

April 1960

## The Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency: State Statutes and Programs

Calvin D. Trowbridge Jr.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.kentlaw.iit.edu/cklawreview>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Calvin D. Trowbridge Jr., *The Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency: State Statutes and Programs*, 37 Chi.-Kent L. Rev. 1 (1960).

Available at: <https://scholarship.kentlaw.iit.edu/cklawreview/vol37/iss1/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarly Commons @ IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Chicago-Kent Law Review by an authorized editor of Scholarly Commons @ IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law. For more information, please contact [jwenger@kentlaw.iit.edu](mailto:jwenger@kentlaw.iit.edu), [ebarney@kentlaw.iit.edu](mailto:ebarney@kentlaw.iit.edu).

# CHICAGO-KENT LAW REVIEW

*Copyright 1960, Chicago-Kent College of Law*

---

---

VOLUME 37

APRIL, 1960

NUMBER 1

---

---

## THE PREVENTION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY: STATE STATUTES AND PROGRAMS

Calvin D. Trowbridge, Jr.\*

### I. INTRODUCTION

IT SHOULD BE REASONABLY APPARENT, from past experience, that the several programs designed to rehabilitate juvenile delinquents do not serve to prevent, although they may minimize the effects of, delinquency. What is needed is an increased emphasis on prevention for, as one author has noted,

The way to solve the delinquency problem is to prevent boys and girls from becoming delinquent in the first place. . . . We have never seriously gotten down to the job of preventing delinquency, although we talk a great deal about prevention. What we have done and continue to do in coming to grips with this whole problem is to overemphasize the role of correction—correcting or reclaiming youths who have already committed serious delinquent acts and overlooking the very simple fact that the way really to reduce delinquency is to prevent it from happening in the first place.<sup>1</sup>

\* B.A., Yale University; J.D., Harvard Law School. Member, Illinois Bar; Associate, Isham, Lincoln & Beale, Chicago. The author gratefully acknowledges the counsel and suggestions offered by Dean Wm. F. Zacharias of Chicago-Kent College of Law.

<sup>1</sup> Solomon, "Why We Have Not Solved the Delinquency Problem," 17 Fed. Prob. 11 (Dec., 1953).

Since the establishment of the first juvenile court and over the last half century, substantial changes have occurred in the judicial procedures devoted to handling the problems of children accused of committing illegal acts and offenses. For the past quarter century, significant advances have been made in the techniques employed to rehabilitate adjudicated delinquents. But it is only since World War II that there has been any serious attempt made to prevent juvenile delinquency by way of working with children before they commit antisocial acts<sup>2</sup> and, with few exceptions, these attempts are still in their initial stages.

To reduce delinquency significantly, it is not enough to rely solely on rehabilitating children already in official trouble. Even if all delinquents could be successfully rehabilitated, their numbers would be more than replaced by new delinquents,<sup>3</sup> particularly so as long as the factors responsible for antisocial behavior on the part of children remain at large in society, whether or not treatment is provided for delinquents. Treating children only after they have committed illegal acts does not prevent delinquency. It does not reduce the incalculable human damage associated with delinquency in terms of personal unhappiness, wasted and unproductive years, family distress and injury to other people. Nor will it decrease the exorbitant dollar cost of delinquency that our states are now bearing.<sup>4</sup> These considerations,

<sup>2</sup> The only substantial programs designed to prevent delinquency undertaken before World War II, of which the author is aware, were the California co-ordinating council movement, the Chicago Area Project, and the Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study Project.

<sup>3</sup> The prospect for the future is revealed by the fact that in the face of the serious problem of delinquency, "reflected by a general increase of 29% between 1948 and 1952 in the United States and by the fact that the bulk of the delinquents come from the age group between 10 and 17," the country faces "a group that will be 42% larger in 1960 than it was in 1951." See report of the National Conference on Juvenile Delinquency, June 28-30, 1954, Washington, D. C., p. 18.

<sup>4</sup> A California report notes that "in the long run prevention is much less costly, in terms of human lives as well as money than the present appalling and ever-mounting sums we spend annually on law enforcement, probation, juvenile courts, detention halls, forestry camps, institutions of the Youth Authority, jails, and prisons." See report of the Citizen's Advisory Committee to Attorney General on Crime Prevention entitled "Juvenile Violence in California," at p. 27 (1958). The average annual cost of maintaining a ward in the facilities of the California Youth Authority was said to be in excess of \$3,000. In one year, that of 1955-6, Los Angeles County alone spent \$8,164,831 on detention facilities and \$9,665,156 on law enforcement, which figures represented direct operating costs and did not include the expenditures for capital investment in facilities.

therefore, clearly call for a prevention, rather than a rehabilitation, program.

Yet, in view of the obvious need for preventive measures, the scarcity of prevention programs in this country today is surprising. As will be seen hereafter, substantial state-level programs exist in only seven states.<sup>5</sup> Community-level projects are more prevalent, but the effectiveness of such projects is open to serious question. Privately sponsored activities are rare.<sup>6</sup> In fact, at the time of making an evaluation of a 1954 study of prevention programs, one of the authors thereof concluded that only three types of prevention programs in this country might be able to demonstrate that they were reducing delinquency.<sup>7</sup>

It might be possible to explain the scarcity of prevention programs by pointing out that the actual causes of delinquency have not, as yet, been finally determined. The success of any program will depend upon its relation to these causes. Perhaps, therefore, prevention measures are being delayed until the causes are better understood in order that the measures will have a greater chance of being effective. But no matter how unsuccessful programs may be for a while, prevention projects today are vitally necessary. Inadequate knowledge does not justify a failure to attempt to strike at the roots of delinquent behavior.<sup>8</sup> Even

<sup>5</sup> These states are California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Texas and Wisconsin. Some states with heavy urban concentrations, such as Michigan, Ohio and Pennsylvania, for example, have no provision for a state-level prevention program.

<sup>6</sup> On the local level, some private agencies contribute specifically to prevention programs. Individual financial contributions are more frequent, especially in New York and in Chicago. Personal participation of lay citizens is widespread in those states that encourage community organization as a preventive technique. The only private national organization known to the author to sponsor work in prevention programs is the Ford Foundation. This note does not, of course, purport to cover all private support for research.

<sup>7</sup> Witmer, "Forward," *Annals* (March, 1959), p. vii. The three types of programs were said to be (1) child guidance clinics, (2) programs that reach out to gangs or families, and (3) the work of the Chicago Area Project.

<sup>8</sup> Capes, "New York State's Blueprint for Delinquency Prevention," 18 *Fed. Prob.* 49 (June, 1954), has indicated that the Youth Commission of that state has "based its program upon the existing knowledge of delinquency causation while attempting to refine and supplement this information with original research." He says the Commission has refused to use the incompleteness of its knowledge of behavior motivation as an excuse for not translating what is known into practical and effective delinquency prevention programs, and adds that the Commission's program is "predicated upon certain assumptions for which there is at least partial scientific substantiation and with which there is almost universal agreement."

projects that fail or only partly succeed can make significant contributions to an understanding of delinquency.<sup>9</sup> The current prevalence of delinquency, and the human suffering which accompanies it, are too great to allow society to stand by until all the details with respect to delinquent conduct have been fully developed.

To keep this study within reasonable limits, it would be well at the outset to provide a degree of definition for that type of delinquency to be here considered. Two well-known workers in the field have said:

[D]elinquency refers to repeated acts of a kind which when committed by persons beyond the statutory juvenile court age of sixteen are punishable as crimes (either felonies or misdemeanors)—except for a few instances of persistent stubbornness, truancy, running away, associating with immoral persons and the like. Children who once or twice during the period of growing up in an excitingly attractive milieu steal a toy in a ten-cent store, sneak into a subway or motion picture theater, play hooky, and the like and soon outgrow such peccadilloes are not true delinquents even though they have violated the law. . . . Children appear to be no worse for very occasional and slight experimental deviations from socially acceptable norms of conduct. Since they soon voluntarily abandon such misbehavior, their misconduct or maladaptation cannot be deemed habitual or symptomatic of deep-rooted causes.<sup>10</sup>

If anything more is to be added, it should be that delinquency does include any minor misdeed leading to a court adjudication of delinquency. While the primary mission of a comprehensive prevention program should be to root out the deep-seated causes

<sup>9</sup> According to Witmer and Tufts, "The Effectiveness of Delinquency Prevention Programs," p. iv (1954), we "learn by doing and by examining results. In this field, as in that of child health and welfare generally, service and research must go hand in hand if progress is to be made."

