

1954

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, 45 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 311 (1954-1955)

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

Sanford Bates Retires—Reeve Schley, president of the New Jersey State Board of Control of the Department of Institutions and Agencies, on May 13 announced retirement of Sanford Bates, commissioner of the department, effective July 17, the date of his 70th birthday. In his announcement Mr. Schley stated: "Commissioner Bates has served this department with distinction for the last nine years. During that period he has maintained a high standard of service to the public, which has made the Department of Institutions and Agencies outstanding among similar departments throughout the nation. He has also conceived and developed projects of the highest importance in the field of welfare, such as the Diagnostic Center and the New Jersey Neuro-Psychiatric Institute. His energies in presenting the needs of those who cannot speak for themselves was largely responsible for the overwhelming passage of both of the Institutional Bond Issues of 1949 and 1952. It is the hope of the State Board of Control that, in the future, it may have the opportunity to avail itself from time to time of his profound knowledge of every phase of activity of the department. The board has now before it the difficult task of selecting a successor to one who has given such outstanding and devoted service to the state of New Jersey."

Prior to assuming his New Jersey appointment in April, 1945, Mr. Bates was a member of the Massachusetts legislature, commissioner of correction for Massachusetts, director of the United States Bureau of Prisons, executive director of the Boys Clubs of America, a member of the New York State Board of Parole, and active in a number of professional organizations allied to correction. President of the American Prison Association in 1926, the commissioner was president of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission in 1946 at Geneva, and was the first American to be elected to

that office. In 1949, he was designated a member of an advisory group of experts to the Secretary General of the United Nations, in the field of crime prevention and treatment of offenders. In 1951, he was appointed one of three correspondents from the United States to the United Nation's Department of Social Affairs in the same general field.

His friends and colleagues will wish him a well-earned and well-deserved retirement—*THE PRISON WORLD*, May-June 1954.

Program of the Center for Education and Research in Corrections (University of Chicago)—The Center for Education and Research in Corrections was established at the University of Chicago in 1953 with the support of the Russell Sage Foundation. The purpose of the Center is to prepare a volume of materials which will clarify the functional relationship of social science knowledge, theory and concepts, with practical problems in the correctional field. Attention will be directed toward certain recognized obstacles to effective professional work in corrections, in an effort to enhance the contributions made by professional persons with educational backgrounds consisting of specialized study in the social sciences.

The major focus of attention in the Center will be directed toward problems arising in connection with institutions for the care and treatment of offenders, and agencies for the supervision of offenders in the community. Over-extension of the resources of the Center by attempting comprehensive treatment of problems in the entire field of corrections is an obvious pitfall. Therefore, an effort will be made to explore certain selected problems which are relevant and important to the development of effective professional services. In general, these problems may be classified within three major areas of interest:

1. Problems relating to institutional organization.
 - A. Analysis of the structure, objectives, roles, functions, and controlling conceptions of the agencies, as well as standards and procedures for the recruitment and training of personnel.
 - B. Conceptions relating to the role and function of professional workers.
 - C. Factors and pressures affecting institutional change and acceptance of professional objectives and procedures.
2. Problems in the formulation of administrative policies, practices and decisions.
 - A. Analysis of bases of administrative decisions; controlling influences, factual premises, and situational considerations.
 - B. Mobilization and control of factors and pressures involved in the changing of administrative policies.
3. Problems encountered in effectively performing routine professional duties.
 - A. Demonstration of close working relationship between social science theory and the handling of practical problem situations.
 - B. Analysis of typical problem cases and situations.

Current planning for the Center does not envision the development of a permanent institute of correctional training, nor the detailed technical training of professional workers for specific vocations in the correctional field. The staff of the Center will prepare field studies of important correctional problems, and also assemble appropriate materials from the literature. Analysis of these field studies will seek to demonstrate the value of social science knowledge concerning the nature of society and human behavior in understanding and dealing with problems in routine correctional work, in administrative policy, and in institutional organization and change. The completed materials will be organized into a three-quarter course of instruction, and tested experimentally with a group of students at the University of Chicago.

The program of the Center will extend over a three year period, and its activities will be carried on with the assistance of a full-time

director, a part-time associate director, a secretary, and three research assistants. An interdisciplinary advisory committee, composed of faculty members of the University of Chicago, will help to guide the work of the Center, and assure representative contributions from the accumulated knowledge of the relevant fields of social science study, such as education, law, psychology, social work and sociology. An effort will be made to draw extensively on the background of experience represented among correctional workers with long periods of service in the field.

It is anticipated that the published volume of materials, and the developed course of instruction will prove useful in supplementing the training of persons now employed in the correctional field in a professional capacity, and those who are candidates for higher degrees in the several disciplines from which professional workers in corrections are drawn. The work of the Center may be employed to fill unmet needs of inservice training programs, and of the curricula of schools of correctional administration. In universities without organized programs of instruction in correctional work, the materials and the course of training developed at the Center may stand as a bridge between the university and the field of correctional practice for interested students of the social sciences.—
From LLOYD E. OHLIN, Director.

