The Expansion of the Juvenile Court Idea

By John Otto Reinemann
Director of Probation, Municipal Court of Philadelphia

ANNIVERSARIES in the field of social legislation lend themselves well to stock-taking. Many articles celebrating the fiftieth return of the day on which the first juvenile court was created are dealing with the development of child care during this half-century span. These articles attempt to evaluate the contributions which the juvenile court has made to the whole child welfare program. They appraise the progress which the court itself and its closely related services—i.e., case study, classification, clinical treatment and supervision on probation—have made. Some of them are critical, because the work of the juvenile courts throughout the country has not fulfilled all the expectations of its original protagonists and its later standard-bearers. Others have allocated praise to many outstanding examples of good juvenile court practice.

There are voices heard, too, in these commemorative papers and addresses which say that the juvenile court's scope should be restricted and that other agencies should take over part of its original functions. There are strong and convincing opinions, on the other hand, which point proudly to the record of the juvenile court as the outstanding example of the new concept of "social jurisprudence," of the universal acceptance of the juvenile court's philosophy and practice, not only in all of the states and possessions of the Union, but by most civilized countries which adapted the American prototype to meet their own national needs and social exigencies.

The following presentation strives to highlight some of the areas of sociolegal activities which were influenced by the theory and practice of the juvenile court. The soundness of an idea, the validity of a concept, the genuineness of a belief are tested and proved by the spread of their underlying philosophy beyond its primary frame of reference. Evidence for the expansion of the juvenile court idea beyond its original scope has been specifically apparent in four developments: (1) the establishment of adolescents' courts; (2) the creation of the Youth Correction Authority and similar agencies; (3) the idea and practice of the family court; and (4) the influence of certain juvenile court methods upon procedure in general criminal courts.

Adolescents' Courts

In a few states concurrent jurisdiction has been conferred upon the juvenile court with the ordinary criminal courts either in all cases or only regarding specific offenses committed by youngsters above juvenile court age but below the age of 21. However, the most significant development in this connection has been the establishment of special courts for adolescents in the three largest cities of the country.

The Wayward Minors' Act of New York State of 1923 (and later amended several times) provides that a person between the ages of 16 and 21 who is habitually addicted to the use of liquor or drugs, who habitually associates with undesirable persons, who is found in a house of prostitution, who is wilfully disobedient to the reasonable and lawful commands of a parent or guardian, or who is morally depraved or in danger of becoming morally depraved, may be deemed a wayward minor. Jurisdiction over these cases is given to the children's court (as the juvenile courts in New York State are called) and all criminal courts.

Under this act, an adolescents' court was established in Brooklyn in 1935 as part of the City Magistrates' Court, in order to deal with boys between 16 and 19 years of age. Its scope of jurisdiction, however, transcends the types of offenses enumerated in the Wayward Minor's Act. These are some of the phases of procedure:[1]

> All adolescent offenders charged with felonies or serious misdemeanors are brought to the Adolescents' Court instead of to the Felony Court. Hearings there are conducted in chambers. The arresting officer, the parents of the boy, the probation officer, an assistant district attorney, and witnesses, are the only ones present at the time of the boy's arraignment before the judge. If the boy admits his guilt or the magistrate believes him guilty after the hearing, the case is discussed with the assistant district attorney and the probation officer who had already interviewed the boy. A thorough investigation by the probation department follows, including, when necessary, a psychiatric examination. In many cases the boy is placed on probation to his parents.

Another adolescent court in New York City

[1]These excerpts are taken from *Socio-Legal Treatment of the Youthful Offender: A Statistical and Factual Analysis of the Work of the Adolescent's Court*, Brooklyn, 1939 (mimeographed).

was created in 1936 as part of the Felony Court of the Borough of Queens. More recently the General Sessions Court of Manhattan has begun to apply the wayward minor technique to boys of the same ages as those in the Brooklyn and Queens Courts.

