

1956

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, 47 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 217 (1956-1957)

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*

Illinois Academy of Criminology—The Annual Meeting of the Illinois Academy of Criminology was held at the University of Chicago on April 27, 1956. The theme of the meeting was "Vistas and Vectors in Criminology."

The particular subjects under discussion and the participants were as follows: "World Trends in Criminology"—Jordan T. Cavan, Professor of Education, and Ruth Shonle Cavan, Professor of Sociology, both of Rockford College; "The Professional Worker in the Prison of Tomorrow"—Neil A. Schafer, Groves B. Smith, and Stow E. Symon, of the Illinois Penitentiaries; "Mass Media in Relation to Crime and Delinquency"—Clem Lane, City Editor of the Chicago Daily News, Isaac Gershman, Managing Editor of the City News Bureau, and Ben S. Meeker, Chief U. S. Probation Officer for the Northern District of Illinois; "Psychiatric Issues in the Courtroom"—William Haines M.D.; "Behavior Clinic in the Criminal Court of Cook County, Illinois"—Fred E. Inbau, Professor of Law in Northwestern University; Fred Strodbeck, Associate Professor of Law and Sociology in the University of Chicago, and Hans Zeisel, Professor of Law and Sociology in the University of Chicago; "The Political Prisoner: Censorship and Civil Liberties"—Kenneth Doughty, Executive Director of the American Civil Liberties Union and S. Kirson Weinberg, Professor of Sociology in Roosevelt University; "The Next 50 Years in Criminal Law"—Francis A. Allen, Professor of Law in Harvard University.—EUGENE ZEMANS, John Howard Association.

Southern Conference on Corrections—The First Annual Conference on Corrections was held at the Florida State University in Tallahassee on March 14 and 15, 1956. Professor Vernon Fox of the Program in Corrections in the University School of Social Welfare was Chairman of the Conference and delivered the welcoming address.

The morning of the 14th was given over to a discussion of the criminal insane by Doctors Arnold Eichert, Superintendent of the South Florida Mental Hospital, W. R. Rogers, Superintendent of the Florida State Hospital, and DeHart Krans of the Florida State University.

A program on the Legal Aspects of Custody was given on the afternoon of the 14th. The participants were the Hon. Reeves Rowen, Assistant Attorney General of the State of Florida, and a panel consisting of L. W. Griffith, Director of the State Road Department in the Florida Prison System, and J. Lewis Hall, Attorney of Tallahassee.

The evening program consisted of an address by Robert H. Gault, Editor of this JOURNAL, on some interrelated functions of the Parole Board and Parole Supervisors.

On the morning of the 15th there was a program on Corrections—A Challenge To All. DeWitt Sinclair, Superintendent of the Florida State Prison was Chairman. Professor Charles L. Newman, of the University School of Social Welfare, made the principal address which was followed by a panel discussion. The panel participants were Paul Eubanks, Superintendent of the Apalachee Correctional Institution, Joe Cheney, Chairman of the Florida Parole Commission, and Gus Bischoff of the State University.

The closing session was devoted to a discussion of Emotional and Behavior Patterns Predisposing to Penal-Correctional Problems. The Chairman was Arthur G. Dozier, Superintendent of the Florida Industrial School for Boys at Marianna. Dr. E. N. Pleasants, Psychiatrist in the Florida State Hospital at Chattahoochee, gave the principal address which was followed by a panel consisting of Mrs. Sylvia Carrothers, Executive Secretary of the Florida Children's Commission; Mrs. Alyce D. McPherson, Superintendent of the Florida Industrial School for Girls, and Dr. W. Douglas Smith, of the Department of Psychol-

ogy in the Florida State University.—COMMUNICATION TO THE EDITOR.

Weather and Crime in Tallahassee during 1954—The effect of weather on human behavior has long been conjectured. The effect of weather and climate on criminal behavior, in particular, has been a source of some speculation. The F.B.I. has listed "climate", among other factors, in recent *Uniform Crime Reports* as one condition which influences the amount of crime in a community.

