1950

Michigan's Experiment in Minimum Security Penology

Vernon Fox

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

Vernon Fox, Michigan's Experiment in Minimum Security Penology, 41 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 150 (1950-1951)

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

MICHIGAN'S EXPERIMENT IN MINIMUM SECURITY PENOLOGY

Vernon Fox

The author is Assistant Deputy Warden at the State Prison of Southern Michigan, in charge of Individual Treatment. In years past he has been Psychologist in the same prison, Psychologist and Chairman of Classification at Cassidy Lake (Michigan) Technical School and Director of Case Work and Athletics at Starr Commonwealth for Boys at Albion, Michigan.—EDITOR.

During the war years the newspapers, school officials, and the general public became concerned with juvenile delinquency. In Michigan, Governor Harry F. Kelly appointed a Youth Study Commission which made a survey of the opinions of police chiefs, school officials, and probate judges with regard to what they thought about juvenile delinquency. The Department of Corrections was intent upon establishing on an experimental basis a minimum security, wall-less, "honor camp" type of institution for the young, reformable, first-offenders who had been sentenced to prison. The thinking of public officials had been emphasizing prevention of delinquency and the treatment of the reformable first-offender.

After unsuccessful negotiations with the Conservation Department for a suitable site at Higgins Lake, the Department of Corrections in December, 1943, obtained the loan for the duration of the war and six months thereafter of an N.Y.A. training camp no longer in use. This training camp at Cassidy Lake, near Chelsea, Michigan, became an administrative adjunct to the State Prison of Southern Michigan at Jackson. Students were selected by the classification committee at Jackson on the basis of lack of criminal pattern as amenable to a trade training program. However, just as many "maintenance men" were assigned to the Cassidy Lake project by the deputy wardens on the basis of criteria which have been seriously questioned by the individual members of the classification committee. The "adjunct" status of the minimum security institution did not make for satisfactory administration, and top management in the Department of Corrections had to concern itself with details. For instance, by blanket order in November, 1944, many of the excess and misplaced "maintenance men" were returned to the main prison.

On July 1, 1945, Michigan's experiment in minimum security became an independent institution under the name, Cassidy Lake Technical School. A recruiting procedure was established whereby the classification committee at Ionia selected some of the better adjusted inmates in their population on the basis of lack of criminal pattern. A com-

mittee from Cassidy Lake would then review the cases, selecting a few for transfer to Cassidy Lake after clearance through the Lansing office. The men who finally arrived at the Lake, then would have been sentenced to the State Prison of Southern Michigan or, if sentenced from the upper peninsula, to the Branch Prison at Marquette. At Jackson or Marquette, a classification study would have been made.¹ The youth would have been transferred through the classification procedure to the Michigan Reformatory at Ionia, and subsequently selected for Cassidy Lake placement. The new Cassidy Lake Technical School provided trade training in drafting, welding, radio, and the machine shop trades. Agriculture and commercial trades were subsequently added. In the academic school, elementary reading, writing, and arithmetic were offered, and a high school curriculum was formulated. The emphasis was on education and trade training as media by which the socialization process could be effected.

Just as in the public schools, however, high-sounding objectives frequently blind the observer to practicalities he would prefer not to see. Much has been written about the "honor camp" and other versions of minimum security penology. Most of this writing, however, has been in the form of subjective praise and about how a prisoner must feel to be trusted. This investigator has not been able to find an objective study of the actual results of a minimum security program. Although minimum security programs have been known to exist for about a hundred years, and the movement received impetus from the English Borstal Act of 1908, there has been no evaluation based on the objective facts available only through a follow-up study. Hopkins was parsimonious when he asked, "Why spend a million dollars on a wall to retain 2,000 men when 1,800 would stay in a prison without a wall?"² The criteria of practicability has more complex ramifications than the cost of original construction.

Minimum security penology is the antithesis of the old convict ships, the dungeon, the Pennsylvania and Auburn systems and their modern counterparts or derivatives. Minimum security implies the absence or de-emphasis of custodial thinking, leaving the emphasis elsewhere. It is in the direction of this emphasis in which various minimum security programs differ. Many States have penal farms, road crews, forestry camps, and other minimum security programs where the dignity of labor is upheld and the emphasis is on healthful outdoor work. Other minimum security programs place the emphasis on education and trade train-

1. For a more complete explanation of Michigan's classification system, see AKERS, ELMER R.; *Classification in the State Prison*, J. CRIM. L. & CRIMINOLOGY, 34, No. 1, May-June, 1943.

