

1948

## 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, 39 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 212 (1948-1949)

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

---

V. A. Leonard, Editor

---

**Veteran Prison Worker Honored**—The Executive Committee of the Prison Association of New York recently honored with appropriate presentations the 35th anniversary of the affiliation with that organization of its General Secretary, E. R. Cass. Excerpts from his professional biography reveal the nature of his contributions in this area. Appointed to the staff of the century-old Association in June, 1913, Mr. Cass was named General Secretary in 1922 upon the death of the late Dr. O. F. Lewis, who formerly held that position. The Association, founded in 1844, is a semi-official group interested in all aspects of the correctional affairs of the City and State of New York. Obtaining his first experience in the welfare field in New York City as director of boys' camps for the Children's Aid Society, he was also the director of the Brace Memorial House for Boys. Since 1922, he has been General Secretary of the American Prison Association, a national correctional agency, and in 1928 was its president. Three times appointed a delegate by the President of the United States to the various congresses of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, he has on frequent occasions represented the Government on official missions in the United States and abroad dealing with matters relating to crime and its prevention and control.

Appointed by former Governor Lehman in 1936 to membership on the New York State Commission of Correction, he has continued in that post since that time. During his many years of relationship with the correctional field, Mr. Cass has been an active member of various official legislative commissions and has served in an advisory capacity in various state and national crime studies and surveys. Since 1916, Mr. Cass has been an outstanding critic of poorly managed parole administration. His criticism through the years, as an agent of The Prison Association of New York, was largely responsible for the development of the sound parole machinery now in operation in New York City. With the Hon. Sam A. Lewisohn of New York City, he initiated the idea of the National Parole Conference held at the request of the President of the United States in Washington in 1939. During the recent war years he was a Consultant with the Prison Industries Section of the War Production Board; a member of the National Advisory Committee on Prison and Parole Matters Affecting Selective Service; and a member of the Board of Consultants appointed by the Secretary of War to advise with the War Department on problems concerning military prisoners. More recently he was a member of Governor Dewey's informal four man committee to study the problems presented by the sex offender.—*From a current news release by The Prison Association of New York, 135 East 15th Street, New York 3, N. Y.* *Editor's note*—Mr. Cass is also an Editor of The Prison World and a member of the Editorial Advisory Council of the JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY.

---

**Annual Conference of the National Probation and Parole Association**—“The current upsurge of lawlessness in large cities throughout the United States is directly related to the weaknesses in our crime prevention and correctional services,” said Charles L. Chute, executive director

of the National Probation and Parole Association before leaving to attend the 41st annual conference of the Association scheduled to be held at Atlantic City, April 15 through April 19. He continued, "Surveys of juvenile courts, probation and parole departments, detention facilities and related agencies, conducted by the Association in 100 cities during the past year, show that practically nowhere is the staff employed to work with youthful or adult offenders adequate in either numbers or training. Effective preventive and rehabilitative work with youthful offenders cannot forge ahead under such circumstances. Augmentation of police forces will not bring about a decrease in crime, unless courts, probation and parole services are equipped to give modern individual treatment to law-breakers." The National Probation and Parole Association, which was established 41 years ago, is the only organization of its kind in the country whose objectives are national in scope in the approach to the extension and establishment of standards in probation and parole work, development of well equipped juvenile and other specialized courts for the social treatment of offenders, and the promotion of effective treatment and prevention of crime. More than 400 judges, probation and parole officers, correctional workers and public-spirited citizens, including forty-seven experts in correctional work from 35 cities in 15 states were expected to participate in the discussions.—*From an announcement by the National Probation and Parole Association.*

---

**Director of Probation Named**—Dr. John Otto Reinemann, supervisor of in-service training and research at Philadelphia's Municipal Court since 1943, has been named director of probation. Joining the staff of the Municipal Court in 1934, Dr. Reinemann served as district supervisor of the juvenile division of the probation department until 1943 when he was placed in charge of the in-service training and the court's research program. Since 1940, he has also taught correctional training courses in various parts of Pennsylvania under the auspices of the Public Service Institute, Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg. Dr. Reinemann received his doctor of jurisprudence degree from the University of Frankfurt am Main in 1926, and also engaged in graduate study at the University of Pennsylvania. He is the author of a number of articles on delinquency and probation, domestic relations problems and adoption appearing in scientific journals. Readers will remember his most recent publication in this JOURNAL, "Our Responsibility Toward Wayward Youth in War-Torn Europe and Asia," Vol. XXXV, No. 6, 375-384, March-April, 1945. Dr. Reinemann has been active in various professional organizations, such as the National Probation and Parole Association, the Pennsylvania Association on Probation and Parole, the Penal Affairs Committee of the Public Charities Association of the State of Pennsylvania, and the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Association of Social Workers. In 1946, he also served as a member of the Advisory Committee on Child Welfare Legislation to the Joint State Government Commission of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.—*The Editor.*

