

Spring 1936

Current Notes

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

Current Notes, 26 *Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology* 942 (1935-1936)

This Note 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.

CURRENT NOTES

NEWMAN F. BAKER [ED.]

Northwestern University Law School
Chicago, Illinois

Federal Survey—On January 7, 1935, Attorney General Homer S. Cummings announced a nation-wide survey of parole and its administration.

“The importance of parole and its administration suggests that the time is opportune for a nation-wide examination of this problem, vitally related as it is to the proper administration of criminal law throughout the country. Because of the variations existing among the statutes and practices of the several jurisdictions, I am convinced that such survey should include pardon, probation, commutation, suspended sentences and similar subjects.

“With these considerations in mind the Department of Justice has procured funds from the Works Progress Administration for such an inquiry. During the next few weeks a staff of trained workers will be sent into the field to initiate this undertaking:

“The facts thus secured, the comparisons of experience thus made possible, the interchange of information thus facilitated and the varied results shown to have been obtained through contrasting methods and techniques will, it is hoped, be of great practical benefit in dealing with the crime problem.”

The general purpose of this study is to make: (a) a comprehensive digest of the laws, procedures and

practices used in the different states (including the District of Columbia) and by the Federal authorities in the disposition of convicted persons; (b) a statistical survey and analysis to show (1) the number of such individuals convicted, (2) the frequency of the different types of dispositions made by the courts and the basis of selection of cases for this purpose, (3) their personal, social and other characteristics in relation to types of dispositions made by judicial, custodial, parole, and other authorities, and (4) the inter-relation between personal, social and other characteristics of such convicted persons and the type of treatment and its success. The ultimate objective of the study is to disclose the effectiveness of the different statutory, institutional, and other measures used currently in the several jurisdictions. A subordinate purpose is to determine the nature, extent and prognostic value of information now obtained by courts, probation officers, prisons, and parole officials.

In order to carry out the purpose of the study as it has been broadly outlined, two different approaches are to be adopted:

I. An examination of the laws in force in the several jurisdictions relating to procedures of release will be made by a staff of trained and qualified persons, to include

studies of organization and qualification of personnel, and the actual practices followed in the treatment of the offender, as these are related to release. The examination will cover:

- A. A digest of the laws governing disposition of persons convicted of crime.
 - B. A study of facilities available for administering probation.
 - C. A study of types of disposition other than probation and imprisonment, such as suspended sentence, fines, etc.
 - D. A study of institutional facilities, policies and procedures as affecting releases.
 - E. A study of laws, policies and procedures in granting pardons and commutations, and in granting and administering parole, conditional release, "good time," etc.
 - F. Writing a comprehensive summary of the findings as specified herein for each of the jurisdictions studied in conformity with the instructions of the Administrative Director.
- II. The collection from available records of statistical and other characteristics of persons convicted of crime. This will be performed under the direction of a staff of trained statistical field supervisors, who will establish as many Works Progress units as necessary for this purpose. This information, recorded on specified schedule forms provided for the purpose, will be sent to the central office in Washington where it will be subjected to an intensive analysis to determine inter-rela-

tions existing between: (a) the characteristics of persons convicted of crime and the type of disposition made of them, (b) differential characteristics of probationers, (c) differential characteristics of persons given an institutional sentence, (d) length and kind of institutional sentence in relation to offense and other characteristics of prisoner, (e) differential characteristics of parolees, (f) inter-relation between various characteristics of offenders and the degree of success of corrective methods to the extent that these are of prognostic value in relation to conditional release, (g) preparation of experience tables wherever the findings warrant.

Federal Survey Appointments—

The general direction of the survey discussed above is in the hands of Justin Miller, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, and chairman of the Section on Criminal Law of the American Bar Association. For the statistical studies he has appointed Barkev S. Saunders, Ph.D., Columbia University, who has had extensive experience in statistical study with various governmental agencies. Dr. Saunders will have active charge of the compilation and analysis of the data gathered by the W.P.A. workers of the 48 states serving under the regional directors and field supervisors. At Washington he will have a staff of clerks, typists, coding experts and analysts.