<sup>10</sup> Glueck, S. and E. T., *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* (The Commonwealth Fund, New York, 1950), pp. 13-4.

of antisocial behavior, its purpose should also be to keep children out of all trouble, even only occasional trouble, with the law.

Operating in the area thus defined, it is the purpose of this article to be concerned with developing a concept for an adequate "prevention program," but again some comment on the meaning of that term ought to be made at this point. The purpose of a preventive program has been stated above. Some states would include, within their definition of prevention, any services to children which would tend to improve the community environment generally.<sup>11</sup> Prevention here is intended to be limited to those undertakings aimed primarily at juvenile rather than general delinquency. Since rehabilitation is not a prevention measure, it is the position of this paper that prevention programs should focus on mitigating those factors responsible for creating antisocial behavior patterns in children during their formative years and before rehabilitation becomes necessary.

The approach to the subject delineated takes the form of a description of current state legislation dealing with the prevention of juvenile delinquency and of the programs developed thereunder. This is followed with a discussion of four concepts fundamental to an effective prevention program. Existing state statutes and programs are analyzed and evaluated in terms of these concepts. A suggested statute, embodying the conclusions of this article, is offered by way of an appendix both for consideration and for adoption.

## II. EXISTING STATE LEGISLATION

Current state legislation for the prevention of juvenile delinquency may be classified in three main groupings, to-wit: (1) legislation which may stimulate some preventive action but which will not be effective in reducing delinquency; (2) legislation which gives to some specific state agency the duty of giving advice and making studies and recommendations about preventing delin-

<sup>11</sup> The Wisconsin program is an illustration of this.

quency; and (3) legislation which gives to some specific state agency both the authority and the responsibility for developing and carrying out juvenile delinquency prevention programs.<sup>12</sup>

#### A. INEFFECTIVE LEGISLATION

In the first of these areas, that dealing with legislation which may stimulate some preventive action but which is unlikely to have significant preventive effect, the statutes fall into five sub-categories. One type of statute, found in five states, often no more than a single sentence long, states that it shall be the duty of public and private agencies, officials, institutions and associations to "co-operate" with and assist juvenile courts or juvenile officials.<sup>13</sup> Four other states rely on a provision of this nature in combination with other legislation.<sup>14</sup>

Four states, comprising the second sub-category, have authorized the creation of juvenile court advisory boards.<sup>15</sup> The statutory duties of these advisory boards include conferring with the judge and making recommendations to him, aiding in the coordination of programs emanating from the court, and helping to inspect local institutions. The decision whether or not to create a board usually lies within the discretion of each juvenile court judge;<sup>16</sup> the members of the board are appointed by the judge;

<sup>12</sup> The states of Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Louisiana, Maine, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota and Vermont appear to have no legislation whatever relating to the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

<sup>13</sup> See *Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann.*, Tit. 8, § 239; *Burns' Ind. Stat. Ann.*, Tit. 9, § 3116; *Miss. Code Ann.*, Ch. 7185, § 22; *Vernon's Mo. Stat. Ann.*, Ch. 211, § 411; and *Utah Code Ann.*, Tit. 55, Ch. 10, § 62. The reasons for assuming that legislation in this general area will be unlikely to have any significant effect on the prevention of delinquency are discussed below.

<sup>14</sup> *Ga. Code Ann.*, Tit. 24, § 2433; *Page's Ohio Gen. Code Ann.*, Ch. 2151.40; *Okl. Stat. Ann.*, Tit. 20, § 847; and *Va. Code*, Tit. 16, § 1-156. The statutes of Georgia and Virginia also call for juvenile court advisory boards. Ohio has also created a Division of Juvenile Research, Classification and Training. Oklahoma relies upon juvenile court advisory boards as well as a state agency responsible for advice, study and recommendations. Further comments on these provisions appear under subsequent appropriate headings.

<sup>15</sup> *Ala. Code*, Tit. 13, § 375; *Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann.*, Ch. 208, § 310; *Md. Ann. Code*, Art. 26, § 80; and *Mont. Rev. Code Ann.*, Tit. 10-628. The Maryland provision, differing slightly from the others, covers Montgomery County (adjacent to Washington, D. C.) only.

<sup>16</sup> Only in Montana is the appointment of juvenile court committees made mandatory.

and they serve without compensation. Three additional states have passed juvenile court advisory board statutes but use such bodies in conjunction with other preventive measures.<sup>17</sup>

The third sub-category includes five states and the District of Columbia. The legislation there enacted, in varying degree, has included among the responsibilities of a Department of Public Welfare, or the equivalent thereof, concern for the welfare of delinquent children and of children who are in danger of becoming delinquent.<sup>18</sup> In all of these jurisdictions but one, Oregon, the legislation so noted constitutes the entire statutory program, with the typical statute providing that, among the objects of a child welfare study or a child welfare service program, attention shall be given to children who are in danger of becoming delinquent.

The two states of Nevada and Rhode Island constitute the fourth sub-category. The only program to be found in operation there rests on a single act concerning delinquency which serves to authorize designated state agencies to receive federal funds offered in aid of prevention and to co-operate with federal preventive programs.<sup>19</sup> The new state of Hawaii, which alone forms the fifth sub-category, has authorized the establishment of juvenile crime prevention bureaus whose purpose it shall be to suppress, prevent and investigate crimes committed by minors.<sup>20</sup> The lack of effectiveness in legislation of the types noted will be discussed hereafter.

<sup>17</sup> Ga. Code Ann., Tit. 24, § 2434; Okla. Stat. Ann., Tit. 20, § 849; and Va. Code Ann., Tit. 16, § 1-157. All three states have "duty to cooperate" provisions. Oklahoma has added a state agency charged with responsibility to advise, study and make recommendations.

<sup>18</sup> D. C. Code, Tit. 3, § 126; Iowa Code Ann., Ch. 235.2; Kan. Gen. Stat. Ann., Ch. 39, § 708; Neb. Rev. Stat., Ch. 43, § 505; N. H. Rev. Stat. Ann., Ch. 161:2; and Ore. Rev. Stat., Ch. 419.002. In the District of Columbia, the program of the Board of Public Welfare is supplemented by a duty on the part of the director of social work, who is associated with the juvenile court system, to assist in developing plans for prevention: D. C. Code, Tit. 11, § 923. In Nebraska, there is no provision for the protection of children in danger of becoming delinquents but only a theoretical possibility that the statutory powers of the county child welfare boards have been drafted broadly enough to allow these boards to lead in the formulation of prevention programs. Oregon, the noted exception, now has a statute authorizing prevention programs on a county basis. See note 26, post.

<sup>19</sup> Nev. Rev. Stat., Tit. 430.010-430.020; R. I. Gen. Laws, Tit. 14, Ch. 5, §§ 1-3.

<sup>20</sup> Rev. Laws Hawaii 1955, Ch. 333, §§ 22-5. Hawaii has also made provision for a state agency charged with responsibility for advice, study and recommendations.



## B. ADVISORY LEGISLATION

Legislation delegating responsibility to a state agency or department for the giving of advice, the making of studies, and the furnishing of recommendations concerning delinquency and its prevention tends to fall into two categories, to-wit: (1) legislation which delegates such responsibility only in a general way to some department which carries on many diverse activities; and (2) legislation which specifically delegates such responsibility to an agency with primary concern for delinquency and delinquency prevention.

