Federal Probation

Estimates of Dru... Probationers: ... — *...Eric D. Wish, ...ry Cuadrado, ...L. Martorana*

Felony Probation ... — *...naro F. Vito*

Probation: An E... — *...ichard Gray*

The Butner Resea... — *...raig T. Love, ...e G. Allgood, ...am Samples*

...Offi... Tra... — *...mas Schade*

...ocial Needs of Families of Prisoners: ...nate Rehabilitation ..... *James D. Jorgensen, Santos H. Hernandez, Robert C. Warren*

Mediation: A National Survey ..... *Mark S. Umbreit*

...e of Mental Deficiency Among Adult Offenders ..... *Gordon H. Doss, David W. Head, J. Vernon Blackburn, James M. Robertson*

...l Deficits and Treatment Needs of ...nality ..... *Gary Field*

...Job Analysis: Rural-Urban Differences ..... *Lori L. Colley, Robert G. Culbertson, Edward Latessa*

DECEMBER 1986

Federal Probation

A JOURNAL OF CORRECTIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE

Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts

VOLUME L DECEMBER 1986 NUMBER 4

This Issue in Brief

Estimates of Drug Use in Intensive Supervision Probationers: Results from a Pilot Study.—Authors Eric D. Wish, Mary Cuadrado, and John A. Martorana present findings from a pilot study of drug use in probationers in the New York City Intensive Supervision Probation (ISP) Program, a study prompted by ISP staff need for on-site urine testing of ISP probationers. Confidential research interviews were conducted with 106 probationers in the Brooklyn ISP program, 71 percent of whom provided a urine specimen for analysis. The urine tests indicated a level of drug use strikingly higher than the level estimated by probation officers, who depended upon the probationers to tell them about their drug use. The authors contend that the costs of reincarcering drug abusers who fail probation are substantial when compared with the costs of a urine testing program. They conclude that ISP programs, with their small caseloads and emphasis on community supervision, provide a special opportunity for adopting systematic urine testing and for learning how best to intervene with drug abusing offenders.

Felony Probation and Recidivism: Replication and Response.—As a result of the Rand report on felony probation in California, probation supervision is attracting close attention. In the present study, author Gennaro F. Vito examines the recidivism rates of 317 felony probationers from three judicial districts in Kentucky and makes some direct comparisons to the Rand report. The general conclusion that felony probation supervision appears to be relatively effective in controlling recidivism rates is tempered by the limitations of both studies. The author stresses the need to closely examine the purpose and goals of probation supervision.

CONTENTS

Estimates of Drug Use in Intensive Supervision Probationers: Results from a Pilot Study ... Eric D. Wish, Mary Cuadrado, John A. Martorana 4

Felony Probation and Recidivism: Replication and Response ... Gennaro F. Vito 17

Probation: An Exploration in Meaning ... Richard Gray 26

The Butner Research Projects: The First 10 Years ... Craig T. Love, Jane G. Allgood, F. P. Sam Samples 32

Prison Officer Training in the United States: The Legacy of Jessie O. Stutsman ... Thomas Schade 40

Addressing the Social Needs of Families of Prisoners: A Tool for Inmate Rehabilitation ... James D. Jorgensen, Santos H. Hernandez, Robert C. Warren 47

Victim/Offender Mediation: A National Survey ... Mark S. Umbreit 53

A Quick Measure of Mental Deficiency Among Adult Offenders ... Gordon H. Doss, David W. Head, J. Vernon Blackburn, James M. Robertson 57

The Psychological Deficits and Treatment Needs of Chronic Criminality ... Gary Field 60

Probation Officer Job Analysis: Rural-Urban Differences ... Lori L. Colley, Robert G. Culbertson, Edward Latessa 67

Thomas E. Gahl ... Harry N. Huxhold 72

Roberts J. Wright ... 72

Departments

News of the Future ... 74
Looking at the Law ... 78
Reviews of Professional Periodicals ... 82
Your Bookshelf on Review ... 86
Letters to the Editor ... 90
It Has Come to Our Attention ... 90
Indexes of Articles and Book Reviews ... 91

Prison Officer Training in the United States: The Legacy of Jessie O. Stutsman*

BY THOMAS SCHADE, PH.D.

