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PRESIDENT'S LETTER

NORMAN K. MORGAN
President

Dear Fellow Members:

Our Association must become strong and maintain its strength if we are to insure positive public relationships, and influence legislation afecting both personnel and those we serve. This we won't achieve by half-hearted interest and effort in promoting its aims and purposes. We must be proud of our profession just as those in other fields are proud, and we must recognize that in union there is strength.

The handwriting is on the wall if we will but look. Public opinion is demanding more and better services as evidenced by the numerous surveys being made and by the influential committees being appointed to study correctional procedures and basic needs. If we should disagree with some of the findings we will not make them disappear by refusing to recognize that they are being publicized.

If we are to provide a measure of security for ourselves then we must justify our past work by upgrading our services and standards in the future make known the principles and philosophies by which we are guided.

The Committee on Standards is even now completing such a draft for presentation to the membership.

I permit me to urge you to participate in your Area Council Meetings and increase its effectiveness. There is no magic way to progress. Persistent and sustained effort are the only keys to strength and solidarity. The aid and public support which we admit we need should come from the recommendations made the Association whose members work in and know the field better than anyone else.

We hope for a big representation at the Pittsburgh Conference in April.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN K. MORGAN

ASSOCIATION NEWS

Various actions and other information presented below are the findings of the Executive Committee sitting in regular sessions from June, 1957, through November, 1957.

ANNUAL CONFERENCE - APRIL 15 TO 16, 1958.

The time for the annual conference has been set for April 15 to April 16, 1958. This meeting will be held jointly with the Middle Atlantic States Conference of Correction at the Penn-Sheraton Hotel in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. We suggest you all make plans well in advance for this conference and wish to advise that program listings and other information will be given in the next issue of the Quarterly.

SUGGESTED TOPICS FOR AREA COUNCIL MEETINGS.

Mr. Morgan has from time to time received requests from Area Council Chairmen as to the type of meetings Area Councils should hold. Therefore, he had prepared a list of topics which he felt would be areas for study and discussions at such meetings. The Executive Committee unanimously agreed the following topics were most appropriate:

1. Study of community resources for youth recreation.
2. Study of the Interstate Compact on Juveniles.
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IT'S YOUR ASSOCIATION

Cooperation and participation are key factors in the success of any organization. This must come from our various Committees, the Area Councils and most important, you, the individual members of the Association.
3. Study and presentation to the public of statistics on the incidence of juvenile crimes.
4. Foster care service.
5. Program of public education relative to the work of the probation and parole office.
6. Thorough study of legislation affecting correctional workers.
7. Discussion of any subject of mutual interest to people in the council area.

LEGISLATION COMMITTEE.
Dr. Kenneth E. Taylor, Chairman of this Committee, had contacted Mr. Morgan, suggesting that in view of the fact the Legislature would not be in session during his term of office, the Legislation Committee would not be able to do much more than to gather together some areas where legislative action would be helpful insofar as our Association is concerned, present it to the Executive Committee and then pass it on to the next group. He requested approval of this plan, together with any suggestions the Executive Committee might have relative to proposed legislation.

It was the consensus of the Executive Committees that all such proposed legislation should be studied carefully by the Legislation Committee and presented together with any comments or recommendations to the Executive Committee for approval.

PROGRAM COMMITTEE.
Mr. Ziegler requested the opinion of the Executive Committee as to holding joint meetings with the MASCC at the 1968 Annual Conference against separate meetings of the two organizations. It was the consensus that the meetings should be joint with the exception of the business meetings, provided the program planned is of mutual interest to all concerned.

Mr. Gernet suggested the morning sessions be general sessions, keynote by outstanding speakers. As an example, he pointed out Mr. Harold Zitto of the Office of Administration on the topic of Supervisory Training.

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE.
Mr. Waisinger, Chairman, advised his committee has recently been completed. He noted that the Pennsylvania Board of Parole is currently in the process of organizing parole advisors throughout the State and be suggested this as a possible means of publicizing our Association and securing new memberships.

PUBLICITY COMMITTEE.
It was suggested this committee consider the possibilities of a newsletter being sent to members monthly to keep them up to date on current activities of the Association.

STANDARDS COMMITTEE.
It was agreed that standards in the correctional field cover a tremendous number of areas. It was noted also it would be difficult to establish standards in the field of probation since every county probation department in the State differs. However, it was agreed that a set of standards for correctional workers should be set forth by this Association and placed in the hands of every judge who uses. It was felt that whether or not the administrators choose to follow the standards, the Association is charged with the responsibility to set the standards.

It was the Executive Committee suggestion that the Standards Committee work toward this end, keeping in mind that (1) the standards be such that the Association will support them and (2) that the initial draft not be too technical and should avoid that which might be controversial.

QUARTERLY COMMITTEE.
Mr. Henchaw, current Editor, suggested the possibility of providing extra copies of this Quarterly to be forwarded to Judges so they will be aware of the work of the Association.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE.
The following two suggestions were made relative to projects for this committee:

1. Formulation of a system for keeping records and reporting statistics on investigative Relations Office. It was noted that Mr. Candis has established a system in Lehigh County which would be of aid to the State if it undertakes this project.
2. Analysis of case histories of 50 cases selected at random from each juvenile institution within the State to determine if in 80 to 90 per cent of the cases the parents are directly at fault.

RESOLUTIONS AND BY-LAWS.
It was suggested this committee consider the following changes to the By-Laws of the Association:
1. The president's term of office shall be two years.
2. Clarification of what consists of voting membership in the Executive Committee. It was noted that Committees of Committees have been given voting power in the past. This is not specifically stated in the By-Laws. It was also pointed out that the majority of our committees, which are now actually standing committees, are not named in the By-Laws, and perhaps they should be.
3. The past president of the Association should be given voting power the year following his term of office.
4. The Secretary's annual fee should be increased.

Reason is the life of the law; nay, the common law itself is nothing else but reason . . . The law, which is perfection of reason.

Sir Edward Coke (1552-1634)
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The quality of mercy is not strain'd,
It dropeth as the gentle rain from heaven
Upon the place beneath. It is twice blest;
It blesseth him that gives and him that takes . . .

It is an attribute to God himself;
And earthly power doth then show likest God's.

William Shakespeare (1564-1616) The Merchant of Venice Act IV, Scene 1
FINANCIAL STATEMENT FOR PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION ON PROBATION, PAROLE AND CORRECTION

June 22, 1956 to May 31, 1957
A summary of the financial activities of the Association for the above mentioned period is as follows:

Balance, June 22, 1956—received from Mrs. Elizabeth E. Leader, former treasurer $ 677.92
Receipts, June 22, 1956 to May 31, 1957 1,747.00

3,424.92

Expenses, June 22, 1956
to May 31, 1957 1,245.96
Balance, May 31, 1957 $1,174.96

"Does not include $50.00 withdrawn from bank May 29, 1957 to be used for change purposes at annual conference.

This $50.00 represents cash on hand May 31, 1957.

ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP LIST AND INSIGNIA

The Secretary has advised that up-to-date mailing lists of membership and insignias of the Association are available at no expense to members upon request. If you desire either or both, mail the coupon found below.

C. Arlene Kartz
Box 86
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Please forward me an up-to-date mailing list of Association membership and/or an Association insignia.

Name

Membership List

Address

Association Insignia
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Address

CONFERENCE AND CLASSES

REPORT OF 2nd INSTITUTE FOR JUVENILE AND CORRECTIONAL PERSONNEL

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY in cooperation with Pennsylvania Committee for Correctional Staff Personnel, October 24-26, 1957—University Park, Pennsylvania.

The second institute for Juvenile and Correctional Personnel sponsored by the Pennsylvania State University in cooperation with the Pennsylvania Committee for correctional staff personnel met at University Park, Pennsylvania, on October 24 to 26, 1957. Edmund G. Burbank, Chief Probation Officer of the Quarter Sessions Court, Allegheny County, Pittsburgh, was the Institute Chairman. The conference theme was, "Fostering Staff Growth through Supervision" and was intended for those who work in small organizations as well as large and who wanted to know more of how to cope with such problems as "Getting Results through Supervision", "How to get People to Work for You" and "How the Small Office Develops Ways of Working with Persons in other Agencies."
The opening session consisted of a panel discussion on the topic "Our Social and Administrative Goals and Objectives" and the speakers were: Dr. G. I. Giardini, Dr. Kenneth Taylor, and Richard Farrow. Other sessions were devoted to the topics of "The Administrative Role," led by Dr. Thomas J. Davy of the Institute of Local Government, University of Pennsylvania; "Supervision—Human Relations" led by Harold F. Zeiko, Professor of Public Speaking, Pennsylvania State University and "Achieving Objectives through Supervision" with Edmund G. Burbank as Chairman. The Institute closed with a luncheon on October 26th with Dr. Myrl Alexander as the main speaker.

The seventy-five people who attended the Institute were unanimous in their enthusiasm for the continuation of these Institutes and are looking forward to the next one in the fall of 1958.

Mr. Elton R. Smith
Assistant Superintendent
Parole Supervision

AMERICAN PRISON CONGRESS

August 18-23, 1957, Chicago, Ill.

REPORT ON SESSIONS ATTENDED

G. I. Giardini
Superintendent
Parole Supervision
Pennsylvania Board of Parole

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

E. Preston Sharp

Dr. Sharp intimated that much of the progress in penology has been the result of crises. We have enough knowhow but have not developed the means of applying our knowledge. One of the difficulties has been the lack of a practical lobby for the promotion of treatment programs. Such a lobby is lacking because the people most concerned are ashamed of their experiences.

He reviewed some of the problems facing correction. Any program requires not only planning, but proper administration and au-
PENAL REFORM AND THE AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION

Peter P. Lejins
Professor of Sociology
University of Maryland

Dr. Lejins, with the help of a grant, studied the Proceedings of the American Prison Association, now the American Correctional Association, from its first meeting in 1870 to the present. By the proceedings disclosed that by 1870 penological thinking was getting away from the doctrine of deterrence and imprisonment for punishment, and toward a more humanitarian conviction in the direction of crime control through correctional measures. About 20 per cent of the articles in the proceedings dealt with cause and effect relations in the explanation of crime, 50 per cent dealt with correctional procedures and 7 per cent were papers on strictly humanitarian aspects of correction.

The leaders of the Association introduced the Irish Penal System, also known as the progressive system, in this country in modified form. They also were responsible for the introduction of the reformatory system. They were responsible for the creation of an international penal organization that met every five years and has continued to this day. They established a set of correctional principles that are still sound today and require little change. These principles were laid down in 1870 and were slightly revised in 1900. Dr. Lejins' study of the preamble to include new areas of correction.

The THE LEGAL BASIS FOR CORRECTION

Sol Rubin, Counsel, NPPA

Mr. Rubin contended that the law is the most important aspect of any aspect of correction: administration, personnel, and techniques. He indicated the following:

1. The law determines the sentencing structure that is to be used in the administration and therefore determines whether the offender shall be placed on probation or sent to prison; to what kind of institution he can be sentenced; how long he will remain there.

2. The law will also have an impact on the treatment. Frequently what must be done with the offender after sentence is regulated by law. If he is on probation, he may or may not be required to pay a fine. If he is sentenced to an institution the law does not only determine how soon he will be released but also may prescribe in some detail what treatment he must receive.

3. The law further determines the conditions of eligibility for parole, how his release will affect his civil status, whether there will be any time deducted from the sentence.

In preparing legislation for the field of correction, therefore, it is necessary to study existing laws against available standards, but it is also necessary to study the laws against existing practices, for frequently the practices do not conform with the laws.
Frank J. Remington  
School of Law  
University of Wisconsin

Prof. Remington did not appear. A substitute, whose name I did not get, reported on a piece of research in which he has participated. The project is an illustration of the use of research as a basis for legislation. He pointed out that research cannot evaluate, it can only give facts and consequences. It cannot point out what is good and what is bad. This survey attempted to trace the consequences of a particular statute. The question was whether the legislature or the judge should control the sentence. The survey considered three jurisdictions; one in which the minimum is set by law and the maximum by the judge. In the first two states it was discovered that there was much bargaining in attempts to have the charges reduced. Trials were rather rare; there were pre-trial conferences which usually ended in either guilty or not guilty. In the third state, where the maximum was determined by the judge, the procedure followed depended upon the judge. In some courts the facts of the crime and background of the offender were placed before the judge. In other courts the facts were considered by the probation officer who tried to determine guilt or innocence.

