

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, 27 Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology 287 (1936-1937)

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

**Progress of the Attorney General's Survey**—In the March-April issue, XXVI J. Crim. L. 942, the nationwide Survey of Release Procedures, launched January 7, 1936, was discussed. Since then the organization of the Survey has been perfected, the Executive Committee consisting of Brien McMahan, Assistant Attorney General, Sanford Bates, Director, Bureau of Prisons, and Justin Miller, Chairman of the Attorney General's Advisory Committee on Crime. Mr. Miller is Administrative Director with Barkev S. Sanders serving as Technical Director. At our request Mr. Sanders prepared for the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology a statement concerning the progress made in the Survey which statement was designed to be printed in the last issue of the Journal. Unfortunately the report arrived too late to be included in that issue. But a great part of the content of the report is still of current interest. Mr. Sanders writes as follows:

"A field supervisor and eleven regional field supervisors left Washington at the end of January for the purpose of setting up work units in various institutions, courts, probation and parole offices. These units are abstracting statistical information on carefully prepared individual schedules. The analysis of these schedules will make pos-

sible the determination of the frequency of various types of releases by different courts, custodial institutions and parole authorities. In addition, the analysis will indicate, first the personal characteristics of convicted individuals in relation to the disposition of their cases. Second, in the case of persons placed on probation or parole the analysis will show the characteristics of these individuals as related to their success or failure on probation or parole. Third, the analysis will make possible the determination of criteria used by courts, by custodial institutions and by parole authorities in different jurisdictions in the selection of persons for various forms of dispositions. Fourth, the analysis will show whether the available case history data obtained by custodial institutions, probation and parole authorities can be systematized to aid sentencing judges, probation officers, and pardoning and parole boards in selecting persons for various types of dispositions. Fifth, it will show whether the available case history material can be systematized for use by probation and parole officers to individualize their methods of supervision for better results.

For the proper prosecution of this statistical phase of the survey, the regional field supervisors were given months of actual first-hand

experience in abstracting information from the jackets of federal parole and conditional release cases. In addition, the supervisors were supplied with detailed printed instructions devised to make the recording and the interpretation of case history material uniform throughout the states.

To date, May 16, the regional directors, besides making personal contacts in their respective areas, have also completed their intensive survey in various states of the statutes and laws which have to do with the sentencing and releasing of persons found guilty of crime.

Rapid progress is being made in filling out questionnaires which provide a comprehensive analysis of the facilities and practices of the courts of general criminal jurisdiction in various parts of the country.

Soon, the directors will begin to fill out a comprehensive questionnaire designed to provide a complete inventory of the facilities, personnel and procedures of various state and federal penal and correctional institutions. At present the questionnaire is being experimentally tried in selected institutions before its adoption for general use in connection with this project. Similar questionnaires have been prepared to provide a detailed inventory of the facilities for probation and parole in different jurisdictions. These questionnaires also will be filled out by our regional directors.

Under the immediate supervision of regional field supervisors, work units have been set up in the District of Columbia and the following 25 states: Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey,

New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia and Wisconsin. This covers 56 institutions for adult felons with an inmate population of about 110,000. There is also a unit in the Department of Justice abstracting information from federal files. To date these units have filled out 40,000 schedules, giving individual case histories of paroled or other provisionally released cases in which the provisional release was granted and terminated by discharge or revocation between 1928 and 1936. More than half of these schedules have been edited, coded, and the information transferred to punch cards at the central office in Washington and are being tabulated for an intensive statistical analysis. Similar case histories are to be recorded on appropriate schedules for expiration of sentence cases and for other forms of release.

In order to determine the degree of precision with which this case history data is being abstracted from prison files, 1500 schedules have been recorded by separate sets of recorders, independent of one another, and results have been analyzed to determine the reliability of various items on this schedule.

The survey at present is providing employment to over five hundred persons. Consistent with the policy of the W.P.A., about ninety per cent of these employees are from local relief rolls and they are being paid from W.P.A. funds. Effort is being made to extend the work to all the states as rapidly as the limitation of supervisory personnel permits, without jeopardizing the high standard of uniformity

and precision which is being maintained in this study.