The field for the survey will be divided into the present W.P.A. regional fields. Regional directors and Field Supervisors are as follows:

REGIONAL DIRECTORS			FIELD SUPERVISORS	
<i>Name</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>States</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Name</i>
Charles D. Piper	1.	New York, Vt., N. H., Maine, Mass., Conn.	1.	Frank Prever
Leon T. Stern	2.	Penn., Maryland, Delaware	2.	D. A. Deane
Edward J. Crawley	3.	Ohio, W. Va., Kentucky	3.	Chester Farley
Richard Chappell	4.	Va., N. C., S. C., Georgia Tenn., Ala., Fla.	4.	Byron Wheeler
Walter J. O'Brien	5.	Ind., Ill., Mich.	5.	Harold Katzenstein
John B. LaDue	6.	Wisc., Minn., S. D., N. D.	6.	Milton Johnson
Rollin Perkins	7.	Nebr., Kans., Mo., Iowa	7.	Charles Hackett
C. S. Potts	8.	Okla., Ark., La., Texas	8.	Abel N. P. Reily
John R. Burroughs	9.	Wyo., Utah, Colo., N. M.	9.	Henry E. Edmunds
James M. Brown	10.	Mont., Idaho, Oregon, Wash.	10.	Karl Grimm
Ronald H. Beattie	11.	Calif., Nev., Ariz.	11.	Robert Eckendorff

Late in January a conference was held in Washington for the purpose of instructing the above appointees. At this Conference such men as Professor Thorsten Sellin, Judge Uiman, Warden Ash, and Messrs. Lane, Chute, and Hiller of the National Probation Association, Sanford Bates and several assistants from the Federal Bureau of Prisons discussed various aspects of the study, including courts, probation, parole, and penal administration.

New Jersey Report — The Sixth Report of the Judicial Council of New Jersey, Arthur T. Vanderbilt, Chairman, H. Edward Toner, Secretary, was devoted to a study of the administration of the Criminal Law in that State. The report, virtually a "crime survey," contains both statistics and concrete recommendations analyzed and drafted by Mr. Leonard V. Harrison, Consultant in Criminology of the Rockefeller Foundation and Mr. Morris Ploscowe, noted research scholar in the criminological field.

Specific recommendations are:

1. The Attorney General should be granted complete super-

visory authority over criminal prosecutions and the functioning of the county prosecutor's office.

- II. The general supervision of local police forces should be entrusted to the State Police.
- III. The Sheriff should be required to report periodically on the status of all unserved criminal writs.
- IV. The County Probation systems should be placed under the supervision of a central court consisting of three Judges.
- V. A Sentence Adjustment Court of three full time judges should be created, with complete authority to review sentences and supervise probation administration.
- VI. The minor criminal courts should be recognized.
- VII. The period of time between the commission of the crime and the punishment thereof should be minimized. In particular, the long delays in the Appellate Courts should be eliminated.
- VIII. The highest professional standards should be main-

tained in the selection and tenure of law enforcement personnel.

IX. Interstate Cooperation. "We recommend that the legislature consider the enactment of uniform legislation to provide: 1. For securing the attendance of witnesses from without the state in criminal proceedings. 2. To make uniform the procedure on interstate extradition. 3. To make uniform the laws on close pursuit and authorizing New Jersey to cooperate with other states therein. 4. That New Jersey may enter into compacts with other states for mutual helpfulness in relation to persons convicted of crimes or offenses who may be on probation or parole."

As an explanation of the eighth recommendation above the Council makes this pertinent suggestion:

"In this, as in other States, police, prosecutors, and judges have been handicapped in the enforcement of criminal laws by defects of organization and archaic procedure. But men of ability, industry, and independence, manage to achieve fairly satisfactory results despite these difficulties. Men count for more than machinery or rules in governmental administration. This has been demonstrated over and over again in criminal law enforcement. The special prosecutor appointed by the Governor in New York County is up against the same obstacles as the regular district attorney, yet he is obtaining results in cases in which the district attorney has been helpless. Care in the selection and training of its agents, is one of the principal reasons for the striking success of the Federal Bureau of In-

vestigation in dealing with dangerous offenders who were immune to interference by local police and prosecutors. Fundamental improvement in criminal justice, may, therefore, be obtained through raising the quality of law enforcement personnel. 'So long as the public continues its attempt to make crime suppression more effective by changes in the criminal law, it will meet continued disappointment', states a recent report of the American Bar Association. 'Its efforts, to be successful, must be directed towards improvement in the character and attitude of the law's administrators'."

