

1921

## Meeting of the American Prison Association

F. Emory Lyon

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

F. Emory Lyon, Meeting of the American Prison Association, 11 J. Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology 479 (May 1920 to February 1921)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

were excellent men on this committee; they were all opposed to the public defender because the bill provided that he should be chosen by popular election. When it was suggested that the defender could be appointed by the judges of the Supreme Court most of the opposition disappeared.

This idea of judicial appointment finds further endorsement in the amendment which the Pennsylvania Constitutional Commission has adopted giving the Supreme Court power to regulate procedure and to regulate and control all legal aid work in the state.

The Connecticut plan represents the accomplishment of this idea. A preliminary study indicates that it is eminently successful. The plan seems to inspire the bar with confidence. The judges have appointed excellent trial lawyers as the public defenders. A further and more detailed study of this system ought to be made.

It is perhaps not too much to say that we expect the next year to witness marked progress in this whole field. The committee desires to continue its studies and therefore asks that it may be appointed for another year.

I take pleasure in submitting a supplemental report which has been prepared by Mayer C. Goldman, Esq.

(This will be published in our next number.—Eds.)

---

## MEETING OF THE AMERICAN PRISON ASSOCIATION

---

F. EMORY LYON

---

The semi-centennial session of the American Prison Congress, held in Columbus, Ohio, October 14-19, was an important landmark in the progress of penal science.

To anyone who has listened to the discussions of the Congress for a period of years the change in the spirit and import of the papers presented is most marked. That reformation rather than retaliation is the true purpose of imprisonment is taken for granted. To this end it was suggested that the Standing Committee on Prison Discipline should more properly be a Committee on Prison Training. The modern prison, in other words, should enlarge its functions from the mere custody of a class to the careful study, classification, treatment, and education of individual inmates in accordance with their physical condition and mental responsibility.

The addresses at the semi-centennial dinner dealt with the relation of the original principles of the Association to the courts, and the courts to correctional institutions; the relation of these principles to the prison labor problems, to juvenile reformatory institutions, to county jails, to the treatment of women offenders, to the indeterminate sentence and parole, and to classification of offenders. Mr. Joseph Byers, as toastmaster, gave the delegates a glimpse of the pioneers, of whom his father was one, who formulated the principles. Dr. O. F. Lewis gave an inspiring review of the lives of Dr. E. C. Wines, Dr. C. R. Henderson, Dr. Barrows, and Dr. F. H. Wines—a few of the noble men who gave spiritual impetus to the Prison Association.

In addition to the Wardens' Association, the first auxiliary to the general organization, others have been added. The more recent of these are the National Prisoners' Aid Association and the American Association of Clinical Criminology. The need of giving better after-care to all released prisoners was the motive of the first of these, and the rapidly growing interest in the proper understanding of the individual delinquent's nature is the impetus to the other.

Nearly every state is dealing thoughtfully with the problem of the defective delinquent. The discussion of this subject was uppermost in the Juvenile Reformatory Auxiliary and the Prison Physicians' meetings.

Very little was heard about self-government that pervaded many discussions a few years ago, and the Committee on Prison Discipline definitely recommended against it. The present dominance of psychiatry will doubtless prove to be more permanent. Two important questions, however, occur to the writer in this connection: First, should wards of the state be compelled to serve as material for experimentation, either in the matter of physical treatment, which is still empirical, or in working out theories concerning which there is wide disagreement with reference to mental states? Second, what is to be done with the considerable per cent of defective delinquents, in face of the well-known fact that no state has any suitable place for them? In other words, what real value in identifying the defective delinquents, if they must remain either in the prison or the insane hospital?

An important action of the Congress is seen in the creation of a new Committee on Treatment of Jail Prisoners and Misdemeanants. The program for the coming year, it was voted, should stress this problem of dealing with the delinquent in the early stages of court proceedings. This effort at prevention is typical of the forward-looking tendencies of the recent Congress, and a promise of the future efforts of the American Prison Association.