

Fall 1959

Abstracts and 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

Abstracts and Notes, 50 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 275 (1959-1960)

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.

evidence against him violated the established rules relating to the conduct of trials. The fact that the proceedings under the juvenile act were labeled

an inquiry rather than a trial did not justify a dispensation with the "legal, constitutional and traditional rights incident to a fair trial."

ABSTRACTS AND NOTES

THE ARMY'S CORRECTIONAL PROGRAM

(A Resume of an Address Delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1958.)

The mission of the United States Army is to provide an effective fighting force to protect the interests of our great nation. The Army's correctional program must be and now is directed toward accomplishment of that primary mission. The program is carried out at 61 stockades located at large Army posts throughout the world and at two disciplinary barracks—the Army's specialized correctional facilities—located at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, and Lompoc, California.

Guns and missiles can function only if they have highly trained, disciplined soldiers operating them. A Nike defense system provides little protection to our cities and vital industries if soldiers who should man them are AWOL. Discipline is the cement that binds our Army into an effective fighting force—without it we would have a mob, worthless in battle. The first objective of our correctional program, therefore, is to determine as quickly as possible whether a soldier who has got into trouble has a potential for further service as a disciplined soldier. To meet this challenge, we have enlisted the well-coordinated team work of the entire staff of each local command having a stockade—legal personnel, mental hygiene specialists, chaplains, troop commanders—to evaluate each prisoner's potential for further service on his first trip to the stockade. Upon the basis of this evaluation, a schedule of work, training, and individual treatment is devised for each prisoner according to his ultimate disposition. Restorable prisoners are given intensive military training designed to enhance their effectiveness as disciplined soldiers. They are returned to duty as quickly as possible through the exercise of the commander's authority to suspend and remit sentences. Prisoners serving

long sentences for serious crimes are transferred to the Army's disciplinary barracks, which are staffed and equipped to provide rehabilitative treatment for this type of offender. Men serving short sentences for minor offenses who are found to be unfit for return to honorable duty are promptly recommended for administrative separation from service. While confined they are required to undergo work and training which will contribute to their reintegration into the civil community as useful citizens. No longer are soldiers permitted to return to the local stockade time after time to serve a short sentence for a minor offense. Our present correctional screening and evaluation are used to detect the potential recidivist who, as experience has shown, very often commits a serious crime requiring costly, long-term confinement with the stigma of a dishonorable discharge added.

A few years ago, it was a common sight on almost any Army post to see an armed guard "chasing" a single prisoner around on some kind of "rag-picking" detail. This is no longer true. Maximum emphasis now is placed upon minimum custodial supervision. As a result of our present method of study and evaluation, we are able to safely work and train large numbers of prisoners in a parolee status or under unarmed supervisors with less personnel. In one area of heavy troop concentration, over 50 percent of the prisoners now are employed without armed guards. Three years ago, less than 10 percent were so employed.

The present system of correctional treatment and disposition of prisoners confined in Army stockades was adopted in September 1957. During the first 15 months of operation, the population

of Army stockades declined from 5,618 on 30 September 1957 to 2,705 on 31 December 1958—a reduction of 51.9 percent. At the same time the troop strength of the Army was reduced only 9.2 percent. These impressive reductions, although not attributable solely to our enlightened correctional policy, obviously mean an attendant rise in over-all efficiency as well as tremendous savings in money and manpower—savings which can be passed along to the taxpayer. Further, this reduction in the Army's stockade population is reflected in a similar decrease in the number of long-term prisoners being transferred for confinement in disciplinary barracks, which means still greater savings and increased Army effectiveness.

The Army's disciplinary barracks are operated for the confinement of Army and Air Force prisoners with sentences of more than six months whose crimes or behavior patterns are not so serious as to require confinement in a Federal penitentiary. They are staffed with specially trained custodial personnel, psychiatrists, psychologists, chaplains, and a host of educators. Academic education from elementary through college level courses is offered, as well as a full range of vocational courses and

related training on actual projects. The treatment of prisoners in disciplinary barracks, while firm, is humane and in no way calculated to humiliate or degrade. Our program makes extensive use of psychiatric and psychological services, religious therapy, and academic and vocational training properly related to the development of educational achievement, marketable skills, spiritual values, and socially acceptable attitudes on the basis of the individual prisoner's needs. The Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force are authorized by law to grant clemency. Each prisoner's case is considered at least once each year for possible reduction of sentence or return to honorable duty. In addition, provisions exist for the parole of prisoners after serving a minimum period which, in most cases, is one third of the sentence.