Associate Professor, Arizona State University

ON JANUARY 2, 1930, the first training school for Federal prison officers opened its doors at 427 West Street in New York City. Two months earlier, Jessie O. Stutsman had been asked by the Superintendent of Federal Prisons, Sanford Bates, to become the Director of the United States Training School for Prison Officers. Stutsman agreed and began the final and most productive phase of his distinguished career.

Born in Indiana in 1877, J. O. Stutsman was ordained as a Methodist minister in the early 1900's. He became disillusioned with the ministry and moved his family to Maryland soon after to pursue a degree in chemistry at Johns Hopkins University. While working part-time as an assistant pastor in Baltimore, he became affiliated with the Prisoners' Aid Association of Maryland. Appointed General Secretary of the Association in 1906, Stutsman began a 27-year career in corrections during which he would become an instrumental force in the development of professional training for first-line prison officers.

Following 5 years with the Prisoners' Aid Association, Stutsman moved into state and local prison administration with positions in Kansas City and Detroit. In 1920, he became Superintendent of the Rockview Penitentiary in Bellefonte, Pennsylvania and, eventually, of the United States Detention Headquarters in New York City. In 1926 Stutsman authored *Curing the Criminal* that was to become a standard text in penology. Written from the perspective of a prison administrator, the book brought a new synthesis of theory and practice to the literature. As Stutsman states in his Preface:

> Many able and comprehensive articles have appeared from time to time on sporadic phases of criminology and correctional methods; but seldom has any prison manager undertaken to present a concise statement of the philosophy and practice of modern methods.[1]

In addition to his major text, Stutsman also published two articles on the role of prison officers in *The Prison Journal*[2] and *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences.*[3]

History of Prison Officer Training

Before describing the events immediately preceding the Federal training school operation, a brief history of earlier efforts to train prison officers will help to set the context for events in New York City. The first documented attempt to formally train prison guards was apparently undertaken in Ghent, Belgium in 1834.[4] Later discontinued, a similarly structured school was established at the Luneburg Prison in Hanover, Germany in 1859. Fully developed, the school graduated 16 students after a 1-year course of study that included practical experience assisting a regular prison officer. The school was apparently discontinued in 1868 as the need for personnel declined.

During the last half of the 19th century, prison service schools were also being developed in France, Switzerland, and Italy.[5] These schools were usually residential and ran from 3 months to 1 year in length. Their activities emphasized military drill, physical training, and routine prison duties. Each, however, had some form of academic training as the students could be presumed to have little, if any, prior formal education. The establishment of prison officer training schools in Europe also became the focus of some attention at several international prison conferences. At both the London International Penitentiary Congress in 1872 and the International Prison Congress of Stockholm in 1878, it was affirmed that theoretical and practical training of prison officers was critical to the operation of a modern prison.

By the early 20th century, the movement to provide prison officers with formal training had spread to Japan and England. In 1908, Japan opened an academy for prison officers and by 1925 had grad-

---

***Much of the material drawn upon in the latter sections of this article comes from the private papers of J. O. Stutsman, made available to the author by his late daughter, Rachel Ball, as well as correspondence, forms, and records of the Bureau of Prisons located in the National Archives, Washington, D.C. An earlier version of this article was presented at the 1985 annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Science.**

[1] J. O. Stutsman, *Curing the Criminal.* New York: MacMillan, 1926, p. VII.

[2] J. O. Stutsman, "A Uniform, a Club and a Gun; or a Profession," *The Prison Journal,* XI(1), 1931, pp. 4-11.

[3] J. O. Stutsman, "The Prison Staff," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 157, September 1931, pp. 62-71.

[4] Thorsten Sellin, "Historical Glimpses of Training for Prison Service," *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science,* 15, 1934-35, pp. 594-5.