2. HOPKINS, ALFRED; *PRISONS AND PRISON BUILDING*, New York, 1930, p. 8.

ing. It is in this letter group that Michigan's Cassidy Lake Technical School is identified.

A recent survey of minimum security correctional camps by Price Chenault of the New York State Department of Correction presents the status of such institutions in the United States with unusual clarity.³ Chenault found that the uses, objectives, and programs of these minimum security institutions varied widely from State to State and the U.S. Bureau of Prisons. "Road camps" generally had a high degree of security in the form of armed guards and shackling devices, presumably, despite the absence of walls. Farm camps and work camps are fairly widely used, usually in conjunction with the U.S. or State forestry service or department. Most of these minimum security institutions were found to be adjuncts to larger maximum security prisons. The independent institutions were found to be four adult prison camps and one camp for juveniles operated by the Federal Bureau of Prisons, five camps in California which are operated by the Youth Authority in conjunction with the State Division of Forestry, and Michigan's Cassidy Lake Technical School. In Chenault's study, six institutions were treated in detail. In their order of appearance, they were (1) Michigan's Cassidy Lake Technical School, (2) Michigan's Marquette Honor Camp, (3) the federal camp at Mill Point, West Virginia, (4) the federal camp at Montgomery, Alabama, (5) the federal camp at Tuscon, Arizona, and (6) the federal Columbia Camp at Benton City, Washington. The Michigan institutions were used for the younger first-offenders who are "reformable," with no other blanket requirements. The populations of the federal camps consist of short term offenders having sentences of a year or less, and a few "transfers of long term offenders who made good adjustments in other institutions for the completion of their sentences." These transfers are very infrequent.⁴ The survey indicates that Michigan's Cassidy Lake is the only institution which maintains full educational emphasis in its program. With regard to this school, Chenault found the institution "unique" and "apparently most progressive."⁵

Unique and most progressive it may be, but there is no tested and recorded proof by way of results, positive or negative. This study purports to describe the first testing. It is the purpose of this study to determine the results of Michigan's experiment in minimum security—the efficacy of the program at Cassidy Lake Technical School. The

3. CHENAULT, PRICE; REPORT ON SURVEY OF CORRECTIONAL CAMPS, a mimeographed report published by the State of New York, Department of Correction, 1947, 19 pp.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 19.

results of the experiment will be evaluated in terms of failure and success of men on parole and in terms of monetary cost to society and government.

PROCEDURE

The group of men included in this study for experimental purposes were those who were at Cassidy Lake Technical School at any time between July 1, 1945, the date Cassidy Lake became a separate institution, and July 1, 1947. The latter date was arbitrarily chosen to include a two-year period from which to draw an institutional population, and still afford sufficient time for most of the men to serve on parole. From this group of 183 men, all who were sentenced prior to July 1, 1943, were eliminated to avoid permitting individuals who had actually served longer in maximum security from influencing minimum security results. This procedure eliminated 39 men, the remaining 144 men constituting the experimental group. Actually, it is felt that because of their maturity, good prison records, and high selectivity, these men would have influenced the results favorably. However, their inclusion would have to some extent invalidated our data.

The question arose as to whether or not the men who were at Cassidy Lake less than one month, or even two or three, should be eliminated on grounds that they had not been in the minimum security situation long enough for effective treatment, or on the ground that erroneous selection was made. This question was raised by the appearance in our experimental group of four men who went into the neighboring town, Chelsea, stole an automobile, and parked it near the institution so that they could drive to Jackson or elsewhere after bed-check at night. All were returned to maximum security as a result of the discovery of their misbehavior in less than a month from the time they had arrived at Cassidy Lake. It is pointed out that inside the walls of maximum security, where the opportunity for such temptation would not be present, these boys undoubtedly would have compiled good institutional records. At present, there is no well-defined way of predicting who would compile good records in minimum and maximum security situations as distinguished from those who would perform well in maximum security but not in minimum security. Because of the complex implications which would be introduced in setting up a control group if these short-term boys were excluded, no further elimination from the experimental group was made.