Ten state legislative programs come under the first of these headings. In five of the programs, the responsibility for giving advice and for making studies and recommendations refers only to child welfare in general, hence it can only be inferred that this authority is broad enough to include advice, study and recommendations concerning delinquency and delinquency prevention.<sup>21</sup> In the other five programs, the statutes specifically allude to delinquency and delinquency prevention.<sup>22</sup> In none of the programs, however, are the provisions uniform as to whether responsibility is given in all three areas of advice, study and recommendations and there is a similar lack of uniformity with respect to the amount of responsibility given in each area.<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, the agency to which the responsibility is delegated may be a general department, such as a department of public welfare, or

<sup>21</sup> Mich. Stat. Ann., Ch. 25.262; Tenn. Code Ann., Tit. 37, § 701; Wash. Rev. Code, Tit. 43, Ch. 19, § 440; W. Va. Code, Ch. 49, § 4904(15); and Wyo. Stat., Ch. 18, § 2404. "Advice" refers to advice given to local units and other agencies, public or private, which are generally concerned either with government or social welfare. "Studies" usually cover existing needs, services and facilities in the fields of social welfare and/or in relation to delinquency. "Recommendation" usually refers to recommendations made to other agencies or to legislative recommendations delivered to the governor or to the legislature.

<sup>22</sup> Fla. Stat. Ann., Ch. 417.02-417.04; Rev. Laws Hawaii 1955, Ch. 334, §§ 2-4; Ida. Code, Tit. 16, §§ 1821 and 1830; Okla. Stat. Ann., Tit. 10, § 121.3; and Purdon's Pa. Stat. Ann., Tit. 611.2. For seven of the ten states listed in notes 21 and 22, the provisions for advice, study and recommendation are the sole preventive legislation. Hawaii, in addition, has a juvenile crime prevention bureau; Oklahoma specifies not only a duty to co-operate but provides for juvenile advisory boards; Tennessee has, in addition, a "duty to co-operate" provision.

<sup>23</sup> An exception should be noted for Florida and Hawaii, where the provisions are identical in wording.

it may be an agency which is solely concerned with child and youth welfare.<sup>24</sup>

In four more states, each possessing legislation calling for advice, study and recommendation, the delegation of responsibility is a specific one to an agency with primary concern over the matter of juvenile delinquency and its prevention. Thus, the New Jersey Division of Community Services for Delinquency Prevention and the New Jersey Youth Study Commission, the New Mexico Commission on Youth, the North Carolina Youth Service Commission, and the Ohio Division of Juvenile Research, Classification and Training, have each been created primarily for the purpose of giving advice, for the undertaking of studies, and/or for the making of recommendations in this particular area.<sup>25</sup> The New Jersey statute focuses on studies and on advising and co-operating with municipal youth guidance councils; the North Carolina act emphasizes recommending legislation to the governor and consulting with people involved in delinquency programs; the one in Ohio is limited to research. The New Mexico legislation is the most comprehensive and detailed, but even it concentrates on the areas of investigation and recommendation.

#### C. PROBABLY EFFECTIVE LEGISLATION

The legislation enacted by the states of California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Texas and Wisconsin would appear to be of a character most likely to be effective in preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency.<sup>26</sup> While not uniform

<sup>24</sup> For example, in Pennsylvania, the assignment is made to the Department of Public Welfare; in Florida, to the Children's Commission.

<sup>25</sup> N. J. Stat. Ann., Ch. 9:22-7 and Ch. 30:4C-1; N. M. Stat. Ann., Ch. 13, Art. 10-1 to 10-7; N. C. Gen. Stat., Ch. 143, § 330; and Page's Ohio Gen. Code Ann., Ch. 5119.06. New Jersey, in addition to the provision cited, has comprehensive legislation authorizing municipal governing bodies to create municipal youth guidance councils whose functions shall include assisting and co-ordinating community plans directed to the general welfare of all children and to the protection of children exposed to conditions conducive to delinquency: N. J. Stat. Ann., Ch. 9:21-1 and 2; Ch. 9:22-1 to 9:22-11.

<sup>26</sup> West Ann. Cal. Code, Welfare and Institutions, §§ 560, 606, 1650-3, 1752.5 to 1752.7; Ill. Rev. Stat. 1959, Vol. 1, Ch. 23, §§ 2502, 2507, 2524-6, 2528, 2530, 2581-2; Mass. Ann. Laws, Ch. 6, §§ 65-9B, Ch. 119, § 67; Mass. Acts and Resolves, 1955, Ch. 696; Minn. Stat. Ann., Ch. 242.01 to 242.32; McKinney's Cons. Laws N. Y. Ann.,

in text, the several statutes provide for delegation to a state agency of specific authority as well as responsibility for the development of constructive programs for the prevention of delinquency. The selected agencies are authorized to stimulate as well as to assist local communities in creating community coordinating bodies, or to help these communities promote greater co-operation between social agencies to the end that there may be achieved a more thorough coverage of community needs by the services of such agencies.

Except for Minnesota, six of these statutes outline a variety of specific activities to be undertaken by the designated agencies, such as compiling statistics, undertaking community surveys, training personnel, fostering educational programs, publicizing the need for prevention and the services of the agency, and the receiving and expending of funds.<sup>27</sup> The statutory programs of these states are not limited to these provisions alone, for in a number of instances statutes of the types previously discussed have also been enacted,<sup>28</sup> and in some instances municipalities, counties and other state agencies have been authorized to un-

---

Exec., §§ 410-26, Gen. Mun., § 95, Soc. Wel., § 36, Unconsol., § 4324, Crim-Child, § 37, and McKinney's Sess. Laws N. Y., 182nd Reg. Sess., Ch. 523, p. 656; Vernon's Tex. Civ. Stat., Art. 2338-1, § 19, and Art. 5143c, §§ 1-7; and Wis. Stat. Ann., Ch. 46.001, Ch. 46.016, Ch. 46.030, Ch. 48.01, Ch. 48.48, Ch. 48.56, Ch. 48.79, and Ch. 48.80. Particular provisions of these state statutes will be described and analyzed for their effectiveness hereafter. It should be noted that Michigan had a statute falling within this category but that statute expired by its own limitation on July 1, 1947: Mich. Comp. Laws 1952, Ch. 25.243(1)-(4). A recently enacted Oregon statute would fall in this category except for the fact that its programs are to be run from the county level and no state agency is involved: Ore. Laws 1959, Ch. 610, p. 1215.

<sup>27</sup> The statute which outlines the powers and duties of the New York State Youth Commission provides for no less than sixteen different activities to be undertaken by the commission: McKinney's Cons. Laws N. Y. Ann., Exec., § 415.

<sup>28</sup> In California, for example, county boards of supervisors have been made responsible for protective services for children: West Ann. Cal. Code, Welfare and Institutions, §§ 1650-3. Illinois has established an Institute of Juvenile Research, charged with scientifically studying delinquents and children in danger of becoming delinquent: Ill. Rev. Stat. 1959, Vol. 1, Ch. 23, § 2582. Massachusetts has a provision authorizing the acceptance of federal funds: Mass. Ann. Laws, Ch. 6, § 69B. New York has two "duty to co-operate" statutes, one standard provision creating a juvenile court advisory committee, and one provision for accepting federal funds: McKinney's Cons. Laws N. Y. Ann., Crim-Dom. Rel., § 56, Crim-Child, § 37, Unconsol., § 4324, Exec., § 415(o). Texas has a "duty to co-operate" act: Vernon's Tex. Civ. Stat., Art. 2338-1, § 19. Wisconsin has provision for an advisory board and a provision to accept federal funds: Wis. Stat. Ann., Ch. 48.11 and Ch. 46.03(4)(b).

dertake programs designed to supplement or complement the responsibility given to the prime state agency.<sup>29</sup>

The most important feature of legislation falling in this category lies in terms of the potential effectiveness thereof in reducing delinquency. By reason of the emphasis placed upon state leadership, because of the centralization of responsibility in planning, promoting and assisting the enactment and development of prevention programs on a community or local level, and in view of the delegation of flexible and discretionary powers to the responsible state agency, it is reasonable to believe statutes of this type will prove to be more effective than any of the other programs here analyzed.

