1958

School of Police Administration and Public Safety, Michigan State University, The

A. F. Brandstatter

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


This Criminology 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.
woman, become straight as a ruler in a studio portrait; fortunately we had available also a snapshot, which though very poor for features in general, told us what had happened to the nose at the photographer’s bench. Most snapshots do not rouse the anthropologist to much enthusiasm; they are generally badly lighted, small in the original, and grainy when enlarged. The only cure for their deficiencies is to obtain all possible, in the hope that features not apparent in one may be discernible in another. It should be noted also that in order to avoid bias, it is advisable, even when indications are beginning to point rather certainly to one person, to present the anthropologist with photographs of more than one individual. This principle, well recognized in regard to face-to-face identification, is sometimes forgotten by the investigator dealing with the less familiar problem of skeletal identification. The anthropologist making an identification from such a line-up is relieved of the fear that he may be unduly influenced by suggestion and is able to make his judgement more comfortably and accurately. (Such a procedure will also sound a lot better if related in court at a later date.) A procedure sometimes resorted to, when the necessity arises of proving a skeleton-to-photograph identification to the skeptical, such as a jury, is to photograph the skull from an angle corresponding to an available photograph, and then enlarge and superimpose the two pictures to show the correspondence of skull and facial outlines. A classic of this method was published by Glaister and Brash in 1937. This is an attractive technique of demonstration, but not generally used in preliminary study, since a person familiar with skulls can see the presence or absence of correspondence without going through all the extra motions.

In cases where the identification is wide open with no likely candidates to be found from the missing person files, it may become necessary to circulate some notice about the characteristics of the individual for the attention of those who may have knowledge of missing persons not reported. If no leads develop, a description may be put into circulation through a news release, which will generally elicit several leads, (some of them concerning individuals who are not very missing except insofar as they have eluded a spouse or creditors). Such a description will include height, sex, age, and race (which have probably already been publicized from the preliminary report prepared shortly after the anthropologist receives the skeleton) and will continue with other available facts, including a description of facial features. Such a description is most accurately prepared by taking standard measurements of the facial skeleton and comparing them with averages available in published studies of various collections of skulls, or of averages of measurements on the living, with correction made for thickness of the soft parts. Such comparisons can be summarized as “face longer than average, comparatively wide in the forehead, narrow across the cheek bones, especially narrow in the jaw”. Add to this a comment on prominence (or lack of it) of nasal bridge and of chin, and one or two other features that are distinctive, and you have presented a picture which will not only, in the passive sense, screen out possibilities, but one which will actively stimulate the memory of persons who have pertinent information to report.

Certainty of Identification

A final and most difficult problem is to define the certainty of an identification made from skeletal remains. The relative certainty of various single factors, as age, sex, and height, has already been considered. It should be remembered also that correspondence in various different respects is cumulative in its significance. Diagnosis of sex eliminates half the human race from consideration. Determination of height, even if allowance is made for maximum possible error, places an individual as tall, medium, or short, thereby limiting possibilities to one-third of the given sex or one-sixth of the population. Age determination, again allowing a large leeway for inaccuracy, divides this group by five, leaving only one-thirtieth of the whole population as possibilities. Race, depending on whether the diagnosis is of a majority or a minority group, again divides the remainder and eliminates a further percentage. Under optimum conditions, therefore, (i.e., with no doubt of sex, race, etc.) this process is extremely selective.

In a case which goes through to the final stages: i.e., actual matching of skull and skeleton with photographs and other records of a given individual, the positiveness of identification is a matter for the anthropologist’s own conscience. In most cases a trained scientific worker will approach such a problem more cautiously and conservatively than many persons called upon to make identifications for legal purposes. The nature of
personal identifications sometimes made and accepted as proof of death are appalling. Not uncommonly bodies which have been immersed in water for long periods and nearly lost the semblance of humanity are “identified” by relatives; such identifications are really only on the basis of clothing and other circumstantial evidence. If any real doubt exists in such a case, it would be far better to reduce the body to a skeleton and have it examined by the anthropologist.