IMPROVING WORKING CONDITIONS

L. Wallace Hoffman, Director  
Lucas County Probation Office  
Ohio

Mr. Hoffman maintained that discrimination in recruitment and retention of competent employees are due to poor administration and poor public relations. He made the following proposals:

1. Provide adequate salaries. Set the standards where they should be and then fight until you get the salaries that should be paid.
2. Carry on a constant program of public relations through public speaking, radio and television, and press.
3. Have a continuous in-service training program.
4. Provide professional supervision for all staff.
5. Invite participation of staff in matters of policy.
6. Provide opportunity for promotion.
7. Encourage employees to prepare for themselves for advancement; one in which the maximum only is fixed by legislation; and a third in which the minimum is set by law and the maximum by the judge.

Ernest Timpani  
The Quarterly  
Indianapolis Department of Corrections  
Kenyon J. Seudder  
The Quarterly  
The Osborne Association

Mr. Timpani spoke on the Obstacles in the Path of Rehabilitation. He discussed the following:

1. Lack of adequate probation services. He emphasized the importance of the presentence investigation as the basis for classification. Classification is basic to rehabilitation and properly should begin with the courts, but this will not happen unless there is a presentence investigation and the provision for probation as one of the tools of rehabilitation.
2. Lack of classification. There is inadequate diversification of institutions. We have large institutions with mixed inmate populations which make individual treatment impossible. Even in the best institutions treatment is limited by the nature of imprisonment. True treatment lies in the field. There should be greater use of camps, not as substitutes for prisons but for preparation of parolees. They offer the best hope for treatment.
3. Lack of adequate parole service. Parole selection is affected by the local institution morale. There is inadequate preparation for parole. Supervision is the responsibility of parole; parole is treatment.
4. Lack of coordination between probation, institutions and parole.
   a. There is no coordination between probation, institutions and parole.
   b. There is no coordination between departments of the same institution.
   c. There is need for in-service training to promote understanding and cooperation between various correctional services.
   d. There should be more communication with employees. We sometimes treat inmates better than employees.
5. Lack of cooperation between officials and agencies in the community. There should be some way of coordinating community services. There should be more prison agencies to look after discharged prisoners.
6. Mr. Timpani also discussed briefly the need for coordinating correctional services. 

Mr. Seudder emphasized the importance of the help of the citizen. He must understand the problems and the problems. In the place of the candidate for release who is attempting to develop a plan, the citizens must understand the sources of inferiority feelings that may arise from physical defects, lack of education or other defects. The average prisoner is afraid to face society. He is afraid of work because he is not prepared; he does not know how to sell himself.
He referred to the California Trade Council, made up of 400 trade association representatives who work out employment plans with industry to eliminate the so-called "sickout." The other refers to the parolee. Religious groups hold that these parolees should do more. The parole officer must know his community. He must have the right attitude toward parolees, he must not be the kind that takes out of the side of his mouth, or that carries a gun to show his authority. He must be able to grant the parolee freedom to the extent that the parolee can use freedom. He must not make parolees a marriage threat, and must make proper use of his authority. The citizen can be made to understand through meetings, following the patterns of the old town meeting. We must deal with the citizen at the local level.

In the afternoon session of the workshop the following topics were discussed at some length:

1. Confidentiality of reports. The question was raised as to whether parole authorities would or should provide private agencies, such as prison search societies, with copies of case records. The consensus was that this could be done without serious risk. Parole authorities would be wise to learn if a particular agency could be relied upon to use records confidentially.

2. Handling the discharged prisoner. This refers to prisoners who are released at expiration of maximum sentence without supervision. Frequently he has no contacts and the inmate may become disoriented to today's city life and living conditions. Some are scared, some provision should be made for guidance of what they expect to find outside.

3. Deportation cases. What can be done in cases with deportation detainers and cannot be deported because the person has not only not been convicted of a crime, but lived in the country for many years. The problem is that these persons can be released in the custody of the Immigration authorities.

4. YOUTH AND CRIME

David Grimstead and Carol Donley

Both 17 years old.

Grimstead described today's youth as immature, irresponsible, unresponsive and giving nothing in return; he likes to take short cuts. Youth's prime move to action is social pressure. If there is no pressure, he will not do anything. Parents are the people of least importance in the lives of young people.

The above speaker said that there are no effective collective institutions for the guidance of youth.

Although there are welfare agencies and juvenile courts, they are not doing enough. Police are responsible for the juvenile delinquent. The juvenile delinquent is always one whose needs are not being met. The case for individualization has been overstated. The facts are that delinquency is a group phenomenon. The police are not facing the problem because they deal with individual acts committed by a person. Police must learn to deal with groups.

Miss Donley agreed with Mr. Grimstead. She stated that the juvenile delinquent is governed by instant-clan spirit, which creates mass hysteria. The police are not aware of the staggering of the individuality of youth. Youth must learn to say no, so that the situation that youth is in is absorbed by the apathy of adults. Youth must learn to take a deep interest in the problem.

Joseph Lohman

Sheriff of Cook County, Illinois

Dr. Lohman spoke on Youth and Crime in Terms of Law Enforcement. He stated that delinquency is not a general condition of society. More than half of the crimes are committed by young people. The police officer recognizes this and has not reconditioned in conformity with the needs, i.e., to work with young people. He has 30 persons on his staff that work with young people. In the past five years delinquency has increased 40 per cent. We must not overlook that there was a fall in the birth rate beginning about 1925. If the present rate continues we will have a much larger number in a few years.

He attributed the increase of delinquency to the movement of people to large urban centers and the emergence of a mass kind of community resulting from housing projects. These new communities have not as yet developed a design for the control of conduct of their members, there is no code, there are no effective collective institutions for the guidance of youth.

The adolescents have much to adjust to, both from a social and biological standpoint. The physiological changes that take place during this period of development cause considerable emotional stress in themselves. In addition to this in recent years the adolescent has had greater difficulty in finding a steady frame of reference. The adolescent of today has some difficulty with society because society is not as adolescent, which is normal. It is changing. There are changes in the general population and in the communities. But we must not confuse change with real pathology. Ninety five per cent of the children develop into satisfactory persons.

Ten per cent of school children are emotionally disturbed; 900,000 of them drop out of school each year and 50 per cent of these are unemployed. The police remains the major agency dealing with juvenile delinquency. We must recognize for him the immediate and swift justice, not its severity, is what impresses the offender. The "second chance" frequent
dy breeds contempt. Whatever is done with the juvenile offender, nothing will be accomplished unless his needs are met. The individual case of youth or the case of justice leads to return to crime rather than pulling away from it because the needs of youth are not met.

Raymond Robertson, M.D., Supt.

Institute of Juvenile Research

Chicago, Illinois

Dr. Robertson contended that the lack of success with juvenile de
inguents is to be attributed to the changes that have taken place during the last 10 to 15 years. The adolescent has much to adjust to, both from a social and biological standpoint. The psychological changes that take place during this period of development cause considerable emotional stress in themselves. In addition to this in recent years the adolescent has had greater difficulty in finding a steady frame of reference. The adolescent of today has some difficulty with society because society is not as adolescent, which is normal. It is changing. There are changes in the general population and in the communities. But we must not confuse change with real pathology. Ninety five per cent of the children develop into satisfactory persons.

Ten per cent of school children are emotionally disturbed; 900,000 of them drop out of school each year and 50 per cent of these are unemployed. The police remains the major agency dealing with juvenile delinquency. We must recognize for him the immediate and swift justice, not its severity, is what impresses the offender. The "second chance" frequently breeds contempt. Whatever is done with the juvenile offender, nothing will be accomplished unless his needs are met. The individual case of youth or the case of justice leads to return to crime rather than pulling away from it because the needs of youth are not met.
Mr. Moeller spoke on Youth and Crime and Correctional Treatment. He began with the question, "What do we want in youth? We want responsibility, willingness to work, good parents, good doctors, sound citizens. Compare this with those that appear before the courts.

An effective correctional treatment of delinquency we must have adequate staff. The staff must be capable to set goals for youth and of developing effective techniques. There must be improvement in probation services, and we must have more diagnostic centers at disposal of the courts.

The programs of the institutions must affect the individual inmates; they must not be ends in themselves but must be means to an end. It must inculcate life values. Merit systems calculated to make the inmate conform while in the institution are wrong.

Mr. Walsh spoke on Youth and Crime and the Press. He talked about the problem of publishing the names of the delinquents when youthful offenders are arrested. He noted that the local newspapers had reached an agreement of publishing names when a felony has been committed, but in the final analysis the news editor must be the judge whether to publish names. The view of the press is that secrecy is bad. The public must not be kept in the dark.

AN EXPERIMENT IN THE EVALUATION OF CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

A LaMont Smith
Executive Officer
California Board of Corrections

Mr. Smith surveyed 8 Californian institutions on the basis of 18 chapters of the Manual of Correctional Standards published by the American Corrections Association. He first prepared a check list for each of the 18 chapters, of the items that are recommended for a standard correctional institution. Some of the requirements are clearly stated, others had to be inferred from the context. The seven prisons studied agreed to make their own survey on the basis of the check lists provided by Mr. Smith. The scoring was done by more than one member of the staff. Usually the member of the staff most concerned with the material covered by the particular chapter was asked to do the scoring on that chapter.

Three symbols were used in scoring the check lists, (X) meant that the provisions or conditions referred to in the check list were present to the extent that the question could be answered affirmatively without qualifications; (—) meant that there was some variation or omission of the required item within the element; (O) meant that the essential factors were missing or limited as to be ineffective; (D) meant that a question was deleted as not applicable. A score was derived for the check list of each prison by computing the proportion of X's after deducting the number of deleted items from the total number of items. The total score would be the average of the percentages for each check list.

So far the application of these check lists has shown that self-appraisal results in immediate procedural and physical improvements. The list will require some modification for accurate application. The speaker pointed out also that other chapters in the Manual can be used to appraise other correctional services, like parole and probation, if someone will take the trouble to work out check lists.
1961: "The underlying theory of the Act is to substitute for retributive punishment methods of training and treatment designed to correct and prevent anti-social tendencies. It departs from the mere punitive idea of dealing with criminals and looks primarily to the principle of rehabilitation." I should like to add to this that our program neither assumes a "tough" approach, but one of firm, consistent understanding.

This Act offers to the judge, if he considers it appropriate, a program that can be geared to the individual's needs and at the same time provides for the protection of the community. It also provides for an intensive study of the defendant prior to sentence if the judge desires it. This has proven especially valuable in select cases in which the Probation Officer, under the press of time or because of limited facilities for diagnosis, is unable to furnish the court with needed information.

Accomplishments to date

Now what has been done under the Youth Corrections Act in the short time since January 1, 1957, when the Attorney General announced that facilities were available to receive commitments for those Judicial Districts east of the Mississippi? Part of it is revealed in what would otherwise be a very dry, dull statistics which I hope I can humanize for you. Part of it consists of a great many new and important procedures which, under the Joint effect of the Youth Division of the Board of Parole, the Bureau of Prisons, and the Probation Division of the United States Courts, have been developed to meet the new responsibilities for youth offenders.

The volume handled

As to the volume of youth offenders "in our care" as to speak, let me give a few statistics first, and then we can get on to see what they mean. As of January 1, 1957, a total of 1,102 youths had been committed during that first year and a total of 1,102 youths had been committed during the first three years since the Act has been in operation. Of the 1,105 committed under the Act, 420 had been granted parole as of January 15, 1957. At this time the Division is providing parole for an average of 40 to 60 youth offenders per month. These were committed from districts in the East and have remained in the institution an average of 12 months.

Of the 426 youths paroled only 76 had violated the conditions of parole. Their release as of January 1 of this year. Since many of them have been back into the community for only a relatively short period of time we cannot expect this unusually low rate of violation to continue. Indeed, when we examine the type of person with whom we are dealing we would normally expect a higher than average number of violations from this group. This is characteristic of the age bracket of 18-22 years of age. This is a very difficult but challenging age group and one that is responsible for most of the crimes committed in the United States. Based on our past experience it is only natural to expect that this group of parolees will prove to find themselves in difficulty with the law. But, it is this age group that must be specialized in automobile thefts. As you know, automobile thieves, as a class, do not have parole after release on parole. Of the group committed under the Youth Corrections Act in fiscal year 1955, 88 per cent of them had been convicted of violation of the Dyer Act. Another factor to be considered in comparing the Youth Offender with a youth committed under the general law is that a general law offender, usually serves a shorter parole period than a committed youth offender.

