Interstate Compact on Juveniles—For years the states have been without adequate procedural means to deal with the problem of children who have run away from home across state lines, have absconded while on probation or parole, or have escaped from institutions to which they had been committed. Especially during the last few years the need for developing a uniform interstate compact has been stressed as the means of dealing with such children. The draft endorsed by the Council of State Governments is an important step toward this goal. It was distributed immediately and bills to adopt it have been introduced in several of the state legislatures.

With respect to runaways crossing state lines, the interstate compact provides that the parents of the runaway may apply to the juvenile court for a requisition to return the juvenile. The requisition is directed to the juvenile court in the state to which the juvenile has gone or to the compact administrator in that state. It authorizes the court or administrator to take him into custody and turn him over to an officer sent by the court in the first state, and provides that the judge in the state to which the runaway has gone may take him into custody pending the receipt of a requisition from his state of residence. A corresponding procedure is set forth for the return of escapees and absconders who cross state lines. In each case of a child returned, the state of residence is responsible for probation costs. The compact also authorizes cooperative supervision of probationers and parolees.

Copies of the compact and additional information may be obtained from the Council of State Governments, 1313 E. 60 St., Chicago, Illinois.

Planning a Law School Course on Law and Psychology—This project at the University of Pennsylvania Law School will bring psychologists into the law school to collaborate with law teachers in collecting, developing and testing teaching materials for law school courses on Law and Psychology.¹

Only a few law schools (like Ohio State) now offer experimental courses or seminars that try to bridge law and psychology, but widespread interest is shown by two activities of the Association of American Law Schools: (1) Some years ago the Association set up a round table on Law and Psychology which has a program at each annual meeting. (2) The Association appointed a Special Committee on Law and Psychology in 1952 with the mission of securing financial support for proper projects proposed by member schools. This project will be submitted to that committee.

¹ Funds for financing this project are contributed by the National Institute for Mental Health.
A barrier to getting more law schools to offer courses on Law and Psychology is the lack of adequate and suitable teaching materials. Accordingly the primary object of this project is collection, writing, organization, testing and publication of materials for a suitable coursebook and a teaching manual. The coursebook will contain statutes, courts decisions, administrative regulations and determinations and legal and psychological essays designed for the Socratic and problem teaching methods which have proved to be the strength of modern legal pedagogy. The teacher's manual will deal with techniques of teaching peculiar to the subject matter and will list alternative selections of coursebook materials suitable for various limited objectives. The manual (or a separate publication) will put forth suggestions for incorporating appropriate psychological materials into traditional law school courses such as family law, criminal law, torts, wills and evidence.

The goal of the project is to furnish interested law schools over the country with the wherewithal for a course in psychology oriented to the training of lawyers—a course which will display the legal consequences of psychological facts, and the bearing of psychology on lawyers' activities as counsellors, advocates, legislators, administrators and judges. Such courses should train lawyers to approach their dealings with people in trouble with an awareness of basic psychological concepts. Lawyers so trained are more competent to perform their own functions and more alert to needs (when they arise) for expert guidance from behavioral scientists. The project should also kindle interest in legal-psychological research. Untested psychological assumptions lie at the base of legal thinking on insanity as a defense to charges of crime, mental capacity necessary to enter valid business transactions, marriage, divorce, adoption and many other subjects. Most of these psychological assumptions were made before the birth of modern behavioral science. Preparation and testing of teaching materials will underline these assumptions and set them against available scientific data. As the project progresses specific research may be undertaken to supplement and develop some new scientific data.

The following personnel is needed: Major burdens will be carried by a small team—two psychologists and one law teacher. Their work will be supplemented by a working advisory group composed principally of behavioral scientists, augmented by one or more qualified law teachers. Graduate students in psychology will be drawn into the latter part of the project. A faculty seminar will draw local personnel together and be attended by several law teachers whose interests touch on various aspects of behavioral science.

The project should be substantially completed at the end of the third year; though publication of results may take longer.

