

TRANSITIONS TO FREEDOM, INC.

2160 LAKE STREET • SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121 • (415) 752-7716

Here is an article which articulates the
ex-prisoner issue as well as anything I've seen
yet.

I urge you to read it carefully and I would
appreciate your comments (detailed or general)
very much.

Regards,

NO. 1

DOMESTIC PRIORITY:

NEW CAREERS for CRIMINALS

by Arnold S. Trebach

Despite rising public concern and fear, despite pledges and promises to reduce crime and restore "law and order," despite vast increases in funds for crime control, enlarged police forces, tougher laws and court procedures, we are still losing the battle against crime - and we do not have any overall strategy.

The FBI reports that serious crime increased 148 per cent between 1960 and 1969; allowing for population growth, the crime rate increased 120 per cent. In 1969, there were almost five million reported crimes, an increase of 12 per cent over 1968.

It is my profound belief that we can make very significant gains on this, our most serious domestic problem, during the '70s without compromising a single fundamental freedom - if we adopt a national strategy for crime control which clearly recognizes one major priority among the many valid approaches to reduction of crime, which puts together presently scattered, uncoordinated resources, programs, and funds to focus on this priority, and uses quantitative measures to record success or failure.

In proposing a single major priority for effective crime control, I recognize that crime is an enormously complex problem which must be attacked on many fronts. But, unless clear target priorities are set, a simultaneous diversity of approaches seriously hinders an effective control program.

For example, in 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice made excellent recommendations covering a broad scope of action throughout the entire justice system - police, courts, corrections, and prevention - and wrote a beautiful encyclopedia. But even in the section entitled "A National Strategy," the commission set no solid priorities. And the majority of its recommendations have yet to be acted upon.

One current approach to crime control is to strengthen the police and their ability to cope with proliferating kinds of crime now afflicting our society - particularly violent crime and civil disorder.

Another approach is to strengthen the management capability and technology of our antiquated, often ineffective, institutions of justice.

Another focuses on the control and prevention of drug addiction,

now reaching epidemic proportions in some cities and responsible for a major proportion of crime.

Still another approach concentrates on crime prevention through community action programs such as those started by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and the Office of Economic Opportunity, which are aimed at social change to discourage the development of criminal behavior.

All of these approaches are important and should be pursued. But I do not believe that any of them should be the first priority for winning the battle against crime.

What should be target number one? Consider these incredible statistics:

- (1) According to an FBI analysis of a sample of over 100,000 persons arrested in 1967-68, 82 per cent had prior arrest records; 70 per cent had been convicted previously of one or more crimes; 46 per cent had been imprisoned on a prior sentence of 90 days or more.
- (2) An FBI study of 240,322 serious offenders during the 10-year period 1960-69 found that, as a group, these offenders averaged almost four arrests. During this time, 36 per cent had two or more convictions and 46 per cent served a prison term of a year or more. After their initial arrest in the early 1960s, these offenders were rearrested, primarily on local and state charges, a total of 693,000 times.
- (3) The recidivism rate among offenders released from some youth institutions has reached a scandalous 75 per cent! And young offenders constitute our single worst crime problem.

Any respectable business executive who presided over an enterprise with a record comparable to this would do the decent thing and quietly commit hari-kari on his desk set.

Betting men could get good odds, especially on a young offender, on the following triple-horse parlay: 1) the correctional process he goes through will not rehabilitate him, and indeed, may do him more harm than good; 2) he will commit another crime within several years of release, and 3) the next crime will be more serious, perhaps more violent, than the preceding one.

"Repeated offenders," the Presidential Crime Commission concluded, "constitute the hard core of the crime problem." There are, today, between 1.5 and two million identified criminal offenders now under some form of correctional control - approximately 500,000 behind bars, with the remainder out on probation or parole.

It seems overpoweringly clear that our number one priority in the war on crime should be the rehabilitation of these people now under correctional control. Every dollar spent on rehabilitating a convicted person has the potential for being more cost-effective, in terms of reducing crime, than a dollar spent in any other area of national endeavor.

