

BULLETIN

of the

SOCIETY FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF CRIMINOLOGY

VOL. II. No. 2

Edited by the Secretary-Treasurer
G. Douglas Gourley
1611 Selby Ave., Los Angeles 24, California

October, 1955

BRUCE SMITH

All S.A.C. members will regret the death of Bruce Smith who, during his lifetime, did so much for the advancement of Police Administration in America. A letter has been sent to his widow by S.A.C. President, Richard Simon, expressing the Society's appreciation for Bruce Smith's contributions in this field and our regrets concerning his death.

CUSTODIAL ADMINISTRATION

Attached to this bulletin is a copy of a paper by Austin MacCormick which was presented before the 1954 annual S.A.C. meeting in Berkeley, California.

NEW MEMBERS

Since the last bulletin was published the following have become members of S.A.C.:

Albert C. Germann, Assistant Professor,
Police Administration,
Michigan State University,
East Lansing, Michigan.

Dr. Julius H. Klinger, Criminologist and
Instructor in Forensic Medicine,
Golden Gate College,
San Francisco, California.

Wayne Laitinen, Executive Instructor,
Boston School of Criminology,
Boston, Massachusetts.

Melvin H. Miller, Instructor, Police School,
San Jose State College,
San Jose 14, California.

Jack E. Rytten, Lecturer on Recording
Techniques,
100 Court Square Bldg.,
Baltimore 2, Maryland.

PAID UP MEMBERS FOR 1955

Attached to this bulletin is a list of S.A.C. members whose 1955 dues have been paid, according to records of the Secretary-Treasurer. If any errors have been made, kindly contact Doug Gourley. Corrections and additions will be published in the next bulletin.

ACTIVITIES OF MEMBERS

Dr. Marcel Frym has just returned from the International Criminological Conference in Great Britain, which he attended as the official representative of S.A.C. as well as U.S.C.

John P. Kenney has recently resumed his regular duties as director of the Curriculum in Police Science and Correctional Administration at U.S.C., after a year's leave of absence. During this time he was a member of an academic team sent by the United States Foreign Operations Administration to the Institute of Administrative Affairs in Iran. Kenny attended the International Criminological Conference in Great Britain as an official representative of the University of Southern California.

Eastern Vice President, Donal E. J. MacNamara, has recently returned from Porto Rico where he was active in organizing and instructing in a Law Enforcement Training program.

Arthur Brandstatter, head of the Department of Police Administration, Michigan State University (Michigan State became a University on July 1, 1955) has been assigned to select an eight-man police group to administer police affairs in Vietnam.

C. Gordon Martin has scheduled a six day Institute of Insurance Fraud Detection to be held in Dallas, Texas, October 24 to 29, 1955. He has also been successful in establishing a permanent postgraduate Institute of Forensic Science for practicing members of the bar at Baylor University. Mr. Martin would appreciate hearing from any member of S.A.C.

S.A.C. President, Richard Simon and Secretary-Treasurer, G. Douglas Gourley have moved into their new Police Building in Los Angeles. It is, no doubt, the most modern and best equipped building in the world. All S.A.C. members are invited to tour the building whenever they find it possible to come to Los Angeles. A brochure is attached to this bulletin.

Albert C. Germann, Jr., a former member of the Los Angeles Police Department, has been appointed Assistant Professor of Police Administration at Michigan State University. Holder of the Master's Degree in Public Administration from U.S.C., Germann has passed his qualifying examinations for the Degree of Doctor in Public Administration.

News of the activities of other S.A.C. members is solicited by the Secretary-Treasurer.

1955 ANNUAL MEETING

The time for S.A.C.'s annual meeting is fast approaching. Although under the constitution the place of this meeting is to be selected by the executive committee, it is their desire that each of you express a preference. Will you kindly communicate with the Secretary-Treasurer, Doug Gourley, and answer the following questions:

1. Where should the meeting be held?
2. When should it be held?
3. What topics should be discussed?
4. Who should make the presentations?