It is quite understandable that there may have been some who, in the beginning, feared that the implementation features of the Youth Corrections Act might greatly lengthen the incarceration period. However, such is not the case at least among the group thus far released. The average length of institutional stay for committed youth offenders is 15.3 months compared to 37.9 months for the average offender under the general law during the fiscal year 1955. I feel that with the continuing and regular reviews of each case by the Youth Division these will be only a very short time and those will be as a result of cautious and deliberate decision.

Parenthetically, I should like your attention to the fact that the Youth Division is the parole authority for a much larger volume of juvenile and youthful offenders. I refer here to the juvenile committed under the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act and to those committed by the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia. Then too, there is a final clause of offenders over whom the Youth Division exercises parole responsibility. These are young inmates who, while sentenced under the general law, fall within a similar age bracket as the committed youth offender and are therefore housed within some of our six youth institutions.

The Youth Correction Division thus has the responsibility for a total of 5,700 youths. As you know, we must plan for parole releases at the rate of approximately 5,500 individuals per year, and supervise, with the help of the United States Probation Officers, approximately 2,000 young offenders who are on parole.

During the fiscal year 1956 the Youth Division conducted 1,371 personal interviews with inmates of all classes in the six youth institutions. At the end of the fiscal year there were 5,344 inmates in these six youth institutions where the Youth Division is the paroling authority. Roughly, 80 per cent...
attitudes, religious interests, unused skills, and personality structure. His social history is compiled through interviews with specially trained staff members. And here I want to point out that a great contribution to the youth's social history is the presentation of an interview that has been prepared with such skill and attention to detail by your Probation Officers in cooperation with the Administrative Office, Mr. Louis Sharp and his staff. Without it all of our classification procedures and our efforts to plan a program for the youth will have been done hopelessly. Furthermore, it is in the community under the guidance of the Probation Officers that the effectiveness of the efforts that have gone into a case prior to parole is finally measured. I must say here that the cooperation and enthusiasm of the Probation Officers in connection with this program has been most encouraging.

In keeping with these statutory requirements, the Youth Division conducts an Initial Hearing with each youth offender soon after the admission study has been completed. At this time, the Division considers the youth's offense, his background, and the program which the classification committee has proposed for him. If it approves, it orders that program put into effect and undertakes the difficult task of selling the youth on his own part in that program. If it disapproves, it recommends certain changes to the Director of the Bureau of Prisons so that a meeting of minds is achieved on what is best for the youth and society. The closest kind of cooperation and coordination has been developed between our Division and that Bureau of Prisons. Its Assistant Director, the Honorable James V. Bennett, played an important part in drafting the Act and since its passage his constructive and insuring influence has been felt in the organization and day-to-day operation of the youth facilities, as well as in all high levels of policy.

The youth is not dropped from sight after the Initial Hearing. We want to know how he is getting along under the program, whether there should be any changes in it, whether the objectives that were first laid down were accomplished. This means that a series of reports must flow from the institution to the Division, that the youth must appear again before the Division to explain practically, that everything possible is done to salvage the youth within the framework of Federal youth institutions or beyond it to the offerings of local facilities if need be. More dramatically, certainly the most significant standpoint of the individual youth offender, it means that the Division must conduct a series of personal interviews with him. We call these Institutional Review Hearings, and their purpose is to bring the youth before the Division so that in a face-to-face situation we can go over his progress—or lack of it—more effectively than would be possible if we were to rely on paper reports alone, no matter how informative those reports may be.

We have not been in operation long enough to test out our program with a sufficiently large body of youth offenders on parole to make any final statement about how the parole phase is working. The reports we have received so far on the 426 youth offender parolees are encouraging but we are alert here, as elsewhere, to adjust our procedures and standards of our task as we unfold. One of the procedures we have devised to make our parole supervision more effective is a special report every six months in which the Probation Officer reviews the progress the youth is making much more exhaustively, and we feel objectively, than has been possible before.

Research on the Youth Offender

Soon after the members of the Youth Correction Division were appointed, plans were completed for a research project dealing with the youths to be committed under its provisions. This was designed to provide a check-up on ourselves as the program, and we agreed from the beginning to let the chips fall where they may. We believe we have an ongoing record of the empirical and qualitative stock taking and we have made provisions for this. It was decided first to do a descriptive analysis of the group of persons committed under the Act during its first full year of operation. In other words, we wanted to know what type of youths were being committed to us. The 320 youths received under the Act during the fiscal year 1935 were selected as the study group. At the present time we have practically completed the first phase of our study. I am happy today to share some of it with you. The second phase will be a follow-up study of this same group completed through the institution of parole, parole period and until final discharge.

First statistical reports indicate that the individuals committed under the Federal Youth Corrections Act in the Eastern United States during fiscal 1935 possessed the following characteristics:

a) They most generally are native-born males between the ages of 16 and 20, but a fairly normal intelligence.

b) They usually did not go beyond the tenth grade of school attendance, but a fairly normal intelligence.

c) They normally worked unsteadily in unskilled jobs in an urban area.

d) They had been arrested two to four times, received probation once to four times, and committed to a correctional institution one or more times prior to the present incarceration.

e) They usually were convicted for auto theft accomplished either alone or with one other person.

As a sidelight I might mention that approximately half of the youths had had experience in the Armed Forces of military service. Of that number only 17.7 per cent had received dishonorable discharges. The remaining 82.3 per cent had received other dishonorable discharges under other than honorable conditions, or none, serving in the military at the time of the civil offense.

We have seen that the typical youth offender has a long history of prior arrests and treatment. We have seen too that he might well be classified psychologically as a "socially inadequate person", that is, he is one who has failed to establish a place for himself in conventional society by virtue of mental deficiency, irreparable or unstable personality characterized by extremes of emotion and lack of moral determination. He does not exhibit steadiness in his work or in responsibility in his family relationships.

The law stipulates that the Division should stimulate the formation of local organizations composed of members who can serve as voluntary supervisory agents and sponsors. We now have in operation a plan which calls for the cooperation of groups of this kind in many parts of the nation. Our idea in doing so is the same as the idea held by the framers of the Act: crime control is a grassroots problem, and therefore people in the offender's own local community are likely to be among the most effective means of leading to terminate a criminal career.

The Youth Corrections Act provides also for an Advisory Corrections Council "to consider the problems of treatment and correction of all offenders against the United States and to make such
recommendations to the Congress, the President, the Judicial Con-
ference of the United States and other appropriate officials as may
improve the administration of criminal justice and assure the coordina-
tion and integration . . . of police, legal, prudential, and real-
istic correctional policies. The Council will provide the bench with
reasonable means for keeping the Youth Division informed on its
problems and how the Act is functioning as viewed by the judges.
We invite your attention to this new book that your recommenda-
tions may reach us through this additional source.

Conclusion

In conclusion, let me tell you about one youth offender who was
committed to us in 1954 for bank robbery. We will call him Bob. At
the time of his commitment he was 19 years of age, possessed
above average intelligence, had attended nearly three years of high
school, and had only a 3.5 grade placement, had no prior criminal
record, as a child had been a T.B. patient and came from a broken
home. His father was an alcoholic and of no help, after securing a
divorce from the father, had remarried. The stepfather had a poor
standing in his community, operated a successful business but had
rejected Bob as a member of the family. The mother, for reasons of her
own seen in the new home, failed to give him much support.

From the beginning Bob took the Youth Act and the Ashland
program seriously. He completed his high school work and took
training as a technician in the in-
stitutional hospital. In the fall of 3600 special arrangements were
made and he entered a Junior College, each day he rode in with
the institutional staff to attend classes and returned each eve-
night to the institutional program. His progress in training and edu-
cation and improved understanding of his own problems con-
vinced the Youth Correction Divi-
sion, after a little more than two years, that he was ready for a
trial in the community on parole.

However, we also realized that un-
less the family structure was changed it would be impossible for him to adjust in high school. The local Probation Officer did a
splendid job of interpreting these problems to the family and after
a short period of time Bob was released. For the first three
months he worked as a laborer and decided to secure employment in
one of the hospitals in the state in an effort to make use of his training.
However, when his record became known he was re-
peatedly turned down. Everyone was pleasantly surprised when the
stepfather, who had become increasingly interested in Bob’s welfare, suggested that he con-
tact a doctor in a nearby town re-
quiring securing employment as a medical technician. He followed
his stepfather’s suggestion and secured the job and after a few
months work in the hospital has now been offered, at their expense,
a scholarship to attend one of the
medical schools to secure further training.

It is yet too early to say for
sure how Bob will work out over
the long pull. Many of the
young in this position fail but
here are exceptions. I suggest
the problem of Bob as a little in training juveniles and youths in trouble we will be help-
ing develop young lives toward
creating an improved society rather
than attempting to destroy it as well
as themselves.

This is a most challenging pro-
gram and I am pleased for this
opportunity to meet with you to-
day and discuss it with you.

Knowledge is more than equiva-
 lent to force.
Samuel Johnson (1709-1764)

Rossodus

PROBATION AND
PAROLE MOVE AHEAD

by JOHN OTTO REINEMANN
DIRECTOR OF PROBATION
MUNICIPAL COURT
OF PHILADELPHIA

(The following is part of the opening address delivered at the
"Short Course on Probation and Parole" of Florida State Univer-
sity and the University of Flori-
da, in cooperation with the Flori-
da Probation and Parole Associa-
tion, at Gainesville, Florida, on
5-23.)

Where do we in the probation and parole field find ourselves to-
day? We have moved ahead dur-
ing the past fifty years and we are
still on the move. I like to look
at it from several points of view.

(1) The legal basis for proba-
tion and parole has by now
been established in the overwhe-
ming majority of the states of the
Union. We have juvenile proba-
tion and parole in all states and, with a few ex-
ceptions, there are state laws for adult probation and parole in almost all
jurisdictions. Thus legally, probation and parole have been accepted and are in-
cluded in the legal and administrative programs of the states.

(2) We are also moving ahead in the status of our pro-
fession. We have achieved to a certain extent an identity as probation and parole
officers, or probation

counselors, paro
e agents, etc. I think it is
important to stress this
identity as a profession-
als group, and not to be
known only as court at-
tachees, institutional work-
ers, or similar vague terms.

An important prerequi-
site for the identity, as a
profession, is, of course,
the growing acceptance of
the appointment of proba-
tion and parole officials on
the basis of merit. It means the throwing off the shackles of politics ever
ever they still remain; it means the guarantee to us, as public servants,
of tenure of office, and the sys-
tem commensurate with our responsibilities and with increments over a
number of years as an incentive to us which means a retirement sys-
tem which dispels the fears of persons engaged in our field as to what is going to happen to them at the time when old age arrives. In many states great progress has been made in these areas. Other states, and especially counties, still lag far be-
hind.

Hand in hand with the appointment on merit, goes the matter of paro-
lation for the job. This
is, indeed one of our weak-
est points, and speaking
within the halls of a uni-
versity, I might deal briefly with some ideas I have on this subject.

There should be more courses on criminology, on juvenile delinquency,
and on correctional ad-
ministration, on the un-
dergraduate level. There
should further be a cor-
rectional curriculum on the
graduate level, which would be essentially geared toward the preparation
for positions in our field.

I envision a curriculum which includes sociology, psychology, counseling
and social casework, especially in the public welfare field, as well as courses in cri-
m inology, anthropology and public administration.

Added to this, should be a course in law, particu-
larly criminal law, limited
to the special needs of our
profession. It would in- 

deed be a challenge to 

many universities to pio-

neer in the setting up of 

such a curriculum. 

While we thus contemplate future developments on 

the academic level, it be-

comes us not to forget 

the need for in-service 

training. In-service train-

ing is necessary not only 

for those of our colleagues 

on the job who were not 

able for various reasons to 

obtain academic de-

grees, because continuous 

changes in our social life, 
in our auxiliary sciences, 
and especially in our own 

field make it necessary to 

keep abreast of develop-

ments at all times, in or-

der to be able to perform 

an adequate job. 

Another important item 
in the area of our profes-

sionalization is recruit-

ment for our profession. 

Here lies before us a 
great task, namely, to ap-

proach young people and 

people and persuade them to 
great challenge of help-

ing human beings in trou-

ble and, at the same time, 

protecting society, which 

are the two facets com-

bined in our job. We can 

and should make our spe-

cial branch of service at-

tractive to young men and 

women, provided that we 

move ahead on all fronts 
toward increasing profes-

sionalization, which I 

mentioned a little while 

ago. We receive leader-

ship in this endeavor from 

our professional organiza-

tions, especially the Na-

tional Probation and Pa-

role Association, which ex-

actly fifty years ago, on 

June 17, 1907, was founded 

a group of fourteen 

probation officers, meeting 

in Plymouth Church, Min-

neapolis, at the time of 

the National Conference of 

Charities and Correc-

tions, "for the purpose of 

discussing the advisability of 

forming a national asso-

ciation of probation of-

ficers." Since that time 

the National Probation and Parole Association has achieved an important 

position in our field, with 

far-flung service pro-

grams, promotional activi-

ties, and research func-

tions. State associations, 
such as yours, fulfill on the state level the same 
basic function as the Na-

tional Probation and Pa-

role Association, at a 
national, or even interna-

tional, scale. 