[5] Ibid., pp. 596-8.

uated more than 2,000 officers.[6] England soon followed the trend, and the British Training School for Prison Officers was begun at Wakefield in 1925.[7] The Wakefield school began with 8 weeks in residence and included a strong emphasis on the history of prisons, prison reform, causes of crime, and the role of education in rehabilitation. The largely theoretical training in residence at Wakefield was followed by 2 months of intensive in-service training at the officers' first posting. Here the new officers would be instructed by senior officers regarding the daily operations of the prisons. For the next 8 months, the new officer would serve a probationary period at the prison. If judged to be doing satisfactory work following his 4 months of training and 8 months of probationary status, the officer "becomes an established pensionable Civil Servant."[8]

It is somewhat puzzling to note that given the activity in the area of prison officer training throughout much of the world dating back to at least the 1830's, it was not until almost 100 years later that the first such school opened in the United States. In 1927, New York City formed the Keepers School for the training of its own jail officers. Begun by Richard C. Patterson, Commissioner of Correction for New York City, the Keepers School program was 8 weeks in length and emphasized the daily responsibilities of jail officers. Topics included jail security, use of force, report writing, and prisoner discipline.[9] Little time was spent on the causes of crime, methods of rehabilitation, or prison reform. No doubt the relatively shortterm confinement of prisoners within a city jail added to the custodial emphasis of jail officer training.

Origins and Philosophy of Federal Training School

Appointed to the post of Superintendent of Federal Prisons by President Hoover in June 1929, Sanford Bates had long been an advocate of more professional and formalized training for prison officers. First appointed Commissioner of Penal Institutions for the City of Boston in 1917, Bates was soon asked by Massachusetts Governor Calvin Coolidge to become Commissioner of the State Department of Correction. From 1919 until his appointment to the Federal system, Bates successfully guided the Massachusetts prison system through a series of progressive changes.[10] In 1926, he was elected president of the American Prison Association, reflecting the broad recognition by his colleagues of his accomplishments in Massachusetts. His eventual appointment as Superintendent of Federal Prisons (soon reorganized as the Bureau of Prisons) was an almost natural continuation of his rapidly advancing career. As characterized by Hershberger, "The selection of Bates signified that penal administration in the Federal Government had changed from political patronage to professional administration."[11]

Bates was also well versed in prison activities throughout the world. In 1925, he was a representative of the American Prison Association to the Ninth International Prison Congress in London. In that year, the Wakefield school had just opened and was a topic for considerable discussion among the international representatives. Certainly this exposure to the newly developed training model in England must have made a positive impression on Bates as well as on Dr. Hastings H. Hart who was also in attendance.

Within months after being named Superintendent of Federal Prisons in 1929, Bates contacted his old friend and colleague Dr. Hart, consultant in penology to the Russell Sage Foundation in New York City and chair of the advisory committee for the Wickersham Committee report on prisons. Hart was asked to begin the preliminary development of the curriculum for the proposed Federal training school.[12] Shortly thereafter, on November 19, 1929, Sanford Bates appointed J. O. Stutsman as Superintendent. The training school was to be located in New York City, giving it access to several operational prisons as well as the educational and professional resources well established in that city. Already Superintendent of the Federal Detention Headquarters in New York City, Stutsman had complete control of what would serve as a training laboratory for his student recruits.

During the 2 months following his appointment, Stutsman and Hart worked together to finalize the curriculum of the United States Training School which would open in January 1930. Dr. Hart's contributions were no doubt considerable, but the ultimate responsibility for both course organization and lecture content fell to Stutsman. His philosophy and approach to the emerging field of corrections and the training of its practitioners is nowhere better expressed than in his own words from an unpublished document summarizing his first 2 years as Superintendent:

> The general purpose of the School is to train officers to think intelligently on the practical problems of prison duty; to give them an adequate understanding of the historical and sociological background of modern corrective services to help them understand the human material with which they have to deal; to give them resourcefulness in handling tangled personalities, and to impress them with the reformative and constructive value of the work in which they are to engage. Emphasis is

[6] J. O. Stutsman, "Purposes and Methods of the United States Training School for Prison Officers," unpublished manuscript. 1932.

[7] Hart Hastings, *Training Schools for Prison Officers.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1930, pp.43-70.

[8] Ibid., p. 40.

[9] Ibid., pp. 31-39.

[10] Sanford Bates, *Prisons and Beyond.* New York: MacMillan, 1936, pp. 5-15.

[11] Gregory Hershberger. "The Development of the Federal Prison System," *Federal Probation,* December 1979, p. 16.