The progress of the survey has been made possible through the hearty cooperation of state authorities who have generously aided, allowing their files, necessary equipment and even in some instances supervisory personnel to be used so as to insure the success of this nation-wide undertaking."

[In a letter dated June 27, 1936, Mr. Sanders reports that units have been established in 15 more states and "have completed some 60,000 to 65,000 schedules for provisionally released cases."]

**Interstate Commission Meeting—**Four model acts: Close Pursuit, Extradition, Removal of Out-of-State Witnessess, and Out-of-State Parolee Supervision, were drafted by the Interstate Commission on Crime, January 1, 1935 (see 26 J. Crim. L. 773). In the few months since that time, despite the few state legislatures meeting in regular session this year, one or more of such acts have been adopted in the following states: New York, New Jersey, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Rhode Island, Minnesota and Virginia. Next year, 1936-37, will be the big legislative year. The Commission is accordingly making thorough preparation for even more general adoption of these model acts then.

Both for this purpose and to carry out further projects in curbing crime, both administrative and legislative, the summer sessions of the commission will be held at the State House, Boston, on Friday and Saturday, August 21 and 22, with hotel headquarters at the Parker House. The sessions of the American Bar Association and of the Na-

tional Association of Attorneys-General will be immediately following these sessions.

New topics of discussion include: interstate detection and apprehension Bureaus; fingerprinting of motor vehicle owners and operators; firearms; jury verdicts by less than 12; crime prevention in the schools; compulsory self-incrimination and the "third degree."

**Crime Prevention Objectives—**The National Crime Prevention Institute, Inc., 425 Fourth Avenue, New York City, through its secretary, Frederic M. Thrasher, has reformulated its objectives. Dr. Thrasher was appointed chairman of a committee to state the functions of the Institute, by Professor Sheldon Glueck, President of the Institute. A tentative statement follows:

"Recognizing that crime is related to social and personal conditions involving a vast range of knowledge and technique that is too extensive to be included in one program, and that many national agencies are already at work in most of the ranges of this expanse, the Crime Prevention Institute sees as its chief possible contribution the coordination of existing activities and the filling of gaps. There is a definite need for a cosmopolitan organization that can secure a perspective on these varied activities and use its efforts to bring them into closer functioning. It can sense important projects and secure their adoption by the pertinent national agencies. It can conduct exploratory or demonstration studies in conjunction with the appropriate specific agencies; it can build community programs through drawing together the various part-interests; it can discover

needs for which no agencies exist; develop these new fields and organize agencies to care for them; it can arrange periodic reviews of the activities of specific national agencies either directly or through supervising joint enterprises and thereby bring the separate agencies into unison.

Through this procedure, it can bring the public schools to give more serious attention and service to children in danger of becoming delinquent, through further development of the responsibilities of the teacher, through the organization of special activities and services of the school staff outside the classroom, and through similar development of community services, conditions, and responsibilities. It can concern itself with the informing of parents; it can bring about a preventive function on the part of police; it can develop in theological circles a better appreciation and technique for meeting problems with which they are faced daily, both through its own efforts and those of related agencies; it can support legislation designed to prevent crime, and enlist the assistance of the press, the cinema and the radio; it can bring national agencies in other fields to a more serious consideration of the problems of rural communities and small cities.

In the light of these considerations, the following basic objectives are tentatively stated—

1. To act as a clearing house of crime prevention information
2. To provide a machinery for conference and voluntary cooperation looking towards the coordination of crime prevention activities in the city, state, and nation
3. To provide and carry on crime prevention programs in areas of this field not now occupied by other agencies
4. To promote public education for crime control through use of recognized channels of publicity."