PG. 3

We do not have to send our search parties out to find who will be committing crimes this year or next year or the next. We already have many of their names and addresses. Here is a highly identifiable target, and we are allowing an incredibly ineffective, underfinanced, antiquated, undermanned, and underequipped correctional system to throw away a supreme opportunity for making our streets safe and our homes secure.

Today, the half million or so persons behind bars are caged and counted, denied normal relationships, sometimes brutally treated by staff who usually have no training or interest in rehabilitation, and then put out on the streets and expected to behave normally - whereupon the hapless policemen must go about catching a large percentage of them again to put them through the same meaningless justice process. Much the same thing occurs, though more humanely, with many offenders under probation or parole supervision. Probation and parole officers are underpaid, undertrained, and generally have huge caseloads (a hundred or more) and few facilities for treatment or other training to prepare offenders for rejoining society. Correctional officials, for the most part, deserve as much sympathy as blame, and it is a credit to them that the recidivism rate is not higher.

If offender-rehabilitation becomes the first priority of our national crime-control strategy, the nearly two million people under correctional control would be the main focus for money and technical efforts. The identification of a person as an offender would trigger a massive social response to try to prevent him from committing another antisocial act.

But what about the offenders not now under correctional control, not now in an institution, or not now on probation or parole? Some estimates place the number of Americans with some form of a criminal record (including one day in jail) at a staggering 20 million. And what about those offenders too smart to get caught? Would not this national crime-control strategy miss huge chunks of the criminal universe?

Yes, quite probably. But this is a conscious choice, made in full realization of the risk. Moreover, this strategy, like others, sets priorities, but it does not eliminate other courses of action; it merely sets them lower down the list.

As a first step in an offender-centered crime-control strategy, the tools to measure success or failure -- profit and loss -- must be improved. At present, there is an unbelievable lack of information on the most basic fundamentals. While I have cited statistics, neither I nor anyone else actually knows how many arrested or convicted offenders there are in the country, or their rearrest records. We don't even know how many correctional institutions there are. Some jails don't know how many inmates they have on a given day.

As the FBI stated in its 10 year study of recidivism:

"The key to the effectiveness of the system is in knowing what happened to the people who were handled or treated by the criminal justice

process, specifically, whether they were deterred from further criminal acts/or rehabilitated."

Here, then, is the way to keep score, not only of correctional agencies, but of the entire criminal justice system. One of the elements in the new offender-centered justice strategy must be a simple, unified set of numbers that would count heads (of identified offenders), compile criminal histories, and keep track, as the FBI suggested, of the recidivism rate. Fortunately, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) of the Justice Department is now funding several programs aimed at producing a reliable system of national criminal statistics.

But this is only a first step, a measuring tool. There are a number of other basic, practical steps that should be taken by national, state, and city governments and private organizations to develop a winning crime-control strategy. The momentum for these efforts can come from one place only - the White House.

I would urge the President and his key criminal justice advisers to visit a typical county jail and a state prison. There's nothing like starting with a sense of reality. Mr. President, such a visit would effectively publicize your interest in corrections. If the institution is indeed typical, you will find hundreds or thousands of people locked up; that's all, locked up, and often subjected to treatment which at best is inhuman, and at worst breeds increased hostility to all forms of legitimate social authority.

Speak to the prisoners, Mr. President. It should strike you forcibly that these caged humans beings will one day be let out - 98 per cent are eventually released - and they will act as if they have been caged for years, once they hit the streets. No surprise.

Of course, we don't know how much is spent in this country each year on corrections, nor what part of that goes for rehabilitation - but the figures are probably around \$1 billion for all corrections, with perhaps 5 to 10 per cent, \$50 to \$100 million, for rehabilitation.

Mr. President, you must "put it all together," at the national level. I say this in the most positive way, and urge my liberal, intellectual brethren to do the same, much as we might cheer on the coach of a bunch of football stars who keep fumbling the ball. Virtually all the ingredients for a winning strategy are present in Washington, but the resources are scattered and unfocused, and thus ineffective.