Kindly make suggestions also for any proposed changes in the Constitution and By-Laws.

Let us hear from you.

EDUCATION FOR PENOLOGY

Paper by Austin H. MacCormick, Professor of Criminology, University of California, at meeting of the Society for the Advancement of Criminology at Berkeley, December 28, 1954, as part of the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

The best way to lay the foundation for what I have to say is to question the word 'Penology' in my assigned subject. I assume that I am to discuss education designed to prepare people for work with convicted offenders, to train people whose work begins when the police have done their job of detection and apprehension, and the prosecutor and courts theirs of conviction by trial or plea. Note that I have said 'conviction' not 'imposition of sentence.' Probation workers come into the picture before the sentence is pronounced. In a court with proper standards and requisite personnel, a sentence would never be pronounced without a pre-sentence investigation by a trained probation officer, a report to the court, usually with specific recommendations, and a decision by the judge that probation will or will not be granted when the sentence is pronounced.

An obvious exception would be a case where a mandatory death penalty is imposed, or some other offense for which the law prohibits probation is involved. There is growing realization, however, of the fact that a pre-sentence investigation and report should be made in every case, for the use of those who must deal with the offender after sentence, if for no other reason. Study of offenders of the type that are not placed on probation, such as sex murderers, also gives us valuable information on crime causation and prevention.

The pre-sentence investigation report is the first step in the process of socialized justice by which we try nowadays to deal with convicted offenders. This process is no longer properly called penology, and it is not penology, with all that word connotes, for which we are educating workers in the sector of criminology in which I specialize; correctional work.

The word penology traditionally carries the implication of a punitive philosophy of punishment imposed in the name of retributive justice. Workers in the fields of probation, institutions and parole consider retributive punishment an idea that is discredited by history as ineffective from the practical standpoint, and as unworthy of acceptance from the humanitarian standpoint. We recognize that the law and its agencies impose penalties in the form of loss or restriction of liberty, and that this constitutes punishment. When we receive the convicted offender on probation, in prison, or on parole, we accept the fact that it is our duty to see that the restrictions on his liberty imposed by the court are maintained. We consider it our chief duty, however, to see that during the time his freedom is restricted he is prepared, if possible, for return to full freedom, for law-abiding, self-supporting, self-respecting life in the free community.

In short, we realize that we have both a custodial and a correctional function to perform, not only in prisons but also when the offender is on probation or parole, in what have been called the 'prisons without walls.' We have learned how to do a good job of custody, but never lose sight of the fact that our main mission is correction, since over 90% of all prisoners are going to come out some day. As a matter of fact, the prison systems that have the best correctional programs are also the most efficient in custodial and disciplinary measures.

Today we seldom speak of penal, but rather of correctional, institutions. Prison guards in our better institutions are called correctional officers. We have to face the fact realistically that the

great majority of the prisons and adult reformatories in the United States are so staffed and operated that little correction is accomplished. Nevertheless, in the Federal Prison System, in California, and in a few other states the modern philosophy of corrections is in effective operation, and this philosophy is accepted and subscribed to even in states that lack the resources or the 'know how' to translate it into correctional plants, personnel and programs. A few years ago the American Prison Congress, first convened in 1879, changed its title to The Congress of Correction. Last October the American Prison Association changed its name to American Correctional Association and that of its publication from 'The Prison World' to 'American Journal of Correction.'

These changes not only emphasize the correctional function of our prisons but also recognize that agencies and personnel in the probation and parole fields, and those dealing with juveniles as well as adults, are working together in what we consider a continuous and coordinated process of prevention, control and treatment of delinquency and crime.