(5) One of the most important 
aspects of our growing responsibilities is the com-

munity attitude both to the 
institution of probation and parole, as well 

to the men and women who are charged with 

carrying out these functions. Let us frankly ad-

mit, that while considerable 

advances have been made in the two areas 

mentioned before, namely, the 

legal, and administris-

tive basis of our ac-

tivities, and the growing 

professionalization, pro-

gress in the area of com-

munity acceptance has 

been sporadic, full of ups and 

downs — often two steps ahead and one step back, if not sometimes the 

other way around. We must realize, of course, that the recognition which 

we, as probation and parole officers, receive from the community, is strongly 
tied up with such matters as merit appraisals and 

freedom from political and 

pride in our profession. 

However, the public's 

view of probation and 

parole is greatly influenced 

by the dual role which we 

have to perform, namely, 

that of the enforcement 

officer and of social work-

er and counselor. Such a 

combination, which some-
times puts us on the two horns of a dilemma, on our individual casework, is 

very difficult to under-

stand for the outsider. 

We should, always in keep-

ing in mind that the average citi-

zen justifiably approaches 

the problem of crime in 

a strongly emotional man-

ner. His desire for revenge 

and retribution still very 

much alive. Even if these 

emotional reactions are somewhat sub-

limated, the paramount 

idea in the mind of the 

citizen — quite under-

standably so — is that of 

protection. This means 

protection of the individ-

ual, as well as protection of society; therefore, a 

taxpaying public is much 

more willing to expend 

money for honesty and for 

institutions, particular those of maxi-

mum security, than for 

probation, parole and mo-

dern institutional services. 

For the same reason, it is so 
difficult to get money for 

crime research, while the 

American public always 

has been generous in 

its donation of funds for 

research in cancer, mul-

tiple sclerosis, infantile 

dysrhythmia, and other 

crippling or fatal diseases. 

In the mind of the citizen, 

the restoring to health of 

a physically ill person or 

even now a person who is 

mentally sick, is within 

the purview of his own 

citizenship and best friends; either he, himself, or one of 

his loved ones might 

fall prey to a disease, but 

it is outside the general 

perception of the average 
citizen that either he or 

anyone near or dear to him might become a crim- 

nal. 

One should, of course, 

keep in mind that the at-

titude of the general pub-

lic toward probation and 

parole is strongly govern-

ed by the mood of the 
times. We are living 

through years in which a 

continuous increase in 

youth crime is reported 

and in which the types of 

offenses committed by 
youths have grown more 

and more serious. The 

recently published F. B. I. 

reports show that from 

1955 to 1966 arrests of 
young people under 18 

years of age increased by 

17.3 percent. It is also 

frightening to see that 

juveniles at a much younger 

age level are now involved 

in law-breaking than 

previous years. No wonder 

then that critical generaliza-

tions about the behav-

ior of young people are all 

too frequent and that the 

whole younger generation is 

being condemned for the 

misdeeds of a small 

minority. 

Together with probation and parole, and often 

fused with the latter, are 

the instruments of parole and 

commutation are attacked 

by the public and the 

press. 

It, therefore, seems that 

ours is a great job of inter-

pretation, a sustained and 

continuous task, namely, to 

make the public and, 

incidentally, also the 

members of related pro-

fessions, understand what 

the basic philosophy of 

the practical application, 

and most specifically, what the purpose and aim
of probation and parole are. Valiant efforts have been made along that line. The professional organizations on the national and state levels, have felt called upon to do their part in this interpretative job. Some radio and television programs have favorably dealt either with probation or parole, or have at least presented to the public eye the ex-convict as a human being. These, however, are only beginnings, and we should use all our possible connections with these important media of communication and entertainment for the furthering of our ideas. Naturally the picture is not too dark in all respects. Probation and parole have found a great amount of public recognition in the United States, where I had the privilege, several years ago, to serve on a United States Study Group, which presented to the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations our basic principles and practices of probation and parole. Probation and parole, prison reform, as well as crime and delinquency—rehabilitation, are indeed a growing concern in the United Nations' organization. A number of international congresses and seminars were held on these topics under United Nations auspices. Continuously, visitors from other countries come to the United States in order to learn of our experiences in probation and parole.

One of the most agonizing appraisals in judging our own work is that of measuring the success of our endeavors. This country is known for its reliance, if not too willing acceptance, of statistics. In our field, success is most difficult to gauge in cold figures, even if we measure success in so-called negative statistics, namely, recidivism or recidivous behavior of a probationer or parolee. Statistics so compiled do not reveal the sum total of work which is put into an individual case. Often, the need for institutional commitment, because of technical violation of conditions, and not necessarily denote lack of success on the part of probation and parole, but rather a realization that a stricter form of discipline is needed, at least for a certain period of time, to make probation and parole more meaningful. Indeed, a much more comprehensive integration of the various forms of penal systems, probation, intramural treatment and correction, and parole is needed.

I am optimistic enough to say that in general, statistics show an encouraging gains with improved techniques. Tens of thousands of individuals were helped to help themselves and were led into the re-establishment of good family relationships; hundreds of thousands of children were counseled and guided into adjustment within their families and within the community.

Trying to summarize my remarks, I would like to say a few words about the spiritual aspects of our job. I conceive it as one that has to build bridges between what appear to be extremes. Let me illustrate: we have to build a bridge between the inherently conservational components of the law, and the essentially liberal and progressive aspects of social work; we have to try to find a common ground for the use of authoritative measure and the technique of counseling, which are based upon individual self-help by the person who is being counseled; we have to overcome within ourselves and in our job the apparent gap between traditional and advance, and finally, we have to keep in mind that at the same time when we stress the professional content of our job, with its attendant objective criteria and detached approaches to the individual case, we should never be void of a feeling of consecration and devotion to this job of ours.

Using a term which is germane to another profession, as we do so often, namely, that of medicine, from which we have borrowed the words treatment, care, diagnosis and prognosis, let us think of ourselves as being engaged in a work of healing. To heal is a word that it not too often used, but it is a magnificently evocative one which implies that the physician who administers curative, including surgical, treatment, knows that if nature itself performs a healing process. Therefore, let us dedicate ourselves to healing the ill of the community, such as poverty, overcrowding in cities, slum conditions in urban, as well as rural areas, religious or racial discrimination, all of which lead to delinquency and crime, and to healing the illness of the individual who has engaged in delinquent or criminal behavior, and in those efforts, let us combine decisiveness and determination with comparison and understanding.

Mr. Shaw stated as follows: Next month, I shall reach the end of 25 years—a quarter of a century— as a newspaper and radio-television reporter and editor, in several states of the United States, and in numerous countries. At the end of those 25 years, sitting at an editors desk, I still consider myself first and foremost a reporter. As a reporter, I have to get my facts straight before I can write a story. As an editor and commentator, I must have the facts before I can draw any conclusions.

In preparation for this appearance, I have been trying to learn the facts about probation, parole and detention. I have been startled by the vast difference between the facts and what some people would like us to think are the facts. I do not accuse anybody of lying; but I do believe there are those in Pennsylvania who are giving me the impression, intentionally or otherwise, that the pardon and parole situation is much different from what it actually is.
I do not propose to argue that the situation in Pennsylvania is permanent. My studies have led me to believe that much needs to be done, that much is wrong. And I must make it clear that I speak here tonight as a reporter, not as an expert on the problems with which you deal. You are the experts. Probably nothing I shall tell you will be news to you. Some of my conclusions may be provocative, may meet with disagreement, although I believe they will be valid conclusions.

In Philadelphia recently, because of extraordinary newspaper attention to the misdeeds of parolees, the legislative investigation of the State Pardon Board because of clemency for one convicted murderer, not a few people have decided that parole and probation are practices that should be completely abolished. Judging from conversations overheard in public places and from letters to newspaper editors, I find that a lot of people favor the severest punishment for all offenders, without regard to circumstances and the character of the offense, that minimum sentences should have the effect of determining that the maximum should be the minimum. I don't believe such people are in the minority. We don't know who they are, but their number is disturbingly large.

The whole system of probation, parole and pardon is threatened—to what degree I don't know—by the state's failure to realize, and by the failure of the information media to inform them that the vast majority of parolees in Pennsylvania, from 80 to 85 per cent, never get into trouble since they are released from confinement. The small minority that do get into trouble make the headlines.

I keep thinking of a somewhat comparable situation right after World War II. If an ex-soldier, sailor, flier or marine got into trouble, the headline would read VERT ROBS STORE OR VERT IN VOLVED IN SHOOTING SCRAP OR VERT SOMEONE ELSE DIED.

Now, just about every young person who has not had a father of those who were—veterans, and usually when a young fellow got into trouble, you'd find he was a orphan. The impression created by such headlines was that of course the servicemen had turned into a bunch of gangsters, hoodlums and thugs. But the vast majority of veterans had gone back to peaceful, law-abiding lives, suffering in their lawfulness from guilt by association, while the reputation of our wartime citizen military service was besmirched by the exaggerated attention to the actions of a few.

It used to be that when a Negro got into trouble, the fact that he was a Negro would be mentioned prominently in the newspaper story—usually in the headline, always in the lead. When a Negro did something worthwhile, that story didn't make a lot of pages, or it was carried in a separate column, often called a FOR O-

AMERICAN NEWS.

Now, most newspapers don't identify colored wrong-doers as Negroes—and we in radio and television don't label—yet the offender is a fugitive and color is an important part of any publication to guide those who would aid in the search. The wrong-doer is plain John Smith, not John Smith, Negro. We felt there is no need to add to the many problems of our Negro society by singling out the wrong-doers among them.

Now I admit there is a certain special news value in repeated fractions of the law, the usual is more news in the arrest of a second or third offender than of a first offender. None of us here can logically ask that the word "parole" be treated as we would have the words "vort" and "Negro" treated. We believe we should all like to find some means of convincing the public that these recidivists are in the minority.

The trouble is that the general public can't hear—can't hear—about the parolees, the other ex-convicts who have made good. I know of a man, for example, who occupies an important position in one of our state's public school systems, Married and the father of several children, he is as sound, as law-abiding and as honest a citizen—what you would call a pillar of society. He served time in Eastern State Penitentiary. But he's not going to come forward to say—and if he can help it, he's not going to let anybody else say—that he's an ex-convict who made good. The life he has built since his escape from prison would crash into ruins.

Yet this man is not unusual, except in the height to which he has risen. Thousands of others with parole backgrounds are leading law-abiding lives, perhaps obeying the law more assiduously than some of us who have not shared their experiences. As an aside, I might refer to an article in a recent issue of Eastern Penitentiary's in m a e publication THE EASTER ECHO, from a recent inmate John L. Williams, "If society throws the 'Book' at a person and completely forgets about him during his infirmity, then how can society expect this forgotten prisoner to show respect toward them and abide by their rules and regulations when he is eventually released?"

Wouldn't it automatically follow that abolition of the parole system, the imprisonment of individuals which have to be served in their entirety without remission, endanger society more than even the worst of our parole systems? One doesn't want a system in which prisoners may earn their right to decommit an offense that would draw no attention if the offense were committed by a person without a record.

But that is not the point at the moment. The point is that the parole system may have a completely wrong idea of the results of probation, parole and pardon and, in their mistaken idea, support efforts to punish the deserving along with the undeserving.

Society demands protection, and society deserves protection. But protection takes various forms. Does society consider itself less safe today than it did many years ago, when as many as 350 infractions of the law, especially in foreign countries, were committed each year, when seven years old were hanged on the Tyburn gallows? Society must also protect itself from itself, from its own inhumanity. We are more humane today, and we are safer.

Let us not forget this: Ninety-five percent of the inmates of the correctional institutions ultimately called back are released—even if they serve maximum sentences. But again from THE EASTER ECHO, from a recent inmate John L. Williams, "If society throws the 'Book' at a person and completely forgets about him during his infirmity, then how can society expect this forgotten prisoner to show respect toward them and abide by their rules and regulations when he is eventually released?"