---

**Cost of Underwriting Crime Shows Upward Trend**—Typical of most sections of the country, in an average year close to 3,000 lawless Iowa

citizens pass in or out of penal institutions in that state. To confine these lawless people and keep them secure, it is necessary to maintain three state prisons and two state reformatories. These institutions employ approximately 450 persons, occupy 4,604 acres of land and require buildings and equipment representing a capital value of \$8,419,364. Along with other costs, the costs of imprisonment have advanced. In 1936, it cost Iowa \$350 to keep one inmate in prison for one year. Ten years later (1946), the yearly cost was \$612—an increase of 74%. The cost of operating five correctional and penal institutions for the two year period, 1945-1946, was \$1,158,175. In a decade, capital investment in these institutions increased from \$5,348,470 to \$8,419,354, or 56%. In the 12 years, 1935-1946, Iowa's 99 counties sent 17,000 persons to state institutions, averaging about 1,400 a year. During the same period about an equal number were released. Eighty-five per cent of the juveniles and 65 per cent of the adults are natives of Iowa. In 1946, 80 per cent of the 1,074 persons committed were men and boys, 20 per cent were women and girls. Counties with cities of 25,000 or over sent 40 per cent of the persons committed to the three prisons in a 10-year period. Yet, these same counties represent only 33½ per cent of the total population of the state. A great many of the persons in Iowa prisons today have been there before. Sixty-five per cent of the prisoners who entered Fort Madison in 1946 had a previous prison record. Some had been in prison as many as seven and eight times in Iowa and other states. At Anamosa, where the men are younger, only 31 per cent were repeaters. This endless traffic of lawless persons in and out of our prisons is costing us money. Would it not be wiser to prevent the crime in the first place and rely less on punishing the criminal? If we spent more money for prevention and rehabilitation, we would spend less for apprehension and punishment. And the results would save us more than money.—*Walter A. Lunden, Professor of Sociology, CRIME DOES NOT PAY BUT TAXPAYERS DO, Iowa Farm Science, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, Vol. II No. 10, April, 1948. Editor's Note: Professor Lunden is the author of the article, "U. S. A. Supervision of Bavarian Prison," appearing in the November-December, 1947, issue of this JOURNAL.*

**Economics of Probation**—The National Probation and Parole Association calls attention to the significance of an article appearing in a recent issue of a popular magazine in which the methods and economics of probation are intelligently presented. Quoting the Association, the article states that probation stands the test from a dollars-and-cents point of view. Before the war, it cost California more than \$700 to educate and care for a child in a state training school. In contrast, this child could have been schooled in his local school and supervised by a probation officer for a total of about \$190. And figures for prisons in Massachusetts, in 1944, showed that it cost \$716.50 to keep a man there, while adult probation supervision cost only \$54.40 a year. In addition to the saving in prison costs, probationers in California alone paid off in one year \$68,000 in fines; and \$174,000 to people whose property they stole or damaged. It is pointed out that the economy of probation has been both a strong argument for it and a serious menace to its development. Today, most probation officers are underpaid and overworked. In New York City, sanitation workers make \$380 more a year than juvenile court probation officers. Often, officers have loads of 300 or more cases instead of the 50

or less generally recommended. The Association long has fought for better standards and higher pay for these officers. It believes we behave foolishly when we rail about juvenile delinquency and then starve the one agency that could do much to solve this serious problem.—*Recent issue of Look Magazine.*

