (p. 652), INMATES OF INSTITUTIONS (p. 648), and PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS (p. 1047).

The 1968 ACS on p. 212 finally canceled IDIOT ASYLUMS, now referring from the defunct form to MENTALLY HANDICAPPED—INSTITUTIONAL CARE. It did *not*, however, excise IDIOCY. If "idiots" are to be termed (properly) "Mentally handicapped," their *condition*, it follows, should be something like "Mental retardation" or "Mental subnormality." The same reasoning, in short, that produced MENTALLY HANDICAPPED—INSTITUTIONAL CARE as a substitute for IDIOT ASYLUMS should simultaneously have spawned a new rubric for IDIOCY. While welcome, the change is yet incomplete. And it may be further observed that "Asylums," as both a prime head and subdivision, elsewhere remains wholly intact (cf., e.g., 1968 ACS, p. 223). Indeed, "Idiot asylums" is itself still retained as a referent. One day, it is to be hoped, the scheme will be 100 percent "idiot"-free.

4. *Items: CHILDREN AS ARTISTS; CHILDREN AS AUTHORS; etc.* (p. 220–21; Sears, p. 144)

A few moments spent leafing through *I Never Saw Another Butterfly*, a collection of evocative, enduring verse and graphics produced by youngsters in the midst of torment and despair,¹ or *Children of the A-Bomb: The Testament of the Boys and Girls of Hiroshima*,² should devastate any lingering myths about children's incapacity to richly express themselves in word or picture. On the contrary, the overwhelming evidence suggests that *every* child, more so than *every* adult, is (at least potentially) a poet or artist.³ LC, however, stands this postulate on its head, crediting only rare or "gifted" children with signal achievement as creators, implying that "ordinary" youths can't—or don't—cross the threshold of *real* creativity. This is rank Adult Chauvinism and contributes mightily to widening the "Generation Gap."

Remedy: To conform with existing constructions like ARTISTS, AMERICAN and ARTISTS, BLIND (p. 81), revamp such forms into ARTISTS, CHILD; AUTHORS, CHILD, etc., with "x's" for "Child artists," "Child authors," etc.⁴

Notes (Item 4)

1. The State Jewish Museum in Prague assembled and published these "Children's drawings and poems from Theresienstadt concentration camp, 1942-1944." In the United States, McGraw-Hill assumed distribution in 1964. By May 1945, some 15,000 children had passed through the Terezin KZ. Only 100 survived.

2. (New York: Putnam, 1963). Arata Osada compiled these moving, vivid memoirs of the nuclear holocaust, written by eyewitnesses whose ages ranged from 4 to 16 at the time of the blast.

3. Cf., as further examples, random issues of the *Teachers and Writers Collaborative Newsletter*, *op. cit.*, each well-laden with compelling, child-authored prose and verse, much of it confectioned by "disadvantaged" young people; *Mother, These Are My Friends* (New York: Liberty House), a "collection of wishes of Harlem children in their own words," compiled by Mary Anne Gross (in Anne Sexton's opinion, "the speech of these children is true poetry," quoted in the Oct. 9, 1969, *New York Review of Books*, p. 58); and Daniel M. Mendelowitz, *Children Are Artists; An Introduction to Children's Art for Teachers and Parents*. 2nd ed. (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1963), including a chromatic portfolio of "Children's paintings from many lands," prefaced by the observation that "although each culture colors the way its children react to their environment, the visual language of childhood remains universal in its power to communicate ideas, experiences, and above all the intensity of feeling with which the growing child discovers the world."

Also: Kenneth Koch, "Wishes, Lies, and Dreams: Teaching Children to Write Poetry," *New York Review of Books*, v. 14, no. 7 (April 9, 1970), p. 17-29. Koch holds that "children have a great talent for writing poetry and love to do it." A sampling of "Poems from P.S. 61" appears on p. 29.

4. The 1967 ACS on p. 48 introduced CHILDREN'S WRITINGS as a prime head. That children *write*—indeed, voluminously—is thus admitted, but a scope note nonetheless explains that "*Discussions of such literature are entered under Children as authors.*" The 1969 ACS likewise recognized the capacity of young people to draw and paint with a new form, CHILDREN'S ART (p. 38). It did not, however, revise CHILDREN AS ARTISTS.