The proposed problem was to determine whether the weather variations in a community influence crime in that community sufficiently to show statistical significance. With growing speculation about such things as artificial rain-making and other phases of the inter-action between man and climate, as proposed by the relatively new discipline in meteorology of micro-climatology, it would seem helpful to delineate in one community the demonstrable differences or lack of differences in behavior resulting from changes in weather.

The literature is not very definite about the relationships between weather and behavior, nor could the writers find any objective studies of the relationship between behavior and weather. The F.B.I. lists in their *Uniform Crime Reports* as affecting crime, "climate", with no further explanation.¹ Montesquieu indicated that criminal activity increased in proportion as one approached the equator, and drunkenness increased in proportion as one approached the poles.² Adolph Quetelet claimed that crimes against the person, particularly those of violence were prevalent in the south and in warm seasons, while crimes against property occurred in the north and in colder weather, a statement to which he referred as the "thermic law of delinquency."³ Mayo-Smith asserted that crimes against the person were more

numerous in warm weather while property crimes were more frequent in winter.⁴ Albert Leffingwell, in 1892, referred to climate as a "true factor of causation."⁵ Seasonal variations in types of crime have been shown to exist, but they are explicable on the basis of culture factors, such as Christmas season, harvest time, hazardous driving conditions, and similar factors. Calvin Schmid found that seasonal variations in homicides, like those of other crimes, can more easily be explained in terms of cultural factors, such as the high homicide in winter distress and disorder among migratory, workers.⁶

The hypothesis is that the accepted measurements of weather, such as humidity, temperature, and barometric pressure will be related to such crimes as traffic offenses, drunkenness, and other offenses as indicated to an extent measureable by statistical techniques. The city of Tallahassee, Florida, was selected for purposes of this study. It was assumed that these measures taken at the same time in any 24 hour period would be sufficiently stable to serve as an index of the entire 24 hour period.

Measures of temperature, barometric pressure, and humidity were taken as of one p.m. daily from U. S. Weather Bureau records at Tallahassee, Florida, January through December, 1954. Data of arrests are from the official Police Department records of Tallahassee, covering the same period. They were tabulated daily for (1) Traffic offenses, 342; (2) Drinking and drunkenness, 299; (3) All crimes which were not covered in the preceding groups, 309.

Pearsonian coefficients of correlation were computed between humidity ratings and traffic offenses, between humidity ratings and drunkenness, and between humidity ratings and other crimes. Similar coefficients were computed between temperature and traffic offenses, temperature and drunkenness, and

¹ F.B.I.; UNIFORM CRIME REPORTS, Semi-annual Bulletin, 1954, Page 11.

² MONTESQUIEU; THE SPIRIT OF LAWS, The Colonial Press, New York, 1899, p. 126.

³ BARNES AND TEETERS, NEW HORIZONS IN CRIMINOLOGY, Prentice-Hall Inc., Ed. II, 1952, p. 126.

⁴ MAYO-SMITH, STATISTICS AND SOCIOLOGY, The MacMillan Co., New York, 1902, p. 270.

⁵ BARNES AND TEETERS, *op. cit.*, p. 127, after Thomas, Franklin: the Environmental Basis of Society, New York 1925.

⁶ SCHMID, CALVIN F., "Study of Homicides in Seattle," 1914-1924, SOCIAL FORCES, Vol. IV.

temperature and other offenses. Computations were also made between barometric pressures and traffic offenses, and drunkenness and other offenses.

RESULTS

The results of the computations are shown in Table I.

No relationship can be shown between any of the weather factors considered and any of the criminal behavior patterns used in Tallahassee during 1954.

TABLE I

Factors	Correlation
Humidity and crimes.....	-.09
Humidity and drunkenness.....	.08
Humidity and traffic offenses.....	.01
Temperatures and crimes.....	.03
Temperatures and drunkenness.....	.03
Temperatures and traffic offenses.....	.07
Barometric pressures and crimes.....	.02
Barometric pressures and drunkenness....	.02
Barometric pressures and traffic offenses..	.01

CONCLUSIONS

While the literature and many lay comments may suggest a relationship between the weather and human behavior, especially criminal behavior, no studies have been reported to shed light in this area. This study of daily weather conditions and daily crime rates for one year in Tallahassee, Florida, indicates that no relationships could be shown in that community.—
ERNEST LAROCHE AND LOUIS TILLERY, Undergraduate Students in Correction, Florida State University.