We hope the day will soon come, moreover, when it will be recognized that the correctional process is not something distinct and separate from law enforcement, but an integral part of it. Actually, law enforcement in adult cases begins with the first organized effort to prevent offenses, begins in earnest when the police go to work on an actual offense that has come to their knowledge, goes on through arrest, arraignment, indictment or information, prosecution, trial, conviction, sentence, probation or imprisonment, and parole. The police officer who prevents delinquency by patrolling his beat alertly, and one who is assigned to a police-sponsored preventive program, are engaged in law enforcement. But so is the parole officer who is supervising a juvenile or adult offender, released after a period in an institution.

There is still a tendency to think of law enforcement as meaning what takes place up to the point of conviction and correctional work as everything beyond that point, and to consider them as two separate processes that are frequently antithetical in philosophy and procedure. We shall deal more effectively with crime and criminals when we recognize them as coordinated stages in the same process, and as working to the same end: the protection of society from delinquency and crime.

Although, in the School of Criminology, we may seem to be treating law enforcement and correctional work as separate processes by requiring students to major in one or the other (or in criminalistics), their interdependency is recognized by the close correlation of courses in the major fields. We want our correctional majors to have specific as well as general knowledge of police work, and law enforcement majors to have similar knowledge of correctional work. Both groups, moreover, must take four semester courses dealing with psychological and psychiatric aspects of criminology, and two semester courses in the legal aspects. In addition to these basic courses, which total 33 units, undergraduate correctional majors must take 16 units of courses in the institutional and non-institutional treatment of the criminal and delinquent, social welfare, and such subjects as Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology and Social Institutions.

Our undergraduates, as you know, are juniors and seniors and they must have completed the University's lower division requirements, or their equivalent, to be admitted to the School of Criminology. They must also have taken, or must take after being admitted to the School, certain specific courses. These prerequisite courses are: for all criminology students, American History and American Institutions, a statistical course, Physiology 1, and Psychology 1A; for students majoring in law enforcement or correctional work, Political Science 1-2, Psychology 1-B or 3 or 33, and Sociology 1-2.

I have cited these requirements not merely to show what specific courses we consider a necessary part of training for correctional work, but also to show how broad and deep a foundation in the subjects commonly offered in a liberal arts curriculum we consider necessary. We are not willing to limit our training to a compressed course that includes only the information and techniques that can be applied immediately and directly on the job. We are certain that a person who has sound preparation for correctional work must be a well-educated person in the broadest sense, not merely a well-trained person in the narrow sense. We recognize, moreover, that much of the training in techniques and procedures can best be imparted through in-service training after one enters on duty in a specific institution or service.

The term correctional work should not be used in as general a sense as I have been using it. The three major fields are probation, institutions and parole. But in any one of these fields one may find himself working with juveniles or adults and with either sex. A probation officer may be assigned to investigation, or to supervision, or to both. He may work in a juvenile hall or other detention facility, or in a forestry camp or ranch school for probationers. A parole officer in California may work for the Youth Authority or the Adult Authority. He may be supervising young boys or girls, youths, or adults. He may have an ordinary case load to supervise, or may be assigned to the Adult Authority's SIPU, the experimental Special Intensive Parole Unit, where carefully selected officers have only 15 cases to supervise and an effort is being made to determine how the heavy rate of parole failure during the first 90 days after release can be cut down. Or the parole officer may be assigned to an institution, where he is a part of the classification program.

As an illustration of the variety of personnel engaged in probation work, for example, note the personnel roster of the Los Angeles County Probation Department in the California Probation and Parole Officers Directory published by the Youth Authority in 1952. Under the Chief Probation Officer there are three division chiefs and six probation directors. Personnel below this level include the following: 32 senior deputy probation officers in five categories of services; 286 deputy probation officers; 11 boys' counselors assigned to forestry and probation camps; 7 persons in charge of camps and schools; and 139 administrative officers, physicians, psychiatrists, psychiatric social workers, psychologists, nurses, head and senior counselors, recreation directors, counselors and attendants assigned to the Juvenile Hall and its Medical-Psychiatric Division.

