

Editorial

The Academy has reason to be indebted to Robert L. Sadoff, M.D., for his efforts to bring forensic psychiatry into the mainstream of clinical psychiatry. This symposium is a tribute to his ability to involve a number of individuals in just such an enterprise.

The isolation of the criminal from the society of which he is a part has been a hallmark of our criminal justice system since the early nineteenth century. In contrast to capital punishment it has been seen as an act of benevolence. To see it in this way, however, meant to ignore the deprivation the imprisoned individual must experience and the fact that often a family had to suffer deprivation of a different sort. Clearly the issue at stake was that of individual responsibility and individual punishment. Everything else has been of secondary importance.

With the introduction of the term "treatment" into penology, the emphasis was again on the individual. The medical model of one-to-one treatment in psychiatric practice was used as an ideal of what treatment in corrections should entail. The introduction of such practices as behavior modification has given its own stamp to the focus on the individual, *viz.* the individual as separate from his family and as separate from his society.

This symposium represents a concerted effort to focus on the topic of violence in the context of the individual as a member of a family. The facts that California now allows conjugal visits and that Pennsylvania offers its play programs for children while parents visit would suggest that the offender as a member of a family is now being given some recognition.

Besides the family group, there are also other groups to which the offender belongs. One such group may be termed the group that is disciplined as opposed to the group that disciplines. How these two groups interact might well be a topic for a future colloquium. An historical example of such an interaction is to be found in the behavior of certain Roman generals who on occasion would order the decimation of a legion which showed a lack of courage or of discipline or, most probably, of both. This meant that every tenth man was put to death in order to intimidate the remainder. One can't help but wonder if these generals knew that Alexander the Great, four hundred years earlier, had never put one of his soldiers to death for either reason. One historian has written that the Macedonian was reported to have disciplined one of his men in time of battle only once, *viz.* he once pushed a man out of a phalanx for failing to prepare his javelin quickly enough. It would seem that the interaction between the disciplined and those that discipline can change over time and from place to place in drastic ways. Is the criminal court judge who spends one evening a week discussing rehabilitation with men on parole simply an anomaly, or does he perhaps represent a possible new model for the future? Is it possible for offenders and courts ever to relate to one another in any way other than they do at present? It would seem to me difficult to respect an individual as such whose family and other group activities are almost completely unknown. And if the offender is not respected, then how can he respect those who punish him?

I would like to thank Geigy Pharmaceuticals for choosing to distribute copies of this Symposium to practicing psychiatrists throughout the United States. In particular I would like to express my appreciation to Mr. Robert W. Boswell-Stiles of Geigy Pharmaceuticals for his interest in the *Bulletin* and his thoughtful cooperation.

HERBERT E. THOMAS, M.D.