5. *Item: Underground press*

See Underground literature (p. 1339)

Our media, the underground press, both creates and reflects our new consciousness. The Establishment press reflects the irrelevant, dying and repressive institutions with which we are at war. . . . The underground press is the beating heart of the community.¹

No, the “underground literature” treated by the referred-to head is *not* the variously ribald, revolutionary, pro-pot, hard-rock, anti-Establishment, psychedelic, “hip,” four-letter-word-larded produce of magazines and tabloids like *Oz*, *Georgia Straight*, *Great Speckled Bird*, *Los Angeles Free Press*, *IT*, *Avatar*, *Kaleidoscope*, and the *East Village Other*. It embraces, rather, the truly clandestine, officially proscribed literature spawned by wartime resistance movements such as the French Maquis. The calamity, especially from a youth perspective, is that *no* head whatever encompasses the new genre—labeled by its practitioners either the “underground” or “alternative” press—that dates from approximately 1964 and presently numbers millions of young people (and others) among its readership. Standard indexes have simply subsumed material on this subject under “Newspapers” or “Periodicals,” neither of which satisfactorily recognizes the extent, impact, or unparalleled nature of the phenomenon.

Remedy: (a) Establish UNDERGROUND PRESS, 1964– as a primary head, with an “x” for “Alternative press, 1964– ,”² and, in recognition of the widespread harassment visited upon UG hawkers and publishers, an “x” for “Censorship.”³

(b) Divide UNDERGROUND LITERATURE into two more precise, realistic forms: UNDERGROUND LITERATURE (OCCUPIED COUNTRIES) and UNDERGROUND LITERATURE (TOTALITARIAN STATES), changing the present *See* roster to:

See Underground literature (Occupied countries)
 Underground literature (Totalitarian states)
 Underground press, 1964–

The first head would encompass material now subsumed under UNDERGROUND LITERATURE, while the second may be applied to patently *illegal* literature confected or circulated *inside* essentially totalitarian, dictatorially-governed countries by nationals of those countries, whether in war or peacetime.⁴

(c) To differentiate the *civilian* "underground press" from its later, soldier-produced offshoot, create UNDERGROUND PRESS, U.S. MILITARY, 1966- as a complementary form, with *See* references from "U.S.—Armed Forces—Underground press, 1966- ," "GI newspapers, Unofficial, 1966- ," "GI antiwar newspapers, 1966- ," "Antiwar newspapers, GI, 1966- ," and the unused heads, "Underground literature" and "Underground press." Additionally, institute an "×" for "Censorship."

(d) Large collections of education, youth, and or radical material may wish to employ UNDERGROUND PRESS (SECONDARY SCHOOLS) to cover the High School Undergrounds (HSU), like *Options* (Sioux Falls, South Dakota) and *Smuff* (Chicago), which have been created variously to "voice student opinions . . . bring students together on the issues that affect them most . . . [and] check the hypocrisy and lies of administrators and the educational system in general."⁶

Notes (Item 5)

1. Jerry Rubin, *op. cit.*, p. 236–37.

2. *API* favors ALTERNATIVE PRESS, but since nearly all the publications so described have formed themselves into an "Underground Press Syndicate" (UPS), the latter term seems preferable. For bibliographic and evaluative data on the genre, cf. the several directories and commentaries cited by Sanford Berman in the *Assistant Librarian*, v. 63, no. 4 (April 1970), p. 58–9, as well as the listing that concludes Anne Leibl's contribution to the Jan.–Feb. 1970 *Canadian Library Journal*, *op. cit.*, p. 23. Also: Roger Lewis' discerning overview of "The American Underground Press," *Assistant Librarian*, v. 63, no. 8 (Aug. 1970), p. 122–24. Lewis, Research Assistant at the American Arts Documentation Centre, University of Exeter, organized the first British exhibition of American "underground" publications at the University Library in mid-1970.

The *BHI* has established UNDERGROUND PRESS as a primary head, with

a "related heading" reference under NEWSPAPERS. Cf., e.g., no. 1 (Jan.-March 1970), p. 82, 119.

The "1964" refers to the year in which the *Los Angeles Free Press*, apparently the earliest UG organ, began publication. Cf. Katz, *Magazines for Libraries*, *op. cit.*, p. 353.