On November 13, 1969, Mr. President, in a speech and memorandum to the Attorney General, you laid it on the line: "The American system for correcting and rehabilitating criminals presents a convincing case of failure." And you directed Mr. Mitchell to implement a specific 13-point program for massive overhaul and reform of the entire correctional system through "bold, imaginative programs" with emphasis on prisoner rehabilitation. The Attorney General was directed to report back in six months with a progress report.

I am persuaded that the Department of Justice has made a good college try at implementing your directive. There are many talented people in that department, and in Labor, HUD, KEW, OEO, and other agencies, who dedicate long workdays in a devoted effort to reduce crime. But the mandated six-month progress report has not been made public nor, to my knowledge, has any major action been taken that reflects the urgency and scope of your message.

Moreover, and most distressing, there does not exist an articulated national strategy on offender rehabilitation that logically coordinates the millions spent by the federal government every year on corrections, nor that directs the power-house of talent in the federal bureaucracy toward agreed-upon goals. There is no overall crime-control strategy, applicable to other parts of the system.

Democrats, don't crow. Things were no different under Mr. Johnson or Ramsey Clark. In fact, this crew is doing a mite better.

We all know where the buck must stop. Mr. Nixon, allow me to urge you to make a declaration of national policy placing offender rehabilitation as the top priority. Some of the most important elements of that strategy are to be found in the April, 1970, report of your own President's Task Force on Prisoner Rehabilitation.

A successful, offender-centered crime control program can also be a very positive force to bring many of us "together again." Most of the people of this country, whatever their party, color, or viewpoint, are very deeply concerned about crime, and will certainly support an intelligent program to rehabilitate offenders. Richard Harris noted in his recent book, "Justice," that the overwhelming importance of prisoner rehabilitation was one of the few matters on which Ramsey Clark and John Mitchell clearly agreed.

The key elements of a new crime-control strategy can be stated simply.

(1) THE NEW STRATEGY MUST PROVIDE OFFENDERS WITH WHAT THEY NEED TO STOP BEING OFFENDERS, ESPECIALLY JOBS AND JOB TRAINING. I agree completely with the President's Task Force on Prisoner Rehabilitation which clearly emphasized that "Satisfying work experiences for institutionalized offenders..... and the assurance of decent jobs for released offenders should be at the heart of the correctional process."

Currently, the unemployment rate of men released from prison runs three to four times higher than that of the general population. Many offenders are poorly educated, come from unstable family backgrounds, and have numerous personal, mental, and physical problems which may make them unemployable or unlikely to remain in a job. While we cannot expect to remake or deal with all the problems of all of the several million offenders under correctional control, we can concentrate education, training, and treatment efforts toward motivating and preparing offenders for worthwhile jobs, helping them to find such jobs, and working with personal problems which prevent successful employment.

The quantifiable test of success or failure here would be the number of jobs secured for offenders, the salaries; the length of time they stay on the job, their promotions and raises, or their dropouts and terminations.

Of course, this priority on jobs is not the only solution. Criminal offenders may need psychiatric, medical, and dental treatment, legal services, personal and family counseling. Many offenders are too old, too young, or too sick to work.

An increasingly serious problem, which needs special handling, is the rising number of offenders who are drug addicts. Drug addiction is not only a tragic human problem; it may impel the addict to commit criminal acts. The rise in crimes related to hard drug addiction is reaching epidemic proportions in some cities today. In the District of Columbia, for example, 43 per cent of those arrested for crimes in recent months were heroin addicts. And many of these addicts are constantly bringing new recruits into drug dependency.

The narcotics problem is so serious that the priority clearly must be to identify and get control of addict-offenders and give them medical treatment. To date, only a few programs seem to have had any significant success in breaking addiction. For example, programs which use methadone or similar chemical treatment as a substitute have had a high degree of success in dealing with heroin addiction. More of these programs are badly needed, and more money and effort should be spent on seeking alternative treatment. But along with medical treatment, the goal should still be to get the addict a stable job.