Police Services for Juveniles—Released last month is a new U. S. Children's Bureau publication, *Police Services for Juveniles*, including the report of a conference held at East Lansing, Michigan, in August 1953, sponsored by the Children's Bureau in cooperation with the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the Special Juvenile Delinquency Project.

The booklet covers the importance of the police role in the handling of juveniles, police services for alleged delinquents, police services for neglected children, offenses by adults against juveniles, organization and training of police for work with juveniles, police relationship with other agencies, prevention activities and related police programs for juveniles.

Copies of the booklet may be secured from the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at a price of 35¢ each—**THE POLICE CHIEF**, June 1954.

First United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Treatment of Offenders—The General Assembly of the United Nations provided in Resolution 415 (V) of December 1, 1950, for the convening every five years by the United Nations of a world congress on the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders. The congress is part of a broader structure, calling in addition for appointment by governments of individual correspondents with the United Nations Secretariat and for organization of regional conferences, set up by the plan relating to the transfer to the United Nations of the functions of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission. Thus, the congress will be, from an historical point of view, a continuation of the congresses previously organized by the IPPC, the last of which was held at the Hague in August 1950. It is expected that the congress will be held at the *Palais des Nations*, Geneva, Switzerland, from August 22 to September 3, 1955.

The congress will group three categories of participants:

(1) Members officially appointed by their governments, who will be experts in the field of the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders possessing a special knowledge of, or experience in, the questions of the agenda.

(2) Observers of specialized agencies and of non-governmental organizations having working relationships with the United Nations.

(3) Individual observers.

The agenda of the congress will include:

(1) Standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners.

(2) Selection and training of personnel.

(3) Open institutions.

(4) Prison labor.

(5) Juvenile delinquency.

These questions will be examined on the basis of the findings of the United Nations regional conferences in the field of the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders, as well as

of additional documentation prepared at the request of the United Nations Secretariat. In accordance with the above-mentioned resolution of the General Assembly, the resolutions adopted by the congress will be communicated to the Secretary-General and, if necessary, to the policy-making bodies of the United Nations. In addition, the program of the congress will include certain related activities, such as visits to institutions, films, etc. The United Nations Secretariat will give later further information concerning the organization of the congress, *inter alia* with regard to the participation of individual observers—**THE PRISON WORLD**, May-June 1954.

Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions—1953—At the close of 1953 a total of 172,729 prisoners were confined in State and Federal institutions for adult offenders. This number was 5,355, or 3.2 percent, more than at the end of 1952, and represented the highest year-end prison population since 1940. The increase was proportionately much greater in Federal than in State institutions. There were 19,363 prisoners in Federal institutions on December 31, 1953, an increase of 1,349, or 7.5 percent, as compared with the close of 1952. State institutions had 153,366 prisoners, an increase of 4,006, or 2.7 percent.

Of the four major geographic regions, the West showed the greatest increase in prisoners confined in State institutions, 5.4 percent; the South followed with a 3.2 percent increase; then the North Central States with 2.6 percent. The Northeast showed no change. With a 16.8 percent increase in prisoners confined at the end of 1953, as compared with a year earlier, the District of Columbia's percentage of increase in prisoners exceeded that of any State. Substantial increases also occurred in Wisconsin, 14.7 percent; Texas 11.8 percent; Georgia, 9.9 percent; and Montana, 9.4 percent. The greatest relative decreases in prison population occurred in West Virginia with a 14.1 percent decrease, Wyoming with 10.4 percent, and Mississippi and Nebraska, each with 8.3 percent.

In 1953, a total of 34,033 prisoners were released from State institutions by parole or

some form of conditional release, an increase of 4 percent over the number so released in 1950. In contrast, over the same period the number of violators of conditional release sent back to State institutions increased by 24 percent. The number of such violator returns rose from 7,321 in 1950 to 9,080 in 1953. This increase may indicate that there actually were a greater number of violations of parole and conditional release, or, on the other hand, it may indicate merely that more efficient supervision was bringing a greater proportion of them to light, or possibly that paroling authorities were being more strict in returning offenders for minor violations of a type which previously had been disregarded. Perhaps there was a combination of these reasons. At any rate, the rise in the number of former prisoners returned to the institutions as violators has represented an appreciable factor in the increase in prison population—NATIONAL PRISONER STATISTICS, Number 11, July 1954, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Washington, D. C.

Society for the Advancement of Criminology Meets in Berkeley—The annual conference of the Society for Advancement of Criminology will be held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Berkeley, California, December 26–31. The personnel of the SAC comprise those engaged in the teaching and supervision of programs in the field of criminology on the college and university level. Included among the branches of criminology to be discussed are: *General Philosophy for Criminology Programs* by O. W. Wilson, Dean, School of Criminology, University of California; *Law Enforcement* by Richard Simon, Deputy Chief, Commander, Bureau of Administration, Los Angeles Police Department; *Penology* by Austin H. MacCormick, Professor, School of Criminology, University of California; *Psychological Aspects* by Douglas M. Kelley, M. D., Professor, School of Criminology, University of California; and *Criminalistics* by Professor Paul L. Kirk, also of the U. C. School of Criminology—From an announcement to the EDITOR.