It is too simple a statement to say that probation and parole are case-work, and that persons entering these fields need only to be trained as case-workers. One may well ask such questions as these: What kind of case? What kind of work?

Correctional work in institutions is even more varied than probation and parole work. The staff of an institution with a good program includes top-level administrators; custodial personnel ranging from correctional officers to captains, doctors,

dentists, psychiatrists, psychologists, therapists, nurses, medical technicians, sociologists, counselors, chaplains, teachers, vocational instructors, librarians, recreation specialists, industrial foremen, farmers, engineers, mechanics, clerical personnel ranging from file clerks to expert accountants, and so on.

Obviously, the personnel in many of these categories do not need to be graduates of a school of criminology or social work. Their professional or technical training will have been received in appropriate institutions or courses, and they can be given orientation and basic correctional training on an in-service basis. But professional training in criminology and specifically in correctional work before and after entering the service is an essential for wardens and associate wardens, custodial personnel on all levels, personnel in the classification and counseling services, and all others whose function is primarily to bring about improvements in the social comprehension, attitudes and behavior of prisoners.

The idea of a career correctional service for which one can be trained on the university level is becoming more widely accepted each year. Probation work is being more rapidly professionalized than any other branch of correctional work, but personnel standards and salary scales vary widely even within a given state, such as California. Parole lags behind probation in all but a few sections of the country. The Professional Council of the National Probation and Parole Association recommends a Bachelor's degree as the minimum educational qualification for entering the probation and parole fields, but in many politically dominated, sub-standard services throughout the country persons with less than an 8th grade education can and do get jobs every day. By contrast, our better probation services in California require a college education, at least, and sometimes a year of graduate work. This standard is also set by the Adult Authority for parole officers, unless the candidate has such extended experience that a Bachelor's degree is accepted.

Taking the country as a whole, we have a long way to go in raising institution personnel standards. Acceptance of a grade school education as sufficient for prison guards is very common, and even our best prison systems, such as the federal and California's, require only high school graduation. More and more college and university graduates, however, are entering the juvenile and adult institution field, principally in the professional and technical categories but also in the custodial and administrative branches. In states where university training in criminology is available the correctional institutions are beginning to be recognized as a field where one can find interest and satisfaction in his daily work, adequate compensation, and a chance to rise to the highest administrative levels.

The American Prison Association's Committee on Personnel Standards and Training published a manual in 1954 under the title *Suggested College Curricula as Preparation for Correctional Service*. The Committee realized that it would be impractical to suggest a four-year curriculum as the only defensible type of training. On the other hand, it was not willing to suggest a 'substitute, watered-down, cheaper type of professional education to meet current needs.'

The Committee first outlined a proposed two-year undergraduate curriculum for the position of correctional officer. It was not designed to follow two years in a liberal arts curriculum, although the Committee thought those who completed the two-year course might continue their education after entering on duty. The suggested curriculum includes certain 'understanding' courses, such as psychology

and sociology; certain 'information' courses, such as criminology and applied psychology in corrections; and certain 'tool' subjects, such as physical education and firearms courses, those on written and oral communication, and those in interviewing and counseling.

A complete outline of the suggested Two-Year Undergraduate College Curriculum to prepare for service as a correctional officer in an institution follows:

FIRST YEAR:

First Semester

Elementary Psychology
Principles of Sociology
Basic Principles of American National Government
Training in Simple and Effective Written Communication
Physical Education--Judo
Self-defense Methods

Second Semester

Personal and Social Adjustment
Sociology--Social Problems
State and Local Government and Administration
Fundamentals of Report Writing
Safety Education and First Aid

SECOND YEAR:

First Semester

Elements of Oral Communication
Elements of Criminology and Correction
Applied Psychology in Corrections
Correction Institution Organization and Program
Physical Education:
Firearms--Pistol and Rifle