#### Judicial Criminal Statistics, 1933—

The Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, under Act of Congress approved March 4, 1931, has undertaken the task of an annual collection of judicial criminal statistics, 1932 being the first year for which this collection was made. The returns for 1932 covered only 16 states including the District of Columbia. The recently issued report for 1933 covers 24 states and the statistics are from an area containing approximately 36 per cent of the total population of the United States. It is hoped that eventually each State will adopt the Census form and classifications as this would avoid needless expense and duplication and vastly increase the value of the Census statistics.

"Judicial Criminal Statistics: 1933" is in attractive booklet form covering 94 pages of tables and text. Dr. Leon E. Truesdell supervised the report assisted by Dr. Alba M. Edwards and Alice V. Hagan. The statistics presented in this report are of two classes: (a) Those relating to procedural outcome of all cases that came before the courts, and (b) those relating to sentence or treatment of defendants found guilty. The statistics relating to procedural outcome show the total number of defendants in criminal cases definitely before the trial courts of general criminal jurisdiction in the 24

states covered by the investigation for 1933; what offenses these defendants were charged with; how many of them were disposed of without conviction; how many were found guilty of the offense charged; how many were found guilty of a lesser offense than that charged; and how many cases were pending at the end of the year.

---

**Indiana Conference**—The last issue of "Current Notes" should have contained an account of the Conference held March 31 at the University of Indiana under the auspices of the Indiana University Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology. This was the first Conference of the Institute and was highly successful in every way, four hundred visitors attended the sessions which were devoted to various phases of criminal law administration. The presence of Justin Miller, Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, O. W. Wilson, Chief of Police, Wichita, Kansas, and Professor William Ernest Hocking, with Indiana officials, made the program exceedingly interesting. During the day an exhibit and demonstration by the Indiana State Police was supervised by Lieutenant Don L. Kooken. Professor J. J. Robinson is Director and Professor E. H. Sutherland is President of the Indiana Institute.

At the Conference the announcement was made that the Indiana University Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology was in the process of developing a four-year police training school which would begin operations in September, 1936.

**The "Recueil"**—In a letter to Hon. Sanford Bates, Director, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, and Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, Dr. J. Simon van der Aa, Secretary General of the Commission, discussed the Commission's publication "Recueil de Documents en Matière Penale et Penitentiare" and asked for renewed efforts upon the part of members from the United States to increase the subscriptions. Volume 4 (Special) of "Recueil," July, 1935, contains glimpses into the penitentiary systems in force in various countries, "which present matters of peculiar interest."

---

**Graz Institute**—"Das Kriminologische Institut der Universität Graz" recently written by Professor Adolf Lenz and Assistant Professor Ernst Sellig, describes the growing usefulness of this parent organization. Founded in autumn of 1912 by Hans Gross the Institute was the first Criminal Law Institute attached to a University. Adolf Lenz became Director upon the death of Gross in 1915 and the Institute, which had previously concerned itself mainly with simple criminal investigation, turned toward more complex forms of investigation: handwriting analysis and from this toward microscopy, microphotography, ultra-violet ray photography, paper analysis, etc. The earlier work on testimony, particularly upon the detection of false testimony was continued. In 1927 there was begun an Institute for Criminal Psychology and Biology, and with it, what Gross had long desired, a criminal museum. The new Institute is described in Lenz's "Grundriss der Kriminalbiologie"

(1927) and in the proceedings on the several Kriminalbiologischen congresses. It is now engaged in the following: Fingerprint and other identificationary means; handwriting, typewriting, etc., identification, forgery, erasures, etc.; ink analysis, paper analysis, seal and stamp forgeries; "kriminalbiologie," evidence, detection of false testimony, pathologic lying, criminal types, criminal slang. The number of cases in which the Institute was called upon for assistance shows a steady increase—58 in 1924, 117 in 1930, and 172 in 1935.