The two psychologists would contribute a substantial part of their time to work at the law school for the first year. One should be a man of considerable stature in his profession; he would be relied upon most heavily in breaking of the new ground; after the first year he would become, largely, an active consultant. The second would be a younger man prepared to devote the major part of his time to the project for three years. The principal function of both at the outset would be explorations in methods of legal education, in identifying and analyzing psychological assumptions implicit in various areas of law, and in gaining an understanding of the working and purpose of legal subjects which have important psychological aspects. They would help teach our course in law and psychology. They would sample law courses, do limited legal research with the help of law faculty members, and participate in a faculty seminar on law and psychology (which will draw in law teachers from related fields and perhaps other behavioral scientists). Such a year would provide a needed foundation of awareness and understanding of law from which they could proceed to assemble and develop psychological materials bearing on legal subjects with a view to reorienting it and presenting it so that it will be meaningful in the context of legal education. In this work the junior psychologist would take the most active part; he would also continue to participate in
teaching the law and psychology course, in guiding research by psychology graduate students and assisting selected law students in legal researches involving psychological assumptions. The senior psychologist, who had shared in the basic orientation to the law side of the problem, would be his adviser and mentor.

Concurrently, the law teacher team member would collect legal data to be integrated in the teaching materials and would share in teaching the law and psychology course. He would continue to pursue his own education in psychology with the help of the psychologists. He would also have primary responsibility for organizing two phases of the project designed to draw in personnel participating in preparation of materials: the joint law-psychology faculty seminar, and the advisory group.

Besides the team, members of the seminar will be law teachers who are specialists in fields most directly concerned with psychology. Other behavioral scientists and graduate students in psychology will participate, perhaps on a limited basis. The seminar will search for and explore areas of the law which are appropriate for psychological investigation, help the psychologists grasp the relevant legal material within those areas, help the lawyers grasp the relevant psychological data, and discuss ways in which psychological information can be integrated into a law curriculum.

The advisory group will be appointed during the first year and will meet as required to collaborate in the production of the materials. It will consist of law teachers from other law schools and eight to ten behavioral scientists. The need for such a committee lies in the existence of sharply conflicting schools of psychological theory as well as widely divergent fields of practical psychological experience. Aid in writing, selection and editing of materials within their special competence will be sought from psychologists committed respectively to the psychoanalytic, the gestalt and the behaviorist schools, as well as from a clinical psychiatrist, a marriage counsellor, a probation social worker and a child placement specialist. The need for other specialists, such as a neurologist and an anthropologist, may appear as the project progresses and the advisory group personnel should be flexible to adjust to such needs. Of course the work of members of the advisory group will not be confined to formal meetings; jobs within the special competence of members of the group will be farmed out to them.

As preliminary drafts of teaching materials are completed, they will be mimeographed, distributed to seminar and advisory committee members, and tested by actual use in law school class rooms. In addition to their use in our course in Law and Psychology, the active interest of the Association of American Law Schools in the project may facilitate try-outs in other law schools—so that experience of other law teachers can be mobilized for help in final revisions.

As the project progresses it will bring together a vast body of judge-made or statute-created "legal psychology"—assumptions about mental illness, concepts of psychological normality underlying legal rules on intent and motive, and innumerable legal rules and evidentiary procedures whose validity depends upon tacit assumptions about the nature and functioning of human personality. It is reasonable to expect that existing literature of psychological research will throw considerable light on the soundness of many of these "guesses" about psychological phenomena. We contemplate, however, that further research will be required to verify, qualify or disprove many of these assumptions. This project will bring home to psychologists the extent and social impact of these unverified "legal-psychological" rules, with the probability that it will stimulate such research. Much of this research will be long range and therefore beyond the scope of this project, but the budget includes a limited appropriation for research fellowships for the second and third years of the project, so that graduate students in psychology can work in areas where short-range projects would provide a valuable contribution to the teaching materials.

This project is being financed by the National Institute for Mental Health.—From WARREN
Education for Correctional Work—The University of Notre Dame announces the appointment of an Advisory Committee for its Graduate Curriculum in Correctional Administration. Members of the Committee are Dr. Frank T. Flynn, Professor of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago; Mr. Thomas J. McHugh, Commissioner, New York Department of Correction; Mr. Hugh P. O'Brien, Chairman, Indiana Board of Correction; Mr. Russell G. Oswald, Director, Division of Corrections, Wisconsin Department of Public Welfare; Dr. J. P. Shalloo, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Robert E. Pollitt has been appointed Director, Curriculum in Correctional Administration at Notre Dame effective September 1, 1955. Mr. Pollitt, a graduate of Providence College and the Boston College School of Social Work, was for some years a consultant with the Wisconsin Department of Public Welfare and, since 1953, has been case work supervisor in the Wisconsin Bureau of Probation and Parole.