A control group was established in such manner that it would represent men who could have qualified for placement at Cassidy Lake had there been room for them and/or had they been recommended by the

classification committees of the maximum security institutions. Because of the selection process in recruiting for the Lake, a control group is difficult to establish. The youths who have been selected for transfer from the State Prison of Southern Michigan and the Michigan Reformatory were chosen on the basis of their "reformability." This is a vague term, difficult to objectify. It is a somewhat subjective and comprehensive term which refers to a youth's lack of general criminal pattern, his adequate motivation for self-improvement, and the presence of sufficient native capacity to accomplish such improvement in a school program based on trade training. The validity of this study rests on the assumption that a control group of youths with maximum security experience can be chosen by individually matching selected objective factors with similar factors of youths who were at Cassidy Lake so that the factor of "selectivity" can be sufficiently neutralized to permit valid conclusions to be drawn.

Data on each of the 144 youths in the experimental group was tabulated, including (1) previous probations, (2) commitments to juvenile institutions, (3) previous jail terms, (4) age, (5) race, (6) minimum sentences, (7) history of escapes, (8) residential background, i.e., rural, metropolitan Detroit, etc., (9) marital status, (10) intelligence, (11) grade completed in school, (12) results of academic achievement tests. These were the objective factors which have been considered for selection of youths for Cassidy Lake placement.

Perhaps the most important single factor in the selection process is the previous criminal record as an objective indication of anti-social pattern. All men with previous prison records were eliminated. Of the 144 men, 58 had never heretofore been arrested, 24 had had juvenile institutional experience, and 66 had been on probation. Only one of the youths had had an escape history. This boy had run away from Boys Vocational School three times, had an extensive juvenile record, and was accepted by Cassidy Lake "as a challenge," only to be tabulated subsequently among the failures. All types of crimes were represented with the exception of homosexual offenses. There were 130 white men, 12 Negroes, an Indian, and a Mexican in the group. With regard to marital status, 10 of the youths were single, 23 married, one widowed, two divorced, six separated, and two maintained common law marriages. Thirty-eight boys came from Detroit, 15 from the rural areas, with the remainder rather evenly scattered among the smaller cities and towns in the State. The average age of the experimental group was 21.0, but this includes 17 men over 24 years of age who were employed as maintenance men, clerks, and/or school monitors. The average age

of the "student" group was 18.6 years. It should be noted that since March, 1948, the upper age limit for reception at Cassidy Lake under any circumstances was set at 24, with the minimum age remaining at 15. The average IQ of the Cassidy Lake group was 101.2, as compared with 90.5 at the Michigan Reformatory,⁶ and 87.7 at the State Prison of Southern Michigan.⁷ Only four of the youths had completed high school, and only one of these had entered college. The average grade completed in school was 9.2.

With the assistance of two disinterested persons, Mr. Robert Glass, Director of the Central Statistical Bureau for Michigan's Department of Mental Health, and Mr. Harold Kachelski, Public Relations Director for the Department of Corrections, a control group was established by individual matching on the above factors in the cases in the experimental group with youths who had served all their terms in maximum security institutions. This matching was accomplished through the use of I.B.M. sorting procedures under the supervision of Mr. Glass. The previous criminal pattern and lack of escape history are two of the most important factors in selection for Cassidy Lake. Race, rural or urban residence, and marital status are not selective factors for Cassidy Lake, but they are important social factors the influence of which should be controlled. Hence, the individual matching was made exactly with regard to previous criminal or delinquency record, race, residential background, marital status, and escape history. Age has been a factor in selection only as far as upper limit is concerned. The lower age limit has been 15 years, the age at which a boy may be sentenced to prison in Michigan. The upper limit on age for students has ranged from 21 to 25, according to departmental policy. The time the youths have to serve has been a selective factor only in that it tends to eliminate men with more than three-year minimum terms, but for exceptional cases. Intelligence and education have been considered only in programming, and not in the selection. For these reasons, matching was close, but not exact, with regard to age, minimum terms, intelligence, grade completed in school, and academic achievement test results. Homosexuals, especially vicious crimes, and first-degree murder cases were also eliminated after inspection of the files. Subsequent to the matching, it was found that five of the boys had at some time been transferred to the Marquette Honor Camp. These boys were eliminated because of their minimum security experience, and were replaced with other boys closest to their serial numbers

6. FULLER, GORDON L.; A SURVEY OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF IQ'S IN THE MICHIGAN REFORMATORY, an unpublished report, 1947.