**Psychiatric Convention**—At the 1936 convention of the American Psychiatric Association at St. Louis in May several topics relating to criminal law and criminology were considered. Dr. J. W. Moore, Albany, Chairman of the New York State Board of Paroles, for the American Psychiatric Association Committee on Legal Aspects reported recent exchanges of ideas with the similar committee of the American Bar Association on (a) incompetence of lay juries, (b) narrowing the legal concept of mental disorders, (c) that commitment for felony should not be made until after a neuropsychiatric examination and report, and (d) that methods should be evolved for neuropsychiatric examination and advice for petty offenders in connection with probation because with these petty offenders the roots of their deviation from socially accepted standards lie in their emotional spheres. He also commented on the statutes providing for neuropsychiatric examination and for qualification standards for certified neuropsychiatrists. (Such a

bill has passed in New York, but the second part failed to pass the Massachusetts Senate.) Dr. Moore declared that the psychiatrists should seek legal permission to comment to the Court or in Court on what they believe but what the lawyers do not want discussed, viz., partial responsibility.

Dr. L. S. Selling of the Detroit Recorder's Court Clinic presented a paper "A Psychiatric Technique for the Examination of Criminals" wherein it was shown that for persons convicted and awaiting commitment a different methodology was needed than in examining the obviously insane such as at State Hospitals—written self-administering tests first, then interview and examination, elicited psychopathology if it existed. The older methods drove the criminal into inaccessibility and negativism. Detroit's examinations are adequate; the Clinic of the Court of General Sessions in New York City is hurried and the examinations are too brief, sometimes only fifteen minutes each. Detroit averages four to five hours per prisoner, and has a larger and more varied staff and greater sources of data.

Dr. C. C. Wholey of Pittsburgh read a paper, "Psychiatric Report of a Study of Psychopathic Inmates of a Penitentiary," in which attention was especially directed to that borderline, puzzling, barely-modifiable group, the Constitutional Psychopathic Inferiors. Compared in percentages to the rest of the prison population or to the extra-mural "normal mixed" population, they showed these characteristics: they tended to be single, non-alcoholic, susceptible to alcohol and criminal under alcohol if they did use alcohol, of foreign parents, white, or poor work rec-

ord, young, repeaters, who left home early, sex perverse, of poor inheritance, and more prone to murder than to robbery, i. e., more apt to commit crimes against the person than crimes against property.

Dr. Wholey commented that the term "Criminal Insane" was a paradox but useful. Often circumstances determine whether such a person eventuated into a state hospital or into a penitentiary, e. g., an epileptic or parietic who shot at his wife and missed her; straighter aim would have determined the penitentiary. Speaking of other types, he said, and the Section concurred, that in crimes of passion, the emotions being overwhelming, there is a question or a variable degree of responsibility. Alcoholic furors as well as epileptic furors if followed later [not at once] by amnesia indicate insanity [but do not preclude recidivism].

Other types of insanity are found in prison, and the insanity in some cases antedated adjudication and the crime: dementia praecox, syphilis of the brain, organic dementia and arterio sclerotic and senile dementias. Sometimes the insanity causes the crime; sometimes it does not.

The psychoses which develop in prison are paranoid [ideas of injustice, "double crossing" and then innocence] or paranoid with confusion. Such cases cannot accept their fate, especially if act and arrest and incarceration abruptly terminate a habitable existence, e. g., business and good family life, or, as in the case of a loyal workman, daily threatened by pickets as a "scab," who shot one who assaulted him and in fleeing shot and killed a police officer thinking he was one of the pickets chasing him.

Increasing emotional tension threw him into an insane, primitive panic in which the crime was committed. Here the prison psychosis is a mixture of paranoid (self-excusatory) and panics.

In cases of plea of insanity used as a defense at the trial, Dr. Wholey recommended the New Hampshire criterion: the psychiatrist is asked his opinion on this question—Could the defendant form a criminal intent?

A hopeful note was sounded by Dr. M. Molitch of Jamesburg, New Jersey, in his paper "Endocrine Disturbances in Behavior Problems." In a boys' penal institution 25% of the boys had endocrine gland disorder of one kind or another. Such boys might show any type of behavior disorder but surely some type or other; in adjustment they showed social pathology often overcompensated with over-aggressiveness; in school achievement some might be bright, but endocrine cases usually are below average; in personality they were unstable and emotional. Before arrested and later in the institution they, more than the average boys, are spoken of negatively, and they get into trouble and more trouble. Whereas 11% of all boys here became parole violators, 18% of the endocrine cases violated parole. Eighty per cent of these cases could be treated successfully medically and the personality defects re-corrected: only medical treatment can modify these cases.