The Wayward Minors' Court of New York City with city-wide jurisdiction over girls 16 to 21 years of age, functions as part of the Women's Court and, since 1945, is officially known as "Girls' Term." Its jurisdiction encompasses only those types of offenses which are listed in the previously quoted Wayward Minors' Act. Its socialized procedure is characterized by the fact that defendants are not guilty but are "adjudged." There are no "convictions" but rather "adjudications" in the Wayward Minors' Court. Girls so adjudged are not fingerprinted. Upon adjudication, a wayward minor may be placed on probation for an indeterminate period of time or may be committed to an institution "duly authorized by law to receive such commitments."[2]

Chicago, the birthplace of the juvenile court, also pioneered in the setting up of special judicial facilities for the handling of adolescents apart from older offenders. In 1914, the Boys' Court was created as one of the specialized branches of the Municipal Court of Chicago. The Boys' Court deals with misdemeanors and quasicriminal offenses, involving boys from the ages of 17 to 21, but, unlike other similar courts, it has no power to deal with such matters as waywardness, incorrigibility, or association with undesirable persons, which are not mentioned in the Criminal Code of Illinois. The Boys' Court also conducts preliminary examination in cases of felony committed by boys in this age range, holding them for action by the grand jury and possible trial by the criminal court of Cook County. Case investigations and examinations by the Social Service Department and the Psychiatric Institute, both adjuncts of the Municipal Court of Chicago, are another feature of socialized procedure employed by the Boys' Court, This court also has developed a very close and continuing co-operation with four different agencies, the Holy Name Society, the Chicago Church Federation, the Jewish Social Service Bureau, and the Colored Big Brothers Association. According to Judge J. M. Braude, of the Municipal Court of Chicago,[3] a youthful offender—instead of being officially placed on probation—is referred to one of these organizations for supervision.

Shortly after the Chicago Boys' Court was established a similar step was taken in Philadelphia. In 1915, the Municipal Court, created 2 years before and vested with broad jurisdiction in civil, criminal, domestic relations, and juvenile matters, was given additional exclusive jurisdiction over minors above juvenile court age. The new branches of this Court, which took the name Boys' and Men's Misdemeanants' Division and Girls' and Women's Misdemeanants' Division, assumed jurisdiction in cases of minors between the ages of 16 (the upper juvenile court age limit at that time) and 21, "who shall disobey their parents' command or be found idle in the streets," or are deemed disorderly. The law defined disorderly children as those "deserting their home without good or sufficient cause, or keeping company with dissolute or vicious persons against their parents' command." Social investigation, similar to the practice employed in the juvenile court, precedes and largely guides the disposition of these cases; physical and mental examinations are given before the court hearing; probation frequently is used and medical treatment is prescribed and carried out whenever needed. Community agencies are called upon to assist.

Although the establishment of adolescents' courts represents a step in the right direction of expanding socialized procedure of juvenile courts into the higher age groups, these adolescents' courts are necessarily hybrids, embodying on the one side various but not all juvenile court aspects, and on the other side certain features of criminal procedure without, however, all the legal safeguards which the adult offender enjoys in the general criminal court. A much more adequate approach to the problem of the adolescent or youthful offender is found in the movement for the establishment of a Youth Correction Authority.

The Youth Correction Authority

In 1940 the American Law Institute, a research body devoted to the clarification and systematization of American law and composed of outstanding lawyers, judges, and professors of law and criminology, published a model law for the treatment of the adolescent offender. This model act, which was the result of careful deliberation of experts, proposed the creation of a Youth Correction Authority to be set up in each state by the legislature. Its function is to provide and administer corrective

[2]See *The Wayward Minors' Court*, issued by the Probation Bureau, City Magistrates' Courts, New York City, 1939 (mimeographed).
[3]Judge J. M. Braude, "Boys' Court: Individualized Justice for the Youthful Offender," in FEDERAL PROBATION, June 1948, pp. 9 ff.

and preventive training and treatment for persons under 21 years of age at the time of their apprehension and committed to this Authority; it shall consist of three full-time members, to be appointed by the Governor for a term of office of 9 years, with a possibility of reappointment after the expiration of the term.

The late Judge Joseph N. Ulman of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore, a noted author on problems of criminal justice and a member of the committee which prepared the draft of the act, described its main features as follows:[4]

> The act provides that convicted offenders within the age group over the juvenile court age and under twenty-one shall be committed to the Youth Correction Authority for correctional treatment in all cases except those in which the trial court imposes the death penalty or life imprisonment at one end of the scale, or imposes a fine or a short term of imprisonment for minor offenses at the other end. The act provides an extended period of control by the Authority which may in exceptional cases, and subject to judicial review, continue for the life of the offender. The Authority is given wide discretion and the greatest measure of elasticity in dealing with the offender. It may release him under supervision before any period of incarceration whatever, it may limit his freedom slightly in a work camp or a supervised boarding home, or severely in a prison cell; and it may change its method of treatment from time to time and from less to more, and again to less severe forms as the exigencies of the individual case require. This plan differs from all existing practice in that it subjects the offender to continuous planned control by a single responsible administrative body instead of shifting him from one control to another. Finally, the Authority is given the right to terminate its control over the offender conditionally or unconditionally as soon as it appears that the protection of society and the welfare of the individual will be served by such termination."