7. FOX, VERNON; *Intelligence, Race and Age as Selective Factors in Crime*, J. CRIM. L. & CRIMINOL. July-August, 1944, 37, No. 2, p. 145.

who could be matched on the above factors. The experimental and control groups in this study, then, consisted of 144 men who had served at minimum security Cassidy Lake, and 144 men who had served in maximum security, respectively, individually matched on the objective factors considered important in selecting for Cassidy Lake placement.

The progress of the 288 men on parole was determined by inspecting their files in the Department of Corrections office in Lansing to observe the monthly reports of the men while on parole, the progress reports and parole violation reports submitted by the parole officers, parole violation warrants, and reports of returns to institutional custody. Progress of paroled men was classified for statistical purposes in the following categories: (1) men who have served their paroles without adverse incident and have been discharged from supervision, (2) men still performing well on parole, (3) men still on parole, but who have had minor violation reports, and even may have had their parole periods extended, (4) men who have been returned from parole status to the prison for a major violation, and (5) men who have been returned as parole violators and are also under sentence for new offenses. Besides the men who may be readily classified in these categories, the control group includes ten men who have been discharged from prison at the end of their maximum terms, and one who is still incarcerated. The experimental group also includes 24 men who have been returned to the prison prior to parole because they were not amenable to the minimum security situation, and two escapees who are now incarcerated in the Tennessee State Penitentiary at Nashville. These groups will be considered separately.

The paroled men from the experimental and control groups were compared, using chi-square tests of statistical significance. Within the experimental group, the parole records of the men who had been paroled from Cassidy Lake were compared similarly with the parole records of those men who were returned to prison because they were not amenable to minimum security placement. Men were interviewed in an effort to determine what some of the important factors in minimum security penology might be as compared with maximum security treatment. Per capita yearly costs were computed, and costs were then considered in relation to the success-failure ratio of paroled men in the experimental and control groups.

RESULTS

The computed and recorded results show a tendency for the men from the minimum security institution to be more successful on parole

than similar men who served in the maximum security institutions. Together with the 118 men who had been paroled, the 144 cases in the experimental group (Cassidy Lake) included 24 men who had been transferred to maximum security for disciplinary or other reasons, and two escapees who are being held in the Tennessee State Penitentiary at Nashville. The 144 cases in the control group included, besides the 133 paroled men, ten who were discharged at the expiration of their maximum sentences and one who is still in prison. Table I shows the comparison of those paroled from minimum security with those paroled from maximum security in terms of success or failure on parole.

TABLE I
Comparison of Parole Success and Failure from
Maximum and Minimum Security

Parole Category	Minimum Security		Maximum Security		Total
	Expected	Observed	Expected	Observed	
Successfully discharged from parole	37.4	38	41.6	41	79
Still on parole, thus far successful.	37.5	50	42.5	30	80
Still on parole, but with minor violations . . .	4.2	6	4.8	3	9
Returned as a parole violate	28.1	15	31.9	45	60
Returned with a new sentence	10.8	9	12.2	14	23

Computation reveals from this table a chi-square value of 20.152, indicating a probability of about one in a thousand that the differences between these distributions are due to chance. The differences are highly significant, statistically.

Considering as successful those who were discharged from parole and those still on parole, and considering as unsuccessful those who have been returned with new sentences or as parole violators, we find that 94 were successful and 24 were unsuccessful in the experimental group, while 74 were successful and 59 were unsuccessful in the maximum security group.⁸ A chi-square test in this table would emphasize the superi-

8. Based on tabulations by the Division of Paroles, Pardons and Probation, Mr. John Eliasohn, Chairman of the Michigan Parole Board, reports that the rate of parole success in Michigan is about 80 to 82 per cent of all those paroled. The rate of parole successes in this group of younger first-offenders is 67 per cent. This would suggest that the gains in parole successes are among the older men, a point which Mr. Eliasohn confirms. About 98 per cent of the long-term men paroled under authority of Michigan's "Lifer Law" are successful. The social implications of these figures have a telling effect on Michigan's

ority of results of minimum security over maximum security in our sample.