Second Semester

Fundamentals of Interviewing and Counseling
Modern Administration of Criminal Justice
Applied Psychology in Corrections
Institutional Treatment Policies and Procedures
Physical Education:
Pistol and Rifle

The Committee also outlined a Proposed Four-Year Curriculum for General Correctional Workers in Institution and Non-Institutional Programs. The first two years of this curriculum would not differ from the usual liberal arts program for freshmen and sophomores. The Committee proposed that the correctional student's program in the upper division be arranged in one of several ways. The student might major in one of the established majors that are closely related to correctional work: sociology, criminology, psychology, political science, etc. In addition to such a major, the correctional student would take the following core correctional courses:

Criminology (1 year course)
Institutional Treatment of the Criminal and Delinquent (1 year course)
Probation and Parole (1 year course)
Legal Aspects of Criminology (1 year course)
Methods in Social Work (1/2 year course)
Human Relations in Corrections (1/2 year course)
Introduction to Research and Elementary Statistics (1 year course)

Alternatively, the Committee suggested, the correctional curriculum might be organized as an independent curriculum within the college or university, consisting of the core correctional courses plus others carefully selected from other departments, or it could be considered as a group major or concentration composed of the core correctional courses

plus others chosen from the fields of sociology, psychology, anthropology, government, economics, public administration.

The Committee urged the necessity of an emphasis on dynamic psychology and modern theories of personality development for the correctional student, since he will be working daily in the 'intricate and sensitive area of inter-personal relationships.'

Finally, the Committee stressed the need of gaining practical experience in supervised field work, and outlined a Suggested Internship Program that could be administered by a Department of Corrections in collaboration with colleges and universities as an integral part of student training. Such a program should serve to interest students in correctional work as a career, and thus act as a medium of recruitment. It would help screen out those who are not adapted to correctional work, and would help others decide whether or not they care to make it their life work. It would orient students to the field, and give them practical experience of general and specific value. The California Department of Corrections, Adult Authority and Youth Authority have internship programs and they have proved valuable both to the agency and to students.

There is one level of training in the correctional field which universities and correctional agencies have barely explored, although a great opportunity is found on that level. I refer to the training of senior officials: the 'top brass.' Some of them have university degrees; others, especially in the adult institution field, have limited education. All of them need refresher if not basic training, and most of them would welcome the opportunity to get it. Since they cannot ordinarily take leave to attend a regular session at a university, or even a summer session, the best solution is a University Extension Division course, taught by a qualified member of a university faculty. If distance makes this impracticable, an Extension Division correspondence course, used as the basis of discussion groups under a qualified member of the agency or institution staff, is a possible plan.

During the winter of 1952-53, I conducted such a course at San Quentin Prison under the auspices of the University of California Extension Division. The 25 enrollees included the warden and two associate wardens, the chief medical officer (a retired Admiral in the Navy Medical Corps), the chief psychiatrist, the business manager, the superintendent of industries, the supervisor of education, chaplains, sociologists, psychologists, instructors, captains and lieutenants from the custodial force. We met every Thursday evening from 7:30 to 9:30 p.m. for 12 weeks. I lectured during part of each session, but it was primarily a discussion group on correctional philosophy as well as on procedures. It was one of the most stimulating experiences in my professional career, and those enrolled in the course seemed to find it interesting and useful.

The day will come when correctional workers on all levels are given periodical assignments to duty for training, just as high-ranking Army officers are ordered to General Staff School and other Army personnel are assigned for specialized training not only to service schools but also to universities. Until that day comes, as it cannot until budgetary and legislative authorities as well as correctional administrators fully recognize the value of training, universities, colleges and state departments of education should collaborate with institutions and agencies in providing on-the-spot training opportunities of all types and on all levels. The need for training in the correctional field is great; the desire for it is also great.