What is the purpose of imprisonment? Do we look upon it as a deterrent to crime or as an instrument of exacting vengeance? Do we hope that prisoners will be able to rehabilitate those who are capable of being rehabilitated, or do we look upon prisons as places where the eye is paid for the eye, the tooth for the tooth?
The doctors and nurses in that prison hospital in England couldn't work their way into the minds of those men — the doctors and nurses of the parole system in France could. The medicine was the same; the difference was the degree of empathy. And so I submit that reforms in parole service must be recommended by people with empathy, by experts in the field of human behavior — not lawyers, not politicians, not elected or appointed men only whose recommendation is that they are pillars of society in their communities.

Then there is the problem of manpowepr — especially in the juvenile field. You may have read a few weeks ago that Dr. John Otto Reinemann, Probation Director for the Philadelphia Municipal Court, warned that the case load in the juvenile division is threatening the collapse of the probation system. Dr. Reinemann said there is an urgent need to relieve the pressure in the mounting number of probation cases in the 15 to 18 year olds category. There are 60 probation officers assigned to the juvenile division, and each one of them carries 100 cases or more over the average. That's too many — Dr. Reinemann said it just isn't human. And it's a real close touch conflict between the probation officer and the offender.

And then, probation often is not earned — it is only alternative to nothing. There are many instances in which juveniles have not committed offenses serious enough for them to be sent to the juvenile wing of the House of Correction. The judge has no other alternative — he must sentence an offender on probation; and Dr. Reinemann says the judge must understand the good and constructive idea of parole as an instrument. It derives its power from the pose of probation. It takes away the initiative to see the probation. It tends to increase the case load of the already overcrowded probation officers.
Just last week, one of Philadelphia's great judges, Herbert E. Mil len, asked to be transferred from the Juvenile Division of the Municipal Court to another division. Writing about his decision in last week's Bulletin, Judge Mil len said: "The past four months have been the most frustrated and disappointing period in my entire career on the bench. I am frustr ated because day in and day out, a steady stream of juvenile of fenders has been brought before me — many of them second, third and even fourth offenders. The of fenders involved generally are not of sufficient gravity to war rant more than three months under 16 being confined in an institution for a year and upward. But this is our only alternative to turning them out on parole. What can the community do about it? Nothing. Our hands are tied."

Judge Mil len wrote the story of one boy who was before him first at the age of eight as a runaway, at the age of ten as a truant from school, at the age of thirteen for breaking a window pane, at the age of fifteen for another type of breaking. On June 9 of this year he was committed to an institution and at the age of sixteen about a year — and finally at the age of seventeen for breaking into and stealing from automobiles over a pe riod of six months. Then Judge Mil len said: "I am sure that if we had some place in Philadelphia to send a boy like this when he first started to break the laws of society, he could not have become such a person."

But I wonder if, in considering the problems of probation and parole, however necessary it is to consider those problems, we are not putting the cart before the horse. What I mean is this: Should not society, angered by the offenses committed by probationers and parolees, direct their an ger instead to the causes of the first offenses committed by these men and women? The nature of probation and parole, like the offenses of these people themselves, are effects, not causes — consequences of an assortment of conditions which cry out for remedy.

Last December, following the killing of a Philadelphia businessman who ran into the line of fire of a garage between two buildings, the police searched for a week of afternoons and nights in that part of Philadelphia where most of the major and savage crime occurs, an area which Police Commissioner Thomas J. Gibbons called the "Jungle." I did a series of broadcasts about my findings and wrote a long article which the Bulletin splashed all over the front and second pages of the news and opinion section. After my experience in the "Jungle," my surprise was not from the amount of crime in that area but from the fact that there wasn't more.

Except for a few areas, sort of clearings in the Jungle, where people maintain clean, law-abiding neighborhoods, small neighborh oods, to be sure, the people of the Jungle live as they please. As many as four children sleep in one bed while their parents oc cupy another bed in the same room and continue to reproduce the species. The houses, as usual, are scenes of indecent public. Mar riage is not a very popular insti tution. Children wake up many a morning to find a new daddy across the room. Men borrow children of their friends and take their children and their own to relief offices to apply for generous assistance. The only brightness in the area, aside from the few small neighborhoods I mentioned comes from the many lights of the tap rooms, as many as a dozen in a block and a half of some of the main streets.

The Jungle is an area of immorality and amorality. The Jungle is an area of crime. The population of the Jungle in 1920, of all of Pennsylvania's cities, only Philadelphia and Pittsburgh have more people than the Jungle. The 394,000 is the population of five Lan caster cities, five Bethlehems, four Wilkes-Barre's or three Alle n towns. You could take the popula tion of the city of York and move it into only one tiny way of the 394,000 — which has an area of less than ten tenths of a square mile, and you'd still have less than a thousand more of the 67 counties of Pennsyl vania, only five have more people than the Jungle; of all the cities of the United States, only 84 contain the population of the Jung le's population. And in that area where more crimes are committed than in any other part of the Jung le, a stretch covering a little more than two square miles, there are 245,000 people — 58,000 per square mile.

The tenement buildings are overcrowded; many of them are unsafe structurally and are firetraps. The Jungle is a place well named.

How can one expect any obedience to the law in an area like that? As I said, the wonder is not that there is no obedience there; the wonder is that there is not more.

Of course, we have to worry about probation and parole problems, and, of course, we have to worry about how to tackle these problems.

But the chief need, as I see it, is for a concerted attack on the causes of crime — the conditions which breed contempt for the law and the problems which create your problems. Sensible statesmen in other countries learned many years ago that the best way to deal with the men of Communism was not merely to punish Communists such as but to elimin ate the conditions which breed Communists, to improve conditions so that it is impossible for the Communists to have any good people. The late President Magaysay of the Philippines, whose recent death was an inexcusable loss to the free world, was hailed as a tough fighter against the Communists. Mr. Magaysay conducted military operations against the Communist Hukbalahap, but he didn't crush the Communist movement in the Philippines by military operations. He went out into the country and learned for himself why the Communists had so much support. He listened to the many evils which the country people felt only the Communists opposed. He instituted land reform, he developed the national education programs, he instituted a fair deal for all. The Communists gave up.

Magaysay attacked the causes of Communism; and, as I see it, we'll continue to attack the causes of crime problems until the ma
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It seems clear to me that God designed us to live in society—just as He has given the bees the honey; and as our social system could not subsist without the sense of justice and injustice, He has given us the power to acquire that sense.

Francois M. A. Voltaire
(1694-1778)
Letter to Frederick the Great

The extenuating circumstance which wins probation for an offender in the U. S. District Court in Philadelphia is not always a fact, a bit of evidence, or a word of testimony produced at the trial. More often than not, a man is saved from a prison term by something the Judge learns from a report made by the Probation Department. It usually is submitted to him between the time the defendant is convicted or pleads guilty and the date of sentence.

Attesting to the success of probation is the fact that out of 904 cases supervised by the U. S. Probation Office only 30 were cited for violation of probation. Un-

doubtedly, this screening process is due to the wide use made by the Board of Judges of the presence reports. These reports are no hit-or-miss affairs but represent a painstaking investigation that virtually probes into the life of the defendant from cradle to the day he arrives in Court and much more. The information gathered in these reports acquaints the sentencing Judge with background material on the offender, the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime, the general economic status of the accused and his family, and the general attitude of the offender with respect to his predicament. With this information at his disposal, the Judge can be and is completely selective in deciding who is worthy of probation. For a 15-year period dating back from January 1, 1957, the Court has never been an instance of a probation violator coming before the Court for any act of violence or a heinous crime.

The Eastern District of Pennsylvania embraces Philadelphia, Montgomery, Bucks, Delaware, Chester, Lancaster, Berks, Schuylkill, Lehigh and Northampton Counties. The U. S. Probation Staff is composed of a Chief Probation Officer and eight Field Officers.

A recent survey conducted by the Sociology Department of the University of Pennsylvania reflected that only about twenty percent of those placed on probation ran afoul of the law a second time.

It is significant to note that it costs $3.50 a day to maintain an individual in prison as against only $2.40 cents to supervise a person on probation. The community benefits when a person is placed on probation. Such individ-
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The quarterly, therefore, is a cruel and outrageous waste of time. Let us look for the causes of the failure, not the guilt of those who fail. If we have to get together in the search we can perhaps find a method that requires that we must try to understand the delinquent as an individual and formulate for ourselves the reasons that make it possible for us to realize that it is normal for him to make us angry. We demand us personally, and also our property; therefore, we feel the need to get him before he gets us. Actually, the delinquent is so much alike as to cause us to believe it is ourselves to be understanding of his situation, and take long-range steps for prevention.

The factors which make our society so productive of antisocial people affects all of us, and it is amazing that so many escape doing time behind bars. The delinquents deal with have ventilated their hate, hostility and destructiveness against society, while the rest of our legal breakaways who are not apprehended to find their own a way to release the energy of self-destructive channels. We find individuals who have difficulty in controlling these hostility anxious to take it out on the delinquent simple because they cannot tolerate the thought of his getting away with it. It is imperative that we remember such attitudes arise out of the same needs and not out of the needs of the delinquent. Having a need to punish him, pass laws or publicly his trouble is absolutely unrighteous. We see that it will cure him. Also, and perhaps the most important of all, until we are willing to take the time to bring in consciousness those unconscious processes which motivate much of our youngsters' antisocial behavior, we will continue to have failures. Unfortunately, courts are becoming increasingly aware that the delinquent frequently lacks a continuous realization of the relation between his unacceptable behavior and its deeper causation.

Any consideration of the obligations involved between a court, its staff and the community must start with the problem of feeling that the court is the community's instrument, and that it reflects its successes and its failures are constant in the position of having to administer the social work of justice to protect society in a way that is compatible with the rights and dignity of the individual and with the ultimate goal in mind — the constructional treatment of the offender. It calls for a unique and most important kind of legal-social leadership, for the judge and staff of a children's court deals with the most precious raw materials of citizenship — the children of our community. Somewhere along the line the forces having a part in the child's development had a breakdown, for they have not succeeded in their job of developing happy, effective, and law-abiding youth. The court is then required to step in and remedy the situation, to control character and personality and to do so with friendliness and understanding, but, nevertheless, with the awesome authority of the law. When unable to achieve this, there can be no efficient and orderly downward progression from the industrial school to the matron to the prison, and while quietly carried on in an unspectacular manner, its submerged existence should never be out of the public's mind. Regardless of how good the court may be, it needs the help of the community, state and national resources, and in its widest sense, are its backbone and its lifeline.

Example is always more efficacious than precept.

Samuel Johnson (1709-1784)
REPORT ON PAROLE VIOLATORS

The following two reports dealing with parole violators are based on the records of nearly 5000 parole violators, under the supervision of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole, who were returned to prison. The first report covers a five-year period, beginning June 1, 1951, and ending May 31, 1956, and deals with 1649 violators of the rules of parole.

The second report, entitled Statistical Report on Convicted Parole Violators, returned to prison covers a ten-year period, beginning June 1, 1946, and ending May 31, 1956, and deals with 3424 convicted parole violators returned to prison.

It should be kept in mind that these two reports deal with parole violators only, and no attempt has been made to compare the number returned to prison with the total number on parole at any given time. With these thoughts in mind, the following reports are presented.

Pennsylvania Board of Parole
Why are Parolees Returned to Prison as Parole Violators?

(Prepared by
William L. Jacks, Statistician)
Pennsylvania Board of Parole

On May 5, 1953 a report was prepared entitled “Indecis of Return,” which was based chiefly on the rules of parole. For example, Drinking in violation of Rule 5 of the Parole Rules and Association with Criminals, Parolees, or Persons of Questionable Reputation is a violation of Rule 6. In each of these cases the reasons for return are given on an objective basis and are not stated because of the subjective judgment of the agent. A good example of the elimination of the subjective judgment of the agent appears under the rules of parole. When the reasons were first tabulated for 1622, this item appeared at least 20 times in as many cases. In the following years, Association continually decreased until it disappeared entirely from the returns for 1956. With the elimination of the subjective element, the results are based in this report are actual reasons for return to prison and therefore should serve as valuable indices of return.

Throughout the five years of this period, Drinking was listed as the reason for return. In each of the five years, Drinking in violation of Rule 5 was first and ranged from 49% of the cases for 1951 to 1% in 1955. A word of caution must be inserted here in order to state that this statement is not misconstrued. Although this reason appeared 800 times in 1649 cases, it is not to be thought that it was the sole reason for return. In very few cases was it used as the only reason for return, and in these cases it was stated as a special condition of parole. The fact that the parolee drank contributed to other reasons for return, such as Loss of Job, Association with Persons of a Questionable Reputation, or being arrested for Drunkenness or on a minor offense.