The University of Notre Dame first offered special training in the fields of probation, parole and prison administration for college seniors and graduate students in 1929. This was the first training of this type offered in any American university. The initial program was developed under the direction of Mr. Frederick A. Moran, formerly of the New York State Parole Commission and Rev. Raymond W. Murray, C. S. C., founder of the program and formerly Head of the Department of Sociology at Notre Dame. This program, after being merged with a program in recreational leadership (Boy Guidance) in 1938, was discontinued temporarily during World War II. The program in correctional administration was re-established in 1947.

The present Curriculum in Correctional Administration, offering graduate training for the correctional field, consists of the following courses leading to the M.A. degree:

- **Fall semester**—Criminology, Juvenile Delinquency, Social Case Work Theory, Probation and Parole, Administration of Correctional Institutions, and a special conference course featuring lectures by leaders in the field of corrections.

- **Spring Semester**—the block placement of students for fulltime field work experience in correctional agencies throughout the United States.

- **Summer Session**—students are required to attend two in-service training workshops in corrections to be offered at Notre Dame in June of each year. These workshops will be open to all persons working in the field of corrections. In addition, students are required to take two courses offered during the regular summer school session at the University. These are: Methods and Techniques in Social Case Work and Trends in the Field of Correction.

Further information about the program may be obtained by writing to: Director, Curriculum in Correctional Administration, Department of Sociology, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.—From Professor John M. Martin, Univ. of Notre Dame.

**Themis on the Rack in Indonesia**—In 1933 the editors of the Nederlands Juristenblad protested, in an article entitled "Themis on the Rack", against the injustice which had become flagrant in Germany, where thousands were being prosecuted without any legal grounds. It took a whole world-war for mankind to protect itself against these methods. There are still places, however, where for purely political purposes justice is violated and trials held which everyone feels have been staged by means of shameful coercion. We now see this happening again, unfortunately, in respect to some twenty-five citizens of The Netherlands and an unknown but large number of Indonesians who have been imprisoned in Indonesia by the Indonesian police. The government of The Netherlands has already protested repeatedly to the Indonesian government, without any success. The accused are denied legal aid during the preliminary examinations. At present an

1 Dutch Jurists-Weekly.
attempt is being made, through various machinations, to frustrate the defense efforts of Mr. H. Bouman at the public trial. The Indonesian government has expressly denied the charge that the accused have been maltreated.

Letters from prisoners show with absolute explicitness that maltreatment has already occurred.

On each page of these letters mention is made of hearings in which the victims were beaten and kicked, were threatened with being thrown into a well, and in which some of the accused were held under water in a pond until they were almost drowned. Almost without exception, the accused state that they were grievously maltreated, in particular by Inspector of Police 1st Class M. Enduh of Bandung and by a certain Manoch and Tomasoa who appear in the prosecution as “witnesses for the Crown”, for the purpose of making them confess to relations with subversive movements in Indonesia, with which they had actually had nothing to do. The abuses were so extreme that some of the accused invented confessions to put an end to the beating and kicking. The confessions they were forced to make were primarily invented by the Tomasoa in question and a certain van Hulst.

One of the prisoners writes: “After the police had first beaten me with a rottan chair in my own house in the presence of my wife and children until the chair broke, I was then handcuffed in the police station in Bogor and beaten with a wooden club for about half an hour. After this I was brought to Djakarta in the evening. There the Messrs. van Rijnst and Manoch charged me with a photo which showed Capt. Smit, Capt. Bos, Achmad Sunhawa and Teerling; I have only made these false confessions because both my arms were beaten stiff”.