3. On the censorship aspects of UG publishing, particularly in Great Britain and America, cf. the extensive *API* citations under "Censorship" (e.g., v. 1, nos. 1/2, p. 12); consecutive issues of both *Censorship Today* and the *Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom* since mid-1969; and Sanford Berman's letter, "Underground Press," in the Jan. 22, 1970, *Times Literary Supplement* (no. 3543), p. 84.

4. For example: Franco Spain, post-April 1967 Greece, Nationalist-ruled South Africa, and the several "people's democracies," including the Soviet Union, where only literature embodying the prescribed orthodoxy is permitted. In this last connection, Wassily Leontief, reporting on a visit to Osaka's Expo 70, drily mentions that in the USSR pavilion "one does not see Solzhenitsyn's mournful face, nor does one find among the books displayed on endless shelves the underground publications of the 'Samizdat' . . ." Cf. "Mysterious Japan: A Diary," *New York Review of Books*, v. 14, no. 11 (June 4, 1970), p. 28. For continuing reportage on the worldwide press situation, accenting the repressive regimen in "totalitarian states," cf. the bimonthly *IPI Report* (International Press Institute, Münsterstrasse 9, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland). For a few firsthand observations on "intellectual freedom" in Greece at the time of the Colonels' coup and in Russia later that same year, cf. Sanford Berman, "Notes from Europe," *Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom*, v. 16 (Nov. 1967), p. 82-4.

5. Bill Katz, in his May 1, 1970, *Library Journal* column (v. 95, no. 9), lists the five principal titles published by (or for) GIs in Europe, describing these papers as "the chief raw material for documenting an almost incredible episode in military (if not publishing) history" (p. 1719). A full roster of all active "GI anti-war papers" usually occupies the last page of the bi-weekly *GI Press Service* (1029 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Room 907, Washington, D.C. 20005). Most of the European and many of the Stateside vehicles are produced under auspices of the American Servicemen's Union (ASU), Friends of Resisters Inside the Army (FRITA), and Resisters Inside the Army (RITA). Since Katz's note appeared, new GI "rags" have surfaced in Kaiserslautern, West Germany (*The Propergander*), Schwäbisch Gmünd (*Witness*), Hanau (*Speak Out*), Heidelberg (*About Face*, prepared by UBS: Unsatisfied Black Soldiers, and distributed by *Graffiti*, Schiffgasse 3, 6900 Heidelberg), Okinawa, Japan, and Vietnam (the last three are identically titled *We Got the BrAss* and available from R. Hobbit, 6-44 Ishii Bldg., Kagurazaka, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo). Also, the European *We Got the BrAss* has in the meantime fused with *The Next Step* (P.O.B. 2441, Frankfurt-am-

Main) and Berlin's *Where It's At* amalgamated with *Up Against The Wall* (Postfach 65, 1 Berlin 12), while *Act* (10 Passage du Chantier, Paris 12) reports a mid-1970 per-issue press run of 25,000 copies. Source: personal communication from a "Frita" via the Politische Buchhandlung in Heidelberg. Cf. Also the section on "GI Antiwar Papers" in Muller, 2nd ed., *op. cit.*

The year "1966" indicates when the two issues of *Yin-yang*, in all likelihood first of the genre, appeared. Cf. Sanford Berman's annotation for *Vietnam GI* in Katz's April 15, 1970, *Library Journal* column (v. 95, no. 8), p. 1459. Copies of *Yin-yang*, incidentally, are archived at the UCLA Research Library's Department of Special Collections.

6. For a short history of HSU, plus a statement of purpose, cf. "Why High School Undergrounds Are Formed," *Los Angeles Free Press*, Jan. 22, 1971, p. 17.

6. Item: YOUTH AS CONSUMERS (1967 ACS, p. 295)

Adolescents thus join the ranks of Blacks, Jews, Amerindians, women and children for whom certain activities are considered extraordinary. Has no LC cataloger ever visited a record shop on a Saturday morning? Or peeked into a "psychedelic" emporium *anytime*? Perhaps it ought to be made a regular staff activity, duly stipulated in job descriptions.

Remedy: Contract the form to YOUTH CONSUMERS.