The second reason for return was Failing to Maintain Steady Employment, in violation of the conditions of Rule 3. In 350, or one-third of the total cases, this reason was cited for return. It shows a second every year except 1954, when it dropped to third position.

The third reason was Absconding from Parole Supervision. This occurred in 141, or 34%, of the total cases, and ranked third every year with the exception of 1954, when it dropped to fifth position.

The fourth reason was Being Arrested for Minor Offenses, such as Drunkenness, A & E, Disorderly Conduct, etc., in violation of Rule 6. This reason occurred in 293, or 45.6% of the total cases and ranked fourth every year with the exception of 1956, when it dropped to fifth position.

The fifth reason for return was a Violation of Rule 7. This occurred in 310, or 22.6% of the total cases.

After the fifth reason for return, the percentage dropped to less than 20%, and the principal reasons for return are all grouped in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Return</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing to Maintain Steady Employment</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absconding</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association with Criminals, etc.</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed, Evaded</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Supervision</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested for Minor Offenses</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association with Criminals, Parolees, etc.</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed, Evaded</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent, Falsified Information</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation with Paravent</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Home without Permission</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owning or Operating Motor Vehicle without Permit</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving State without Permission</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Support of Family and Dependents</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving Community without Permission</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Threats of Bodily Harm</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative or Indifferent Attitude Toward Parole</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping Late Hours</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying Concealed Deadly Weapons or Violation Uniform Firearms Act</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern Displayed Formerly</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to Report to District Office or Agent</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As explained in the original report, this study was encouraged by two different articles appearing in the 1951 Year Book of the American Prison Association pointing out the need for information on recidivism, in order to answer the question, "Why do some men fail on parole and others succeed?" It is true that the information contained in this report is negative in that it deals with reasons for failure on parole. However, these reasons can serve as valuable indices to point out to the parole agents that the parolee is failing on parole and corrective measures should be taken.

During the period of years covered in this report, 1649 were returned to prison as violators of the rules of parole. In each of these cases the reasons for return were carefully noted according to the statements appearing on the Parole Violation Summary. In some cases only one reason was given, such as Absconding from Supervision, while in other cases as high as eight reasons were given for return. In the total of 3149 cases studied, 5620 reasons were given for return, or an average of 1.6 reasons per case. Not all of these reasons were the same, but each was selected according to the conditions of the case.

It is important to note that the reasons for return were not selected at random, but were based on the actual reasons given on the Rules of Parole. For example, Drinking in violation of Rule 5 of the Parole Rules and Association with Criminals, Parolees, or Persons of Questionable Reputation is a violation of Rule 6. In each of these cases the reasons for return are given on an objective basis and are not stated because of the subjective judgment of the parole agent. A good example of the elimination of the subjective judgment of the agent appears under the rules of parole. When the reasons were first tabulated for 1649, this item appeared at least 20 times in as many cases. In the following years, Association continually decreased until it disappeared entirely from the returns for 1956. With the elimination of the subjective element, the results are based in this report are actual reasons for return to prison and therefore should serve as valuable indices of return.
A total of 18 Drug and Narcotic cases originally committed to prison for this crime were returned as parole violators, but 111 of the total convicted violators who returned were guilty of this crime. This is an increase of 335.5%, and compared with the original crime committed on parole, what is the cause for this increase?

The facts contained in this report are based on a continuous study of convicted parole violators returned to prison over a 10-year period, beginning June 1, 1946 and ending May 31, 1956. During this period of 10 years, 4,934 parolees were returned to prison because of new convictions on parole. The new conviction was noted in each case, and this crime was compared with the original crime by means of a chart showing the various crimes arranged along the horizontal and vertical axis of the graph. A copy of the chart is attached to this report.

The first question to be answered at this time deals with the rate of recidivism for the convicted parole violators returned to prison. In other words, of a given group of parolees returned to prison, how many actually repeated the crime of Burglary? In a similar way, how many of each type of crime were actually repeated the crime for which they were originally committed to prison?

In summarizing the results, it was discovered that the highest rate of recidivism was for parolees originally sentenced for the crime of Sodomy. Of 65 parolees originally sentenced for this crime and returned to prison, 49, or 75.4%, actually repeated the crime of Sodomy.

The next highest rate of recidivism was for Drug and Narcotic cases. Out of 13 original cases sentenced for this crime and returned to prison, 11, or 61.1%, actually repeated this crime.

The third highest on the list was Burglary. Out of 155 sentenced for this crime, 71, or 45.8%, repeated.
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Burglary ranked fourth, with 681 out of 1,650, or 47.5%, repeating this crime.

At the extreme end of the list will be found Homicide and Receiving Stolen Goods. Out of 64 originally sentenced to prison for criminal Homicide and returned to prison, 5, or 7.8%, repeated this crime. One of this group, Walter Maloney, Parole No. 1062-

Table 1
CRIMES REPEATED BY PAROLEES
ARRANGED IN RANK ORDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Number Repeated</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sodomy</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcency</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Theft</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny of Auto</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; B w/ aggravated A &amp; B</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCKD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offenses</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1296</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next comparison to be made is the relationship between the original crimes and the crime committed on parole. In other words, how does the total of each group of original crimes compare with the total of each group of crimes committed on parole?

In a similar way, only 9 parolees were returned who were originally committed for Receiving Stolen Goods, but of the grand total returned, 61, or 467.6%, were convicted of the same crime. Here again it appears that the crime of arson has a more serious nature was dropped in favor of a lesser crime.
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TABLE 2
CRIMES COMPARED WITH ORIGINAL CRIME AND REPEATED CRIME FOR CONVICTED VIOLATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>New Increase</th>
<th>Old Increase</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCWD, VUFA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>+88</td>
<td>678.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>+96</td>
<td>533.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Stolen Goods</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>+42</td>
<td>466.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault &amp; Battery</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>+88</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny of Auto</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>+111</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; B w/i to Ravish</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Pretense</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodomy</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>+35</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>-258</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>-340</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Crimes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>+141</td>
<td>335.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 3424

In Table 1 it is shown that a certain percentage of parolees returned to prison actually committed the same type of crime for which they were originally sentenced. In other words, a definite pattern is created as far as the same type of crime is concerned. This can be further expanded into two main groups — that is, crimes against property and crimes against the person. Of the 689 convicted of Robbery and released on parole, 194, or 28.2%, actually repeated the crime of Robbery. The question naturally arises, "What type of crime did the others commit to warrant return to prison as parole violators?"

An examination of the chart shows that in addition to the Robbery convicted persons, actually repeating the same crime, 19 committed Criminal Homicide; 51 Assault and Battery; 176 Burglary; 68 Larceny; 59 Larceny of Auto; 12 Receiving Stolen Goods; 3 False Pretense; 16 Forgery; 12 Rape; 11 Assault and Battery with Intent to Ravish; 6 Sodomy; 25 Drugs or Narcotics; 25 Carry-

TABLE 3
CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY REPEATED 1946-1956

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Number Repeated</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>121 out of 352</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny of Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>225 out of 680</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>107 out of 339</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Pretense</td>
<td>24 out of 108</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCWD, VUFA</td>
<td>11 out of 92</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>349 out of 423</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Stolen Goods</td>
<td>7 out of 9</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>535 out of 848</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table, Table 4, shows the crimes committed against parolees reentered by parole violators.

TABLE 4
CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS REPEATED 1946-1956

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Number Repeated</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sodomy</td>
<td>48 out of 65</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>15 out of 18</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; B w/i to Ravish</td>
<td>35 out 37</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Homicide</td>
<td>24 out of 64</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault &amp; Battery</td>
<td>55 out of 149</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>24 out of 70</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORGANIZATION OF PAROLE ADVISERS

During the latter part of 1955, the Pennsylvania Board of Parole instituted the idea of regional meetings of Parole Advisers. Parole Advisers complement the work of the Board in giving guidance to parolees and serve as a liaison between the Parole Officer and the parolee. Another important function of the Parole Adviser is to make known and to promote the advancement of the parole program among the rest of the public.

The initial meeting of a Parole Adviser group was held May 23, 1966, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The enthusiasm exhibited by this group led to the formation of a steering committee and five area councils, as well as provisions for additional meetings, so that today an active organization exists. There has also been a meeting of Parole Advisers held on October 29, 1957, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and on October 30, 1957, in Erie, Pennsylvania, and others are contemplated. In addition to Parole Advisers, representatives of social agencies, police departments, employers and others have attended. The results have been of benefit to all as these meetings provide the means for exchange of information about the experiences in working with men and women on parole.

The following statement entitled "Two Friends" was written by Mr. William J. Roberts, Vice-President of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, very ably states the role of the Parole Adviser and illustrates the type of leadership prevalent in the group.
TWO FRIENDS
By William J. Roberts
Vice-President
Philadelphia
Chamber of Commerce
Being a Parole Adviser is one of the most gratifying experiences in life. It provides an opportunity to render a service to both a deserving individual and to society as a whole. This activity is bound to make a lasting impression on the adviser.
A good adviser must be dedicated to the work and hold a sympathetic attitude toward the purposes of parole. The mere act of signing a monthly report statement by an inmate raises a safe question does not make a person a Parole Adviser. To be effective and to accomplish the results which the Parole Board expects, the adviser must assume his place in the "friendship team." This team needs further elaboration.

The prospective parolee is informed, in the initial conversation, that he has two friends on whom he can always depend. The first friend is the Parole Agent, the second is the Parole Adviser. The sole conditions that a parolee needs to keep to keep his two friends are these: be a friendly and honest inmate; keep all appointments which are designated for his benefit, and play by the rules truthfully with his two new friends. Both the agent and the adviser have a common interest in the parolee.

As the friendship team works together, further conferences should be held periodically, and at any time, if necessary. It is important to keep the agent and adviser in touch with each other regarding progress of the inmate, or the problems he is encountering. Occasionally the parolee may be included in these conferences, for he should fully realize that strong teamwork does not exist between his agent and adviser. The adviser should always encourage the recognition of the agent as a friend. Certainly, your practical and timely point in question, namely whether Leopold should be considered for parole, and further commutation of sentence and eventual parole, it might be debatable that the book was ever written or at least that it was published now. Leopold himself, as quoted in "The Presidio", prisons of the Illinois State Penitentiary, of July, 1957, feels that his chances for commutation and parole definitely were impaired by the Meyers-Leopold trial and its unfairness, it should be stated that Levin recently appeared before the State Pardon and Parole Board of Illinois, appealing for clemency on behalf of Leopold. Originally sentenced to life imprisonment, the author of the novel, which the author ascribes to himself (although using a different name) is difficult to take: fact and fiction seem too much interwoven.

Moreover, one might question the justification for the book which the author calls a "dramatic novel", since at least one of the many chieftains is still alive: Nathan Leopold (the story, his name is changed to Judd Schoenfeld)--the first of the so called "true life" novel create confusion rather than enlightenment. From the more practical and timely point in question, namely whether Leopold should be considered for parole, and further commutation of sentence and eventual parole, it might be debatable that the book was ever written or at least that it was published now. Leopold himself, as quoted in "The Presidio", prisons of the Illinois State Penitentiary, of July, 1957, feels that his chances for commutation and parole definitely were impaired by the Meyers-Leopold trial and its unfairness, it should be stated that Levin recently appeared before the State Pardon and Parole Board of Illinois, appealing for clemency on behalf of Leopold. Originally sentenced to life imprisonment, the author of the novel, which the author ascribes to himself (although using a different name) is difficult to take: fact and fiction seem too much interwoven.

From a broader viewpoint, however, the book is of considerable merit. There emerges—in often painfully stark strokes—a picture of an era which (though only 30 years separates our time from it) often seems to be as distant to us as previous centuries: the aftermath of World War I, the years of prohibition, and its resultant major crimes and minor transgressions of the law, the "lost generation" of the Twenties, the "flapper", the sexual freedom. There also appears—especially in the second part of the book (entitled "The Trial of the Century") —the first large scale impact on American forensic medicine, and the clash of the behaviorist school. But have we in our search for a solution of the "mystery of human behavior", of which the author speaks in his preface, really taken such tremendous strides forward since 1924? True, many techniques—still not yet developed or not yet sufficiently tested at that time—have been added to the fund of our psychological knowledge. But many a crime
committed today—although of less spectacular proportions than the Loo-Leopold case—baffles the experts in their quest for a motive, just as much as the conflicting testimony of the witnesses did in the Chicago Criminal Court trial in 1894; and is not the McNaghten rule of the defendant's ability to distinguish between right and wrong by which insanity is legally determined, still valid today, albeit strongly doubted and often critically attacked?