The Army's correctional program is one of treatment rather than punishment. Every phase is directed toward preparing each prisoner in the time available for restoration to honorable military duty or for return to the civil community as a useful citizen.—Col. Raymond R. Ramsey, Deputy, The Provost Marshal General, U.S.A.

FRUSTRATION AND MURDER¹

Fifty-one male murderers and their 51 nearest-age brothers were investigated. The emphasis was on frustration in infancy, childhood and adolescence as an influencing variable. The frustration-aggression hypothesis of John Dollard and his associates²—that frustration leads to inward or outward aggression by the individual—was employed.

Frustration was defined as lack of satisfaction of an innate or learned need. Murder was taken as a form of outward aggression. A murderer was defined as an individual who has been legally convicted of first or of second degree murder or of first degree (non-negligent) manslaughter. The central hypothesis was: There is a significant, positive, functional relationship between the amount of frustration experienced by individuals in infancy, childhood and adolescence, on the one hand, and whether or not they later commit

murder, on the other hand. Aggression release during the pre-adult years was considered a major control variable.

The records of all males serving prison sentences for murder or first degree manslaughter in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Maine and Rhode Island during the fall of 1957 were investigated. In order to be used as cases in this study, it was necessary that the murderers have mothers as well as brothers who were available for interviewing. Most of the data were obtained from the mothers. Of 254 imprisoned men, 51 met the above criteria.

Indices of Physical Frustration, Psychological Frustration, General Frustration, Socially Acceptable Aggression Release, Socially Unacceptable Aggression Release, and General Aggression Release were developed. As an example, in the Index of Physical Frustration, the individual was allotted one point for a difficult birth, one point for each serious illness and so on. Words such as difficult and serious were operationally defined.

Quite definitely, the Index of Physical Frustra-

¹ Supported in part by four grants from the Central University Research Fund of the University of New Hampshire.

² JOHN DOLLARD *et al.*, *FRUSTRATION AND AGGRESSION*, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1939.

tion scores are significantly higher for the 51 murderers than for the 51 control brothers. In fact, the differences are strikingly great: 23 of the murderers have scores of four or less while 50 of the brothers have scores of four or less. Conversely, 28 of the murderers have scores of five or more while only one brother has so high a score. Further the mean score for the 51 murderers is 5.00; for the 51 brothers the mean score is 1.67.

The Index of Psychological Frustration scores for the murderer group were also significantly greater than for the control brothers group. Ten murderers had scores of two or less while 28 brothers had the same scores. On the other hand, the scores of 19 murderers were six or higher but only three brothers had scores at that level. The mean score for murderers was 4.7 while for the brothers the mean score was 2.5.

An individual's score on the Index of General Frustration was found by adding his scores on the Index of Physical Frustration and the Index of Psychological Frustration. Fifteen murderers had scores of five or less on the Index of General Frustration as compared to 36 control brothers. At the other extreme, 20 murderers had scores of 11 or higher while not one of the brothers had so great a score. To the extent that the mothers' responses reflected the facts, there is great weight in favor of considering frustration as a possible major influence behind murder.

The mean score for the murderers was 9.7 while for the brothers it was 4.2. Comparing scores within pairs of murderers and control brothers, it was found that in 42 pairs the murderer had a higher score than his brother. In five pairs the scores were equal. And in four pairs the brother's score was greater than the murderer's. That is to say, 82 percent of the time—42 pairs out of 51—the Index

of General Frustration scores agreed with the basic idea stated in the central hypothesis of the study.

The number of control brothers with relatively high scores on the Index of Socially Acceptable Aggression Release was significantly greater than the number of murderers with high scores. And the mean score for the brothers was 3.5 while for the murderers it was 2.5. Conversely, the murderers tended to score high on the Index of Socially Unacceptable Aggression Release and the brothers to score low. Here, the mean score for the murderer group was 1.2 while for the control group it was 0.4. Scores on an Index of General Aggression Release were found by adding the individual's scores on the two above indices. On this index there was little difference between the two groups: the mean score for the murderers was 3.6 while for the brothers it was 4.0.