[12] Hart, op. cit., p. 7.

placed on methods of controlling men by intelligence and leadership rather than by force, and the necessity of a humanized, socialized viewpoint as well as technical skill.[13]

It is important to note in this quotation that only at the end of the final sentence is the custodial role of the prison officer even implied in the use of the phrase "technical skill." The emphasis throughout is on the intelligent understanding of the historical, sociological, and psychological dimensions of the correctional profession and the inmates it serves. It is quite evident that although both Stutsman and Hart had to be familiar with the custodial orientation of the New York City Keepers School, the major influence on their development of curriculum for the Federal school came from Wakefield. On September 19, 1929, Hart received a letter he had requested from Gilbert Hair, Governor of the British Training School at Wakefield, detailing the school's underlying philosophy and curriculum.[14] Although far from being directly copied, the influence of the Wakefield experience is clearly present in the curriculum eventually developed by Stutsman.

School Curriculum and Student Profile

The course of study in Stutsman's school can be outlined by the major topics covered during the 3 months of residential training.[15]

1. History of Crime and Punishment
2. A Study of the Present Crime Situation
3. Types of Penal Institutions and Their Functions
4. Physical Aspects of Penal Institutions
5. The Prisoner and His Background
6. The Prison Official
7. Prison Discipline
8. Classification and Segregation
9. The Activities of a Penal Institution
10. Miscellaneous Routine Duties Performed in Actual Service[16]

Appearing perhaps to emphasize the more traditional daily activities of prison officers, the list of topics covered is better understood after examination of the actual lectures given. For example, in a series of 64 lectures developed for both the 3-month training school and a similar correspondence course later developed by Stutsman, the lectures can be topically grouped as shown in figure 1.

Clearly, the subjects included in the course emphasize criminological and rehabilitative themes rather than what might be construed to be the more pragmatic concerns of prison officers. The spirit of progressivism had finally reached front-line prison staff and was being vigorously injected into basic, pre-service training.[17]

Figure 1

TOPICAL GROUPING OF J. O. STUTSMAN LECTURES TO UNITED STATES TRAINING SCHOOL FOR PRISON OFFICERS—1930

Topics	*Number of Lectures*
— Desired qualities in an officer	(5)
— Broad role of justice system	(5)
— Discipline and prison operations	(7)
— Medical and health factors	(8)
— Causes of crime and nature of criminals	(16)
— History and rehabilitative function of prisons	(23)

Approximately five to eight lectures were presented each week. Examinations, both written and oral, were given frequently. Outside reading was assigned to augment the lectures and to prepare the student for the completion of a required thesis. Individual thesis subjects were assigned at the beginning of the course and were submitted 2 weeks before completion. In addition to the demonstration of knowledge in the specific area of the assigned thesis, each student was expected to show a general command of the basic literature in criminology. In the words of Stutsman, "By this method . . . he is more likely to imbibe a lasting interest."[18]

Complementing classroom lectures, recruits were also required to complete what were loosely called "laboratory courses." These included first-aid, boxing and jiu-jitsu, physical exercises, firearms training, visit to courts, and field-based problem-solving exercises.[19] Such activities usually occupied from 1½ to 2 hours each day and were completed in the mornings.

Evenings and 1 day each weekend were usually spent on shift duty at one of the several Federal prisons or detention facilities in New York City. During this time, the students would be observed in interaction with inmates and an assessment made of their on-the-job skills. Certainly valued by Stutsman as an important part of the training, he would later be encouraged by his immediate supervisor, A. H.

[13] Stutsman (1932), op. cit., p. 7.

[14] Hart, op. cit., p. 43.

[15] Actual training time varied. The program at the first school in New York City lasted 3 months, but later schools in Atlanta and El Paso reduced this program to 2 months for administrative and budgetary reasons.

[16] Hart, op. cit., pp. 14-16.

[17] For an excellent discussion of "progressivism" in the American justice system, see Walker, 1980:127-160 and Rothman, 1980:117-127.

[18] Stutsman (1932), op. cit., p. 11.

[19] Hart, op. cit., p. 27.

MacCormick, Assistant Director of the Bureau of Prisons, to further emphasize and expand the practical aspects of training.[20]

At approximately 3-week intervals, a written examination was given to each student. Following, in figure 2, is an example of such an examination, given to a class in Atlanta on June 13, 1930 and included in a status report from Stutsman to A. H. MacCormick, Assistant Director of the Bureau of Prisons.