Goldman Letter—Quoting with approval the article by Chief Justice Finnegan on the work of the Public Defender of Cook County, XXVI J. Crim. L. 709 (Jan.-Feb. 1936), Mr. Mayer C. Goldman, Esq., of New York City has addressed the following communication to the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology:

"Quite apart, however, from this tremendous economy, Public Defenders mean increased efficiency. They will:

- (a) avoid delays and speed up trials.
- (b) reduce perjured defenses.
- (c) eliminate disreputable criminal lawyers.
- (d) minimize useless appeals.
- (e) promote the administration of justice.
- (f) inspire public respect for and confidence in, the criminal courts.
- (g) protect the innocent and punish the guilty.

The soundness of the Public Defender plan for the *poor* is no longer debatable.

On the program of the 1935 Los

Angeles annual meeting of the American Bar Association, it was my privilege to present a plan for compulsory State defense for *all* accused persons, rich or poor, innocent or guilty, gangster or falsely accused.

One solution of the crime problem and organized crime, is to substitute State Defenders for private counsel in *every* criminal case. Disreputable lawyers who shield and pervert justice, must be eliminated. Lawyers should be ministers of justice—not instruments to defeat justice.

The State should select defense counsel of character and ability from a specially selected bar, inspired more by a sense of public duty, than by the mere lure of a fee.

The denials of criminal justice today, the increasing number of 'lawyer criminals,' the alliance between them and their gangster client, the protection of crime by them, before, during and after its commission, the difficulty, delay and expense of convicting guilty or powerful defendants, have become a National menace. They constitute a defiance of law and order and of government itself. If the State defended *all* accused persons, its only purpose would be to seek justice. There would then come truthful defense by public lawyers having no selfish purpose to serve. With State defense for *everyone*, all the scandals of private defense will disappear."

Illinois Investigation—Following the killing of Richard Loeb, of "Loeb-Lepold" fame, in the Illinois State Penitentiary, and other scandals within the prison, Governor Henry Horner appointed a commis-

sion of ten members to make a comprehensive investigation of conditions in the State's penal institutions. At the time of this writing the commission has met several times and voluminous testimony has been taken but no reports have been made public. The members are: the Rt. Rev. J. H. Schlarman, Catholic bishop of Peoria, chairman; Robert L. Kern of Belleville, Ill.; State Representative Thomas Sinnett of Rock Island, Ill.; Roy Best, warden of the Colorado state prison; State Senator James J. Barbour of Evanston; Circuit Judge John Prystalski; Assistant State's Attorney Emmett Moynihan; Col. Henry Barrett Chamberlain, operating director of the Chicago Crime Commission; the Rev. Preston Bradley; and Charles H. Schweppe of Chicago.

Ohio Survey—The Osborne Association, Inc. through its executive secretary, William B. Cox, recently made a report to the Sherrill Commission Survey of Ohio State Government, and its analysis of Ohio conditions should prove to be interesting and instructive to citizens of other states which have similar problems. Specific recommendations are made for institutional management of Ohio's penal and correctional institutions and various problems affecting all institutions such as employment, education, discipline, classification, parole, and general conditions, and administrative methods. As to the last topic the report has this to say:

"It is extremely doubtful if anywhere north of the Mason-Dixon Line general conditions respecting correctional methods are as deplorable and inadequate as in Ohio. The situation has been investigated a number of times but no fundamental

improvements have been made. That the revelations following the Columbus Penitentiary holocaust did not shock the people of Ohio into action can be accounted for only by the fact that they are not only ignorant of actual conditions and the results which flow from such negligence, but apparently also have mistakenly placed too much confidence in some of their officials. Certainly if the people of Ohio knew the facts they would not be callous to the degrading conditions existing in their institutions, or fail to realize that their prison system does not afford them the protection they have a right to demand.