### III. EXISTING STATE PROGRAMS

Analysis has been provided with respect to the existence or nonexistence of statutory foundation for varying types of programs in the general field. It is not known whether there are any preventive programs operating in states without legislation, but there probably are some programs in operation which have been initiated or sponsored by governmental units without specific legislative authorization.<sup>30</sup> Since, however, law on the statute book tends to vary from law in practice, it is proper to comment on the nature of those programs currently in operation, at least to the extent possible, while making an evaluation in this area.

<sup>29</sup> Thus, in California, the county board of supervisors or the juvenile court and the probation committee or department of any agency may establish county agencies or public councils to co-ordinate prevention work: West Ann. Cal. Code, Welfare and Institutions, §§ 560 and 606. Illinois has established a community services advisory board at the state level: Ill. Rev. Stat. 1959, Vol. 1, Ch. 23, §§ 2528 and 2530. Massachusetts legislation provides for school adjustment counselors and police inspection of jails: Mass. Ann. Laws, Ch. 119, § 67, and Mass. Acts and Resolves, 1955, Ch. 696. New York municipalities are authorized to create and operate bureaus to co-ordinate youth recreation: McKinney's Cons. Laws N. Y. Ann., Gen. Mun., § 95. Wisconsin legislation empowers municipalities to establish and operate councils designed to co-ordinate activities looking to the welfare of children: Wis. Stat. Ann., Ch. 48.80. See also the programs outlined in note 28, ante.

<sup>30</sup> As the information for this part of the article was obtained from materials available in the Harvard Law School Library or from materials and letters received from various state agencies and officials, the report is not complete. It is, however, believed to be complete enough to provide a reasonably adequate picture of existing conditions.

## A. IN STATES WITH INEFFECTIVE LEGISLATION

No information is available concerning those states wherein the legislation is limited to "duty to co-operate" statutes, to statutes creating juvenile crime prevention bureaus, or to statutes creating agencies to receive federal funds. Virginia is the only state among those possessing acts which authorize the appointment of juvenile court advisory committees about which anything is known, and the prevention program there is negligible in character.<sup>31</sup>

Jurisdictions where departments of public welfare have some responsibility for delinquent children or children in danger of becoming delinquent total six in number. Studies in the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, now under way, relate only to delinquents.<sup>32</sup> The Director of Social Work for the Juvenile Court does, however, work closely with those other agencies in the community that are primarily concerned with prevention work.<sup>33</sup> Iowa, another of these states, held a Governor's Conference on Juvenile Behavior in May, 1958, after which the Governor appointed a follow-up committee in every county. The committees are at work in some of the counties to plan prevention programs. The Department of Social Welfare has prepared a guide to help these committees, but it has no field service available to provide the leadership which is apparently needed. Other activities of the Department do not appear to touch on prevention.<sup>34</sup> The effort being made in Kan-

<sup>31</sup> The Department of Welfare and Institutions of Virginia provides standard welfare services which may have some ultimate effect on delinquency prevention but these are too indirect to be classified as preventive for the purpose of this article. Discussion of delinquency prevention at monthly meetings attended by the Commissioners of Health, Education, Mental Hygiene and Hospitals, and Welfare, and some co-ordination of the efforts of welfare with visiting teachers, appears to summarize the preventive program of that state: Letter from Richard W. Copeland to author under date of March 9, 1959.

<sup>32</sup> Letter from Raymond F. Clapp to author under date of Feb. 17, 1959. No other information on the District of Columbia is available except that several years ago a Commissioners' Youth Council was established to co-ordinate the efforts of the various agencies working in the field of delinquency and that substantial police programs have been developed. For comment on police programs, see note 38, post.

<sup>33</sup> Letter from John J. Larkin to author, Feb. 17, 1959.

<sup>34</sup> Letter from Esther L. Immer, Feb. 24, 1959.

sas is apparently limited to rehabilitation.<sup>35</sup> No one single agency or organization in Oregon has a specific program geared to the prevention of delinquency, although the juvenile courts of that state do accept referrals and do work with children who are pre-delinquent as well as delinquent. In the same way, the State Public Welfare Commission accepts referrals from the juvenile courts, or from the communities, of children who are in conflict with society.<sup>36</sup> No information is available on Nebraska and New Hampshire.

#### B. STATES WITH ADVISORY LEGISLATION

Note has been taken of the fact that in Michigan, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming responsibility for giving advice and making studies and recommendations concerning child welfare in general is delegated to a department which carries on many diverse activities. Although nothing has been learned concerning Michigan and Tennessee, the Washington Department of Institutions, while it has not undertaken direct preventive activity, has established nineteen child guidance clinics in six areas in the belief that skilled, professional counseling services can, among other things, contribute to the prevention of delinquency. The staff of these centers includes two psychiatric social workers, a part-time psychiatrist and a part-time psychologist. These centers are not open full time, however, and it may be questioned how many of the patients are potential delinquents.<sup>37</sup> The only other prevention program operated by the Department is one under which provision for consultation service to local law enforcement agencies has resulted in the establishment of juvenile bureaus and in-service training for police officers.<sup>38</sup> Programs of the State Department of Public Assist-

<sup>35</sup> Letter from Don M. Pilcher, March 5, 1959.

<sup>36</sup> Letter from Enid Welling, Feb. 25, 1959.

<sup>37</sup> See report entitled "Washington Child Guidance Clinics," State of Washington, Department of Institutions, July 1, 1954-June 30, 1953, pp. 1-4.

<sup>38</sup> Letter from Bernard Saibel, Feb. 17, 1959. The potential value of police work in preventing delinquency is not to be underestimated. Such programs are not included in this article, however, partly because it has been felt that police officers generally do not come into contact with children until delinquent behavior patterns have already been established and partly because the admittedly extensive development of police efforts at prevention could not be treated adequately within the scope of this article.

ance of West Virginia bear only indirectly on delinquency prevention,<sup>39</sup> although the State Department of Mental Health administers guidance clinics in various communities and two judges have helped establish a county council for crime and delinquency.<sup>40</sup> Under the statute of that state, the Wyoming Youth Council has concentrated its efforts on the aspect of the recommendation of legislation but, to date, no preventive statutes have been proposed.<sup>41</sup>

In still five other states in this category, those of Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania, the responsibility for giving advice, as to making studies, and submitting recommendations concerning delinquency and delinquency prevention has been delegated to a department which has many other activities. While no information is available as to the first four of these states, the Department of Public Welfare of Pennsylvania has offered some proposed legislation. The provisions thereof call for the creation of positions for fourteen Youth Service Representatives who, among other duties, are to assist communities in analyzing delinquency problems and developing prevention services. The proposed legislation also includes appropriations for demonstration projects, for the rehabilitation of hard-core delinquent families, and for research and development of youth programs in unserved areas. At the present time, the only state preventive programs in operation there are to be found in the existence of three evaluation and diagnostic centers, in the outpatient clinics of mental hospitals, and in other special mental health services.<sup>42</sup>

As to the four remaining states, those of New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina and Ohio, responsibility for giving advice and the like concerning delinquency and delinquency prevention has

<sup>39</sup> See "Annual Report of the West Virginia State Department of Public Assistance," July 1, 1957 to June 30, 1958.

<sup>40</sup> Letter from Lillian S. Nagy, Feb. 20, 1959.

<sup>41</sup> See Wyoming Youth Council, "Report of the Wyoming Youth Council, 1957-1959 Biennium," issued in 1959.