Figure 2

MIDTERM EXAMINATION ADMINISTERED TO UNITED STATES TRAINING SCHOOL FOR PRISON OFFICERS, ATLANTA, GEORGIA, JUNE 13, 1930

(Answer any five questions)

1. Define: Prophylaxis, Criminology, Penology, Heredity, Environment.
2. Why is it beneficial to a prison officer to understand the causes of crime?
3. Discuss five causes of crime.
4. Name and discuss any five early methods of torture and death for criminals.
5. Discuss the effects on the prisoner of stripes, the silent system, brutality, and poor food.
6. Discuss the effects of crime waves on the public mind, legislation, the courts, and prisons.
7. Discuss two types of prison architecture about which there has been much controversy.
8. Name five men who were influential in the transition from barbarous methods to reformative measures and discuss the work of each.[21]

Far from emphasizing the practical, this examination reflects Stutsman's great concern with the causes, context, and consequences of crime. To pass such an examination must have been a considerable challenge for most students then as it would be today.

At the conclusion of each training class, students would be individually graded by Stutsman on all aspects of their training. Figure 3 represents the original evaluation forms completed on two students from the graduating class at Atlanta, Georgia on July 25, 1930. A particularly capable student, as well as one who seemed to have some difficulty, were chosen for contrast.[22]

[20] Austin MacCormick, personal correspondence to Stutsman, Washington, D.C.: National Archives, June 17, 1930.

[21] J. O. Stutsman, personal correspondence to A. H. MacCormick, Washington, D.C.: National Archives, June 13, 1930.

[22] The original evaluations are on file in the National Archives, Washington, D.C. Names of actual students have been deleted.

Figure 3

PROFILE AND FINAL EVALUATION OF TWO STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES TRAINING SCHOOL FOR PRISON OFFICERS IN ATLANTA GEORGIA, JULY 25, 1930

Student A

Was born at West Liberty, Kentucky, May 19, 1906 and was reared at Lexington, Kentucky.

He attended common school at Lexington eight years, graduating in 1922. He went to the Lexington High School two years but did not finish the course. He then attended the U.S. Pharmacists Mates School at Portsmouth, Virginia.

He enlisted in the U.S. Navy January 29, 1924, sailing on the U.S.S. Camden as Phr. Mate 3rd Class and was discharged December 15, 1927.

February 28, 1929 he was married to [name deleted], of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and is living with her. They have no children.

His habits appear to be fairly good; he says he enjoys reading history and biography a "great deal." He goes to the threatre and vaudeville occasionally and to moving pictures twice weekly. He usually spends three nights weekly wrestling, and spends his Sundays mostly at home and church.

From 1928 to 1930, he conducted a service station for the Standard Oil Company at Louisville, Kentucky.

His grades in the U.S. Training School for Prison Officers are as follows:

Class Work:		*Thesis:*	84
First examination	86	Physical Training:	
Second examination	96	Leadership	75
Third examination	98	Posture	80
Fourth examination	94	Infantry drill	75
		Jiu Jutsu	90
		Boxing	85
		Calisthenics	85
		Foot exercises	85
		Artificial respiration	80
		Revolver practice	100
Average	93.5	Average	83.9

Student B

Was born at Hinton, West Virginia, July 30, 1900 and received his only education by attending Summers Common school six years, 1908-14, where he received a certificate of graduation.

He enlisted in the U.S. Army May 15, 1917, saw both foreign and domestic service and was honorably discharged May 15, 1923. Since his Army experience, he acted as police officer for the U.S. Steel Corporation from 1925-1927; a tire builder for the Goodyear Company at Akron, Ohio, 1927-28; a special officer for Sears-Roebuck and Company at Detroit in 1929; and a guard at Detroit in 1930 until he received his present appointment.

He married [name deleted] of West Virginia, December 19, 1925 to which union was born a child (a little girl) in 1927. He is living with his wife.

This man is quite reticent and reserved, giving the impression that he is more intelligent than he really is. He did not grasp the lectures and made exceedingly poor grades in that division of the course. I believe he has the ability to learn by observation and experience, it is for that reason I am recommending him for appointment. His personality and ability to learn from experience are the deciding factors.