"The fact nevertheless remains that general conditions with respect to the care, treatment and rehabilitation of offenders in Ohio is little short of disgraceful. These conditions can be accounted for in part by repeated postponement of the fundamental changes needed and the failure to make gradual improvements in plant, structure and personnel. This delay has been due sometimes to public antipathy to all criminals engendered by the desperate and heinous crimes of a few; sometimes to distorted ideas of economy, but most frequently to the lack of an aggressive champion of a forward-looking penal program.

"The answer, it seems to us, to most of the faults of the present system lies in providing a more stable and professionalized method of administering all of the matters connected with the welfare of juvenile delinquents, prisoners, the feeble-minded, and similar groups under the jurisdiction of a reorganized Department of Welfare. How can there be anything but muddling when the responsible officers change every two years? How is it possible for any officer to understand the

mazes of his problem and do something about them within a period of two or at most four years? Would it not discourage any officer in his attempts to remedy conditions if he realized he would in all probability be out of office before he could get the attention of the legislature? How discouraging this is can be seen when it is remembered that the director is usually appointed just at the time the legislature begins its session and he must appear before them requesting appropriations without first-hand knowledge as to actual needs.

"Although it may be true that several of the directors of the Department of Public Welfare have been conscientious public officials it must be admitted that they have been far from successful in their attempts to bring order out of chaos. There is little or no doubt that the present backward penal and correctional policies are largely due to the fact that before a director of public welfare can possibly have time to acquaint himself thoroughly with conditions in his department and remedy them he is relieved from his duties and a new director must begin anew.

"Unfortunately, too, present methods of administration fling the whole welfare problem into the political whirlpool. Political rather than scientific considerations necessarily dominate every action of a department which is dependent upon the political fortunes of those in control. Too often also the incumbents of responsible positions in the Ohio Welfare Department are appointed for reasons of political expediency rather than because they have justly earned a reputation as wise and skilled leaders in welfare problems. The record speaks for itself.

"It is not impossible to devise a

system which is at once responsive to the people and yet permit of a continuity of purpose and policy. The taxpayers can control without flinging the whole welfare problem in the maelstrom of political and partisan politics through the simple expedient of appointing a non-salaried, non-partisan board which appoints a director of public welfare to execute its policies. Such a plan overcomes the serious objections to present methods in Ohio, where the administrator is appointed for a short term coinciding with that of the governor. The conflict and lack of understanding between a short-term appointed director and other administrative and institutional officers, the reluctance to initiate a program of research and development, and the division of authority between the head of the department and institutional officers, all can be overcome by authorizing the governor to appoint a non-salaried board of five or seven public spirited persons with overlapping terms to set the policies of the department, and review the actions of the executive director. This scheme, sometimes slightly varied in detail, works well in a number of states. It is the plan which was adopted in New Jersey after an investigation of conditions by the Honorable Dwight Morrow. Similar plans are in effect in Connecticut, Texas, California, Minnesota, Wisconsin and a number of other states. States like Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, and Indiana, where single executives or boards of control having terms of office coinciding with that of the governor, are turning to the non-partisan type of board made up of members with long, overlapping terms of office. Almost all counties and cities have similar boards to control school and educational

policies, and something of this sort must be developed in Ohio or the state's institutional system will continue to be a disgrace, inept, and make for more rather than less crime.

"We therefore, recommend that the governor be authorized to appoint a non-partisan, non-salaried board of seven with overlapping terms of office to control the welfare and institutional policies of the state. The board should have the sole power to appoint and remove an executive director of welfare and should also have under its jurisdiction every state penal, correctional and charitable institution. Adequate provision should be made in the department for divisions of: (a) Administration and Fiscal Affairs; (b) Institutional Employment; (c) Medicine and Sanitation; (d) Classification, Social Service and Education; (e) Inspections; (f) Research and Statistics. The law establishing this board should set forth in bold outlines the policies to be followed and should then repeal all and every statute which is in conflict with its objectives."