H. H.

The U.S.S.R. Institute—Dr. William C. Boyd of the Boston University School of Medicine, Guggenheim Memorial Fellow, 1935-36, has prepared for the JOURNAL an

account of the Scientific Institute for Medico-Legal Research in Russia:

"The Institute was officially organized in 1933, but had actually begun its activities in 1932 under the direction of its present head, Prof. N. V. Popov. Cases are now sent to it from all over the Soviet Union, especially cases requiring unusual or expert investigation. All of the medical schools in the Union have professors of legal medicine to whom local cases can be referred. The Moscow institute serves as the nucleus of the whole system, and combines in its activities practical investigations and theoretical researches. Branch institutes in other cities are being organized.

The work of the Institute is divided into the planning, scientific-practical and administrative sections. Here it will probably be of most interest to speak of the scientific-practical department.

This department is in charge of a certain amount of research on medico-legal lines, carries out the most important of the expert medico-legal investigations needed, prepares sera, and engages in consultation work. It is to consist of seven divisions; there are at present in operation a division of autopsies, a serum laboratory, a biochemical division, a division for the biological study of evidence, a branch for the study of living persons, a toxicological, and a physical-chemical division.

The division of autopsies has access to a large amount of material from the whole city (around 5,000 bodies per year). A well equipped histological laboratory, in addition to routine work, is attempting to work out new methods of pathological histology, especially

in application to legal medicine. From the autopsy material anything worthy of note finds its way into the very interesting museum, where there are on display interesting exhibits of weapons used for homicide and suicide, numerous specimens of medico-legal pathology, and a series of beautiful wax models of gun and knife wounds, and of organs damaged by corrosive poisons. The writer's interest was also attracted by a series of specimens of tattooed skin.

The biochemical division carries out numerous chemical analyses of various kinds. The biological division makes investigations of blood, sperm, hair and such kinds of evidence. Some of the information made possible by such evidence, however, can only be obtained by the methods of the serological laboratory. In this laboratory are investigated blood stains, some of them sent from the most remote parts of the Soviet Union. The precipitin reaction is first applied to identify them as of human origin, then the blood group is determined, by methods described by Lattes and co-workers, Schiff and others, and a number of Russian authors. As has been known for some time, the blood group can be determined from stains from other body fluids than blood. Cases have come up in Japan where the dried saliva on the butt of a cigarette or under a postage stamp has proved sufficient. Seminal stains have also been used. More than this, from the body tissues themselves, even when preserved, the blood group can be determined. In a case coming to the Russian Institute, where a head and two feet were found, it was possible to show that they represented at least two corpses, since one of the feet be-

longed to a member of a different blood group from that of the head and other foot. In this case serological methods made a decision possible when morphological methods had failed.

In the serum laboratory are also investigated the newer M and N blood groups. As is now well known, in many cases the information provided by a determination of these groups enables a solution to be given. For example, in certain cases of disputed paternity the Institute has found it possible to establish the innocence of an accused man by determining the M and N groups, when the ordinary groups establish nothing.

The physical-chemical department comprises three laboratories: general criminological, photographic, and optical laboratories. Here are made photographs and enlargements of finger prints and a collection of finger prints has been begun. In the optical department are used the latest methods for the investigation of handwriting, forgeries, etc., including the use of a quartz lamp.

The Institute also carries on work in ballistics, but in the limited time available, the present writer was unable to see any of this work.

The address of the Institute is State Medico-Legal Institute, Trubetskoi Pereulok, 7, Moscow 21. From time to time the Institute publishes collections of papers on medico-legal questions; the first of these (in Russian, with German summaries) appeared in 1934. The director, Prof. Popov, has published a number of interesting researches on these lines, including papers on blood grouping, and a very excellent work on the investigation of the blood with light of different wave lengths.