In the years since publication of the Youth Correction Authority model law, the issue has left the purely theoretical stage. Four states (California, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and with certain modifications Massachusetts) have passed legislation incorporating the principles and procedures of the model act. In other legislatures, similar bills were introduced but so far failed of enactment; however, there are numerous indications that in the years to come efforts will be made by leaders in the correctional field and civic groups in many states to have such legislation put on the statute books. The Judicial Conference of the United States has fitted the plan of the Youth Correction Authority into a Federal Corrections Act for submission to Congress.

California, true to its pioneering spirit in many fields, was the first state to enact such legislation. Although the original California law of June 1941, establishing a Youth Correction Authority, drew heavily upon the model act of the American Law Institute, there were a number of important differences. One of them was the provision allowing the Authority to accept boys and girls from the juvenile courts (while the model act limited the Authority's function to youths above the juvenile court age). Another deviation from the model act was the extension of the upper age limit to 23 years at the time of apprehension; this, however, was later changed to 21 years. Unlike the model act, the California law left the power to grant probation with the courts. The name of the Authority was changed in 1943 to "Youth Authority."

The Youth Authority is headed by a board of three members appointed by the Governor; a unique feature is that two of the three members are chosen from a list of nominations prepared for the Governor by a panel consisting of the presidents of interested organizations, such as the Bar and Medical Associations of the State, the California Conference of Social Work, the California Prison Association, the Probation and Parole Officers' Association, and the Teachers' Association.

The California Youth Authority is in charge of six correctional schools and institutions, one of which is a ranch school; four permanent forestry camps; and one forestry camp open only during the summer. These institutions, schools, and camps are provided for the different age groups up to the age of majority.

A really well-functioning program of planned institutional placement stems from the services of a diagnostic center. The California Youth Authority's clinic at the Preston School of Industry serves this particular purpose and accommodates 140 youths from 15½ to 21 years of age. In addition to its diagnostic and placement functions, the Youth Authority carries on an educational campaign throughout the state, particularly in the field of positive crime prevention, and assists local agencies in an advisory capacity. It collects statistical data from all criminal courts on the number and disposition of young offenders. Parole from the institutions is also vested in the Authority. It grants parole and supervises parolees through a staff of officers attached to branch parole offices.[5]

In Minnesota a Youth Authority was created in 1947. Called the "Youth Conservation Commission," it consisted of five persons including the director of the Division of Public Institutions, the chairman of the State Board of Parole, and three

---

[4]Joseph N. Ulman, "Youth Correction Authority Act," National Probation and Parole Association *Yearbook*, 1941, p. 234.

[5]For further details on the California Youth Authority, see John R. Ellingston, *Protecting Our Children From Criminal Careers*, New York: Prentice Hall, 1948; also Karl Holton, "The California Youth Authority," *Yearbook* of the National Probation and Parole Association, 1946, pp. 116-126.

others appointed by the Governor. The district courts are committing to the Commission every person under 21 years of age convicted of a felony or gross misdemeanor who is not sentenced to life imprisonment, or imprisonment for 90 days or less, or to a fine only. The court also can place a probationer under the supervision of the Commission. A juvenile court not having a probation officer may request the Commission to investigate and accept juvenile delinquents for probation.

In the same year, Wisconsin adopted the idea of a Youth Authority by creating a "Youth Service Commission" consisting of 11 members who are appointed by the Governor with power of inquiry and the duty to make recommendations regarding the welfare of children and youth. Its operating arm is the newly established Youth Service division within the Department of Public Welfare. Wisconsin was fortunate that its Department of Public Welfare, even before the passage of the 1947 act, had at its disposal a well-integrated correctional service, including a staff and facilities for diagnosis. The law specifies that juvenile court commitments and commitments of minors where the penalty is less than life imprisonment, shall be to the Youth Service Division of the Department of Public Welfare, which may confine the youthful offender or permit him to be at liberty under supervision, and subesquently grant a discharge. Other functions assigned to this department are crime prevention work and the performance of presentence investigation when called for by local courts.