The selection of jobs as a top priority relegates other approaches to correctional rehabilitation to a subordinate status. Thus, the primary aim is not to make offenders happy, God-fearing, patriotic, nor to eradicate all their neuroses or near-psychoses, sexual perversions, or other distressing behavior patterns. In this program of priorities, neither does it matter if offenders, individually or as a group, practice voodoo. If we get them into a paying, hopefully meaningful, job, if they can get to it every day and function effectively while there, if they don't stick up a gas station between home and work, then the crime-offender balance sheet should show a whopping profit, which is what this business is all about.

Truly, I wish I had come up with something more startling, like a new computer system, or violet-scented Mace, or a new theory on the causes of crime. But when I look back over 15 years of work in criminal justice, I keep coming up with the primacy of jobs for offenders. Numerous studies show that steady employment and adequate income are directly related to low repeater rates for ex-offenders.

Moreover, steady employment and adequate income for ex-offenders are directly related to the extent to which correctional programs have provided education, job training, job development and placement, counseling, and follow-up services to deal with personal and family crises that arise after the offender takes the job. In other words, while the primacy of jobs

may be a simple notion, it is not a simple matter to get an offender into a job and keep him there. But there have been a number of successful demonstration programs which show that it can be done.

One of the first programs sponsored by the Labor Department under a new section of the Manpower Development and Training Act providing vocational training for prisoners has resulted in a 25-per-cent drop in recidivism for those in the program as compared to a control group of other prisoners released from Rikers Island prison in New York.

A concentrated rehabilitation program geared to job placement has had very encouraging results at Draper Correctional Center in Alabama. Of 290 graduated, 276 were placed in jobs, and 218 had not returned to jail or prison within one to three years after their release. This is a very good record for a group of young inmates, 70 per cent already repeated offenders, and all school dropouts without previous vocational skills. The Draper program included programmed instruction for basic education and vocational training, incentives and rewards for achievement, personal coaching and counseling, social services to cope with family problems, active job development and placement, and follow-up services to graduate after their release to help them adjust to job and society. Inmates were trained for jobs which were currently available in the surrounding area, such as bricklaying, electrical repairs, and sign painting.

A different, and significant, approach to job training was carried out in Vacaville, Calif. with a group of 18 inmates who, by Corrections Department evaluation, were highly likely to recidivate within a year of release. By means of group dynamics and similar experimental techniques, they were trained to work on social problems related to their own lives. Almost all went on to become job trainers, researchers, and job-program developers in antipoverty programs and similar social projects. Several now have high positions in government and private organizations. Only two returned to prison. In contrast, almost all members of a "control" group with similar backgrounds and records, who received no training, landed back in prison.

The Vacaville project suggests another important aspect of a job-oriented rehabilitation strategy. For many offenders, the best - or only - chance of rehabilitation lies in fields where they can feel socially useful and gain some sense of personal dignity.

The use of offenders and ex-offenders in correctional work itself is increasingly recognized as a very positive aid, not only in their own rehabilitation, but in more effective rehabilitation of other offenders. Correctional officials have testified that ex-offenders can often break down otherwise insuperable barriers between prisoners or juvenile delinquents and the professional, largely middle-class staff who are trying to treat them.

The New York State Division for Youth has had a hundred offenders and ex-offenders in jobs working with youthful offenders over the past several years. The Los Angeles County Probation Office currently has an expanding community treatment program for seriously delinquent youth employing community workers who are ex-offenders. The program director has reported superior results:

"Each juvenile participant in this project represented a dollar saving of \$1,300 to the county...when compared to costs of his residence in a camp."

(2) TO WEAVE A NATIONWIDE FABRIC OF JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND PLACEMENT FOR OFFENDERS, THE MANPOWER SYSTEMS AT EVERY LEVEL MUST BE TIED INTO THE JUSTICE AND CORRECTIONAL SYSTEMS. The Department of Labor, therefore, must be placed in as lofty a perch as that held by the Department of Justice. Here again, the President himself may have to create this marriage - by shotgun if necessary.