The Institute also undertakes medico-legal instruction for interested physicians. This involves actual laboratory work and dissections as well as theoretical instruction. A three-year course is provided."

---

**Criminal Registration Law**—In the editorial section of "The Prison Journal" published in April, 1936, by the Pennsylvania Prison Society the following comment on Philadelphia's registration ordinance appeared:

"Philadelphia's City Council has passed an ordinance providing that any person who has served any part of his sentence of imprisonment for a breach of the criminal law of this or any other State or county within ten years shall, if living within Philadelphia, register with the police. All those arriving in Philadelphia shall register within six hours. In the case of changes of address, they shall re-register. Having registered, they shall notify the police before moving from the city. The registration is accompanied by finger-printing and the procuring of other identification information.

"We do not question, of course, the good intentions of Mayor Wilson and the Police Department of Philadelphia in proposing such an ordinance, but we are utterly opposed to it in principle because we believe, with some competent authorities, that it is unconstitutional. A more important objection, perhaps, than this, is the psychic effect which it has on every man who has committed a crime. It opens up old sores. It re-affirms the conviction which exists in the minds of too many of these people that the police are anxious to get something

on them. The fact that this is not so does not matter. The important thing is that this group of individuals feels that it is so. Such an ordinance tends only to stiffen resistance to police regulation of a large group of people in the community, most of whom are in the potential criminal class.

Moreover, it is extremely doubtful that the law accomplishes anything. The men who want to be law-abiding and forget their past criminal record will register, while those who are engaging in criminal activities of course will not.

We are prone to forget that voluntary association and cooperation are fundamental principles of democracy. Any departure from these principles in law-making invites resistance, and strikes at the roots of democracy."

---

**Juvenile Courts of Italy** — The Report of the Italian delegate to the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, U. Conti, contained a description of the new Juvenile Courts of Italy.

The new legislation concerning minors came into force October 29, 1934. Wherever there is a court of appeal or division sitting as a court of appeal, a juvenile court is set up, consisting of a president, a law officer having the rank of judge, and a citizen with long experience in social welfare, chosen from experts in biology, psychiatry, criminology and education. The juvenile court has jurisdiction over the entire area of the court of appeal or division thereof in which it is situated.

The private members of the juvenile court and of the division of the court of appeal for minors are appointed by Royal Decree on the proposal of the Minister of Justice

and Keeper of the Seals. They are appointed for three years, with the possibility of a second term.

In every locality where there is a court of appeal or division thereof, there is housed in a single building, a reformatory, a rehabilitation institution for minors, a prison for minors and an observation center for minors, organized by the National Mothers' and Children's Protection Society. These are termed collectively the "minors' rehabilitation center." The juvenile court and the division of the court of appeals for minors sit in the same building.

In various establishments or different parts of the same establishment, provision is made for the rehabilitation of homogeneous groups of minors, graded according to age, physical condition and intelligence. The systems of rehabilitation conform to the social status of the minors,—whether agricultural, industrial or scholastic.

The juvenile court has jurisdiction in all criminal cases involving offenses committed by minors under 18 who, by reason of the habits which they have contracted are manifestly erring individuals in need of moral correction.

The court also has civil jurisdiction in cases where minors stand in need of physical or moral protection.

Article 246 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that when a child under 14 is arrested he shall be handed over to the public security authority for necessary administrative measures, and that a minor between 14 and 18 may be interned in a reformatory (*reformatorio gindiziaro*). This internment also takes the place of arrest (*mandato di cattura*) in the case of minors between 14 and 18.

In proceedings against minors, special inquiries must be made as to the child's previous personal and family history, physical, mental, moral, environmental.

As the law on Juvenile Courts did not come into force until October 29, 1934, it is not as yet possible to give a definite report on its results, but it already justifies

confident hopes that it will prove most satisfactory. S. W. D.