His grades in the U.S. Training School for Prison Officers are as follows:

Class Work:		*Physical Training:*	
First examination	45	Leadership	70
Second examination	65	Posture	75
Third examination	84	Infantry drill	75
Fourth examination	84	Jiu Jutsu	80
		Boxing	80
		Calisthenics	80
		Foot exercises	80
		Artificial respiration	80
		Revolver practice	83
Average	69.5	Average	77.9
Thesis	75		

As can be seen from the narratives for both students, their personal habits and private lives appear to have been almost as important as their scores in examinations. Student A was an avid reader, enjoyed the arts, and spent Sundays in church. By contrast, Student B would appear to have no hobbies, did not attend church, and had the unfortunate quality of looking "more intelligent than he really is." One can only wonder the extent to which these factors might have influenced the more subjective elements of evaluation. Both, however, were recommended for service with the Bureau of Prisons and presumably accepted their initial postings.

The End of an Era

Although it is not clear how many recruit classes J. O. Stutsman directed before his death in 1933, we do know that he was actively involved in the training of almost 475 men through October of 1932.[23] Figure 4, retyped from Stutsman's own unpublished manuscript, indicates the number, location, dates and

Figure 4

THE UNITED STATES TRAINING SCHOOL FOR PRISON OFFICERS

Graduate Data as of September 12, 1932

			Total Number	*Passed*	*Failed*	*Resigned*	*Assigned Without Finishing Course*	*Died*
1st Class	NEW YORK	Jan. 2, 1930 - April 3, 1930	28	22	6			
2nd Class	ATLANTA	June 2, 1930 - July 31, 1930	42	41		1		
3rd Class	ATLANTA	Aug. 4, 1930 - Sept. 27, 1930	58	56[a]		2		
4th Class	NEW YORK	Dec. 10, 1930 - March 31, 1931	30	15	12	3		
5th Class	NEW YORK	Apr. 20, 1931 - June 26, 1931	34	23	7[b]	3		1
6th Class	NEW YORK	July 27, 1931 - Nov. 3, 1931	65	44	12[c]	1	8	
7th Class	NEW YORK	Nov. 17, 1931 - Jan. 29, 1932	54	45	1[d]	1	7	
8th Class	EL PASO	Feb. 8, 1932 - April 15, 1932	40	33	6[e]	1		
9th Class	NEW YORK	May 2, 1932 - July 1, 1932	65	61	1[f]		3	
		Totals	416	340	45	12	18	1
10th Class	NEW YORK	Aug. 10, 1932 - Oct. 10, 1932	58 (In Session)					

[a] 3rd Class - 3 passed conditionally.

[b] 5th Class - 3 rejected on account of Civil Service Investigation.
3 rejected on account of failing the medical examination.
1 failed to pass the requirements of the course.

[c] 6th Class - 3 rejected on account of failing the medical examination.
9 rejected on account of Civil Service Investigation.

[d] 7th Class - 1 rejected at beginning of course on account of failing medical examination.

[e] 8th Class - 3 students failed to pass the requirements of the course.
3 rejected on account of Civil Service Investigation.

[f] 9th Class - 1 student was rejected at very end of course on account of intoxication—passed in grades.

[23] Stutsman (1932), op. cit.

graduates of Federal training schools through 1932.[24] It is interesting to observe footnote (f) for the ninth class. Apparently, the anticipation of the upcoming graduation was too much for this student and resulted in a very short career with the Bureau of Prisons!

The closing of the training school in April 1933 was the result of several factors, not least among them, the death of Jessie O. Stutsman. As described by Stanford Bates, the closure was prompted, in part, by the termination of the Bureau's building program and the action of the Congressional Committee on Appropriations which felt that its continuation was an unnecessary expense. In describing the circumstances surrounding closure, however, the *first* reason given by Bates was the death of Stutsman.[25]