Many factors enter into the reliability of commoner types of identification: whether the living person or the body is being identified; whether the person being identified has been recently seen by the witness, and whether if time has elapsed, a change in weight has occurred also; and whether the person was well known to the witness, known casually, or only seen once. Assuming that the distinctiveness of features was average, I believe that my identification of a skeleton from good photographs would be at least as reliable as my identification of a fresh body of a person seen once recently, of one known casually at some time in the past, or of one known well in the past but who has suffered a change in weight during the intervening time. In certain respects—i.e. that the matching of skeleton with photographs is a comparison of two things which can be objectively checked and rechecked against one another, rather than involving a memory or mental image which can be affected by suggestion—the skeletal identification is perhaps preferable.

In actuality the identification of a skeleton rarely becomes a crucial point in court. Stewart, who for years has handled material referred to the F.B.I., says that he has appeared in court only three times, twice merely to state that fragmentary remains were human. In the vast majority of cases the anthropologist’s identification merely opens a lead through which confirmatory evidence of various kinds is obtained. If the evidence of the circumstances of disappearance, and the connection of some culprit with it, is sufficient to warrant bringing the case to court at all, the fact of death is generally presupposed so strongly that the identification is purely confirmatory. In many cases the lapse of time during which the body becomes a skeleton has left the trail so cold that the case is never solved. The anthropologist is left with the satisfaction of having done a good job, plus perhaps a trace of relief that he is not going to have to explain his reasoning to a skeptical jury. Yet the truest deterrent to any over-confidence on the part of the anthropologist is the thought that one of his “victims” may reappear among the living. If one states that a man has robbed a bank, and he states that he has not, it can be dismissed as a difference of opinion; but it is difficult to controvert a man who states that he is alive. I have not as yet been “haunted” in this fashion.
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Describing pioneering movements or "firsts" is always fraught with certain dangers and is frequently subject to embarrassing corrections and challenges. It is sufficient to state from the record that a Department of Police Administration was created by the State Board of Agriculture, governing body of Michigan State College at East Lansing, in 1935. The establishment of this department within the School of Science and Arts provided for the granting of a Bachelor of Science degree in Police Administration upon the successful completion of a prescribed course of study.

Since that date, several changes have occurred in the program. The original course consisted of four years on campus academic work, followed by one academic year of field service training, administered by the Michigan State Police Training Division. In subsequent years, the Department was transferred to the newly created School of Business and Public Service; the length of the Field Service Training Program was reduced, and numerous changes made in the "on campus" curriculum until the program reached its current status. It is presently known as the School of Police Administration and Public Safety, a branch of the College of Business and Public Service of Michigan State University. The present program consists of four regular academic years, which include two terms of field service training. The degree of Bachelor of Science is still granted.

The history of the development of the School of Police Administration and Public Safety is filled with accounts of many discussions and debates about the value of professional police training at the university level, the exact nature of curricula and course content, the composition of the teaching staff, requirements for student admission, employment of graduates, and numerous other details which at times assumed monumental importance to those concerned with the program, but may be of little interest to the reader. In an attempt to evaluate the present status of the program, it may be interesting to quote from a policy statement which describes the goals and objectives of the School: "The goal of the School of Police Administration and Public Safety endeavors to serve two general areas: (1) that of the student body and the pre-service educational opportunities for young people, and (2) to assist the practicing law enforcement officer. Obviously, the needs of the students must be met first, yet many direct, and indirect benefits result to those already engaged in the field of law enforcement through the satisfaction of the first obligation.

"Obligations to the student body are met by carrying out the following objectives:

1. To inculcate within the minds of young men and women a better and higher concept of citizenship.

2. To develop a comprehensive program which can efficiently prepare students for careers in law enforcement administration, highway traffic administration, industrial security, police science, correctional administration, and prevention and control of delinquency and crime, at all levels of government; or service in the broad areas of public and private safety...all of which contribute to the welfare of our fellow man.

3. To develop within the student an understanding of constitutional guarantees and due process of law, insofar as it affects the total administration of justice.

4. To foster an understanding of man's moral and legal responsibilities to his fellow man, his community, and his nation.