Roundup of Parole Conference—The National Conference on Parole, held in Washington, April 9th to 11th, the first since the pioneer conference on the subject in 1939, proved to be an unqualified success. More than meeting its stated objectives of "evaluating existing parole standards and practices," the twelve workshop sessions in which the approximately 500 delegates labored, came up with textual material, spelling out desirable practices and objectives, that will serve as a

goal and guide to parole systems and state legislatures for some time to come. The material will be published by the National Probation and Parole Association, co-sponsor of the conference with the United States Board of Parole. The conference was called by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., at their suggestion. The original material on which the conference members deliberated was prepared over a two year period by the Advisory Council on Parole of the NPPA.

The conference was composed of three voting delegates appointed by the governor of each state, fifteen delegates-at-large appointed by the correction authorities of each state, representatives of national organizations in the corrections and related fields, and educators in sociology, law and social work. These included the chairman of every parole board in the country; a number of the directors of state correction departments; the heads of correctional institutions; the heads and officers of state parole systems; as well as a liberal representation of the judiciary and state bar associations.

Chief Justice Earl Warren set a high keynote for the conference in his address at the opening session. It is important, said he, for people to understand that the parole of a prisoner is not an act of coddling but, on the contrary, is an extension of the state's supervision while the prisoner is trying to reestablish himself in society.

"If we had no adjusting release of prisoners, it would be but a few years until we would need many times the number of prisons with many times the capacity of those we have today," the Chief Justice said. "There are in the nation at the present time approximately 200 state and federal prisons, reformatories and camps. They have a normal capacity of about 175,000. Last year there were approximately 90,000 new commitments. If it were not for the fact that 80,000 were released each year, the number of prisoners would soon engulf us. Should we release them outright or should we subject them to the supervision of parole?" The vast majority of prisoners (nine out of ten), the Chief Justice reminded the

group, must be released eventually to become our neighbors and fellow workers in all walks of life.

"The maximum security prison has its place in our corrective system, but we have every reason to hope that it will play a smaller part as time goes on . . . the sooner the public, legislators, administrators and tax-conscious groups realize that the best security and the cheapest security we can have for our homes against the depredations of people who have once been committed to a penitentiary for serious crime is not only an enlightened prison system, but also an understanding parole system, the sooner we can turn the tide of crime in favor of the law-abiding community."

The Chief Justice reminded the Conference that whereas every state and the Federal government has some form of parole procedure many of these are parole systems in name only, and that in many jurisdictions a parole officer will be assigned more cases than he can possibly supervise (too often more than 500) . . . yet "the value of any parole system lies in the personal supervision given to the individual by trained and understanding people." He pointed out that in his own State of California the entire correction system is under Civil Service and is allowed to do its important public service job without political interference, or interference of any kind.

Chief Justice Warren concluded that the best security available to society is an enlightened prison system, functioning cooperatively with an effective parole system.

In addressing the Conference, Attorney General Brownell spoke of parole as a "process of regulating reformation" and called the attention of the delegates to the fact of "prison gates swinging two ways." He referred to the need for parole, as a "bridge of supervision", to be a strong one.

"The general public has formed its idea of parole from mass media which are hardly conducive to inspire public confidence in the functioning of the parole system," the Attorney General said. It is popularly believed that the successful parolee is rare.

"Yet the great majority of parolees do suc-

cessfully complete their paroles and return to positions of usefulness in their communities," he said. "Only the parole violator hits the headlines . . . ninety-five percent of the persons sent to prison are eventually returned to society, about forty percent on parole and a considerable number of the remainder under some form of supervision. So it is vitally important that the bridge of supervision which must carry them from a controlled situation to freedom and useful citizenship be a strong one."