<sup>42</sup> See report entitled "A Proposed Program for the Prevention and Treatment of Juvenile Delinquency in Pennsylvania," Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Public Welfare, 1958.

been specifically delegated to an agency charged with primary concern in this area. The New Jersey Division of Community Services for Delinquency Prevention has been carrying out its statutory obligation by way of assisting local communities in their efforts to prevent delinquency. Some of the reports and public hearings of the New Jersey Youth Study Commission, formed to recommend legislation in the youth field and to alert the people of New Jersey as to the needs of disturbed young people, have also touched on prevention. But the major effort in New Jersey has been concentrated in the activities of those communities which have established and which operate municipal youth guidance councils. The latter are designed to co-ordinate as well as to develop plans and services affecting the welfare of children and youth and to assist the work of the juvenile court.<sup>43</sup> The one-man New Mexico Commission on Youth has carried on many activities indirectly touching upon prevention, has made proposals for state and community level action that include prevention, and plans to do some preventive work in the next two years. No specific program of delinquency prevention has ever been undertaken, however, due mainly to the minuscule size of the Commission's appropriation, nor have any juvenile aid bureaus been set up there. Instead, the demand for funds and personnel for the adequate operation of a system of juvenile courts has taken precedence over other activities.<sup>44</sup> The activities of the State Board of Public Welfare of North Carolina are only indirectly preventive,<sup>45</sup> and no information is available concerning the Governor's Youth Service Commission of that state nor with respect to activity in the State of Ohio.

<sup>43</sup> State of New Jersey, Department of Institutions and Agencies, "Delinquency Can be Prevented," (1946), p. 2; *ibid.*, "Information Bulletin No. 7, Division of Community Services for Delinquency Prevention," (1947); State of New Jersey Youth Study Commission, "You and Delinquency," p. 1; letter from Alan S. Meyer, March 4, 1959. The Division of Community Services has no affirmative power to stimulate or establish youth guidance councils or other services, but it does serve in an advisory capacity.

<sup>44</sup> New Mexico Commission on Youth, "Summary Report, 1953-5"; *ibid.*, "Youth in Need, Annual Report, Jan. 1, 1957 to June 30, 1958"; *ibid.*, "Two Year Action Program 1959-61"; and letter from Larry Waterman, Feb. 16, 1959.

<sup>45</sup> North Carolina, State Board of Public Welfare, "Relationships and Services of Public Welfare in the Area of Prevention, Correction and Control of Juvenile Delinquency" (1955); North Carolina, Public Welfare News, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 1-3 (March, 1954).



## C. STATES WITH PROBABLY EFFECTIVE LEGISLATION

The legislation of California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Texas, and Wisconsin is the most promising of any in terms of the potential preventive effect it may have on juvenile delinquency. The first of these states, that of California, has long been known for its community organizations which co-ordinate community activities to prevent delinquency. Local units are authorized to establish these organizations without any sanctions from the state level.<sup>46</sup> At the state level, the Youth Authority aids in the establishment of co-ordinating councils by providing skilled teams to undertake surveys of municipal services and facilities. These surveys are made in response to direct request from a political subdivision. The Youth Authority also assists in establishing additional services, stimulates participation by youth in constructive activities, collects statistics, and conducts research into the causes of delinquency. A citizen's advisory committee has also, in the past, made recommendations to the Attorney General concerning delinquency prevention. According to the Director of Youth Authority, the result of the existence of these services is that the increase in delinquency in California has not kept pace with the population increase.<sup>47</sup>

To prevent delinquency in that state, Illinois also relies on community committees. The approach taken there has been influenced by the work of the late Clifford Shaw. While working with the Illinois Institute for Juvenile Research in relation to the Chicago Area Project, he emphasized the importance of obtaining neighborhood participation and leadership both in the planning and the carrying out of programs for the welfare of neighborhood children. As a consequence, even professional workers, so far as possible, were taken and still are being taken from

<sup>46</sup> See note 29, ante. The co-ordinating council movement began in California in the 'twenties. In 1948, California reported 248 councils in operation: Carr, "Organization for Delinquency Control," 261 *Annals* 65, 75 (1949).

<sup>47</sup> Holton, "California Youth Authority: Eight Years of Action," 41 *J. Crim. Law, Crim., and Police Science* 2 (1950-1). For the general California program, see report of the Citizen's Advisory Committee to the Attorney General on Crime Prevention entitled "Juvenile Violence in California," and California Youth Authority release entitled "Prevention and Treatment of Delinquency" (1952).

among the residents. Research, experimentation, and the keeping of records of the undertakings, the problems encountered, and the methods of the Institute have accompanied the activities of the committees.<sup>48</sup> In 1957, the general program of the Chicago Area Project was transferred from the Institute of Juvenile Research, a part of the Illinois Department of Public Welfare, to the Communities Service Division of the Illinois Youth Commission, but the studies, the research, and the special projects have been left in the hands of the Institute. The Youth Commission has, however, adopted the Shaw philosophy and applies it in all of its community work.<sup>49</sup>

It is to be noted that the Illinois committees are not the standard community-wide organizing council, but are usually neighborhood groups which perform a specific function, such as providing children with friendly counseling, or which promote a specific program, for example, the building of a community center. The Communities Service Division is wholly occupied with promoting and servicing these self-help committees by means of education and consultative activities, and the Illinois Youth Commission has no other preventive program. Nevertheless, the potential effectiveness of this type of approach in reducing delinquency is indicated by the reported experience of a neighborhood of some thirteen blocks square located in the middle of an industrialized city in a county of some 115,000 people. Eleven per cent of that city's juvenile court cases had come from the neighborhood before it was helped to organize itself. Seven months after organizing began, there was virtually no trouble.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>48</sup> See Taft, *Criminology, A Cultural Interpretation* (1950), pp. 662-3.

<sup>49</sup> Illinois, Youth Commission, Division of Community Services, "Delinquency Prevention through Community Organizations: Handbook," (1956), pp. 31-2.

<sup>50</sup> Hopper, "Putting Neighborhoods on Probation," 19 Fed. Prob. 40-1 (Sept., 1955). For the general Illinois program, see the Handbook cited in the preceding note and a mimeographed release entitled "Annual Report on the Chicago Area Project for 1956-1957" as well as the publication of the Illinois Youth Commission entitled "Community Committees: A summary of the Activities of Community Committees in Illinois Co-operating with the Delinquency Prevention Program of the Division of Community Services" (1958). In Chicago, several organizations are sponsoring activities that touch on prevention. For example, the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago has undertaken a number of projects, including the Chicago Hard to Reach Program and the Hyde Park Youth Project; the Montefiore Special School for Social Adjustment was established by the Chicago Board of Education; and there is a newly-created Chicago Commission on Youth Welfare.

Under broad enabling legislation, Massachusetts has organized comprehensive and varied programs with which to approach the task of delinquency prevention. Most of the programs are run by the Youth Service Board of that state, which board believes that the local community must assume responsibility for local delinquency and that planning and action programs need local representation, participation and leadership. As a state agency, the Board is ready to assist in planning and giving direction to local preventive activities, but it also sets limits on its participation in order not to impose upon or control groups at the local level.<sup>51</sup>

In 1953, the Massachusetts Board established a Delinquency Prevention Bureau which, in 1955, was expanded to include nine community representatives and four special workers. The community representative provides consultation services to the communities in the district to which he is assigned. These services include making particular communities aware of their delinquency problems, helping them to organize so as to combat these problems, generally educating the public about delinquency, and promoting training programs for those concerned with delinquency. The special or detached workers operate as trouble-shooters who are assigned to undertake area surveys and investigations or to direct services where they are needed. As of 1957, these workers were concentrating on surveys.<sup>52</sup> The Youth Service Board also makes research and statistical studies, co-operates in jail inspections, and works with various police units.