Lehman Recommendations—January 7, 1936, Governor Herbert H. Lehman of New York presented his recommendations dealing with criminal law administration to the legislature in a special message. So numerous are these (covering more than thirty printed pages) that we cannot print them in their entirety. Three recommendations were of unusual interest to the section editor. They dealt with Crime prevention (discussed in the following note), a state department of justice and the limitation of the prosecutor's discretion. As to the state department of justice, he says:

"While prosecution for crime in this state is essentially a county responsibility, the state has such a large stake in the matter that it should undertake a more extensive supervisory and coordinating activity. With that end in mind, I recommend the creation of a state department of justice modeled upon the Department of Justice of the United States.

What should be the principal law enforcement functions of such a state department?

1. It should be given broad powers to cooperate with and assist the local district attorneys. The district attorneys should continue to be elected by the people of the counties. However, I wish to emphasize to the people of each county that they must realize more than they apparently have in the past the vital importance of the office of district attorney. May I urge the electors of our counties to give the closest scrutiny to the candidates for this office and to demand that their district attorneys be vigorous and efficient in the prosecution of criminals without fear or favor?

2. The Division of State Police should be transformed to the department. A large bureau of investigation along the lines of the Federal Bureau of Investigation should be established. Furthermore, this will enable the State more effectively to cooperate with county and local police officials. Let me make it clear that I do not favor vesting in the department centralized and direct power over local police forces.

3. A central bureau of criminal identification should be set up. This bureau will not only be readily available to the State police, but its functions can be so integrated as to assist more rapidly and more

thoroughly the local police and prosecuting officials.

While the entry of the State into this field in the manner recommended above will have a most stimulating effect in the speedy apprehension and conviction of a greater number of criminals, there are other things we can do in the meantime which will have a similar result. Some of them have been before your Honorable Bodies for consideration on previous occasions. Many of them have been considered by other public agencies in this State. Some have heretofore failed of passage owing to faulty draftsmanship or other reasons. I believe that your Honorable Bodies will, however, concur with me that the time has arrived for the adoption of these proposals in a concerted attack on crime along many fronts."

Concerning the prosecutor, he said in part:

"A major abuse attaching to the discretion now vested in the district attorney is the acceptance by him of a plea of guilty to a lesser crime than that charged. There is no question that the courts have a legal right to accept pleas of guilty in a lesser degree, or that it is often desirable to do so. In many cases where the defendant admits his guilt substantially as charged and is ready to plead, the State is justified in saving the time and expense of a trial. I am familiar with the other arguments that are advanced in defense of the practice: the necessity of accepting pleas in order to keep up with crowded court calendars, the understaffed prosecutors' offices, and the reluctance of judges to impose heavy mandatory penalties.

However valid these arguments may be in some cases, the practice of accepting pleas of guilty to mis-

demeanors in cases indicated for felonies has been carried far beyond a defensible limit in many jurisdictions and has reduced much of our prosecution to a process of bargaining. The bad effect on the criminal who succeeds in driving a good bargain is unquestionable.

I therefore recommend legislation which shall require that when a district attorney requests a court to accept a plea of guilty to a lesser offense than that charged, the district attorney shall be required to submit to the court a statement in writing signed by him, in which his reasons for recommending the acceptance of such plea shall be clearly set forth. This statement should be accompanied by the complete criminal record of the accused, and after the sentence has been imposed or suspended, should be filed by the court with the public records of the case. It should be subject at all times thereafter to inspection by the public in general and by the press."

Crime Prevention—One of the recommendations found in the 91st Report of the Prison Association of New York to the Legislature, January 27, 1936, reads as follows:

"Legislation should be enacted to establish a Bureau of Crime Prevention in the Executive Department, as recommended in Governor Lehman's special message on the improvement of criminal law enforcement. The old adage, 'an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure,' still holds. The Governor states, 'This bureau should: (a) Stimulate state departments to develop their facilities and methods to control the factors entering into delinquency and crime. (b) Visit, study and evaluate conditions

in communities throughout the state and advise local agencies as to the organization and development of needed programs. (c) Collate, interpret, and publicize statistics and reports relating to the problem of juvenile delinquency and crime. (d) As need arises, prepare and sponsor legislation bearing upon the many specific problems incident to crime prevention.'