7. Items: INSANE; INSANE, CRIMINAL AND DANGEROUS; INSANITY; and all inverted heads beginning with INSANITY, e.g., INSANITY, MORAL (p. 649)¹

This series of principal headings implies a distinction between "insanity" and the related group of "mental" forms (e.g., MENTAL HEALTH LAWS, MENTAL ILLNESS, p. 807). Indeed, there is a very meaningful distinction, but it is one ignored in the LC list. "Insane" and "insanity" are *legal* terms used in such instances as: (a) when there is the need to prove criminal capacity, such as the near-universal

M’Naghten ruling,² or liability under contract³; or (b) when the question of commitment to a mental hospital comes before a tribunal.⁴ In these and similar cases the need to prove insanity becomes an all-or-nothing matter.⁵ This is a requirement made by the court, and medical specialists themselves would be very reluctant to give such a hard-and-fast ruling. In consequence, there is no such class of persons as the “insane,” as suggested by the phrase: “*Works on the legal status of the insane are entered under the heading Insanity—Jurisprudence*” (p. 807). Insanity is a legal status—and nothing more. Further, the criteria of insanity operative in one legal context are rarely the same as in another.⁶ When the term “insane” is not used in this very special and limited sense, when, for instance, it is interchanged with the term “mental illness” (e.g., “*Works on the law affecting the welfare of the insane are entered . . .*,” p. 649), then the label has very different connotations. It recalls the now discredited terms “lunatic” and “madness,”⁷ which through an aura of mystification became no more than a moral insult carrying the accusation of permanent mental instability (as do the headings INSANE, KILLING OF THE and INSANITY, PERIODIC AND TRANSITORY).⁸ There is the further implication that the insane are somehow a different species of human beings.⁹ By far the most misleading and mischievous usage lies in the unthinking association with crime, as under INSANE, CRIMINAL AND DANGEROUS. Correctly used, this is a near tautology, since to be found “insane” must be in the context either of having committed an indictable offense, or being a danger to oneself, or a danger or menace to others.¹⁰ Used loosely, as it is by LC, it reinforces the public stereotype that there is a positive and logical connection between mental illness and crime or—more specifically—unpredictable acts of violence.¹¹ Studies have shown that just the reverse is true.¹² *Sanity* is more a necessary prerequisite for violent, criminal and loathsome acts than “insanity,” such crimes being lower among mental patients than among the general population.¹³

Remedy: (a) There are no grounds for retaining INSANE, INSANITY, and their various offshoots as prime heads. Instead, the two basic terms, since they have only *legal* import, should be reduced to unused forms which refer directly to appropriate *legal* headings. Both may thus be equipped with an omnibus *See* reference to

Criminal liability
 Forensic psychiatry
 Liability (Law)
 Mental health laws

(b) "Lunacy," now a referent to INSANITY (p. 762), should be altogether eliminated: first, because the referred-to head will have been dismantled under "a" above; and second, inasmuch as it represents obsolescent, slipshod terminology, much like "Savages," "Idiocy," and "Asylums."

Notes (Item 7)

1. The discussion and "remedy" for Item 7 were prepared by Richard Bottomley, assistant lecturer in sociology at the University of Zambia and formerly a psychiatric social worker in England.

Sears, on p. 330, refers directly from "Insane" to INSANITY and MENTAL ILLNESS, from "Insane—Care and treatment" to MENTALLY ILL—CARE AND TREATMENT, from "Insane—Hospitals" to MENTALLY ILL—CARE AND TREATMENT, and from "Insane asylums" likewise to MENTALLY ILL—CARE AND TREATMENT. INSANITY, however, appears as a primary head, with *See also* entries for HALLUCINATIONS AND ILLUSIONS; MENTAL ILLNESS; MENTALLY HANDICAPPED; PERSONALITY, DISORDERS OF; PSYCHIATRY; PSYCHOLOGY, PATHOLOGICAL; and SUICIDE. It is further provided with "x's" for "Dementia; Diseases, Mental; Insane; Lunacy; Madness; Mental diseases; Psychoses," as well as 7 "xx's": BRAIN—DISEASES; HALLUCINATIONS AND ILLUSIONS; MENTAL ILLNESS; NERVOUS SYSTEM—DISEASES; PERSONALITY, DISORDERS OF; PSYCHIATRY; and PSYCHOLOGY, PATHOLOGICAL.