The term “psychopath”—used in the Twenties still rather sparingly—has today become an accepted word in the language of laymen and professionals alike; but the key to the psychopathic personality, and particularly to the treatment of psychopathy, still eludes the practitioners. Jail is the only available recourse in cases of criminal psychopaths,—if not a sentence of death for the homicidal type is meted out. And the efficacy of the death penalty as a deterrent is today as much debated as it was a generation ago.

The novelist has included in his book—verbatim—the summation of Loo's evidence, the magnificent speech of the great Clarence Darrow. Mr. Loo is now persuaded to thank the author, whose book (at the time of this writing) had reached a publication mark of over 120,000 copies, for having re-verified the older and middle-aged reader the contents of that masterpiece of oratory and deep ethical conviction and for having imparted to the younger reader scholarly knowledge of the personality and vision of this man. Fortunately, Darrow's 100th birthday anniversary on April 18, 1957, was the occasion for celebrations, many of the articles and radio and television broadcasts devoted to his life and work; and the dramatic presentation, "Inherit the Wind," shown on Broadway and throughout the country, centered around Darrow's role in the Scopes case, the Origin of Species Trial of Dayton, Tennessee, in 1925.

After all, the positive values of the book are overwhelming; e.g., the interpretation of the era in which the murder was committed; the searching probe—with the use of modern techniques—into the family background and the personality development of the child; the hideousness of the crime; and the story of the truly epic battle between the defense and the prosecution, highlighted by the brilliance and the humanitarianism of the last of the great defense lawyers of this country.

John Otto Reimann
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JOHN P. CAVANAUGH

Mr. Cavanaugh has been Supervisor of Parole in the Butler Dis- trict since last January 17th, after having served as an agent in District Office No. 1 at Phila- delphia, District Office No. 2, at Pittsburgh, and District Office No. 5 at Williamsport. His promotion to the present supervisory post was approved by Governor Leader in December 1956.

The new District 8 parole sup- ervisor was born in Southview, Washington County, on April 4, 1916. He attended the Immacu- late Conception Grade School and High School in Washington, graduating in 1934 after three years of varsity basketball. For the next two years, he coached the school's teams and has continued through the years his deep interest in athletics, helping with the organi- zation and coaching of boys' teams in both basketball and base- ball.

Mr. Cavanaugh's business ex- perience began with a clerkship in a chain grocery store. He later moved to another chain and be- came a store manager in the age of 19 years. He later sold electrical appliances.

His first Commonwealth service was as a clerk with the Penn- sylvania Department of Employ- ment and Unemployment Compensa- tion at Harrisburg.

He entered the United States Army as a private in October, 1942, taking basic and non-com- missioned Officer Training at Camp Wheeler, Georgia. He later entered the Officers' Candidate School and was commissioned on July 16, 1943. He served with the 17th Infantry in Hawaii, the Gil- bert, Makin, Marshall and Kwaile- lain Islands. He retired with the grade of Major in 1944, under a medical discharge because of impairment of his hearing during Japanese bomb- ings.

After his return to civilian life, he was a trainman for the Pitts- burgh Railway Company, and then served another term in salar- y work. Later he became a Service Officer for the Veterans For- eign Wars, Department of Penn- sylvania.

He took the examination and became a parole agent at Philadelphi- phia effective October 1, 1946. On February 14, 1942, Mr. Cava- naugh married Miss Annadale K. Quinn of Jersey City, Pennsylvania. They have three daughters, Jane Ellen, Kathleen and Maureen, and four sons, John Jr., David, Tom- my and Bill.

The Quarterly extends con- gratulations to Mr. Cavanaugh and best wishes for success in his new position.

JOHN R. BIERSTEIN

Parole planning is now the specialty of Mr. John R. Bierstein, who in January, 1957, began his new assignment as Interstate Su- pervisor in the Central Office of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole.

Previously, Mr. Bierstein had been District Supervisor of the Harrisburg District Office for fourteen years, having been ap- pointed to that position January 16, 1943. Prior to that time he was associated with the Depart- ment of Public Assistance since its inception in 1937, and its pre-decessor, the State Emergency Relief Board, since 1931.

Mr. Bierstein who resides in Hershey, majored in Journalism at Temple University from where he graduated in 1931. He attended Pennslyvania School of Social Work from 1936 to 1937. For many years he has been active in the affairs of the Association, and served as president in 1949.

It matters not how a man dies, but how he lives.

Samuel Johnson (1709-1784)

Boswell's Life of Dr. Johnson

The law is the last result of hu- man wisdom acting upon human experience for the benefit of the public.

Samuel Johnson (1709-1784)

Johnsoniana, by Fionzil
PAROLE BOARD
HONORS EMPLOYEES

Chairman Paul J. Gernert of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole presented Certificates of Merit to 10 veteran employees of the Board at the Supervisors In-Service Training Dinner held at Allenberry Inn on January 16, 1968.

Among those honored were: Fred Kurtz and Myra Thwing, both of whom are retiring from Commonwealth service. Mr. Kurtz left the Board on January 30, after more than 14 years as supervisor of the Altoona District Office. Miss Thwing will retire on February 1, after 12 years as agent-in-charge of the Philadelphia Women’s Division office.

Other employees honored included:

Fifteen Years Service: Thomas T. Taylor, District Supervisor, Allentown; James A. Dalrymple, District Supervisor, Williamsport; Peter P. Kraner, Assistant District Supervisor, Pittsburgh; Dr. G. I. Gardini, Supervising Parole Supervision, Harrisburg; Elton E. Smith, Assistant Supervising Parole Supervision, Harrisburg; and Alice Bobah, Assistant Comptroller, Harrisburg.

Ten Years Service: W. Glenn Adams, District Supervisor, Altoona; and Nora E. Kercher, Clinical Supervisor, Pittsburgh District Office.

I do not distinguish by the eye, but by the mind, which is the proper judge of the man.
Seneque (18 B.C.—A.D. 65)
Moral Essays

NATIONAL PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION
1536 Vincennes Avenue
Chicago Heights, Ill.

Professional Council

JOB ANNOUNCEMENT SERVICE
December 1, 1957

CALIFORNIA, Martinez—Field Probation Officer to work with both juveniles and adults. Salary range $435-$529 per month. Graduation from accredited school and one year graduate study in social work, psychology, sociology, or criminology. One year full time experience in probation or juvenile hall case or group work may be substituted for required year of graduate study. Contact Contra Costa County Civil Service Commission, Room 229, Hall Records, Martinez, California.

CALIFORNIA, Oakland—Group Counselor I (male and female) to work with juveniles in Juvenile Hall. Salary range $350-$450. Graduation from accredited college or university within the last 3 years and completion of twelve grade years and 3 years of recent full time experience in organization, direction, or supervision of youth groups in recreation or correctional setting. Contact Alameda County Civil Service Commission, 188-12th St., Oakland, California.

CALIFORNIA, San Diego—Assistant Probation Officer (male or female) to supervise young males and girls. College degree in social sciences plus one year graduate social work or one year paid experience in probation or allied field. Salary range $410-$510. Considerable experience may start at second step. Contact John S. Cowgill, Chief Probation Officer, San Mateo Probation Department, P.O. Box 55, Belmont, California.

IDAHO, Boise—Probation Officer (male) to supervise court commitment of children. Salary $343-$417. Bachelor’s degree from accredited college with min. of 12 units in sociology and/or psychology. Major in social sciences preferred. College must be committed to take examinations, but will not be placed on eligible list until graduation. Contact County Department of Civil Service and Personnel, Room 402, Civic Center, Boise, Idaho.
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WHAT OTHER DOGROOM IS SO DARK AS ONE’S OWN? WHAT ALTERE SO INEXORABLE AS ONE’S self?
Nathaniel Hawthorne (1804-1864)
The House of the Seven Gables
ILLINOIS, Chicago — Probation Officers (men and women) for the Cook County Service Department and Delinquent Boys' Division. Regularly assigned, salary $565, and maximum for Field Officers is $405. All degrees and three years paid experience with social agency required. Write Edward J. Neal, Probation Office, Chicago (Family) Court of Cook County, 2246 Roosevelt Road, Chicago 8, Illinois.

INDIANA, Indianapolis — Probation and Intake Officers—Minimum education A.B. — Salary $3720 to $4400, depending on education and social work experience. Fifty per cent of staff with year or more of graduate social work education or Scholarship program. Write Donald Radomaker, Chief Probation Officer, Marion County Juvenile Court, 168 E. Market Street, Indianapolis 4, Indiana.

MINNESOTA — Parole Agent I: General range $500 to $700.00. Provides casework services to local courts, supervises juvenile and adult probationers and parolees, related duties. Desire Bachelors' Degree with major in pre-social work or related social service, liberal education, employee benefits. Examination: 50% written, 50% oral. Write Minnesota Civil Service, 122 State Office Building, St. Paul, Minnesota.

MINNESOTA, St Paul — Juvenile Probation Officers (Case-workers) — Men, for Juvenile Division. Salary range min. $380 to $560. Starting salary flexible, depending on training and experience. Qualifications with superior qualifications may start at $400 or above. Desirable qualifications include M.A. in social work, correctional administration or closely related areas, plus one year's experience in probation, parole, or related work; liberal education; employee benefits. Contact John K. Donahoe, Chief Probation Officer, 210 Juvenile Court House, St. Paul, Minnesota. 4 Juvenile Parole Agents, Youth Conservation Commission, Bachelors' Degree required, MSW preferred, salary $4400 to $4800. Write to Vincent P. Reis, Director, Division of Prevention and Parole, Youth Conservation Commission, 129 State Office Bldg., St. Paul, Minnesota 55101.

NEW YORK, Albany — Youth Parole Workers — Interesting resident position in Albany Probation Office, Court (Family) Court of Cook County, 2246 Roosevelt Road, Chicago 8, Illinois. Bachelors' degree, one year graduate study in social work and a second year of graduate study or (b) two years social work experience. Salary $4500 to $5300, Write S. D. Friedman, New York State Department of Civil Service, 39 Columbia Street, Albany 7, New York.

OHIO, Marion — Correctional Social Worker II (male)—Salary $3290 to $6000 in five years, Supervisory position in the social service department at the recently activated Marion Correctional Institution for adult offenders. Master's degree in social work and a year of experience desired. Write Joseph G. Cannon, Supervision, Social Services, State Office Bldg., Columbus 16, Ohio.

OHIO, Steubenville—Probation Officer to organize and develop a Probation Program in the school of adult offenders, related services for juvenile offenders, to be responsible to the Board and, indirectly, to Advisory Committee on Juvenile Problems, appointed by the judge. MSW preferred; sound experience in probation required. Must have bachelor's degree, age 25 or older. Salary $6000 plus mileage. Applications obtained from Judge Kenneth M. Morrow, Probate Court, Jefferson County Courthouse, Steubenville, Ohio, or Troy A. Snyder, Advisory Committee Chairman, R. D. 2, Steubenville.

OREGON, Eugene—Juvenile Counselor (male) — Salary $385, and with satisfactory performances there is an increment to $407 at the end of one year. Balance of steps on merit basis to $501. Professional case supervision provided. Requirements: (1) Bachelor's degree in social work, psychology, sociology or related field; (2) two years experience in family case work, juvenile, or social work, and counseling, or two years experience in family, juvenile, or social work, and counseling. Write immediately to Director of Lane County Juvenile Office, 211 W. 6th Ave., Eugene, Oregon, giving personnel data and references.

PENNSYLVANIA, Brookville—Probation and Welfare Officer—To handle pre- and post-release readjustments, all juvenile cases, parole investigations, and non-support cases for Jefferson County. Experience desirable but not essential. Salary not yet fixed, but expected to be in the $5000 to $6000 range, depending upon prior experience and qualifications. Contact J. D. McNally, District Attorney, Brookville, Pennsylvania.

PENNSYLVANIA, York—Probation Officer (2 male). Beginning salary $4000 to $4200. Require at least one year graduate training in social work. There is no experience or residential requirements. For further information write Henry Lens, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, County Court House, York, Pennsylvania.

SOUTH CAROLINA, Charleston—Director of Probation in Children's Court. Bachelor's degree in social sciences and two years' gainful experience in social sciences, plus two years' experience in juvenile probation work; or one year's social work graduate training plus two years' experience, with one year in supervisory capacity or public relations background and community organization skills. Beginning salary $5000. Allowable automobile allowance and moving expenses. Write to Mr. P. H. Pearse, Domestic Relations Court, Charleston, S. C.