This Association, although heartily in accord with the idea of a Crime Prevention Bureau and its functions as outlined by the Governor, desires to emphasize that one of the important functions of this Bureau should be the development of a plan of crime prevention, setting forth not only the objectives but the technique of operation, to serve as a guide in the various communities. There is also need for an evaluation of the work that is being done by various crime prevention organizations. While the phrase 'crime prevention among our young people' is popular, it is true that there is a variety of opinion as to the various methods of approach and technique generally, with the result; that the different agencies are proceeding without the necessary coordination of effort. In other words, there seems to be too many separate undertakings which well might be combined in the interest of economy and team work administration."

Criminal Trial Publicity—Action based upon a study of the trial of Bruno Hauptmann and intended as the basis of a code of ethics for lawyers, the press and the public at future criminal trials was taken by the executive committee of the American Bar Association meeting in Chicago, Jan. 14, 1936. The

committee voted to create a special group to invite other organizations to join in adopting standards that will help avert "pre-judicial publicity."

The study of the Hauptmann case was made by the criminal law section of the bar association and severely criticised the conduct of many connected with the trial. Because of its critical nature, the 100 page report was suppressed pending Hauptmann's electrocution for the murder of the Lindbergh baby.

An outline of the committee's recommendations, however, was made public. The eight principal proposals follow:

Limitation of the crowds to the capacity of the courtroom with sheriff's attachés barred from using legal processes to get politically connected curiosity seekers into the trial.

Taking of pictures in the courtroom should be held in contempt of court.

No telegraph wires into the courthouse building.

No radio broadcasts, no movies of the trial, nor vaudeville appearances of jurors or principals after the proceedings.

No poll of jurors or other attempts to anticipate verdicts.

No interviews with jurors after the trial.

No radio discussions by figures in any trial, such as witnesses or relatives of defendants.

No more "trials of the case" in the newspapers, with both sides giving interviews on the evidence they intend to offer.

Glueck Publications — Professor Sheldon Glueck of the Harvard Law

School recently sent the manuscript of his Lowell Lectures, delivered last spring at the invitation of President Emeritus A. Lawrence Lowell, to the publishers, Messrs. Little, Brown & Co. The lectures have been revised to eliminate forensic features necessary in their oral presentation, and will be published this spring under the title, "Crime and Justice." The book has eight chapters entitled: I—The Battleground of Justice, II—The Halls of Justice, III—The Lameness of Justice, IV—The Blindness of Justice, V—The Knights of Justice, VI—The Pawns of Justice, VII—The Prospect of Justice, VIII—The Prospect of Justice (continued). The book stresses the pathology and pathogenic agents of criminal justice in the American scene. While it is intended primarily as a popular presentation for lay readers, it is hoped that it will also be of professional interest and for that reason the volume is fully documented with notes.

Professor and Mrs. Glueck will soon send to the publishers a volume on "Crime Prevention Programs," which they have been editing. The book will contain contributions on the major aspects and most authoritative illustrations of the various crime preventive efforts under way throughout the country. The twenty-five contributors include the outstanding planners and administrators of crime preventive programs in the United States and Dr. and Mrs. Glueck report that the contributions of these authors are of exceptionally high merit. The book should be a timely tool in the hands of community planners, citizens' groups and teachers of criminology and penology.

Miscellaneous—At the Governor's Conference on Crime, The Criminal and Society, Albany, N. Y., Sept. 30, 1935, Mr. Austin H. MacCormick said: "In connection with the list of things which, in my opinion the criminal is not, may I add one more thing briefly? He is not, I think, characteristically a parolee, no matter what people may think, and I offer in defense of that statement the statistics published by the Department of Justice in its quarterly reports from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's own Bureau, which show that of all the arrests reported in the course of the year 1934 by law enforcement officials throughout the country, the number of people who were on parole was .7 of one per cent of the total arrested."