2. Where the criteria are (a) the ability to understand the nature of the act, and (b) the ability to distinguish between right and wrong in respect of it. The defendant is entitled to acquittal on the grounds of insanity if he or she lacks the ability to do either. Cf. *21 Am Jur 2d Crim Law*, para. 34, and for Britain, *Halsbury's Laws, 10 Crim Law*, pt. 1, sec. 2, para. 530.

3. That he or she should be able to understand the character of transaction in a contract. Cf. for instance, *25 Am Jur Guardian and Ward*, para. 18 and 66 *et seq.*

4. As in *29 Am Jur Insane Pers.*, para. 35; also: Great Britain, *Mental Health Act 1959*.

5. "An offender is either wholly sane or wholly insane for a criminal offence." *21 Am Jur 2d Crim Law*, para. 40.

6. E.g., for hospitalization: "It has been generally recognized that the general test or criterion of insanity or unsoundness of mind, wanting commitment to a mental hospital or asylum, depends upon whether such insanity is of such a degree that if the persons so afflicted were allowed to be at large—would by reason of this be a danger to life, property, or person, or a menace to the public." An indigent insane may be committed without proof of dangerousness. 29 *Am Jur Insane Pers.*, para. 35. The criteria for insanity just cited are so markedly different from those cited in the first three notes above that it is impossible to speak of the "insane" without specifying the legal context. In England, the term "insanity" is almost exclusively reserved in respect of criminal responsibility.

7. In England these terms have been superseded by the term "mental disorder," which is used in almost every instance excepting criminal responsibility. Cf. *Mental Health Act 1959* and *Halisbury's Laws 29 Mental Disorders*, pt. 1, sec. 1, para. 792.

8. Cf. J. C. Nunnally, Jr., *Popular Conceptions of Mental Health* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961).

9. As "violent, immoral, criminal, filthy, idiosyncratic and worthless." Cf. L. H. Rogler and A. B. Hollingshead, *Trapped: Families and Schizophrenia* (New York: Wiley, 1965), p. 218.

10. 21 and 25 *Am Jur.*, *loc. cit.*

11. Cf. Rogler and Hollingshead, *op. cit.*; L. C. Hartlage, "Employer Receptivity to Former Mental Patients," *Social Casework*, v. 49, no. 10 (Dec. 1963), p. 587; and S. Star, *The Public's Ideas About Mental Illness* (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, 1955).

12. Cf., e.g., "Prisoners or Patients?," *Economist*, Jan. 28, 1967, p. 304. Of the orders made from courts to hospitals under Section 60 of the Mental Health Act 1959, 75 percent were for nonindictable offenses. Only 58 out of the 1,100 orders were made after offenses against persons. Cf. also: J. T. Scheff, *Being Mentally Ill* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1967), p. 131. In his study of the behavior of patients at the time of admission, Scheff found that the psychiatrists responsible thought that 76 percent were unlikely to be violent. For similar indications from Cohen and Freeman, cf. their "How Dangerous to the Community Are State Hospital Patients?," *Connecticut State Medical Journal*, v. 9 (Sept. 1945), p. 697-700. Also: Hastings, "Follow Up Results in Psychiatric Illness," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, v. 114 (June 1958), p. 1057-66; Rapoport, and others, "Evaluation and Follow Up of State Hospital Patients Who Had Sanity Hearings," *ibid.*, v. 118 (June 1962), p. 1078-88; and, of course, the well-known argument that most patient violence on admission and within the hospital is situational, *viz* E. Goffman, *Asylums* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968).

13. The problem of deciding what is "sane" or "insane" has been well discussed in Erich Fromm, *The Sane Society* (London: Routledge, 1956).

On the question of violence, R. D. Laing, representative of the "Liberation" movement in psychiatry, drily remarks: "Normal men have killed perhaps 1,000,000,000 of their fellow normal men in the last 50 years." Cf. *The Politics of Experience and the Bird of Paradise* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1967), p. 24. And for the normalization of violence on a world scale, cf. the discussion in David Copper, ed., *The Dialectics of Liberation* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968).