From these examples in three states it is apparent that the basic idea of the model Youth Correction Authority Act has been considered as realistic enough to be translated into legislative acts and administrative practice. The California experiment, in particular, shows the real contribution which diagnostic services at observation and classification centers can render in the handling of delinquents. It further demonstrates that the centralization of control of a number of variegated institutional and other services makes possible the assignment of the youthful offender to the proper facilities and the transfer to another place when necessary. It abolishes the haphazard and planless commitment procedure to which the judges in many states are driven due to lack of study centers and the crazy-quilt of institutions—public as well as private—which are not co-ordinated with each other and which often are not supervised at all, or only superficially, by a central state agency. Because of its underlying philosophy of a systematic approach to the youthful offender, the idea of the Youth Correction Authority has been called "the most revolutionary step taken in American penology since the establishment of the Elmira Reformatory, and much more promising than that innovation."[6]

[6]Barnes and Teeters, *New Horizons in Criminology*, New York: Prentice-Hall, 1947, p. 944.

The Idea of the Family Court

Not only vertically did the juvenile court idea expand, permeating, as we have seen, criminal justice procedure in adult cases but it also transcended its orginal scope horizontally by influencing, to a certain degree, the handling of cases dealing with all kinds of family matters. These cases concerning situations of domestic relations, legal custody, adoption, illegitimacy, and similar problems might be under the jurisdiction of the general courts or, by act of the state legislature, be assigned to courts especially created for their adjudication.

The juvenile court in some localities is closely connected with the domestic relations court; or the juvenile court, according to the laws of various states might have jurisdiction over guardianship, custody, adoption, illegitimacy, consent to marriage of minors, and annulments of marriage to minors. Probation officers, especially in smaller probation departments, have to handle not only juvenile court cases but also domestic relations matters, usually called desertion and nonsupport cases, and cases of establishment of paternity of children born out of wedlock. It is obvious that the principles and methods of juvenile court procedure are influencing the handling of all family cases, especially if they are prepared in the same probation department or in a domestic relations' court probation department operating in close proximity to the juvenile court.

In general, however, the development of special domestic relations courts, sometimes called family courts, has been much more sporadic than that of the juvenile court. Neglect to support wife and children, or desertion and nonsupport, are in many jurisdictions considered misdemeanors or summary offenses, and the begetting of a child out of wedlock (often called in the statute "fornication and bastardy") also is a criminal offense. These cases, therefore, are usually heard in the criminal courts of general jurisdiction. There is still comparatively little social service within the court

machinery offered in the adjudication of these cases, although their very nature obviously would call for it. Adoption proceedings mostly take place in the probate courts, again with the emphasis on the legal phase, although in this field public and private welfare agencies play an increasingly important role and assist the courts in the preparation of these cases with regard to their social and psychological aspects.

The idea of establishing special courts with comprehensive jurisdiction in all matters concerning family and child welfare, requiring judicial disposition, has been advanced for several years by leaders in the field of law and social work, but it has been translated into practice only in a few places. Recently it received a new impetus through the National Conference on Family Life, held in Washington, D.C., in May 1948. In a report drafted by a committee of the American Bar Association for this conference, the establishment of family courts—aptly described as "socialized courts with socialized laws"—was recommended. This report was adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association which met in Seattle in 1948. Pointing to the modern juvenile court as prototype, this report said:[7]

> We suggest handling our unhappy and delinquent spouses much as we handle our delinquent children. Often their behavior is not unlike that of a delinquent child, and for much the same reasons. We would take them out of the quasicriminal divorce court and deal with them and their problems in a socialized court. When a marriage gets sick there is a cause. This cause manifests itself in the behavior, or misbehavior, of one or both spouses. Instead of determining whether a spouse has misbehaved and then "punishing" him by rewarding the aggrieved spouse with a divorce decree we would follow the general pattern of the juvenile court and endeavor to diagnose and treat, to discover the fundamental cause, then bring to bear all available resources to remove or rectify it.

The report further points out that "the proposal to have all justiciable family matters handled by one court is far from new. It has been tried and has long since passed the experimental stage. For over 30 years Cincinnati has had such a court. From the outset the soundness of the idea became more and more apparent, and soon other Ohio cities fell in line and for years the seven largest (next after Cleveland, which has an independent juvenile court) have had such integrated family courts." Other examples of family courts in existence are the Municipal Court of Philadelphia, created in 1913, and the Family Court of New Castle County (Wilmington), Delaware, established by act of 1945.