Another prisoner writes: “In the hope that you have received my cry for help of last Friday, I will try to be a little calmer in this letter, although I am frightfully nervous. My stomach, or better said that small part of it which I have left after the operation, refuses all food, I only vomit and last Saturday had a black discharge. Therefore probably another hemorrhage. If you are able to Doctor help me in God’s name. I cannot survive so. Last year (’53) I also had a hemorrhage because of which I was given a medical rating of “Unsatisfactory” by Dr. Wielinga von Carolus (Djakarta) together with Dr. Lehrer. Under such a mental strain I cannot possibly stay alive.

The accusation which the police make against me goes back to 1950, and the one who accuses me is an explanation-guard named Manoch. What they hold against me is that I am in contact with groups, handed over transport-equipment to them, furnished automatic weapons, frequently went to Bogor for meetings, etc., etc.

This is rank nonsense. Lies.

I did go to Bogor in ’50, where I was at that time under the care of Dr. Ploegman. My whole life I have avoided like the plague anything resembling violence, here in Indonesia never carried a weapon, in spite of the great danger. And now this frightful accusation. I have always served this country faithfully. All my superiors can testify to that. Employer: Engineer Saks-so, % Usmansjah Djalen Sabang 13, Djak-arta (Pusat Perkebunan Negara).

On my arrival in Bandung I received terrible beatings because I would not confess. Confess what, in Heaven’s name, it was always lies. My body simply cannot withstand such torture, and if this clubbing starts again I will irrevocably go under. I live in a continuous nightmare also because I had never expected this of any civilized Indonesian. Please try to help me because you are the only one I have in Indonesia who knows me and my family”.

A third writes to his family: “I never in my life thought I would be in such difficulties, that they have forced me, tortured me to get evidence and the person who has reported my name and me is Baden and one Ulmer. They have named me—though I knew Baden for not even fifteen minutes in the year 1953 and Ulmer whom I have never in my life seen or known—and say that these two people saw me on Tangkubanprahu in the year 1951 in the months of July and August while making contact with an organization of a certain Schmidt and the organization is called the NIGO. And that stands for Netherlands Indies Guerrilla Organi-
zation and I have never heard of this organization. And that they have accused me of really knowing of this organization and that I am also part of this organization and for this organization of which I have never in my life heard and never have seen, have been beaten, tortured, and thrown in the pond and held under water till I could barely keep my breath in order to get the confession out of me, I have only said yes just to save my life because I could no longer hold out because they tortured me so and because they also accused and beat me that I saw Capt. Smith on Tangkubanprahu, where I have never in my whole life been and where they now accuse and threaten me that I must be a witness against Smith because I saw him there on Tangkubanparhu, where I have never in my whole life seen him if I then come before the examining magistrate then I must swear under oath and if I will not take that oath then they will shoot me after the session."

And many others who have been arrested write in this strain. Another prisoner also writes of the pond which the last prisoner speaks about. The government of The Netherlands informed the Indonesian government of these abuses, such as, for example, submersion in a pond. This pond was situated on the Djalan Setia Budi (the former Lembangweg in Bandung).

The Indonesian government then replied that this pond did not exist at all. Proof can nevertheless be established that after the abuses had taken place the pond was filled by order of the police.

A coherent and complete view of the charges discussed here cannot be given, just because of the fact that many suspects and witnesses were brutally forced into giving testimony which was entirely false and invented. The purpose behind all these actions is perfectly clear: to get a seemingly legal conviction with which to "demonstrate" that the "Western Bloc", and especially The Netherlands, are involved with the opposition-parties in a plot to bring about the violent downfall of the Indonesian government, or at the very least to cause unrest and disorder in Indonesia.

Even this early, it can be said with certainty that the falsity of the evidence can quite easily be demonstrated, because people who were designated as participants in the subversive movements had, at the very moment when they were supposed to have been active, long since left Indonesia.

Our protest is really directed at the manner in which this false evidence was obtained. Protests were made in The Netherlands when similar methods were used in Germany. There is even greater cause for protest of the same kind now, when many of our fellow-countrymen are being maltreated to get fictitious evidence from them.

Translation from an article in the Dutch Jurists Weekly written by: Professor J. M. van Bemmelen, L.L.D., of the University of Leiden and Professor D. Hazewinkel-Suringa, L.L. D., of the University of Amsterdam.