Parole has come a long way since the first conference on the subject in 1939 which set forth the Declaration of the Principles of Parole, the Attorney General stated. Now each state has a parole statute and every state is a member of the Interstate Compact on parole.

The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, reiterated the needs and goals of sound professional parole practice in his address to the conference; needs and goals recognized by parole administrators the country over and set forth in this very conference. Two of these were the importance of "careful selection" by the releasing authority and "competent supervision" following release by parole staff. He urged upon the conference the need to establish "an even closer bond of cooperation between those charged with treatment of offenders and those charged with detection and apprehension. Mr. Hoover also pointed up the special needs of the mentally ill and of the emotionally unstable offender.

The Director of the United States Bureau of Prisons, the Honorable James V. Bennett spoke of the cooperative team work which must be engaged in by prison and parole programs alike in working toward their mutual goals. Mr. Bennett reviewed the functions of the correctional institution and the progress of the federal service in recruiting qualified prison administrators and in organizing training programs for institutional personnel improvements still sought for "in the area of diagnostic and training and treatment personnel" as well as in the physical facilities themselves, according to Mr. Bennett. Mr. Bennett reminded the

conference that "the whole process of making citizens out of prisoners must be unified" as must all who share in this responsibility be "united in our purposes and objectives."

The Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, Chief Judge of the U. S. District Court, Washington, D. C., spoke on the importance of solving the problem of the youthful offender and of the techniques of reclaiming him, while there is yet time, before he becomes a habitual criminal.

The Honorable Manuel Lopez-Rey, representing the Secretary-General of the United Nations, told the delegates that the 1954 United Nations study of parole indicated that the selection of whom to be released was of basic importance.

The delegates were welcomed by Scovel Richardson, Chairman of the United States Board of Parole, and by Judge George W. Smyth, President of the National Probation and Parole Association. The presiding officer at the opening session was Will C. Turblad, Director of the NPPA. The presiding officer of the closing session, at which the workshop chairmen made their reports which were voted upon by the conference, was Deputy Attorney General William P. Rogers.

Highlights of the standards recommended by the conference were:

I. Definition of Parole Concepts

To assure uniform understanding of the various terms related to parole and to avoid the confusion attendant on different usage, a number of definitions were laid down for such terms as detainer, worktime, parole hearing, review, suspension, revocation.

The term "mandatory release" for instance, was proposed in place of "conditional release," which should be abandoned because of its confusion with parole. "Mandatory release", then, was defined as the release, as prescribed by law, of a prisoner who has served his term of commitment less good time and/or work time credits, under conditions and preferably under supervision, until the expiration of the maximum term for which he was sentenced.

II. Sentencing Laws

An effective parole law should provide for

the conditional release and supervision of every individual released from a correctional institution.

Statutes whose provisions permit release on parole when optimum response to the correctional-educational program of the institution indicates that the offender is ready to be returned to society are most conducive to parole effectiveness.

The group did not reach agreement for or against impositions of minimum sentences but did adopt the following principle: "If the Court is authorized to impose a minimum sentence, it is vital that the law require a broad spread between the minimum and maximum, and that the minimum be short enough to permit sound release decisions."

In addition, the delegates voted that "a paroling authority must have the power to consider all individuals for parole consideration at such time as they are eligible . . . regardless of the nature of the offense involved."

III. Parole Board Structure

The parole authority should be placed in a centralized board whose members are appointed on a full-time basis when the workload demands. It should consist of no fewer than three members. These should be appointed by the Chief executive officer of the state but the appointment of a permanent parole board under the merit system should be encouraged. Members should meet the qualifications of the position (high personal and educational background, professional experience), and be appointed without regard to political affiliation.

The parole board must be free to make its decisions independently of institutional or departmental administration whether it operates as a separate department or as a unit of a larger department of correction.

IV. Parole Board Functions

A major tenet upon which parole stands is that a period of control and assistance through supervision be provided *every* youth or adult leaving a correctional institution.

In addition, it was recommended that parole be granted at the point at which maximum benefits to the individual have accrued and the

element of risk to society is minimal, which can best be accomplished under an indeterminate sentence law.