The Department of Labor has done some of the most significant work in the country on developing manpower training and placement for offenders. This has operated mainly under Section 251 of the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA). Skill training programs for imprisoned offenders have enrolled approximately 5,000 inmates in 47 institutions and 28 states, with the cost reaching \$6 million. An intensive evaluation of these programs is now under way, but even preliminary reports indicate a highly significant, favorable impact on recidivism.

Labor will increase funding for such programs in this fiscal year (1971) to \$14 million and there are plans to increase the total Labor Department offender-manpower commitment to \$50 million in fiscal 1972. But this will still be highly inadequate to deal with the needs of hundreds of thousands of offenders.

Several manpower programs now have direct links to offender rehabilitation - JOBS, which focuses on employment in private industry; the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps, offering opportunities for youth; and the vast federal-state employment service machinery throughout the country, to name a few. But these programs have never become fully effective, since their links to the correctional system are far too weak.

Moreover, practical experience convinces me that while the President must order the marriage between the two systems as a necessary first step, the impact of that order won't be felt unless vigorous steps are taken at the local level.

Local "establishment" leaders must start building enormous pressure for effective offender rehabilitation and they must make demands for the manpower-correction union in their cities, counties, and states.

Let me make some specific suggestions to state and local leaders, to the heads of local urban coalitions, city criminal justice coordinating councils where they exist, Junior Chambers of Commerce, mayors, and state officials.

Start working on identified offenders. Go into the jails and prisons, talk to probation and parole officials, find out how many offenders there are, what facilities and programs there are for education, job training, job placement, and treatment.

In your city and county jails you will find large numbers of offenders either being detained or awaiting trial and disposition, or serving relatively short sentences, under one year. Except in rare instances, you will find absolutely no programs to get them into jobs or to encourage their rehabilitation. You don't have to look at your neighbors or the bad guys in the next county. You can start right at home.

Find out at what point offenders, under the best possible circumstances, might be put into job training, while in these institutions, or better yet, put on probation or parole or work-release so that they can start working and living, at least part-time, in the community. Work with correctional and judicial officials to get as many of those men out of jails and into community-based treatment programs, halfway houses, and jobs, as soon as possible.

I would urge, plead, even pray, that you do everything possible to get offenders out of the traditional court-jail processes. As a general proposition, courts and jails cannot handle and really don't know what to do with offenders. And offenders, for their part, seem to be generally worse off for the association.

Be prepared for accusations that you are letting hoods and murderers loose on the innocent people of your community. But that is just what is now done, every day.

Moreover, when your son, or nephew, or the boy next door gets busted, skillful lawyers and psychiatrists usually get him out of jail, into probation and a carefully designed program of treatment and supervision. Generally, the middle class and rich are horrified at the prospect of putting their children into the infectious garbage heap of the present correctional system; the same horror should prevent such treatment for children of the poor.

Of course, it will be much more difficult to secure probation and early release for repeated, hardened, serious offenders. But even for them, the quicker we can get them out of the traditional criminal justice process and institutions and into community treatment programs, especially jobs and job-training, the better off they, and society, will be.

Every court, judge, police lock-up, county jail, probation department, and state prison should be available shortly after arrest, even before the "offender" has been formally "identified" by a court conviction.

Two such "early diversion projects" which, incidentally, employ ex-offenders as subprofessional aides, now operate in New York City and Washington, D.C., supported primarily by MDTA funds. The Manhattan Court Employment Project, a three-year experiment conducted by the Vera Institute of Justice, intervenes just after arrest and offers the arrestee counseling, referral to appropriate social service and job-training agencies, and job placement. (Suspects facing serious charges, such as homicide and armed robbery, as well as alcoholics and drug addicts, are not eligible.)

If the person performs well for 90 days, the project staff goes into court and recommends dismissal of the charges. If not, he is returned to court. While a final evaluation of the effect on recidivism has not been made, the project seems to have had a very favorable impact.