Juvenile Court Operations in the U. S.—Delinquency cases reported by juvenile courts in 1953 increased by 13 percent over 1952. This was the fifth consecutive year that such an increase occurred. The level reached exceeded the previous high experienced during World War II. It is estimated that in 1953 about 435,000 children or 2.3 percent of the children in the population between the ages of 10 and 17 came to the attention of juvenile courts in the country because of delinquent behavior.

These data were obtained from courts having jurisdiction in children's cases that voluntarily transmitted "complete reports" to the Children's Bureau through State agencies (such as departments of welfare, departments of probation and State juvenile courts). "Complete reports" are those that include a full count of all types of cases—delinquency, dependency or neglect and special proceedings—including cases disposed of unofficially as well as officially.

For 1953, complete reports were received from 666 courts distributed through 30 States and representing every region of the country. The jurisdictions covered by these reporting courts included 36 percent of the child population of the country. An additional 306 courts reported in 1953 on official cases only. Their reports are considered as incomplete for the
purposes of this report and are not included in the analysis of the data.

Dealing with delinquency cases is only one of the major functions performed by juvenile courts. Of the 243,497 cases handled by the 666 juvenile courts submitting full reports, 74 percent were delinquency cases; 26 percent were “other” cases, such as cases of children who lacked adequate care or support, cases of abandonment or desertion, abuse or cruel treatment, commitment of mentally defective children, and adoption proceedings. These latter generally are designated “dependency or neglect” cases or “special proceedings”.

About half (49 percent) of all children’s cases reported by the 666 courts were disposed of unofficially, that is, without the filing of a petition for formal judicial action. These unofficial cases were adjusted informally by the judge, referee, probation officer or other officer of the court after conference at the point of intake or after more intensive social study and investigation. The other half (official cases) were placed on court calendars for formal adjudication by the judge or referee, after the filing of a petition, complaint, or other legal paper used to initiate court action.

Of the delinquency cases, 53 percent were disposed of unofficially. For a discussion of the desirability of a court handling cases in this manner, see “Standards for Specialized Courts Dealing With Children”, Children’s Bureau Pub. No. 346, pages 43-45. Only 36 percent of the dependency, neglect and special proceedings cases were handled unofficially. Such cases more frequently involve a change in legal custody than do delinquency cases and this accounts for the smaller proportion of such cases handled without the filing of a petition.

The total number of all children’s cases disposed of increased by 12 percent between 1952 and 1953; delinquency cases increased by 13 percent, and “other” cases increased by 8 percent. These comparisons are based on data from 555 courts that reported on all children’s cases disposed of officially and unofficially for both 1952 and 1953.

Although delinquency rates in general are higher in large courts (those serving areas with populations of 100,000 or more) than in small courts (those serving areas with populations of less than 100,000), the increase in delinquency cases between 1952 and 1953 was slightly greater (16 percent) for small courts than for large courts (12 percent). For the small courts also, the increases were more marked for cases disposed of officially than for cases disposed of unofficially. This is in contrast to what occurred in large courts where unofficial cases increased more than did the official cases. Boys’ cases represent five-sixths of all delinquency cases disposed of each year. In 1953, there was an increase of 13 percent in these cases. For girls’ cases the increase was 10 percent.

These changes from 1952 to 1953 represent the combined increase for a group of courts. They do not show variations among individual courts. For example, although the overall increase in delinquency cases for the group of 87 large courts was 12 percent, 19 of these courts had decreases, some of them as much as 30 to 35 percent, and 68 had increases, some of them as much as 65 to 70 percent.

The general trend in delinquency cases during the period 1940 to 1953 was upward during World War II to a peak in 1945; however, the downward trend was reversed and has continued upward each year through 1953. By 1953, the level was 45 percent higher than in 1948 and exceeded the previous high noted during World War II.

The trend data are based on reports from 200 courts that have been able to supply the necessary comparable statistical data to the Children’s Bureau over a period of years. These courts are not necessarily representative of all courts in the country. It is believed, however, that the trend data for these courts do indicate the true direction but not necessarily the exact extent of change in juvenile delinquency cases disposed of by courts in the United States.