Three other Massachusetts activities bear on delinquency prevention. The Commonwealth has instituted a system of grants-in-aid for school adjustment counselors whereby the state will annually reimburse a local school system in an amount not exceeding \$4,500 for the first counselor employed and \$2,500 for each additional counselor. To this basic amount, the local school system may add any amount that it feels is necessary to at-

<sup>51</sup> Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Youth Service, "State Programs for the Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency," (1957), pp. 4-5.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 10-2.

tract top-level people to the job. Among their varied responsibilities, these counselors accept school referrals of potentially delinquent children and work with whatever community resources are available in an attempt to save the child from actual delinquency.<sup>53</sup> In addition, it should be noted that a special legislative commission was instrumental in developing the concept and authority of the Division of Youth Service in its formative years.<sup>54</sup> Finally, there is an advisory board whose duties include that of observing the Youth Service Board and of making recommendations to and concerning the Board.<sup>55</sup>

A basic tenet of the Minnesota Youth Conservation Commission is that the responsibility of the state in relation to delinquency prevention must be to help the community to help itself.<sup>56</sup> To this end, the Commission has participated in community organization, in co-ordination and interpretation of state-wide programs, and in the education of the public in the problems of prevention. In addition to Commission action, the Governor's Advisory Board, composed of fourteen committees totalling over 300 members, sponsors annual conferences. These fourteen committees meet continuously to plan the implementation of the resolutions adopted at the conferences, some of which concern measures to reduce delinquency. Providing a possible indirect preventive effect is the inter-department committee on community service, whose purpose it is to co-ordinate activities of the state departments offering services to communities.<sup>57</sup>

New York, among all the states, has the most comprehensive set of preventive programs. These programs are sponsored by

<sup>53</sup> As of December, 1958, there were over 50 school adjustment counselors employed in 45 communities: Commonwealth of Massachusetts, "Annual Report of the Advisory Committee on Service to Youth: Appendix II," (1958), p. 10.

<sup>54</sup> See reports designated Massachusetts, "Special Commission to Make an Investigation and Study Relative to the Prevention of Child Delinquency," under date of 1948, 1950, Jan. and Dec. 1953, and 1954.

<sup>55</sup> For the general Massachusetts program, see the materials cited in notes 51-4, ante, and Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Youth Service, "The Massachusetts School Adjustment Counselor Program," (1957).

<sup>56</sup> Community Service Unit, Youth Conservation Commission, "Community Service Program of Minnesota Youth Conservation Commission" (1958), p. 3.

<sup>57</sup> In addition to the report cited in the preceding note, see also Minnesota Youth Conservation Commission, "A Guide to Youth Centers," (1958, rev. ed.).

the New York State Youth Commission which, from its beginning, has been committed to the purpose of concentrating its greatest effort on the prevention of juvenile delinquency.<sup>58</sup> The Youth Commission combines an acceptance of responsibility for guidance and of leadership and financial assistance to municipalities with a realization that the operation and administration of state-aided prevention programs is a local responsibility. The Commission believes that a state-imposed program without local interest and support would be unlikely to succeed,<sup>59</sup> hence it has encouraged a variety of preventive techniques at the local level.

The most powerful and unique part of the New York program is in the use made of financial assistance. The Commission will offer a community an amount of money, usually \$1,000, to help it start a youth program, provided matching funds are raised within the community. Once the program is under way, the Commission will continue to finance it up to a maximum of 25¢ per child per year, which must also be matched by the town.<sup>60</sup> What makes this program particularly unique is the fact that it gives to the state commission wide control over the activities undertaken by municipalities. By statute, the Commission may withhold state aid from any municipality which alters or discontinues an approved plan without Commission approval, which fails to adopt or change a plan as recommended by the Commission, which fails to comply with Commission rules or regulations, or which fails to enforce, in a manner satisfactory to the Commission, any law relating to the protection and welfare of children.<sup>61</sup> Officials in other states may advise and recommend, but in no other state are they authorized to approve or disapprove municipal programs. For that matter, in no other state,

<sup>58</sup> New York State Youth Commission, "Reducing Juvenile Delinquency: What New York Schools Can Do," (1955), p. 2.

<sup>59</sup> Capes, "New York State's Blueprint for Delinquency Prevention," 18 Fed. Prob. 47 (June, 1954).

<sup>60</sup> In practice, the towns so benefited contribute much more than is needed to equal state funds, with the result that the state funds have been dubbed "seed" money: Bell, "New York's Answer to Delinquency" (1958), p. 2, reprinted by special permission from the Kiwanis Magazine and distributed by the New York State Youth Commission.

<sup>61</sup> McKinney's Cons. Laws N. Y. Ann., Exec., § 410.

is approval or disapproval backed by specific authority to withhold state funds.

In addition, the Commission provides trained help through its staff of thirty, among which are numbered some seventeen long-time youth workers.<sup>62</sup> These workers assist in the establishment of recreation programs, in the development of youth service projects where special local problems call for research and specific attention, and in the formation of youth bureaus to coordinate all the youth activities of a community. Participating in in-service training are lay people, psychiatrists, psychologists, clergymen and educators. Public education services include the maintenance of the largest free film library on juvenile delinquency in the country, the issuance of a bi-monthly magazine circulated to 15,000 town, school and welfare officials, and the publication of many free booklets, sent to participating municipalities for use in local prevention work.<sup>63</sup> Among other activities undertaken have been surveys of local needs, the establishment and enlargement of psychiatric clinics, the hiring of the services of private social agencies, and the providing of case and group workers to serve in prevention projects.

Evidence of the size, if not of the success, of the programs of the Youth Commission may be provided by a few simple facts. Shortly after World War II, less than twenty percent of New York children had access to youth programs of any nature. By 1958, the Commission was helping to operate local delinquency prevention projects which reached more than ninety percent of the state population. In one year, 1957, New York spent 3.5 million dollars for prevention, a sum larger than the entire amount spent by all the other states combined. In 1958, over 20,000 volunteers were contributing their efforts to Commission programs and the towns of that state were spending some 25 million dollars of their own money to support its projects.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>62</sup> See article by Bell, cited in note 60, ante, at p. 2.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, at p. 3.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, at pp. 1-3. The materials referred to in notes 59-60, ante, give an adequate description of the general program of the New York State Youth Commission.

The state program is not the only one operating in New York, for the most creative and fully developed juvenile delinquency prevention program in the country, whether official or private, is run by the Youth Board of New York City.<sup>65</sup> The guiding principles of the Board contemplate that the community as a whole cannot escape responsibility for the welfare of children and young people, especially those who are in trouble; that the fulfillment of this responsibility necessitates an active "reaching out" to youth and families, particularly to those who have resisted all previous efforts to bring them help; that early detection and referral are vital to the prevention and control of delinquency; and that developing and demonstrating new techniques, filling gaps in services and working with voluntary agencies to improve the potential of the community for service are important functions of the public agency.<sup>66</sup> In general, the Board serves the individual, either in the family, through referral units, by contract treatment agencies, or through service to families and children; it serves the group through street club projects, community centers, leisure time agencies, dance projects and summer transportation; it serves the community through a City-wide and Borough Planning and Co-ordinating Unit, through neighborhood councils, and by developing community relations, research, and in-service training.

The referral units are the hub of the entire city program. It is the function of these units to act as detection centers for the location of children with problems in the incipient stages; to study and diagnose these situations; to locate appropriate community services to treat these individual problems; and then to prepare families or adolescents for referral to these community services. In 1953, nine of these units were operated in public and parochial schools,<sup>67</sup> each staffed with highly qualified case-

<sup>65</sup> The New York City Board of Estimate created the Youth Board under provisions of the State Youth Commission Act.

<sup>66</sup> See New York City Board, "New Directions in Delinquency Prevention: 1947-1957," p. 9.

<sup>67</sup> Whelan, "New York City's Approach to the Delinquency Problem," 17 Fed. Prob. 20 (Dec., 1953).

workers who worked closely with school personnel and with other appropriate people in the community. The Youth Board also contracts with private and public casework agencies and child guidance clinics to assure treatment for those children and their families who are referred to such agencies and clinics by the referral units. A special Youth Board casework project, designated Service to Families and Children, has been created to handle the cases of families so deprived, deteriorated and depressed that they cannot be handled by the usual agencies. A child guidance clinic has been established in one public school to offer direct treatment to troubled youngsters as well as to provide ancillary services to the school in a consultative and advisory capacity.