Favorable experience has also been reported by Project Crossroads, a similar program conducted by the National Committee for Children and Youth with juvenile and adult offenders in Washington, D.C.

Labor will expand its early diversion programs to at least six other cities by early 1971, and LEAA sources report scores of such projects are now turning up in grant applications. There is interest and money at the national level for early diversion projects. The more local pressure for such projects, the better the chance to increase federal funds for them.

Community leaders also must put pressure on all the agencies of the local manpower system - the U.S. Department of Labor office, the State Employment Service, and other job programs - to work with the correctional institutions on training and placement for offenders.

You should also contact appropriate local officials of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, who probably will have more money than any other federal agency in your area. LEAA appropriations are expected to triple during the next few years, up to \$1.5 billion. Most of this money will be available through your state planning agency, which is formally responsible to the governor but is composed of local and regional representatives. It may take some pushing and hauling to get enough money put into the correctional process - for although LEAA is the top fund-granting agency in the crime field, it tends to put most of its money into police projects. However, the percentage of its funds devoted to corrections went up from 10 to 27 this year as compared to last - a total of at least \$50 million for corrections (and perhaps as much as \$75 million). Much of this seems destined for rehabilitation.

And, if the top people in communities all over the country come up with intelligent, carefully planned and focused programs for effective offender-rehabilitation, there is no doubt that the money will be forthcoming.

In many communities, you will find that the really hardcore offenders are sent away to prisons operated by state authorities, often removed from the local community. But the same approach must be taken with them. The felons in the state prisons today are the misdemeanants of the county jails of yesterday. Their basic needs are not terribly different from those of the less hardened in city or county jails.

You will probably find large numbers of juvenile offenders under correctional control in your communities. And these young people represent the greatest challenge and perhaps the greatest opportunity to really do something about crime. Look at them in their cells. See how pitiful and terribly young they look, and at the same time realize that they commit some of the worst crimes in your community - armed robberies, senseless killings and shooting, rapes, and many burglaries and larcenies.

Educational authorities should be heavily involved in all job training programs, but effective educational programs are particularly needed by youthful offenders. Many have not finished high school, and even if they have, check their reading levels. You may be amazed to find how many literally cannot read a newspaper or even a comic book. So young offenders may need intensive basic education as well as vocational training and placement.

Of course, it will do no good to tie the correctional system into the manpower system unless concurrent efforts are made to eliminate the many barriers that bar ex-offenders from jobs. Pressure must be put on both government and business to change restrictive policies so that ex-offenders gain entry into the economic opportunity system of this country.

(3) MUCH MORE MONEY AND EFFORT MUST BE SPENT ON IMPROVING MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT, EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND STAFF SALARIES. In 1969, the prestigious Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training brought it all down front when it declared:

"The public and their legislators must understand that there can be no solution to the problem of recidivism.....as long as there is a predominance of low-paid, dead-end jobs in corrections...."

Again, I urge local community leaders to look at the staff of local jails and prisons. You will probably find, unless you are in an exceptional community, that there is not enough staff, that it is qualitatively poor and badly utilized.

For example, the last county jail I visited was in Dade County, Fla. The warden was an enlightened man who was most concerned that he had virtually no rehabilitation facilities for the approximately 40,000 people who will pass through his institution this year. One of his major problems has been simply getting enough manpower so that he could put at least two correctional officers on each floor to prevent inmate assaults on one another.

The National Crime Commission estimated that the number of correctional employees should be doubled and treatment staff tripled to meet 1965 needs. By 1975, the commission saw need for more than 300,000 employees, with treatment staff needs increasing fivefold.

Correctional manpower structures and policies must also reflect the new priorities. Today, the vast majority of correctional manpower provides mere custodial care. Relatively few staff members know how to develop or operate a rehabilitative, job-centered program. There is a tremendous need to recruit and train academic and vocational teachers, job counselors and developers, group and individual counselors, social services, health, and legal advisers, and other actively working for rehabilitation, job training and placement. Many more correctional workers must be located in the community, to provide links to jobs and other community institutions.