**Crime Decrease in Chicago**—In a report made to the Board of Directors of the Chicago Crime Commission at the June meeting, Col. Henry Barrett Chamberlin reported a further decrease in major crimes for Chicago. The figures for murder, burglary and robbery are quite significant:

MURDER						
(Yearly totals)						
					Jan.-May (incl.)	
1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	
359	344	388	337	230	71	

(Tabulations of verdicts of murder returned by coroner's juries.)

BURGLARY						
(Yearly totals)						
					Jan.-May (incl.)	
1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	
18,689	22,791	21,976	20,691	17,331	5,976	

ROBBERY						
(Yearly totals)						
					Jan.-May (incl.)	
1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	
14,544	15,943	15,157	13,436	9,531	2,593	

**National Probation Conference**—The annual conference of the National Probation Association began on May 22 with an all-day session devoted to community prevention of delinquency. Kenneth S. Beam, special field agent of the Association, presented his report on a six months' national study of the coordinating council movement in many communities. Discussion of the objectives of community councils, of various methods of organizing and supervising them, and of

the part which lay groups can play in their function were among the topics of the day. Professor Frederic M. Thrasher of New York University, pointed out that "No program can have any hope of success without striking at the causes of crime. We cannot cure a disease merely by attacking its symptoms. The finished criminal is the end product of a long process of development usually beginning in childhood. Every hardened criminal has a natural history through

which we may trace back by logical stages the development of his character and personality." The coordinating council, which offers preventive conditioning before even the beginnings of delinquency, is certainly the logical method of attacking the problem.

The possibility of widening the scope of these councils until their focus on delinquency prevention becomes vague was a matter for discussion. A generalized program for promoting child welfare was favored by some speakers as the objective of the councils. Such a function in the opinion of others does not unduly emphasize delinquency, but it may become so diffuse that delinquency prevention is more or less submerged.

Probation and parole in relation to public welfare administration was the subject of a lively panel discussion. In addition to the question of state supervision of probation and parole services, the relation of these services to state and county departments of public welfare was involved. Such questions as these were raised: Should probation and parole be united in administration? Should juvenile and adult work be combined? Should a state department of correction control both probation and parole service? What is the relation of parole administration to prison administration? Has our concept of probation and parole work changed, so that we see these services as more logically included in a state department of public welfare? Should we include juvenile work in a welfare set-up, but keep adult work in a department of correction? How are these various procedures working out? What are the present trends in thinking and in practice?

A matter of unusual interest for juvenile court judges attending the conference was the proposal made by Judge Harry L. Eastman of Cleveland to form a national association having some affiliation with the National Probation Association. A committee was appointed to study the matter further and to report at the next session of the conference.

The program of the conference, which included sixteen sessions, ranged all the way from broad topics in the field of crime and delinquency of interest to probation and parole officers, judges and social workers, to more specialized matters of case work technique, case recording and intake in the juvenile court. Two psychiatrists contributed to the session, Dr. Lowell S. Selling of Detroit talking on psychiatry and the adult offender, and Dr. Douglas A. Thom of Boston on normal development of the adolescent.

Judge Joseph N. Ulman of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore, who is chairman of the Prison Industries Reorganization Administration, discussed prison reorganization and crime control making a suggestion for "a planned criminology in the business of dealing with criminals." Justin Miller, special assistant to the U. S. Attorney General, discussed progress in crime prevention and the need of closer coordination for real achievement. Katharine Lenroot, chief of the U. S. Children's Bureau, traced the development of governmental responsibility for child welfare and more particularly for crime prevention and treatment. Sheldon Glueck, professor of criminology of Harvard Law School, pointed out the value of an exchange of experience and understanding be-

tween the teacher and the social research worker on the one hand, and the judge and probation officer on the other, each serving as a check on the other and as a contributor to the work of the other. At the business session of the conference Sheldon Glueck was elected

to membership on the board of trustees of the Association.

A resolution of the conference, adopted after considerable discussion, recommended that it should become one of the functions of the Association to develop and stimulate parole as it has probation.

M. B.