A research department is also vital to the New York City Youth Board program. It locates the current high delinquency areas of the city, maintains a central register on youth offences, keeps an index on multi-problem families, and systematically re-examines and evaluates Board methods. Two of its studies are of especial interest. For one thing, it is currently testing the validity of the Glueck Social Prediction Table. In 1952 and 1953, it applied this table to two groups of first graders, one of which is serving as a control group. Children in the control group who, according to the table, were predicted as likely to have a high chance of becoming delinquent, have been receiving all available services in an attempt to prevent development of delinquency. Boys in the other group are being kept under observation but are receiving no special treatment. This study may provide an important test, both for the validity of the prediction table and for the available treatment services, but it is still too early to draw any precise conclusions from the experiment.<sup>68</sup> The research department is also engaged in a study of the multi-

<sup>68</sup> Consult New York City Youth Board, "An Experiment in the Validation of the Glueck Prediction Scale: Progress Report from Nov. 1952 to Dec. 1956" (1957). The only other experiment designed to test the Glueck Social Prediction Table, by applying it to six-year old children before they become delinquent rather than by applying it retrospectively to delinquents, is being conducted by the Maximum Benefits Project in Washington, D. C. Comments on the significance of the Glueck table appear below, see notes 77 to 89, post.



problem, hard-core families. It has discovered that 20,000 of these families, constituting less than one percent of New York City's family population, account for 75% of the city's delinquency. This group is characterized by family breakdown, by alcoholism, by mental illness, by drug addiction and by a host of related problems. The Youth Board believes that only a total, concentrated approach can have any success with this group.<sup>69</sup>

To carry out its position that only an informed and interested public can provide the impetus for a significantly effective prevention program, the Board's community relations program disseminates to the public information concerning the work of the Youth Board, as to the problems of delinquency, and concerning the various ways in which citizens can help to combat delinquency. The Board also interprets its philosophy and methods to professionals in related agencies and throughout the field of delinquency prevention.

Finally, two Youth Board methods of approach are of special interest. First, is an active "reaching out," as demonstrated by the activity of the gang worker and by the handling of the family case work. The usual social agency treats only those people who bring their problems to the agency. But under this approach many seriously troubled people go undetected and untreated, especially since many of them are unwilling to take, or are incapable of taking, the initiative to get help for themselves. The Youth Board believes that it is its responsibility to these people and to society to do everything that it can to aid them, even when they resist Board offers. Second, is the Youth Board "saturation" theory, illustrated with respect to the areas which the Board has chosen to serve with its services to the hard-core families, its over-all recreation program, and its work with gangs. The Board does not attempt to cover the city evenly with all of its services. Instead, it concentrates its efforts on the areas of highest need, those where it thinks that its services will be most effective. By saturating an area with all available services, the

<sup>69</sup> New York City Youth Board, "New Directions in Delinquency Prevention: 1947-1957," p. 23.

Board hopes to strike at all possible causes of delinquency, each service complementing the effect of the others. Where services are widely dispersed, they are apt to be lacking in unified effect and individually be too weak to be of significance in the reduction of delinquency.<sup>70</sup>

Prevention activities in Texas are centered in the Youth Council of that state. It has indicated a belief that local leadership and initiative will result in the communities and counties of the state assuming more local responsibility, leading to a better use of the opportunities at the local level and thereby helping to serve children prior to the time it is necessary for the courts to commit the children to the state.<sup>71</sup> One function of the Council has been to serve as a place for the receipt of community suggestions as to how state services might be made more helpful to the community. Under another, it recommends, for local consideration, certain tested procedures regarding the prevention of local neglect and juvenile delinquency. In that connection, the Council has conducted community surveys; engaged in counseling service to local and private institutions; collected statistics; undertaken research; and has published a guide on delinquency reduction through community organization. The purpose of a Texas local youth council, on the other hand, is to carry on continuing studies of the needs of all the community's children and youth; to co-ordinate the work of the several agencies and action programs in the community designed to strengthen children's services in the prevention of child neglect and delinquency; and also to focus community attention on these problems.<sup>72</sup>

As a result of its rationale on delinquency prevention, Wisconsin has developed the most extensive and thorough community

<sup>70</sup> For additional material on the New York City Youth Board, see its publication entitled "Pattern for Prevention," (1952), and Whelan, "Heading Off Delinquency by State Youth Commissions," 1951 Yearbook, National Probation and Parole Association (1951), pp. 184-94.

<sup>71</sup> Texas Youth Council, "Annual Report of the Texas Youth Council to the Governor," (1958), p. 9.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, at p. 2. For additional descriptions of the Texas program, see Texas State Youth Development Council, "The Community, the State, and the Delinquent Child: A Handbook" (1955); Texas Youth Council, "Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency: A Proposed Statewide Program through Community Organization" (1958).

survey system for any state. According to a report issued by the Division of Children and Youth, part of the Wisconsin State Department of Public Welfare, man's knowledge and understanding of the causes of delinquency, and concerning the means for the prevention thereof, have far outstripped integration of that knowledge into cultural and social institutions. The report continues by stating:

This implies that effective "prevention" is essentially an educational task, to inform citizens, officials, youths, adults, parents as to the means of prevention and to assist them in putting their knowledge into practice. Since the means of prevention are carried out primarily within the family and within the local community, the role of the state agency in promoting prevention becomes essentially one of adult education, consultation, community organization, research and demonstration.<sup>73</sup>

As a consequence, the Division believes that the most effective program to prevent juvenile delinquency is one which strengthens services for all children and youth while focusing at the same time upon early identification and treatment of children with adjustment problems which may lead to delinquency, criminality or mental illness.<sup>74</sup>

To implement its program of education, the Community Services Section of the Division of Children and Youth, in addition to employing the traditional media of press, conferences, radio and speeches, has adopted the community survey as an intensive method of public education since it permits of a maximum of

<sup>73</sup> Division for Children and Youth, State Department of Public Welfare, "A Report to the Wisconsin State Board of Public Welfare," (1956), p. 3.

<sup>74</sup> Division for Children and Youth, State Department of Public Welfare, "Community Services for Prevention," (1955), p. 3. It should be noted that the long range and ultimate objective of the Community Services Program of the Department is not just delinquency prevention but also includes the reduction and elimination, so far as possible, of crime, dependency, child neglect, mental illness, alcoholism, family breakdown and disorganization, together with the elimination of such other social ills as are preventable.

citizen participation in the survey process. A description of such a survey discloses that it is intended to

extend over a period of 9 to 12 months and involve as many as 200 to 300 local citizens actively in various survey committees. Emphasis is upon lay participation on such committees, with agency staff professionals serving as resource people. The final report is compiled by the survey staff after an intensive process of screening by various citizen committees. The final recommendations adopted become a product of these citizen participants, because they have the final say as to what stays in the report and what goes out . . . Citizen participation comes to bear at the critical point of deliberation, decision and action on the reports and recommendations.<sup>75</sup>

These surveys are undertaken only upon official request of a county board or a city council, but the request may be stimulated by a community organization consultant. The latter serves as a facilitator, and sometimes as a catalyst, in bringing available resources to bear on the needs of people in the community. Five district community services consultants are available to assist the several community organization consultants with respect to the matter of undertaking studies, surveys, fact-finding, committee work and by planning public education and action on a wide range of community problems. Other activities of the Division include the collection of statistics, assisting schools in early identification of children vulnerable to delinquency, and assistance in extending recreation.

Looking to the future, the Wisconsin Division for Children and Youth now has acquired statutory authority to undertake demonstration projects in order to promote that aspect of its pre-

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, at p. 5. The product of one such survey appears in *Citizens of Walworth County, "An Appraisal of Community Services for Children and Youth in Walworth County,"* (1957).

vention program which focuses upon early identification and treatment of children with adjustment problems.<sup>76</sup>

#### IV. FOUR CONCEPTS FUNDAMENTAL TO PREVENTION.

There is no doubt that there are four concepts which are basic to any effective prevention program. First, it must be recognized that there are certain identifiable types of families which are associated with a substantial majority of the cases of delinquency. Second, it should be clear that the younger a potential delinquent is, the more susceptible he is to remedial treatment. Third, the prevention program must be able to operate in two different areas: one relating to the general community, the other relating to individuals. And fourth, to be truly effective, the prevention program must have strong state leadership.