There is also great need for more members of minority groups working in corrections at all levels. Many offenders are members of minority groups; but, as the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training has recently documented, a very small number of corrections staff come from these groups. In supervisory positions, less than 3 per cent are from minority groups.

Minority correctional workers - like the ex-offenders whom I mentioned previously - have special ability to relate to and work with minority offenders. Many new minority members could first be recruited into newly created subprofessional positions - which are already recognized as essential to relieve severe professional manpower shortage - and then provide further training and opportunity to move up into professional careers.

All relevant agencies must help improve correctional manpower programs. Justice and Labor are starting to do so. One must wonder, in this connection, what HEW is doing to implement the report of the Joint Commission, which it funded.

(4) A PARALLEL, ALLIED, PRIVATE CORRECTIONAL AND OFFENDER-REHABILITATION SYSTEM SHOULD BE CREATED. Government cannot do it alone. I simply do not see enough change taking place, however large the sums made available, solely within governmental structures.

A partnership with private resources must be created to work on crime control and offender rehabilitation just as it has been in other fields. By this I mean that government must provide larger and yet larger sums of money for treatment, education, and training contracts with private industries, and businessmen must start making venture capital and corporate resources available to handle government contracts in this field. Some private firms already operate treatment centers and halfway houses.

Businessmen should use the ingenuity for which American enterprise is famous and come up with new ideas that can help cut the crime rate through rehabilitation of offenders. It is a healthy situation when a contribution to the public weal can be combined with private profit.

Frankly, I am surprised at the enthusiasm with which some private businessmen view involvement in offender rehabilitation. Not only are many firms hiring ex-offenders, but some have plans to carve out a major role in improving the entire correctional field. Last March, for example, Howard C. Wiechman, national administrator of technical and vocational education for the Portland Cement Association (PCA) stated: "Growth within our industry is being stifled by labor shortage. Just as most inmates need jobs and job skill, we need trained people to place and finish concrete and plaster."

The PCA has applied for federal funds for several projects that will provide prison inmates with vocational and basic remedial education, work experience, and job placement in relatively well-paying jobs.

PCA has already received \$200,000 from LEAA for a program working with prisoners who have been released. The program - Operation DARE - has set up a central coordinating unit to work with penal authorities, state and local parole and pardon boards, and public and private community agencies to provide ex-inmates with needed job training, placement, and supportive personal services.

Other businesses have trained and hired offenders in jobs running the gamut of American industry, from computer operators to mechanics to administrative work.

It is encouraging to see that the greatly expanded and enriched 1970 LEAA corrections program emphasizes involvement of the private sector. While still in its beginning stages, the effort, labeled Private Sector Community Based Programs (which funded PCA), is a positive, imaginative step in the implementation of one of the 13 points Mr. Nixon set forth last November. Headed by a former Labor Department official, Don Swicord, the program incorporates many good manpower and career development concepts into the Justice-private sector mix. The program merits vastly expanded LEAA funds, more than the few millions in the next two years now apparently destined for it.

The National Alliance of Businessmen and local urban coalitions, moreover, would seem to have natural roles in promoting and coordinating business involvement.

One great difficulty will be in finding qualified personnel to run projects operated by private industry. Temporarily, this could create an even greater manpower shortage in public correctional agencies, for private industry is certain to pay better salaries and to attract many of the best correctional staff. In a short time, there should be benefits to both the governmental correctional system and the allied, private operation. The manpower situation, especially salaries, should improve greatly because of this competition. Moreover, these private industries are likely to be eager to hire ex-offenders for some of the many good jobs they will have available. This is one line of work in which offenders' experience is relevant and their credentials impeccable.

Finally - but, actually, in the beginning - there is love. It has been said that it is far easier to hate the crime than the criminal. Confront the criminal, capture him, look him in the face - he is us, our children, our brother, our sisters. We created him. I have written about cold statistics, quantifiable tests, and strategies. But human compassion for other humans is still the most important equation, and should move us to do what is not only necessary, but also humane, to help offenders rejoin society as constructive human beings.