---

**Forestry Camps for the Rehabilitation of Delinquents**—California has pioneered in the establishment of forestry camps and ranches for delinquent boys. There are now in operation about fifteen such camps in California, either state-administered, i.e., directly under the Youth Authority, or under county auspices with financial subsidies from the state. Cooperating agencies are the State Board of Forests and the Department of Natural Resources. Some of the county camps are under the direct supervision of the chief probation officer, with the camp supervisors rating as assistant probation officers; in other counties, a board of directors, comprising judges, including the juvenile court judge, a probation officer and a member of the Board of County Supervisors, is responsible. The buildings are similar to the C. C. C. camp structures. In some instances, the boys themselves helped to erect the buildings. The boys are committed to the camps by the Juvenile Court or placed there by the Youth Authority. The cases for placement in camps are carefully selected; feebleminded boys, boys with faulty sex habits, arsonists and serious delinquent types are excluded. The ages are from 12 to 18; in some counties, special junior camps for the 12 to 15 year group are established. The population ranges from 30 to 100. The monthly per capita cost in 1945 varied between \$60 and \$100 a month. The public school system assigns teachers. The county or state forest authorities furnish supervisors for the work of the boys; these activities consist of forestration or reforestation, soil erosion control, building and maintenance of roads, trails and breaks for fire prevention, and emergency fire fighting. Medical care and religious services are provided. The length of stay varies, but this type of project is conducted primarily as a short term operation. In the five camps operated in Los Angeles county, it usually does not exceed 26 weeks; after release into the community the boys remain under the supervision of probation officers. The amount of failures in the Los Angeles county camps, measured in terms of need for placement in correctional training schools, is ten per cent. A similar figure is reported from the Log Cabin Ranch, operated by the San Francisco juvenile court. In more recent years, the U. S. Department of Justice has developed a similar program for juvenile Federal offenders in the Natural Bridge Camp. The 1946 report of the Federal Bureau of Prisons states that "the notable progress of the camp in its second year of operation provides further justification for the establishment of such a demonstration project. Primarily, the camp is a logical product of our increasing conviction that the traditional training-school program fails to meet fully the needs of many youths."—*John Otto Reinemann, "Wanted in Pennsylvania—Forestry Camps for the Rehabilitation of Delinquents," The Prison Journal, Vol. XXVIII, No. 2, April 1948, The Pennsylvania Prison Society, 311 South Juniper Street, Philadelphia 7, Pa.*

---

**Interstate Control of Parolees**—Even though interstate control of parolees and probationers is one of the newer activities in correctional work,

it is definitely proving its worth; for nearly 6,000 parolees and possibly as many probationers are presently being given an opportunity to reclaim themselves in suitable surroundings, at productive employment and with the guidance and counsel of trained supervisors in states other than where they were convicted. This constructive program for the rehabilitation of offenders has been made possible by the interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers. More states (41) are signatory to it than to any other interstate agreement with the single exception of the Federal Constitution. This Compact provides a simple, business-like, legal, and constitutional method of granting probationers and parolees the privilege of moving outside of the sentencing state. It provides also for the full protection of society. Furthermore, if a state desires to retake a probationer or parolee, who has left its immediate jurisdiction under the provisions of the Compact, an accredited officer of the state may apprehend and retake any such person in another compacting state without any formalities other than establishing his authority and proving the identity of the person to be retaken. All legal requirements to obtain extradition of fugitives from justice are expressly waived by the states under the Compact, and by the individual parolee or probationer, whose grant of liberty is made conditional upon his signing a waiver of extradition should he violate the terms of his probation or parole.

As an administrative arrangement between and among the states, the Compact serves many practical purposes. Broadly and briefly stated, it performs the negative function of capturing criminals who have violated the terms of their conditional freedom; it performs the positive function of encouraging the rehabilitation of parolees and probationers by permitting their transfer to a receptive environment where their chances of success are greater. Carefully administered, with a view to the cooperative responsibilities which the Compact imposes upon its signatory states, it will serve to extend and strengthen state parole and probation systems.—*Reuben C. Brustuen, President, Central States Correction Conference, "Interstate Control of Parolees Proves Effective in Forty-one States," Central States News, Illinois Department of Public Welfare, Vol. 1948, No. 1, May, 1948. Editor's Note: The Fourteenth Annual Central States Correction Conference was scheduled to be held at Des Moines, Iowa, May 23-26, 1948. Invitations were not confined to members of the nine conference states, but were extended to educators and fellow workers in related and adjacent areas.*

---

"Catch Me Before I Kill"—Based upon the records, approximately 800 teen-agers will commit murder in 1948—in the United States. Some of the killers will be mere children; about 60 will be 15 or less. Whenever the newspapers print a story about a killing by a minor, some readers complain, accusing the press of sensationalism. Editors attempt to explain that a newspaper's job is to tell the news, whether it is good or bad and that the press is concerned with telling its readers what is happening, whether they like what is happening or not. The suggestion is frequently received, "If you have to print it, at least you could put it inside the papers somewhere and not on the front page." Editors point out that such reasoning begs the question, that it amounts to the old argument that what you don't know won't hurt you, and suggest that the indignation of the reader ought really to be directed not at the story but at the situation the story describes.