TEXAS, Bryan—Juvenile Probation Officer — New full time position set up as outgrowth of three-year delinquency prevention project under state agency sponsorship. Require MSW or two years experience, Psychiatric consultation as needed. Starting salary $3000-5000, depending on qualifications. Write Dr. C. J. Lee, Chairman, Brazos County Youth Development Committee, 504 Varisco Blvd., Bryan, Texas.
TEXAS, Corpus Christi—Case-Work Supervision (male or female) $3420 plus $600 car allowance. Graduate degree from accredited school of social work preferred. Must have had experience in a juvenile court setting. Applicant must have experience in casework supervision. To supervise seven caseworkers; excellent physical facilities. Position open January 1, 1958. Write Chief Probation Officer, P. O. Box 9770, Corpus Christi, Texas.

TEXAS, Crockett — 2 Case-workers (women) — Salary range $3420-$3780. Master's degree in social work and 2 years paid experience (correctional experience preferred). Position will include casework supervision, orientation and counselling of girls in State Training School for Negro Girls, developing an in-service program, staffing of cases, and work with parolees. One position open now, the other open January 1, 1958. Write Mrs. E. G. Harrell, Supt., Crockett State School, Box 901, Crockett, Texas.

TEXAS, Dallas — Supervisor for Juvenile Probation Department. Starting salary $4672 plus $600 travel allowance. Age 31-54. Bachelor degree with major in social work, sociology, psychology, criminology acceptable, but MSW preferred. Five years experience at least three of which must have been in probation department. Graduate work can be substituted for experience, not to exceed 2 years on year for year basis. Write Frank A. Grant, Assistant Chief Probation Officer, Juvenile Department, 4711 Harry Hines, Dallas, Texas.

WASHINGTON, Seattle — 8 Caseworkers, male and female, to serve as probation officers and work with dependent and delinquent children. Good casework supervision, psychiatric consultation, clinical, psychological services available. MSW preferred, but BSW accepted. One year's graduate training plus one year previous social work experience. Citizenship not required. Elastic employee benefits. Staff in-service and student training. Salary range $4292-$5160-$5520-$5860. Can appoint Reutzel, $4920, depending on qualifications. Write Mary Falsberg, Asst. Director, King County Juvenile Court, 1211 E. Alder Street, Seattle 2, Washington.


CALIFORNIA, Alameda County (Oakland) — Display Probation Officer I — Salary $3420-$3560. Advancement to Deputy Probation Officer II $4292-$5040. Required qualifications: (1) Completion Alameda County Probation Dept. training course or b) graduation accredited college or university and 1 year recent full time paid experience in social casework or in social, correctional or recreational group work or 1 yr. graduate study in related work. Counselor, Juvenile Hall — Salary $414-$596. Required qualifications: (1) Graduation accredited college or university with major in psychology, social work, criminology, penology, or related field; and (2) 2 years recent full time, paid experience in social or correctional casework field. 1 year experience and one year graduate work in psychology, social work, criminology, or penology. Salary $414-$596. Apply Alameda County Civil Service Commission, 188-125th St., Oakland, California.

MICHIGAN, Port Huron—Director of Court Services in Juvenile Probation Department to assist judge in recommending release, parole or commitment of children and adolescents in juvenile court; also training and supervision of parole officers. Must have 2 years social work with juvenile court; 2 years casework experience or 2 years social work training in social work plus at least two years supervisory experience in probation agency; closely related child welfare service. Position requires ability to work with neglected and delinquent children. Preferred one year graduate training in social work and two years experience in a children's casework setting. Address inquiries to Hon. Vera I. Black, Judge of Probate, St. Clair County Probate Court, Port Huron, Michigan, stating minimum salary requirements in letter of inquiry.

SOUTH CAROLINA, Charleston—2 Probation Officers. Start $3420 plus $600 travel allowance. Bachelor degree from college and practical experience. Excellent standing with offices in social studies plus one year experience or additional graduate study. Experience desired in welfare agency, teaching, or related fields. Contact Judge C. B. Pearson, Domestic Relations Court, Charleston South Carolina.

Justice is truth in action.
Benjamin Disraeli (1804-1881)

It is better to risk saving a guilty person than to condemn an innocent one.
Francis M. A. Valtorto (1694-1778)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Address Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pratola Peligna Society</td>
<td>766 W. 18th Street, Erie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationwide Insurance Co.</td>
<td>18 W. Airy Avenue, Norristown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Dollar Check Exchange</td>
<td>711 S. Broad Street, Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higham, Neilson, Whitridge and Reid, Inc.</td>
<td>344 N. Broad Street, Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stouffer's Restaurant</td>
<td>335 Lancaster Avenue, Wynnewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diminick Coal Sales</td>
<td>Paxinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal Order of Moose</td>
<td>14 E. North Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny Lodge No. 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazz Mariani Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Company, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>219 High Street, Pottstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler and Thomas</td>
<td>1315 Cherry Street, Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trooper Fruit and Produce</td>
<td>Ridge Pike, R. D. No. 2, Norristown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Inn</td>
<td>620 Montgomery Avenue, Bryn Mawr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Pharmacy</td>
<td>MacDade Blvd, at Holmes Road, Holmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona Shoe Co.</td>
<td>201 Cayuga Avenue, Altoona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Mortgage Corp.</td>
<td>535 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First National Bank of Duquesne</td>
<td>1 W. Grant Avenue, Duquesne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Store Fixture Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co. of Schwenksville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Bank and Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babe's Luncheonette</td>
<td>401 E. Main Street, Norristown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinicum Restaurant</td>
<td>Powhatan Avenue, Essington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linee Aeree Italiane</td>
<td>214 S. 16th Street, Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton Goldstein</td>
<td>2945 W. Diamond Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. A. Staton</td>
<td>Beer Distributors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6542 Germantown Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Solomon Company</td>
<td>Scrap Iron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3045 W. Liberty Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac's Confectionery</td>
<td>672 W. 7th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Bowling Alley</td>
<td>838 Allegheny River Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standfast Book Bindery</td>
<td>925 Liberty Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse W. Vause</td>
<td>Valley Forge Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Gallagher</td>
<td>211 Ford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren-Ebre</td>
<td>Luzerne and E Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Buccellrello</td>
<td>Upholstery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4949 Germantown Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kammerer</td>
<td>Ridley Creek Road, So. of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baltimore Pike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olimpia Whitehall Tavern</td>
<td>708 Hawverford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bryn Mawr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Demko</td>
<td>Naomans Creek, Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wild Goose</td>
<td>Baltimore Pike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1430 Oakmont Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Lomastro Bros.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman's Gulf Service</td>
<td>Cameron and Herr Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. P. Kapner and Sons</td>
<td>General Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1937 Caledonia Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W and L Beer Saloys</td>
<td>420 S. 2nd Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owens Gulf Service</td>
<td>38th and Market Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Bros. and Wilson</td>
<td>Stone Quarry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23rd and Reading Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic States Truck Lines</td>
<td>Chamber Hill Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert S. Fells</td>
<td>Geyspool Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>434 S. Howard Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Piece and Dye Works</td>
<td>Mt. Rose and P. R. R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaman Transportation Corp.</td>
<td>Duncanville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricks Gulf Service Station</td>
<td>6th and Schuykill Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred W. Lox Amusements</td>
<td>500 Parry Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D and B Texaco Station</td>
<td>10th and Louther Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall's Restaurant, Inc.</td>
<td>417 Smithfield Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooley Lilly</td>
<td>Gifts—Toys—Cards—Chino—Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>703 Edgmont Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Adams Electric</td>
<td>Residential and Industrial Wiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTI CONSTRUCTION CO.</td>
<td>311 South Street, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYNN HOME REPAIRS CO.</td>
<td>302 Greenwich Avenue, E. Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENAS FLOWER SHOP</td>
<td>481 Lenox Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILLTOP MOTORS, INC.</td>
<td>11 Empire Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLESPIE ENVELOPE CO.</td>
<td>917 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETER RAUCH BUILDING CO.</td>
<td>2999 W. Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES LINE CONSTRUCTION CO.</td>
<td>5524 Pennsylvania Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANCET MFG. CO.</td>
<td>10 California Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERN SOUND CO.</td>
<td>Wall Street Rd. at Poplar St., Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEAN OLDMOBILE</td>
<td>501 Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATSY MAZZARO</td>
<td>Diagonal, Steadman Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENN SOUTHERN CONSTRUCTION CO.</td>
<td>130 Wawasee Blvd, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES M. HENRY PRINTING CO.</td>
<td>735 Pine Street Blvd, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANNAN &amp; CO.</td>
<td>2128 Keffer's Rd., Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEISER CO.</td>
<td>1504 E. By-Pass Rd., E. Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGAN &amp; DOUGHERTY</td>
<td>515 Lines Trial Rd., Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES ZUBICK &amp; SONS, INC.</td>
<td>45 West River Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK R. BRUNO</td>
<td>510 Edward Place, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE SABIN ROBBINS PAPER CO.</td>
<td>4155 Beveridge Road, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALVARO &amp; LUMBER &amp; SUPPLY CO.</td>
<td>200 Sassafrass St., Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAVMBOURG HARDWARE</td>
<td>19 Second Street, Dravgbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODO MFG. CORP.</td>
<td>4315 Penn Ave, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODYEAR TIRE &amp; RUBBER CO.</td>
<td>4700 Center Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSAL MATCH CORP.</td>
<td>900 Penn Blvd., Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIBBES PRODUCTS CO.</td>
<td>2860 W. Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAVERS, INC.</td>
<td>5000 Baum Blvd., Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBER &amp; CO.</td>
<td>429 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD ELECTROTYPE CO.</td>
<td>79 Second Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHEN SALES &amp; SERVICE CO., INC.</td>
<td>2399 Independence Street, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY HARDWARE &amp; SUPPLY CO.</td>
<td>3100 South 15th Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRI-STATE MOVING CO.</td>
<td>360 Fort Creek Road, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOLFRUM'S BAKERY</td>
<td>2607 South Street, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUND PHARMACY</td>
<td>4200 Beveridge Road, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAPHIC SERVICE, INC.</td>
<td>110 First Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOODEY MOTOR CO.</td>
<td>414 E. 9th Avenue, Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENTREE DAIRY</td>
<td>Quality Daily Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINUS ELECTRIC</td>
<td>Residential and Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARVIN GLASS</td>
<td>1613 Union Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEATLEY &amp; NEPPER INC.</td>
<td>511 East 1st Street, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLER'S FLORISTS</td>
<td>1114 First Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTAL BANK &amp; TRUST CO.</td>
<td>3100 East 15th Avenue, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK COUNTY</td>
<td>211 South Market Street, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIZABETHFORD TRUST CO.</td>
<td>712 W. 2nd Street, Elizabethtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL NOVELTY CO., INC.</td>
<td>2133 West Osborne Street, Harrisburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONIC WHOLESALERS</td>
<td>1922 Foxton Street, Harrisburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYNKO &amp; CO.</td>
<td>710 South 14th Street, Altona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUE WHITE LINES, INC.</td>
<td>516 West Park Road, Altona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY RADIATOR WORKS</td>
<td>614-10th Street, Altona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE'S COAL CO.</td>
<td>730-4th Street, Altona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST NATIONAL BANK</td>
<td>204 S. Washington Street, Altona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSE TRAILER SALES</td>
<td>690 West 12th Street, Beldwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE CONSTRUCTION CO.</td>
<td>311 W. Landis Avenue, Altona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTONTA HOTEL</td>
<td>510 W. Eighth Avenue, Altona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTOONA PIPE &amp; STEEL SUPPLY</td>
<td>2111 Beech Avenue, Altona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTONTA HOME IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>1124 Beech Avenue, Altona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTONTA HOME IMPROVATION</td>
<td>1124 Beech Avenue, Altona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTOONA MINE &amp; MILL</td>
<td>610 South 14th Street, Altona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE ALLOY WORKS</td>
<td>2000 E. York Avenue, Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL ALUMINUM PRODUCTS</td>
<td>Red Street, 500 to 750 Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHESTER SCRAP</td>
<td>330 W. Mary Street, Chester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COULBORN SUNOCO SERVICE</td>
<td>Industrial Highway and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENRY BASS GREENHOUSE</td>
<td>1800 E. 11th Avenue, Altona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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104th Annual Statement
1957
Assets .......... $4,153,060.
Surplus .......... 2,054,472.
Losses Paid Since
Organization .......... 31,538,822.