PERSPECTIVE: THE MULTIPLE PAYOFFS
OF PUBLIC-SERVICE JOB CREATION

by Donald Canty

Where will the jobs come from, to turn offenders to careers other than crime? In fact, where will the jobs come from, to reverse the upward climb of unemployment - which, as always, is hitting hardest precisely the most volatile and most vulnerable segments of our urban society.

Again as always, because we are also a free-enterprise economy, most of the jobs must be supplied by this economy's continued growth to reduce unemployment leaves many behind - gives others on the bottom of the economic ladder a tragically temporary boost upward.

The manpower programs of the Great Society did rely on the unprecedented prosperity of the times to supply the jobs. These programs concentrated on preparing the poor to take jobs. The final annual report of Lyndon Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers warned that even a slight dip on the curve of prosperity could quickly take the jobs away from those traditionally last-hired and first-fired. Now the dip has come and the warning has been proved accurate. Since it was issued, in early 1969, unemployment as a whole has gone from 3.5 per cent to September's six-year high of 5.5 per cent. In nine cities, in August, the rate was 10 per cent or more (20.7 per cent in Flint, Mich.) - and clearly rising.

These trends, quite logically, are causing some members of Congress to question whether the Administration's Family Assistance Plan can, as advertised, transfer people, "from the welfare rolls to payrolls."

They are also giving rise to a new wave of interest in an idea advanced by virtually every major Presidential commission of recent years to take a hard look at the problem of unemployment: the idea that the federal government must create jobs as well as training slots. The Commissions, moreover, have agreed on precisely what kind of jobs should be created: jobs in the area of local public services, from maintaining the parks to providing paraprofessional help in the schools and hospitals.

The commissions and other advocates of public-service job creation through federal subsidy make a convincing case that no other single urban program could have such a multiplicity of deep-reaching benefits. A partial listing of these benefits follows.

1. Such a program would increase the number of jobs rather than the competition for jobs. The Great Society's single-minded focus on training and "hard-core" recruitment generated quite legitimate fears among white workers that they might be pushed aside - especially as the job market tightened. Creating new jobs would diminish this source of urban tension.
2. At the same time, it would get badly needed public business done. Demand for all manner of local public services - from garbage collection to police protection - is rising as the quality of these services declines because of many cities' near-bankruptcy. The money is at the federal level but, as Wilfred Owens of the Brookings Institution has wryly pointed out, the people all happen to live at the local level. The shoddiness of local public services importantly impacts upon the quality of their lives, generating

daily irritations that can - at any time - come together in a fire-storm of urban turmoil.

3. Moreover, a public-service job program would provide the cities with precisely the kind of fiscal relief they need most - money to pay people to do things. More than one city recently has built a new library, but the doors remain locked because there is no money to hire staff. The cities' most critical deficiencies are in their operating budgets, where the public services subsidies would go.

4. Finally, these subsidies could effectively tie the delivery of public services to the communities served. Thus, putting a neighborhood mother in an inner-city school as a teacher's aide does more than augment the teaching process. It installs a friendly, familiar presence in the classroom or hallway: someone who shares, and therefore knows, the particular problems of the neighborhood and its residents, young and old.

It also could lead the mother to an upgrading of her own skills and education and, eventually perhaps, a full-fledged teaching assignment - if the subsidy program were designed, as it must be, to offer a genuine hope of careers, public and private, as well as jobs. This would require, first, that every office of local government regard itself, in part, as a training office. It also would require much firmer linkages than now exist between public agencies and private employers.

A second essential element of the program's design would be sufficiency of scale. The need is great, in terms of both the numbers of the unemployed whom the program could help - and the amount of public business perennially left undone. The best measurement of the latter came in a survey of 50 big-city mayors in 1968, in which the mayors said they could usefully put some 300,000 men and women to work on the delivery of essential public services. Certainly any program involving substantially lesser numbers would be a drop in a bucket that is, at present, dangerously dry and getting drier.

This article was reproduced with the permission of City magazine