There exists a difference of opinion whether divorce cases should be included in the jurisdiction of a comprehensive family court. The previously mentioned report of the National Conference on Family Life favors the handling of divorce cases in the family court. The objection to this proposition usually is based on the argument that it would be incongruous to confer jurisdiction over divorce proceedings upon a family court which should be devoted principally to the maintenance and strengthening of family life. Another objection is that divorce cases may "take too large a part of the court's time and facilities."

But even with divorce cases being heard by courts of general jurisdiction, as is the present rule, the need for social investigation especially where children are involved, has been recognized by a number of judges in several states sitting in divorce cases. Such inroads of social aspects into the primarily legal procedure, as customarily employed in divorce actions, is another example of the expansion of juvenile court techniques into related fields.

Juvenile Court Influence on Adult Criminal Courts

We have seen that basic principles of juvenile court philosophy and practice have influenced decisively the Youth Correction Authority movement, especially in regard to the need of social and medical diagnoses before disposition. While the scope of jurisdiction of Youth Authorities, both in theory and practice, is confined to persons below 21 years of age, the influence of the juvenile court idea has in several respects crossed the border of that age limit and has invaded the criminal justice administration in adult cases. The two most outstanding examples of this development are the presentence investigation, including the utilization of medical diagnostic facilities, and the use of probation.

Use of the presentence investigations for adult cases.—The idea of individualization of justice which has found a concrete expression in the establishment of the juvenile courts also has prompted the demand for presentence investigations in adult cases, similar to the inquiries which customarily are made in cases of juvenile delinquency. Although this demand is far from universal, an ever increasing number of judges are realizing today the necessity of knowing more about the offender than what the trial with its strict rules

[7] National Conference on Family Life, Action Area: Legal Problems. Report prepared by a committee headed by Reginald Heber Smith, chairman, and Judge Paul W. Alexander, vice-chairman, March 1948 (mimeographed).

of evidence and its exclusive limitation to the determination of guilt or innocence is likely to reveal. In order to pronounce a sentence that should serve the rehabilitation of the offender, the judge must have knowledge of the personality of the defendant, his social environment, his physical and mental make-up; he must have insight into the defendant's personal needs and, if possible, into the reason for his antisocial conduct. The presentence investigation supplies him with this information. One of the most important features of juvenile court procedure thus finds increasing recognition in the handling of adult offenders.

However, the safeguards which the law provides for the defendant in criminal trials must be respected. Therefore, information gathered through presentence investigation should be available only to the judge since the purpose of the investigation has nothing to do with the establishment of guilt or innocence and is only to be used after conviction of the accused person.[8]

In the beginning, judges requested presentence investigations almost exclusively in cases where the granting of probation was contemplated. This is also apparent in the not too numerous statutory provisions on presentence investigation in several states.

The later development, though still quite sporadic, showed that not only in those situations where probation was a likely disposition, but also in other more serious cases, presentence investigations were considered by the judges as a vital necessity. The federal judicial system has probably gone farthest toward a more universal use of presentence investigation. The Rules of Criminal Procedure for the District Courts of the United States, adopted by the United States Supreme Court in 1946, specify that "the probation service of the court shall make a presentence investigation and report to the court before the imposition of sentence or the granting of probation unless the court otherwise directs." (Rule 32-c).

Presentence investigations are carried out by the probation departments of the local courts or, wherever they exist, by state probation departments. The compilation of social data follows quite closely the principles governing the preparation of social case studies in juvenile cases. In addition to the social investigation, the diagnoses of the offender by psychologists and psychiatrists are requested by some courts. Such facilities might be offered to the courts by clinics in hospitals and research institutions, or they might be established by the courts themselves as their own special services. An example of this type is the Behavior Clinic of the Quarter Sessions Court of Allegheny County (Pittsburg), Pennsylvania, created in 1937 by the Board of Judges and maintained through funds supplied by the county commissioners.