Forthright editors of the Minneapolis *Morning Tribune* found themselves saying to each other, "If we are correct in saying that readers ought to be angry about the crime itself, rather than at the story about the crime, maybe the fault is partly ours. Ought we to be digging more deeply, getting below the surface facts of the story and giving readers more insight into what kind of children, and what kinds of homes, schools, churches and corrective methods produce such shocking news?" Implementing this approach, the *Tribune* recently printed a brilliant series of articles from the facile pen of Victor Cohn, staff science editor, about children who kill. In fulfilling his assignment, Cohn studied the reports of psychiatrists; he talked with these experts, and with psychologists, sociologists, physicians and social workers. He spent weeks trying to unravel the warped strands of young twisted minds in the attempt perhaps to gain some rational clue that might explain why 808 American boys and girls under 21 years of age became killers in 1947. What he wrote does not make pleasant reading nor does it afford the occasion for reader complaint. On the other hand, his findings challenge the people of Minneapolis as they do the people of all other communities to a re-appraisal of themselves as parents and to a re-appraisal of school, church and local government. The entire series confirms the opinions of leading thinkers in the field of crime control and prevention. In the approach to the problems presented by the delinquent and criminal offender, the total machinery of justice is focused largely on the end result rather than upon the conditioning factors. Not until the youngster knocks at the jail door for admission does society spring heroically into action. As Cohn very ably points out, the time is now at hand in every community to develop mechanisms and facilities for the discovery of the potential delinquent and criminal in the early years of life when behavior patterns are just beginning to take form. Early identification and diagnosis of the mentally, physically and socially different child, followed by therapeutic measures based upon diagnostic findings, overshadow the manhunt in a more enlightened attack upon these social problems. The United States has only a few hundred first-rate child guidance clinics, staffed by professional teams—psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and others. It slowly dawns on us that healthy behavior is as important as healthy lungs. The series of articles includes statements from recognized authorities, such as Dr. Ralph S. Banay, New York psychiatrist, who made an exhaustive study of children who kill, and whose recent work *Youth in Despair* was published in January by Coward McCann. Reprints of the series may be obtained by addressing William P. Steven, Managing Editor, *Minneapolis Tribune*, Minneapolis, Minn. They merit national distribution and contain suggestions which should be of value not only to parents and workers in this field but to members of the press.—*Editor*.

---

**The Community and the Correctional Process**—What can the community expect of the correctional process and what must it do to ensure maximum returns? Based on actual performances over a term of years, a good juvenile court and probation service, operating in a community with adequate social resources and utilizing them fully, can put as high as 90 per cent of its juvenile delinquents on probation the first time around and 50 to 75 per cent the second or third time around, and get as high as 75 to 80 per cent successes. A good adult court and probation

service dealing with the general run of offenders convicted of felonies can put as high as 50 percent on probation and get 75 to 80 percent successes. The Court of General Sessions in New York City, dealing with some of the worst criminals in America, puts only 25 to 30 percent on probation but it gets over 90 percent successes. Los Angeles County put 52 percent of its Superior Court and 69 percent of its inferior court cases on probation in 1946 and got about 90 percent of satisfactory disposals. A good institutional and parole system for adults, working together, can show at least 65 percent successes on parole five years after release. Of the remainder, about half will have been returned to the institution for technical violations, and the other half will have been convicted of new offenses, misdemeanors as well as felonies.

Translate these things into tax dollars saved in a generation, and it is an enormous sum the country over. Figure the difference alone between supervising offenders on probation or parole at \$50 to \$100 a year and maintaining them in institutions at \$500 to \$1,000 a year and you have a ten-to-one shot that really pays off. Add to that the substantial sums in restitution and fines from adult offenders. Then add the welfare funds that are saved because probationers and parolees, instead of the community, are supporting their families. And finally try to calculate the savings in the cost of crimes that probationers, prisoners, and parolees who go straight do not commit, and you will get into really astronomical figures. These are all money gains from good correctional services. The savings in human happiness and in the welfare and safety of society are incalculable.—*Excerpts from a paper*, "The Community and the Correctional Process," given by Austin H. McCormick, Executive Director of The Osborne Association, at a joint session of the National Probation Association, the American Parole Association and the Western Probation and Parole Conference, at the Congress of Correction, 1947.