To discourage any attempt to the possible growth of a "racket" being built around the granting of parole it was emphasized that no representation, legal or otherwise, is necessary at a hearing and provisions are made to file an affidavit as to whether a fee is paid for such representation.

V. Parole and Public Relations

Every paroling agency should periodically publish and distribute a report of its work and concise digests and pamphlets should be developed to tell graphically the parole story.

A policy of strict frankness and honesty should be pursued, with no "cover-up" of failures, yet an attempt should be made to inform on the human interest success stories. Parole boards should not hesitate to interpret their decisions frankly to judges who, because of lack of information, may misunderstand decisions in specific situations. Accurate reporting will require the development and adoption of more reliable statistical reporting methods in most jurisdictions.

VI. Preparation for Parole

Among the rehabilitative techniques within an institution that should be followed to assist the individual to become a law abiding citizen on his release to society that were mentioned were training programs—providing varied employment with training value; general, specific and vocational education—and treatment programs, including medical, psychiatric and psychological services; social case work; religious, individual and group therapy and counseling, and programs making maximum use of all community resources to further the socialization of the individual.

In juvenile institutions the social casework process should exercise the functions of classification in adult institutions; work assignments and programs should be carried on primarily for training. Social life in cottage and campus activities, home visits and community contacts should be stressed.

In general, the report stated, more specific and intensive counseling and orientation are required during the period immediately preceding release.

While it was felt that the feasibility of trial releases, short furloughs, week-end releases as a method of testing the individual should be explored, it was emphasized that such releases should not be a trial parole, but that if an individual was deemed ready for parole, a full or complete parole should be granted.

VII. Criteria for Parole Selection

The two basic criteria are the readiness of the individual for release (a decision based on his personal history, his record in the institution and observation of any growth or change in his behavior and attitudes) and the readiness of the community to receive the parolee. In instances of community hostility or family rejection, successful parole might be better achieved through release to another locality.

VIII. Detainers and Warrants and Procedures for Violators

The presence of a detainer should not stand in the way of any individual being considered for release on parole. A prisoner should not, because of it alone, be required to serve the maximum of his sentence in prison.

The preventive aspect of parole is as vital as its therapeutic one.

IX. Parole Staff

All parole staff members should be appointed through use of a merit system. The qualifications of all staff are enumerated with the recommendation that an employment specialist be included who should serve as liaison between the parole department and the employment services, employers, union officials and employee organizations.

X. Parole Supervision

Emphasis was placed on the recommendation that a department's own time study should provide a basis for a workable caseload standard but that 50 should be the maximum.

Parole regulations should be rules, not

statutes. A suggested list to serve as a guide was included.

XI. Discharge from Parole

Unconditional discharge from parole, and the discharge from parole, and the discharge of a prisoner upon the completion of his time, shall have the effect of restoring all civil rights lost by operation of law upon commitment.

The expunging of a criminal record should be authorized on a discretionary basis, with authority to be vested in the court of conviction.

Public employment and restoration of licenses should be considered by those states barring them, such a bar only to be used where necessary for public protection.

Denial of insurance, housing, employment, private social agency service should not be denied except for public protection.

XII. Statistical and Administrative Reporting

Machinery was put to work to assure uniform statistics along with the establishment of a central correctional statistics bureau.—

From THE NATIONAL PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION.

International Course on Criminology—The sixth international course on Criminology will be held at Lausanne from October 1 to 18 under the direction of M. Marc Thelin, Professor in the Faculty of Medicine in the University of Lausanne. More than twenty European Criminologists will participate, according to the preliminary program, as announced.

The discussions will fall under two main heads: Disturbances of Human Behavior from the Anthropological Viewpoint, and Its Disturbances from the Sociological Angle.

The prevention of juvenile delinquency, of abortion and infanticide, of immorality, and of crimes of violence will have a large share of attention in the program.

Complete information may be had by addressing the Institute of Legal Medicine, 19, Avenue Cesar-Roux, Lausanne, Switzerland.—From JEAN PINATEL, Secretary General of the International Society of Criminology.