The rise in delinquency cases cannot be explained in terms of population growth alone. For example, the 45 percent increase in court cases between 1948 and 1953 compares with a rise of only 10 percent during the same period in the child population 10 to 17 years old in the country.
The number of children’s cases handled by juvenile courts is affected by several factors. The age of children and the types of cases over which courts have jurisdiction are established by State law and often are different for courts in different States and sometimes for courts within the same State. This affects the number of cases reported and, consequently, the comparability of the reports from the various courts.

The number of children’s cases reported by different courts is also greatly influenced by variations in the administrative practices of the courts, by the extent of organization for child welfare services in the different communities and the scope of services covered. In some communities the juvenile court is the only agency available to provide services to children. In others, there are well-established programs of services for children outside the court, either in the public welfare department or in private agencies. In such situations the juvenile court is only one of the many agencies dealing with children and is likely to be used only when its authority as a judicial agency is needed. Many communities have established “screening” agencies (such as a juvenile division in the police department) that adjust many cases without referring them to the juvenile courts.

For these and other reasons, juvenile court statistics are not necessarily a reliable index of the extent of delinquency. They do, however, indicate how frequently one important community resource, the juvenile court, is utilized for dealing with cases of delinquent behavior.

As has been pointed out, data are based on reports received from a limited number of courts that are able and willing to provide the necessary data. They are not necessarily representative of the country nor can their reliability be determined. To help overcome these limitations, the Children’s Bureau, beginning in 1955, is supplementing its current reporting with a plan for collecting juvenile court data from a national sample of about 500 courts. The sample (designed with technical assistance from the Bureau of the Census) is representative of the country as a whole, having been selected according to such factors as the geographical location of the areas served, their population density, economy, and racial composition. Data from the sample courts will provide national estimates with a known and greater degree of reliability.

For the present, the information to be collected from the national sample will be limited to the data currently collected from other courts, i.e., the number of cases, by type of case (delinquency, dependency or neglect, and special proceedings) and by sex, which have been handled officially or unofficially. For the future, the sample courts will provide an efficient mechanism for collecting reliable information on national or additional phases of juvenile court work, such as cost of court services, reasons for referral of children to the court, types of services rendered, disposition of cases.


Three Foundations Award Grants to the National Probation and Parole Association—
Through grants by three foundations, the National Probation and Parole Association will be able to take some real initiative in fields where initiative is urgently needed.

The support of the Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation means that the NPPA Advisory Council of Judges can go forward with the action program it has developed. This calls for a sustained leadership effort through the judiciary itself; development of manuals and practical guides to aid judges in the disposition of juvenile, domestic relations, and criminal cases; and the development of standards for these courts. The Council is working closely with a number of sections of the American Bar Association, and every effort will be made to increase public understanding of the judicial function and responsibility in the control of crime.

Through a grant from the Ford Foundation, the Association will be able to mount, in selected states, a five-year program to strengthen courts and treatment agencies dealing with juvenile delinquency, family breakup, and crime. This
calls for concerted and concentrated action by laymen, judges, lawyers, and correctional administrators and technicians:

1. To examine and evaluate existing facilities and services and from the point of first contact with the offender through disposition and treatment.

2. To determine the type and extent of treatment services and facilities needed and to establish priorities in meeting these needs.

3. To develop means for giving the public full information on the problem and on the services and facilities required to deal with it realistically.

4. To secure the active participation of individuals and public and private groups in marshalling support to provide, on a priority basis, the facilities and services required.

For several years the Association has called attention to the destructive conditions under which children are detained in many communities. It has prepared standards and guides for detention home program, staff, and building and has worked with over one hundred communities in planning improved detention services. A two-year grant from the Field Foundation now makes it possible to undertake on-the-spot studies and appraisals of the best features of the newer detention programs. Detailed descriptions of features of program, staffing, plant, and equipment which have proven effective in actual operation will be pulled together and made available to communities interested in planning new facilities or in strengthening their existing detention programs.

Every effort is being made by trustees and sponsors to strengthen and broaden the ongoing program of the Association. Growing public awareness and concern constitute both an opportunity and a responsibility to meet the national problem of delinquency and crime with intelligence and the sense of reality it requires.—Focus, January 1955.