Another example of a presentence clinic is the Medical Department of the Municipal Court of Philadelphia which is an integral part of this court and not only diagnoses children's cases but also adults standing trial before its criminal division and those referred by other local and federal courts in the area. There are a number of courts throughout the country utilizing similar services. Certain states are particularly well equipped along psychiatric lines, notably California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

Use of probation for adult offenders.—Probation has its historical roots in the treatment of adults as well as juvenile offenders. As a tool of modern juvenile court procedure, however, probation has gained a much wider recognition and generally has shown a more advanced development than it has in the handling of adult cases. It has been this very development in the juvenile field that in recent years increasingly influenced the practice of probation for adult offenders. Supervision of adults on probation—though in some jurisdictions still not more than a routine "roll call" through the probationer's reporting to the probation officer in person or by mail—by now has been recognized in many progressive courts as a positive and scientific form of correctional treatment. Here, the fruitful experience of employing casework principles in the supervision of children has stimulated the use of advanced methods of guidance and counseling of adult probationers. The constructive use of authority in juvenile cases has pointed the way toward a similar approach to the adult offender. The utilization of community resources in the fields of health, family welfare, recreation and vocational guidance by the probation officer has proved of equal importance in juvenile and adult cases.

The various examples of the expansion of the juvenile court's philosophy and practice, as presented here, tend to confirm the prophetic state-

[8]For an interesting controversy whether presentence investigation reports should be made available by the court to the attorneys for the parties involved, see Judge Carroll C. Hincks, "In Opposition to Rule 34 (c) (2), Proposed Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure," in FEDERAL PROBATION, October-December 1944, p. 3 ff; also F. W. Killian, "Presentence Reports," in *Probation*, October 1945, p. 25-26.

ment of Judge Benjamin Lindsey, one of the first protagonists of the juvenile court. More than 30 years ago he said: "The chief significance of the juvenile court movement is that in breaking away from the old procedure it is preparing the way for a new procedure for adults as well as for children."[9]

[9]M. Parmelee, *Criminology*. New York: Macmillan, 1918, p. 407.

Keeping Children Out of Jails: It Can Be Done

BY AUSTIN H. MACCORMICK
Executive Director, The Osborne Association
JAMES H. DOOLING*
Assistant to the Executive Director, The Osborne Association

LATE last year the Osborne Association, in collaboration with the National Jail Association, launched a campaign against the widespread practice of confining children in county jails, 97.3 percent of which have been rated below 60 on a scale of 100 by federal jail inspectors. The campaign, made possible by a grant from the Children's Fund of Michigan, has the endorsement of the National Conference of Juvenile Agencies, the Society for the Prevention of Crime, and other agencies interested in child welfare in general and juvenile delinquency in particular. A close working relationship has been established with the National Probation and Parole Association, which for some years has been doing notable work in the field of juvenile detention and, more than any other organization, has thrown light on bad practices and on feasible ways of correcting them.

The collaborating agencies have no illusions as to the extent and complexity of the problem. The crusade undoubtedly will mean years of sustained effort before progress on a wide front can be registered. It assuredly should have been started decades ago.

The shame of our aptly named common jails has been tolerated far too long by a public that at best can plead ignorance—the lamest of all excuses —by public officials to whom the jail is usually only another pawn in the political game, and by professional penologists who state frankly that the "jail problem has got us licked" but, in truth, have never given it a real fight. We share with the public and private child welfare agencies of the country the specific shame of allowing thousands of children to be confined in these pesthouses, but it is too heavy a burden of guilt for us to carry even with their help.

Exposures and Excoriation Not Enough

How to eliminate even this one of the jail's many iniquities poses a difficult planning problem. It will not be enough to expose conditions in our jails. They have been exposed *ad nauseam* and the public has proved that it has a strong stomach. It will not be enough to excoriate sheriffs and jailers, even when they keep a 10-year-old boy for weeks in a cell in which nobody should put a pig. The best ones will say "What else am I to do?" The worst ones will say "So what?" All too many have little concern for what happens to children or anyone else so long as they hold their jobs. Education in many cases is as unprofitable as excoriation; sheriffs do not stay around long enough to learn. Since last November's election, for example, 550 new sheriffs have come on the scene in our 3,000 counties.

Education, nevertheless, must be our chief mode of attack. It must be education in not more than two-syllable words, education that gets down to bedrock principles and procedures. And before we start educating county commissioners, sheriffs and jailers, we need some educating ourselves. What they want from us is not glittering generalities but common sense solutions of specific problems, not merely what they should do but how they can do it, not merely demands to get children out of jails but advice on where to put them.

To learn some of the practical answers to the problem of the child who must be detained, pilot

*Mr. Dooling left the staff of The Osborne Association in July 1949.