At the Indiana State Conference on Social Work, December, 1935, Professor E. H. Sutherland of Indiana University addressed the Division of Delinquency and Correction. He said, in part: "(1) We are not making much progress in solving the problem of delinquency. The ratio of serious crimes to population has been increasing. Our present methods need to be modified or supplemented. (2) All methods of treatment of delinquency fail most frequently in areas where delinquency rates are highest. Sheldon Glueck has shown that in the slum area which constitutes the jurisdiction of the Boston juvenile court, the best method succeeded only slightly more often than the worst method did. (3) The punitive method is becoming increasingly difficult to use effectively because the punitive policy of the state is not supported by similar policies in other social institutions. Formerly punishment was the principal meth-

od of social control in the home, the school, and the church. These institutions have now abandoned the punitive method almost completely, leaving the state as the only institution which attempts to use this method. When the state uses punitive methods, it applies them principally to classes of people who have little social influence. (4) The improvement in school discipline points the way to the method which may be used by other institutions."

In the annual Report of the Probation Department of the United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois, the statement is made that: In addition to protecting society, and reclaiming human personalities, probation has the advantage of great economy. In federal prisons the per capita cost of care is said to be somewhat over \$300 a prisoner. In the U. S. District of Northern Illinois, the annual cost of probation and parole is approximately \$15 per capita. In New York State the annual prison costs are \$552.72 per capita, while annual probation costs are \$29.34 per capita. *Jail and prison treatment costs from ten to twenty times as much as probation.*"

New Criminological Journal. The first number (Sept.-Oct., 1935) of the bi-monthly *Revista Colombiana de Biología Criminal* has appeared. It is the joint publication of the Institute of Penal Anthropology and Education of the Central Prison of Bogota, Colombia, and the Colombian Society of Criminal Biology, and is edited by Dr. Francisco Bruno. The first number (96 pp.) contains, among others, articles on "Juvenile Delinquency and Crime

Prevention," "Prison Identification," "Recidivists in the Light of Modern Theories of Social Defense," "The School of Criminal Anthropology," "The Revision of Correctional Law," "The Battle Against Crime in Belgium," "The Origin of the Prison Regime in Brazil," and "Endocrinology and Crime." The annual subscription is \$4.00.

T. S.

Central Howard Anniversary—The Central Howard Association of Chicago observed its Thirty-fifth Anniversary at the Chicago Bar Association on February 15, 1936. The Association was founded January 7, 1901, by its present Superintendent, F. Emory Lyon.

Besides giving essential relief to discharged prisoners, the Association sponsors prisoners under parole supervision—nearly 50,000 have been assisted in these ways during its three and one-half "Decades of Service."

The Association has been active, with others, in securing preventive legislation, better prisons, adult probation, Public Defenders, Civil Service Standards, Behavior Clinics, etc. It has supplemented the work of the State in the field of recovery and protection, and demonstrated the citizens' share in reclamation service.

Hon. Floyd E. Thompson, the President of the Association, though out of the city, sent the following message: "I should like to point out that no investment in Social Service work will pay better divi-

dends than personal service for men released from prison. There are many people, I think, who have the impression that The Central Howard Association devotes its attention to procuring the release of prisoners. This erroneous impression should be removed where it exists. Few men are imprisoned for life, and those who are released from prison immediately present a problem. From a selfish standpoint, the investment in providing proper guidance to these men is insurance against loss from criminal acts."

In speaking of "The Citizen's share in Reclaiming the Offender," and in reviewing the work of the Association, Dr. Lyon said: "When the Central Howard Association was born, January 7, 1901, it was increasingly apparent that no program for dealing with the delinquent was complete without proper provision for the after-care of prisoners."

"It is, then, to this individual standpoint of recovery that the Association has addressed its chief efforts. Personally, I believe the occasion calls for more intensive attention to the individual, with all his possibilities, as well as his defects; rather than to more punishment."

"The present trend of thought, education, legislation, and social service is chiefly in that direction, or should be. At no time has this been more apparent than now, with respect to this field, with all prisons overcrowded, with the inmates largely in idleness, and with no adequate provision for their education and training for better citizenship."