A. C. MEMBERS - 1955 DUES PAID TO DATE

BERKE, Arthur L.
284 North Day St.
Orange, New Jersey

BARKER, W. R. Dr., Director, Police Administration
Los Angeles State College
Los Angeles 29, California

BENNETT, Donald J. Lieut., L.A.P.D. & Lecturer,
Police Administration
Los Angeles State College
Los Angeles, California

BRADFORD, Lowell W.
Laboratory of Criminalistics
Office of District Attorney
Court House
San Jose, California

BRANDSTATTER, Arthur,
Head Department of Police Administration
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

BRANNON, Bernard C.
Chief of Police
Kansas City, Missouri

CARR, Jesse
Division of Pathology
San Francisco City and County Hospital
22nd & Potrero
San Francisco, California

DIENSTEIN, William
Fresno State College
Fresno, California

FRYM, Marcel Dr.
Hacker Psychiatric Clinic, Beverly Hills, California,
and Lecturer, Police Administration
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

FULTON, James, Capt., L.A.P.D.
and Lecturer, Police Administration
Los Angeles State College
Los Angeles, California

GERMANN, A. C.
Department of Police Administration
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

GLAVAS, B. James Capt., L.A.P.D.
and Lecturer, Police Administration
Los Angeles State College
Los Angeles, California

GOURLEY, G. Douglas, Inspr., L.A.P.D.
and Lecturer, Police Administration
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

HANKEY, Richard, Director, Police Administration
College of the Sequoias
Visalia, California

HARRIS, John L., Examiner of Questioned Documents
and Lecturer, Police Administration
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

JAMESON, Samuel H.
750 Pacific Electric Bldg.
Los Angeles 14, California

KELLEY, Douglas
School of Criminology
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

KENNEY, John P., Coordinator,
Police Administration Program
University of Southern California
Los Angeles 7, California

KIDD, A. M.
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

KLINGER, Julius H. Dr.
1256 Page Street
San Francisco 17, California

KOOKEN, Don L.
Institute of Criminal Law Administration
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

KREML, Frank
Northwestern University
Traffic Institute
Evanston, Illinois

LAITINEN, Wayne Andrew, Executive Instructor
Boston School of Criminology
Boston, Massachusetts

LEONARD, V. A., Director, Police Administration
Washington State College
Pullman, Washington

MACCORMICK, Austin, Professor
School of Criminology
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

MACNAMARA, Donal E. J.
New York University
Washington Square, New York City

MARTIN, C. Gordon
Baylor University
Dallas, Texas

MARTIN, Don A. Capt., L.A.P.D.
and Lecturer, Police Administration
University of Southern California
Los Angeles 7, California

MCCANDLESS, David, Director
Southern Police Institute
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

MCRAE, Ralph I. Dr.
6621 Snider Plaza
Dallas, Texas

MILLER, Melvin H.
14770 Union Ave.
Los Gatos, California

PERKINS, Rollin
U.C.L.A. Law School, Westwood
Los Angeles, California

REINHARDT, James, Professor
Division of Criminology
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

REYNOLDS, Daniel G.
The Dallas Crime Commission
1033 Fidelity Union Life Bldg.
Dallas, Texas

RYTTEN, Jack Edward
100 Court Square Bldg.
Baltimore 2, Maryland

SCHMIDT, Willard, Director
Police Administration
San Jose State College
San Jose, California

SIMON, Richard, Deputy Chief of Police, L.A.P.D.
and Lecturer, Police Administration
Los Angeles State College
Los Angeles, California

Page 2

SOULE, R. L.
Southern Police Institute
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

THE STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON LIBRARY
Library Advisory Committee, No. 11
Pullman, Washington

TURNER, Ralph
Police Administration
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

VOLLMER, August
923 Euclid Ave.
Berkeley, California

WILLIAMS, John Ball, Lieut. L.A.P.D.
and Lecturer, Police Administration
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

WILSON, O.W., Director
School of Criminology
University of California
Berkeley 4, California