Six youths in the experimental group of 144 were escapees, four of whom were included in the group of 24 men who had been transferred from Cassidy Lake to maximum security primarily as discipline cases. One exception was a boy who requested to return to maximum security because he was not getting along well with the other boys. This group of 24 transferees can hardly be considered failures, but rather as errors in selection, or even, perhaps, isolated incidents of misunderstanding and consequent injudicial treatment conceivably by the comparatively untrained members of the staff or by other boys. They may perform well in maximum security, but find difficulty in locating the boundaries of social behavior in minimum custody. Of this group of 24 men, 13 were paroled from maximum custody and are still successful, five were paroled and were returned as parole violators, one was discharged at the expiration of the minimum term, and five have not yet been paroled because they presented further behavioral problems in the maximum custody situation. A comparison of the parole records of those of the experimental group who were transferred to the reformatory and were successfully paroled with those who were paroled from Cassidy Lake shows a tendency toward more favorable results from those men paroled directly from Cassidy Lake. A similar comparison of the parole records of these men who were transferred back to maximum security with the parole records of the control group indicates a parole record among the transferees from Cassidy Lake more favorable than those in the control group. The transferees from Cassidy Lake are slightly more similar to maximum security parolees in parole performance than they are to parolees from Cassidy Lake.

There is a consistent and statistically highly significant trend toward more favorable results on parole from the minimum security institution than from the maximum security prisons. Despite our efforts to obtain an adequate control group through individually matching pertinent factors, some vestige of "selectivity" may have remained, since the selection for Cassidy Lake placement may well be partially subjective in a manner not entirely reflected by objective factors. On the other hand, the assistance of two disinterested persons and I.B.M. sorting machinery was enlisted for the express purpose of maintaining objectivity. Combined with this objectivity and rigidity in matching, the extent of the statistical significance of the differences in this sample leaves little doubt

as to the superiority of results in minimum security treatment over maximum security imprisonment.

Isolating the therapeutic value of minimum security penology as compared with maximum security is a difficult task. Interviews with inmates, parolees, and transferred men, inspection of their files, visiting, letters, and observation of the behavior groups of men with various amounts of conditioning in maximum security institutions furnish suggestions for such a comparison.

Interviews with ten parolees resulted in somewhat inconclusive reasons for feeling that they benefitted from minimum security treatment. All agreed that a more friendly and informal atmosphere existed at Cassidy Lake, tending to minimize the officer-prisoner dichotomy that is so extreme in maximum security. They tended to express a greater feeling of "belongingness" with regard to Cassidy Lake than they had expected prior to parole. Freedom from regimentation on the one hand, and freedom from the profane and vulgar language and behavior patterns more frequently found in maximum security prisons on the other were cited by inmates and parolees as outstanding differences in Cassidy Lake's favor. Interviews with six youths who had been returned to maximum security institutions corroborated the above statements, emphasizing the maximum security regimentation and its unyielding rigidity of program and routine.

The incidence of visiting Cassidy Lake Technical School by former students by far exceeds visiting of Michigan Reformatory or State Prison of Southern Michigan. When officials at the Michigan Reformatory were asked as to the number of former inmates who visited the institution after parole, the chaplain recalled one "several years ago." A similar question presented to officials at the State Prison of Southern Michigan brought disbelieving grins in reply. In evident contrast, during a month selected at random, October, 1948, six former students visited Cassidy Lake, four of them bringing their wives or sweethearts to see their former home. This type of visiting is a usual occurrence at Cassidy Lake.

Systematic perusal of the letters received at the institution from former students and their relatives emphasize the segregation from "prison atmosphere" and the "evil influence" of more experienced law-breakers. The letters suggest a preference for the friendly, protective, and understanding informality of Cassidy Lake over other types of treatment. This receptive attitude is instrumental in therapy. Excerpts from ten representative letters received in the past year are as follows:

1. From a youth just transferred to Cassidy Lake, addressed to his former supervisor at Ionia: "So this is Cassidy Lake—and I was wondering whether or not to come. What a change! This is everything Ionia isn't. No walls—no bars—no 'running lines'—no standing count—no—I could fill pages. Lots of fresh air and sunshine. Lots of good food, lots of healthy recreation. Lots of pleasant work. Two more days and I'll forget my number."
2. From a man transferred back to Jackson in accordance with administrative policy change on 3-6-48: "What you are doing there for the permanent reformation of the felon is of such merit that it should be used as a working laboratory for teaching other penologists who are sincere in their efforts to be instrumental in salvaging some of mankind's foolish derelicts. I now know the axiom, 'a spoonful of sugar will catch more flies than a barrel of vinegar' is true. For at Cassidy Lake the State has discipline without sadistic archaic methods; punishment without regimentation; and intelligent supervision, as well as instruction without discord."
3. From the mother of a youth returned to prison for disciplinary reasons: "I want to thank you for being so kind to him. And also to tell you all how sorry I am that things had to happen like they did. I know you all were working for R——'s welfare to make him a better man and I for one really appreciate what you all did for him."
4. From a boy to his mother: "It is not like Lansing for they don't force a fellow to do anything. They just tell him the right way and then make him want to do it. There is no punishment at all. All they do is talk to you. I have never been treated that way before."
5. From a youth's mother: "I for one mother at least thank God there is such a place in Michigan for these boys."
6. From the mother of a youth who was sentenced at age 15 and spent two years at Ionia before coming to Cassidy Lake: "We want to thank you for giving us the opportunity of spending Christmas Eve with K—— at Cassidy Lake. We enjoyed your fine program, our visit with K——, and most of all the smile on his face as he received his Christmas packages; his first in three years."
7. From the mother of a youth at Cassidy Lake: "I admire your courage in carrying out such a program, knowing there's a certain amount of risk. It seems to me, activities of that kind would make the boys feel more trusted, and give them confidence; therefore a good understanding."
8. From the county agent of a northern Michigan county: "I think the reason I am so much impressed with the Cassidy Lake setup is the fact that the men who are friends, philosophers, and guides to these boys look like real he-men, rather than long-haired trained social workers."⁹
9. From a youth who went home on parole: "I sure do miss the camp, the boys and everyone there. You all had treated me so darn nice while I was there. Much nicer than my own folks have treated me."
10. From a youth who went home on parole: "I have been in Battle Creek a little over a month now and already I am getting lonesome to see everybody over there. So I have decided to come over Sunday unless something drastic happens between now and then."

An interesting method of evaluating the effects of maximum security conditioning as compared with minimum security treatment is to observe

9. It must be interjected here that the trained personnel at Cassidy Lake are selected for personality, as well as for their training.

the behavior of two groups of students at Cassidy Lake. In the spring of 1948, the Department of Corrections began selecting men for Cassidy Lake placement during the initial classification procedure while the youth was still in quarantine at Jackson or Marquette. Consequently, Cassidy Lake had (a) a group of youths who had experienced maximum security treatment at Michigan Reformatory, and (b) a group of transfers from quarantine without previous maximum security conditioning. The former group seems to be better oriented in penal routine, and a little more inclined to test the limits of custodial tolerance than the latter group. The less well oriented youths without maximum security conditioning seem to be able to accept supervision with less inclination toward resentment than the boys with maximum security conditioning. As pointed out in a previous study, "the highly emotionalized feelings which were considered important in the adjustment processes as a result of juvenile institutionalization become less intense with reformatory experience. An attitude of futility and resignation tends to be substituted. When reformatory experience is present, adjustment processes in prison tend to be less emotional, and based on orientation."¹⁰

COSTS

The cost of a public project is an important item. The initial capital outlay for construction in minimum security is obviously below that of walled and barred institutions. We shall dispense with a discussion of initial capital outlay. The question of costs in this study, then, refers only to operating costs. During the period covered by this study, the per capita cost per year at Cassidy Lake was not significantly different from the maximum security costs at Jackson or Marquette, as shown in Table II.

TABLE II

Yearly Per Capita Costs for Units in the Department of Corrections

Unit	Population on January 1, 1946	Expenditures in 1946-7	Yearly Per Capita Cost
State Prison at Jackson.....	5,258	\$3,156,614.87	\$ 586
Michigan Reformatory at Ionia...	1,233	1,269,074.49	1,022
Branch Prison at Marquette.....	739	828,277.84	1,121
Cassidy Lake Technical School....	100	107,347.52	1,074
Bureau of Pardons and Paroles....	3,708	316,307.30	85

These figures would indicate that a smaller number of men were main-

10. FOX, VERNON; *THE EFFECT OF JUVENILE INSTITUTIONALIZATION ON ADJUSTMENT IN PRISON*, Thesis for M.A., Michigan State College, 1943, p. 171.

tained in minimum security at approximately the same cost as 739 men and 1,233 men were maintained in maximum security institutions during the period of time covered by this study. Treating a smaller population at the same per capita cost would suggest either incredibly greater efficiency or inferior services, neither of which we can accept without qualification. Because of recent developments, including additions to the staff, some of which were caused by a new and "improved" State-wide accounting system rather than being the result of improved program, the per capita cost at Cassidy Lake has risen. Commissioner of Corrections Joseph W. Sanford announced on September 13, 1948, that the cost of maintaining a man for a year was \$700 at Jackson, \$900 at Ionia, \$1100 at Marquette, and \$1300 at Cassidy Lake.