Although Stutsman's creative energy and continuing personal leadership within the training school was no doubt the primary reason for its success during his tenure as Superintendent, several significant events outside his control contributed to both the beginning and end of this era of prison officer training. In the late 1920's and early 1930's there had been a number of serious prison riots throughout the country. New York prisons at Clinton and Auburn as well as the Federal prison at Leavenworth were among those institutions that experienced severe problems. This led to increasing public concern about prison conditions generally. In 1929, The National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement (The Wickersham Commission) had as one of its less publicized responsibilities the examination of the entire field of corrections. In Volume Nine, *Report on Penal Institutions, Probation and Parole,* the prison problems of overcrowding, idleness, sanitation, and discipline, as well as the working conditions, pay, and training of guards, were highlighted as reasons for the riots and general failings of the institutions.[26] Originally published in 1931, this report reflected the concerns about prisons of both the public and the professional community but the recommendations were largely overshadowed by the public attention given to the Commission's findings regarding illegal police practices. Therefore, in the early 1930's both the public and the justice system were more concerned with what the police were doing than they were with what the prisons were failing to do. Consequently, political support for even limited funding of prison officer training was receding. The Great Depression was at its greatest depth, and national concern was focused on food and jobs, not the relative luxury of extended, progressive training for prison officers. It was not until 1936 that formal training was reestablished in the Bureau of Prisons. However, rather than centralized pre-service training, junior prison officers were given in-service training at the institutions where they were employed. Although perhaps more cost effective in the shortterm, the quality of training varied greatly and reflected the importance attached to it by each prison warden.

Stutsman Legacy

In his 1932 manuscript, which was probably a draft of his annual report to the Bureau of Prisons, an important insight into Stutsman's philosophy regarding the purpose of prisons and the training of their officers is reflected in his initial paragraph. Stated emphatically and without reservation, "Imprisonment without restoration is a farce."[27] Although this philosophy was given much publicity in America as early as 1870 during the National Prison Association meetings in Cincinnati, by 1932 it had not yet received widespread acceptance. It is true, as Walker states in his book *Popular Justice,* that the use of probation, parole, and the indeterminate sentence were well established in America by 1915.[28] Respected prison administrators such as Dr. Katherine B. Davis and Thomas Mott Osborne attempted, with varying degrees of success, to implement reforms based on the principle of an inmate's potential for "restoration" or rehabilitation. But within the majority of prisons themselves, there was little evidence that the principle was being taught to or practiced by prison officers.

Jessie O. Stutsman championed this cause at the lowest yet most critical level in the hierarchy of prison personnel—the front line prison officer. One has only to examine his training school curriculum for proof of his dedication to the principle of an inmate's potential for rehabilitation and the need to instill this principle in prison officers. Was he successful? Certainly not in establishing himself as a well recognized and honored leader of the prison reform movement. Certainly not in beginning an unwavering trend toward the universal acceptance of the rehabilitation principle. But, perhaps he left to us something more important. Through his direct involvement in both the substance and form of prison officer training, Stutsman alerts us to the importance of a comprehensive approach to training that should incorporate an understanding of the theoretical context which gives rise to specific interventions and responsibilities required of prison officers. Stutsman's legacy is to alert us to the notion that the "why" of policy adoption is perhaps as important an element of prison officer training as is the "how to" of policy implementation.

[24] The original report is on file in the National Archives, Washington, D.C.

[25] Bates, op. cit., p. 164.

[26] National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Vol. 9, *Report on Penal Institutions, Probation and Parole.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1931.

[27] Stutsman (1932), p. 1.

[28] Samuel Walker, *Popular Justice.* Omaha: Oxford University Press, 1980.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bates, S., *Prisons and Beyond.* New York: MacMillan, 1936.

Hart, H., *Training Schools for Prison Officers.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1930.

Hershberger, G., "The Development of the Federal Prison System." *Federal Probation* (December):13-23, 1979.

MacCormick, A., personal correspondence to J. O. Stutsman dated June 17. Washington, D.C.: National Archives, 1930.

National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Vol. 9, *Report on Penal Institutions, Probation and Parole.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1931.

Rothma, D. J., *Conscience and Convenience.* Boston: Little, Brown, 1980.

Sellin, T., "Historical Glimpses of Training for Prison Service." *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science* 15:594-600, 1934-35.

Stutsman, J. O., *Curing the Criminal.* New York: MacMillan, 1926.

_____, personal correspondence to A. H. MacCormick dated June 13. Washington, D.C.: National Archives, 1930.

_____, "A Uniform, a Club and a Gun; Or a Profession." *The Prison Journal* XI (1):4-11, 1931a.

_____, "The Prison Staff." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 157 (September):62-71, 1931b.

_____, "Purposes and Methods of the United States Training School for Prison Officers." Unpublished manuscript, 1932.

Walker, S., *Popular Justice.* Omaha: Oxford University Press, 1980.