Clinical Diagnosis As a Function of Criminal Justice—Many judges have expressed themselves as being shocked by the nature of certain crimes, or have admitted a feeling of inadequacy in understanding the motivation of certain defendants. Since psychiatry concerns itself with human behavior and unconscious motivation, courts should naturally turn to this medical science for answers to certain perplexing problems. But actually they have not done so to any considerable extent. As Dr. Manfred Guttmacher wrote a few years ago: "Despite the rapidly increasing acceptance of psychiatry by most disciplines—education, religion, the army and even the law—the establishment of court psychiatric clinics has been amazingly and disappointingly slow. We must either conclude that these clinics, during the past quarter century, have proved ineffectual in improving the quality of the work of the criminal courts to which they are attached, or that their accomplishments have not been sufficiently publicised. I hold strongly to the latter view."

Under the direction of a judicial committee, a group of citizens in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, about twenty years ago made an investigation and study of the functions that a psychiatric diagnostic clinic could properly perform. They came to the conclusion that such a clinic would be of value to the trial judge and to the defendant provided certain rigidly enforced policies and procedures were followed. As a result of the recommendation and action of this committee, the Behavior Clinic of the Allegheny County Criminal Court was organized and started operation in 1937. Since then the clinic has examined over 8,000 cases for the trial judges of this court.

The purpose of the clinic is to make an adequate study of the defendant as to personality traits, character formation and, if possible, motivations leading to anti-social behavior. This information, transmitted to the trial judge for his use, helps him to understand the case better and to arrive at a more just disposition. So far as the cost is concerned, the Behavior Clinic is self-sustaining, for the amount of money it saves by effectuating commitment of a large number of defendants prior to trial,

thus eliminating trial costs, is greater than its budgetary needs.

The staff of the Behavior Clinic is composed of a full-time psychiatrist, two part-time psychiatrists, a full time psychologist, two full-time psychiatric social workers, a secretary-statistician who acts as a representative of the clinic in the court, and two stenographers. The clinic functions as a psychiatric team. The information obtained through the independent examinations and reports of the psychiatrists, the psychologist, and the social worker gives the clinic a fairly adequate picture. Hereditary endowment, developmental characteristics, early personality traits in play and school, and adolescent adjustments are evaluated. The subject's version of the offense is checked against the data obtained from other sources. The degree of rapport is determined and evasions, defenses, and rationalizations can be understood. The clinic gets a cross-section of predominant personality traits, unconscious wishes and motivations and the acting out or adjustment to reality situations. The past and present medical status and its relation to the behavior pattern are appraised. The psychobiologic factors together with social, economic and environmental stresses often lead to diagnostic and prognostic conclusions.

Other adult psychiatric clinics which are integral parts of the courts are: Chicago, Psychiatric Institute of the Municipal Court (established 1914) and Clinic of the Criminal Court of Cook County (1931); Philadelphia, Neuro-Psychiatric Division of the Municipal Court (1917); Baltimore, Medical Office of the Supreme Bench (1921); Detroit, Psychopathic Clinic of the Recorder's Court (1921); Cleveland, Psychiatric Clinic of the Municipal and Criminal Courts (1925); New York, Psychiatric Clinic of the Court of General Sessions (1932); and Psychiatric Clinic of the Girls' Term, Magistrates' Courts (1950). From an article, *A Criminal Court Diagnostic Clinic* by Rodney H. Kiefer, M.D., Director, Behavior Clinic,

Allegheny County Criminal Court, Pittsburgh Pennsylvania—Focus, May, 1954.

United Nations Opium Conference—The United Nations Opium Conference was convened by the Secretary General of the United Nations in conformity with resolution 436A (XIV) of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, dated May 27, 1952. States members of the United Nations and non-member States Parties to the international conventions concerning narcotic drugs were invited to the Conference. Libya, Nepal, the Republic of Korea, and Spain were also invited to attend the Conference in accordance with the terms of resolutions 478 (XV) of the Council.

The Conference was held at United Nations Headquarters from May 11 to June 18, 1953, 34 states being represented. In addition, Argentina, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Haiti, Indonesia, Sweden, and Thailand were represented by observers. The Soviet Union did not choose to send a delegate to the Conference. The Permanent Central Board, the Supervisory Body and the World Health Organization also took part in the work of the Conference. Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, Secretary General of the United Nations, opened the Conference. He explained that the purpose of the Conference was to try to solve the problem of drug addiction and to strengthen present controls which are incomplete as regards opium and poppy straw. The task of the Conference would be to limit the use of opium to medical and scientific needs, by reducing annual production from some 2,000 tons to 500 tons. The Conference adopted by a vote of 27 to 0 with 2 abstentions and opened for signature on June 23, the Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and Use of Opium. As of December 30, 1953, representatives of 30 states had signed the protocol.—*Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs*, (for the year ended December 31, 1953), published by the Bureau of Narcotics, U. S. Treasury Department.