Even these costs compare very favorably with the costs of institutional operation by the Department of Social Welfare. With a population of 288, the Girls Training School at Adrian operated during the fiscal year 1947-8 at a per capita cost of \$1,341. With a population of 350, the Boys Vocational School at Lansing operated during the same period at a per capita cost of \$2,022. The educational and professional programs of these schools in relation to their custodial services more nearly approximate the Cassidy Lake situation than do the programs at the walled and barred institutions. Nevertheless, the comparison in this study is between minimum and maximum security penal programs. Comparisons should remain in the Department of Corrections.

Per capita costs in the Department of Corrections are roughly in inverse relation to the size of the institutional populations. The efficiency or proportionate costs can be shown by either of two statistical devices¹¹ which show graphically that the expected yearly per capita cost of maintaining a penal institution of 100 population would be \$1,400, and that Cassidy Lake is operating below the expected cost of penal institutions. This institution contributed a quarter of the data that were available and that were used in the computations. This circumstance, in addition to the fact that Cassidy Lake is below the standard error of the estimate emphasizes the significance of the results. For the same size population it is noted that even with less favorable

11. The hyperbolic curve starting on the y-axis (prison population) and descending along the x-axis (per capita cost). The same relationship can probably be shown to better advantage by semi-logarithmic function.

The writer has prepared a chart in which the population on the y-axis logarithmic and the per capita cost on the x-axis is arithmetic. The chart includes the formula that he used in making the computations on the basis of the populations of the three maximum security institutions and Cassidy Lake. The author has the chart and formula in his files and copies will be available to enquirers.

figures, minimum security operating costs are shown to be below that expected of maximum security.

As far as costs are concerned, then, the issue resolves itself to one of advisability of small institutions, where per capita costs are greater rather than one of maximum or minimum security. In an effort to estimate the monetary worth of the investment in Cassidy Lake, the cost of maintaining in maximum security the returned parole violators from maximum security treatment for one year was compared with that of minimum security failures. Simultaneously, the cost of maintaining the successes on parole was computed. Obtaining the success-failure data from Table I to consider with the per capita costs discussed above, the following table obtains:

Total Per Capita Costs of Maintaining Successes and Failures of Minimum Security as Compared with Maximum Security Treatment

Type of Treatment	Successes		Failures		Total Cost	Per Capita Cost
	No.	Cost	No.	Cost		
Maximum Security	74	\$6,290	59	\$53,100	\$59,390	\$447
Minimum Security	94	7,990	24	21,600	29,590	256

Just from the cost of maintaining parole supervision for successes and institutionalization for failures, the difference in per capita costs between \$256 for minimum security results and \$447 for the results of maximum security treatment makes it rather obvious that the expenditures for a small-sized minimum security, such as Cassidy Lake Technical School, is profitable in monetary terms, despite the higher cost of operating the institution. This is obvious by computing only maintenance costs of parolees and men returned from parole, disregarding costs of apprehension, costs of new trials and legal action, and the immense cost in losses to the public through new crimes and parole violations committed.

It is our contention, however, that the service generally considered rehabilitative should be greater in such an institution as Cassidy Lake. The proportion of custodial personnel to education at Jackson has been approximately 100 to one for a period of years. Marquette maintains a ratio of about 65 to one. At Ionia, the proportion is roughly ten to one. At Cassidy Lake, the proportion is about one "custodial" person to one professional educator. Still, costs are below that expected of Michigan penal institutions. The suggestion again arises that Cassidy Lake is either incredibly more efficient than the maximum security institutions or else inferior services are provided. If the latter is accepted, we are faced with explaining away Cassidy Lake's significantly high success ratio.

It is suggested that further expenditures to improve service even more would be a profitable investment.

EVALUATION

The results of the present study indicates that Michigan's experiment with the small-sized minimum security program has been highly successful, both from the standpoint of successes and failures of men and in terms of long-range costs. The experimental group of 144 men who had been at Cassidy Lake were compared with a group of 144 men from maximum security, individually matched on the selective and cultural factors that were important. This comparison resulted in a statistically significant success-failure ratio favorable to the minimum security treatment program.