Clearly, there are three especially major drawbacks in the study reported here. First, the mothers may not have reported the facts correctly. Second, the group of murderers is probably not representative of any larger murderer population. Third, the frustration and aggression release indices are crude; they do not take into account the fact that one incident of frustration or aggression release may not equal the weight of another such incident. However, this is an exploratory study. It indicates the clear possibility of a functional relationship between pre-adult frustration and later presence or absence of murder. Further studies which do not contain the drawbacks of the one reported here are needed. Such studies would throw more light on the phenomenon of murder and on the usefulness of the frustration-aggression hypothesis.—Stuart Palmer, Department of Sociology, University of New Hampshire

SOME ASPECTS OF TREATMENT IN THE CASE OF A DRUG-ADDICT

There seems to be some consensus among criminologists as well as therapists of various disciplines that the law-offender least amenable to correction is the drug-addict. It seems that the drug-addict is the only law-offender among the various types of addict, and thus he is punished for a symptom of a mental illness. While, therefore, psychodynamically the drug-addict belongs in a similar category as the alcoholic, legally he is punishable, often without any consideration that he is a sick

man, whose illness might have been prevented and should at least be treated. Only recently the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, in the Eighty-Fourth Congress, while it was investigating juvenile delinquency, held hearings on the matter of drug-addiction. The experts testified that little has been done in the treatment of these offenders. They had a dim view of the psychological aspects of hospitalization.

The following case deals with treatment aspects

of one drug addict, covering a period of nearly four years. Sessions were sometimes held weekly, and sometimes discontinued for six months to be resumed at irregular intervals. No attempt was made to structure the treatment sessions.

When this writer first met the patient, she was an eighteen year old girl from a middle-class family, the older of two children; her brother was four years her junior and the "good child" of the family. But Dinah always seemed to have difficulties with her family. The father was sometimes "too indulgent" and sometimes "too disciplining." The mother attempted vainly to be the liaison between her husband and her daughter. She had guilt feelings concerning where her loyalty should be attached. Her husband did not want her to encourage Dinah by being overly permissive toward her, while the patient cursed the mother as "the source of all evil."

Dinah had started her "career" in heroin while a freshman in high school. She had been introduced to the drug by her boy friend whom she later married while still in high school. In fact, this writer had met Dinah's husband before he met Dinah. Rickey, the husband, was awaiting his transfer from a county jail to a state prison. Meanwhile Dinah committed herself voluntarily to the U. S. D. H. Hospital in Lexington, Ky. After her discharge from the hospital against medical advice (the hospital confirmed that Dinah was on a "waiting list" for psychotherapy for many months, too long for Dinah to wait), she returned to the home of her parents and, eventually, to the same county jail where the writer had met her husband a year earlier. From then on, the writer's contacts with Dinah can be viewed in three steps (none of them necessarily consequent upon another, but all intertwined): direct therapeutic sessions with the patient; family-centered contacts; and indirect contacts with the patient. In the following, these steps are summarized.

During the first year of the writer's contacts with the patient, Dinah came to the office now and then; sometimes her office visits were weekly sessions, sometimes monthly. She always had "excuses" for missing her appointments: either her parents' automobile was not available or she had "missed" the bus. Either she had to babysit or she overslept. During the first few months, she never phoned when she was delayed or missed an appointment; later she phoned now and then, according to her "mood." After Dinah's first four months of sessions with the writer, during which

hardly any progress was made, except that she experienced something new: a friendly relationship with a professional person who did not reject her, who did not scold her for missing appointments, and who always "reached out" for her. Within this period her mother gave birth to a baby who, according to Dinah, was conceived as an "accident," and who gave her a new interest; for she looked after him, and the mother encouraged it. However, this improvement, together with her first successful attempt to withdraw from the drug (of course, she had become addicted again in the meantime), did not last long. In an attempt to learn about the fate of a boyfriend who had supplied her with heroin at a police station, she was re-arrested because the officers found numerous fresh needle-marks on her. Again, she was fortunate because the court reinstated her on probation due to the writer's plea (as a representative of The Jewish Committee for Personal Service, Los Angeles, California). Again, Dinah continued her pattern of irregular visits to the office. But her attitude of "What's-the-use?", her defeatism, her intense hatred for her family were difficult to overcome. All along in the therapy sessions, the writer was involved in many family-centered contacts. The mother often called him at his home at any hour, including Sundays, when something had gone "wrong" at home. Less often and less persistent were the calls from the father, who had previously stated that he was "washing his hands" of his daughter. On record are at least three arrests for "offering," which Dinah denied as being a "frame-up," although she admitted that she had "to do something" in order to secure funds for her badly needed heroin. (She had forged her father's signature on his bank account on one occasion before, and it was only with the greatest difficulty that the writer prevented the father from filing a complaint against his daughter, which could have meant an end to Dinah's probationary period.

When the writer left the agency, Dinah at first followed him into his private practice, without, however, paying a fee, even though one had been agreed on. Her contacts with the writer became more regular, perhaps because she considered him less "authoritative" in his private office than in the agency-office. There was one episode, when her husband was released from state prison and the couple was "united" again, for less than a month, when Rickey became addicted again. This time Dinah's newly gained strength manifested