A major advantage claimed for minimum security by parolees and transferred men lies in the avoidance of vulgarity, "prison slang," and the influence of spurious and predatory thinking so frequently found among men in walled prisons. Sutherland presents a genetic theory of differential association which is operative here¹² in which he states that systematic criminality is learned. It is learned in association with those who already practice the behavior. Further, those who learn criminal behavior must have been socially segregated from frequent and intimate contacts with law-abiding behavior. At the same time, minimum security avoids the ill-effects of complete isolation. An advantage which was emphasized was the avoidance of the regimentation which is necessary in large, walled prisons, as well as the undesirable results of such regimentation. Individual initiative is encouraged in small, minimum security programs as fervently as it is discouraged for purposes of orderly administration in maximum security. As a matter of fact, the acceptance of some social responsibility is obvious by lack of marching lines to meals and school, the freedom of choice in a variety of constructive recreational pursuits, and the opportunity to voluntarily pursue vocational, educational, and work projects of the youths' own choosing. Further, the informal and friendly, "personal touch" atmosphere avoids the generating of dangerous resentment and aggression resulting from frustration so common in regimentation.

It is known that there is economy in original construction of wall-less institutions, and this study has demonstrated their lower long range costs. However, it is doubtful that there should be much economy in minimum security. Whatever may be saved in minimum security

12. SUTHERLAND, EDWIN H. *White Collar Criminality*, AMER. SOCIOLOGICAL REV., February, 1940, 5, No. 1, pp. 1-12.

penology should be put back into an improved program, including educational, psychological, sociological, medical, psychiatric, and other services. Were we to consider as the primary objective of penology the economy of maintaining men in institutions, it is suggested that a corral with barbed wire, using bean soup and staple diet, complete with machine guns manned by members of the State militia would reduce costs considerably. However, this is not the primary objective of our penology. Our objective is the rehabilitation of personalities who have deviated from socially accepted behavior. The results of this study show that for many cases the minimum security type of institution may achieve this objective better and at lower long-range costs than those of maximum security.

However, in order to maintain the efficiency of minimum security program, it is necessary to protect the advantages claimed for it. In the first place, the careful selection process must be continued in order to maintain in minimum security the freedom from "prison atmosphere" and the influence of predatory thinking. Secondly, the personnel should be the best trained clinical teams available at State salary levels. The wise choice of personnel is important to eliminate undue social and authoritarian pressures which cause or increase neurotic conflict.¹³ The importance of the "protective coating" of good atmosphere has been emphasized by Redl.¹⁴ Thirdly, the program must continue to be a constructive one into which money and effort are invested, rather than "economizing" to the sacrifice of a successful program.

The place of minimum security institutions in a correctional program is as yet experimental. For the present, the walled and barred, Auburn type maximum security penological programs will remain the mainstay of our correctional systems, modified by the introduction of industry. Anandale in New Jersey and Walkill in New York are outstanding pioneers of wall-less penology, established not on experimental bases, but as integral parts of corrections systems. The trend seems to be toward small minimum security institutions that are designed to treat selected homogeneous groups, such as young first-offenders, older first-offenders, some alcoholics regardless of crime, some types of psychopaths and neurotics, and other selected groups. Minimum security penology will never altogether replace maximum security prisons, for the prisons fulfill a definite function in penology. In time, however, the minimum security institutions may replace many maximum security white

13. GUMPRECHT, HALMUTH: *Common Emotional Disturbances of Children at Camp*, THE NERVOUS CHILD, April, 1947, 6, No. 2, pp. 148-154.

14. REDL, FRITZ: *Psychopathological Risks of Camp Life*, THE NERVOUS CHILD, April, 1947, 6, No. 2, p. 147.

elephants. Hopkins' question, quoted earlier in this study, "Why spend a million dollars on a wall to retain 2,000 men when 1,800 would stay in a prison without a wall?" may presage a new era in penology. Over and beyond this custodial thinking are the advantages to personality reformation which have been considered in this study. Perhaps we have not been fully aware of the place and function of minimum security penology in our governmental and correctional structure. This place and function can even better be defined after further experimentation with it. On the basis of the results of this study, it can be said with confidence that the minimum security experiment with younger first-offenders in Michigan has been highly successful. Progress in penology points toward expansion in the direction of minimum security treatment.