##### A. IDENTIFIABLE FAMILY TYPES

On the first of these points, it is well recognized that, in many instances, the family is a cause of delinquency, although in exactly what way it is a cause is not certain.<sup>77</sup> What is not generally emphasized, but should be, is that no matter what role the family may play as a cause, it is a source from which flows a very significant amount of delinquency. This has been demonstrated in two ways. First, the results of the retrospective application of the Glueck Social Prediction Table, based on five child-parent relationships, indicates that there is a high association between certain types of family relationships and delinquency. Second, it is frequently recognized by workers in the delinquency field, and it has been statistically shown by the New York City Youth Board, that multi-problem, hard-core families contribute a definite majority of the cases of delinquency. What the results of the retrospective application of the Glueck Table and the statistics of the Youth Board together tend to indicate is that these identifiable types of families are associated with

<sup>76</sup> Wis. Stat. Ann., Ch. 46.03(4)(b)(2). A comprehensive statement in support of these demonstration projects is provided by the remarks of Senator Wiley, "Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary," 85th Congress, 2nd Sess., 1958, at pp. 6-8.

<sup>77</sup> See New York State Youth Commission, "Blueprint for Delinquency Prevention," (1953), p. 2.

from 75% to 90% of the cases of delinquency. This in turn suggests that it could justifiably be said that there are two general sources of delinquency, to-wit: (1) certain types of families, and (2) all other sources.

Included in the category of "all other sources" are such matters as mental disorders, physical defects, social conditions of the nature of slum housing, misspent leisure time, bad neighborhoods and associations, and inappropriate schooling. What distinguishes this category from the family category is the absence of "identifiable" families. The validity of the preventive treatment for this category, therefore, depends upon the degree to which the preventive measures approach the various sources of delinquency. For example, general community organization and co-ordination of services are valid preventives to the extent that the source of misbehavior is poor housing, or misuse of leisure time, or economic failure. In addition, these community services have effect if they supplement and reinforce the prevention programs designed for the "identifiable" family category.

An examination of the Glueck Table and its retrospective application, and of the Youth Board findings, will demonstrate that the "identifiable" family category is meaningful as a source of delinquency. The significance of this category for prevention will also become clear. The Glueck Social Prediction Table is based upon five child-parent relationships: (1) discipline of the boy by the father; (2) supervision of the boy by the mother; (3) affection of the father for the boy; (4) affection of the mother for the boy; and (5) the cohesiveness of the family.<sup>78</sup> When these relationships are chaotic or have deteriorated there is a strong chance that the boy will become a delinquent. A justifiable conclusion, then, is that these five family interactions are definitely associated with delinquency.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>78</sup> Glueck, S. and E. T., "Early Detection of Future Delinquents," 47 *J. Crim. Law, Crim., and Police Science* (1956). In addition, see Glueck, "Spotting Potential Delinquents: Can It Be Done?", 20 *Fed. Prob.* 7 (Sept., 1956), and Glueck, S. and E. T., *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* (1950), Ch. 20.

<sup>79</sup> Note that no position is being taken as to whether these family relations are a cause of delinquency. The purpose of this section is to develop categories of sources of delinquency that will provide a meaningful guide for prevention programs.

Just how great this association may be is indicated by the retrospective application of the table. The Douglas A. Thom Clinic for Children, located in Boston, applied the table to 54 boys ranging in age from 6 to 12 years who had been treated for aggressive, destructive, anti-social behavior. The scorings made by the clinic psychologist indicated that 83.3 per cent of these boys would have been clearly identified by the table at the age of six as potential delinquents. That is, in 83.3 per cent of the cases, family relationships had deteriorated. Two other retrospective applications of the table both found that 91 per cent of the delinquents would have been identifiable at the age of six because of the parent-child situation.<sup>80</sup> In other words, in three groups of delinquents between 82 to 91 per cent of the cases were associated with chaotic family relationships. These tests confirm the conclusion that there is a definite category of delinquency with which certain types of family interactions are associated and that this category includes a substantial majority of the instances of delinquency.

The statistical findings of the New York City Youth Board relating to the multi-problem, hard-core families support this conclusion. Youth Board research estimates that 20,000 multi-problem, hard-core families, constituting less than one per cent of New York City's family population, account for 75 per cent of the city's delinquency.<sup>81</sup> In other words, 75 per cent of all of New York City's delinquents came from the same 20,000 families, which indicates that these families must be, in some way, associated with the delinquency. Further proof is offered by a survey made by a Community Research Associate in San Mateo, California. It was there pointed out that all of the cases of

<sup>80</sup> These studies are described in Glueck, E. T., "Identifying Juvenile Delinquents and Neurotics," 40 *Mental Hygiene* (Jan., 1956), pp. 24-43, and in Glueck, E. T., "Spotting Potential Delinquents: Can It Be Done?", 20 *Fed. Prob.* 7 (Sept., 1956).

<sup>81</sup> See note 69, ante. The Chairman of the Youth Board describes these families as the major source of juvenile delinquency. Ralph W. Whelan, Executive Director thereof, calls them the fountainhead of delinquency and states that this group must be reached and helped if lasting progress is to be made. See also "Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on Judiciary," 85th Congress, 2nd Sess. (1958), at p. 85.

serious juvenile misbehavior dealt with by the police, courts and agencies in San Mateo were concentrated in less than one per cent of the families in that community.<sup>82</sup>

These hard-core families are characterized by a multitude of social disorders and many of them are well known to the various social agencies in the community.<sup>83</sup> Some of them have been in this plight for several generations.<sup>84</sup> Because of their particular characteristics and their many contacts with social agencies, these families may be easily identified and located for prevention purposes.

It is not contended that, in those cases falling within the "identifiable" family category, the family is the cause or even the predominant cause of misconduct. However, it is contended that a certain type of family is definitely associated with delinquency and this contention has significance for a prevention program. It indicates that there is a factor which is consistently associated in a substantial majority of cases with delinquency and that this factor is identifiable. This factor is the hard-core family or the family subjected to disintegrated inner-relationships. Because such families are identifiable, specially designed prevention programs can be developed and can be applied directly to a substantial source of delinquency.

#### B. EARLY DETECTION OF POTENTIAL DELINQUENTS

According to the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the most important single factor in helping children with behavior problems is to begin early, before the problem has become acute. A great deal can be done for a child in the first stages of his difficulty that would no longer be possible by the time his misbehavior has

<sup>82</sup>The statement appears in "A Report to the Wisconsin State Board of Public Welfare," issued by the Division of Children and Youth, Wisconsin State Department of Public Welfare (1956), p. 5.

<sup>83</sup>Statement by Whelan, "Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary," 85th Congress, 2nd Sess. (1958), at p. 85.

<sup>84</sup>Glueck, S. and E. T., *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* (1950), p. 496.



brought him to the attention of the law enforcement agencies.<sup>85</sup> Where the family is a cause of delinquency, it is vital that the potential delinquent be identified at as young an age as possible, because the family exerts its greatest influence in the child's early, formative years.<sup>86</sup> As, in a great majority of cases of delinquency, a particular quality of family or family relationship is a demonstrable source of the delinquency, and the younger a child is, the more susceptible he is to remedial treatment, the greatest hope for reducing delinquency lies in combining these principles. By systematically locating those families whose conduct is of the type shown to be associated with delinquency, it should then be possible to identify and treat the potential delinquents at an early age.

#### C. TWO FUNCTIONS FOR A PREVENTION PROGRAM

It has recently been recognized that a preventive program must function in two ways. It must strengthen community services for all children and youth, but it must also focus upon early identification and concentrated treatment of individual children with serious adjustment problems.<sup>87</sup> The community co-ordination and recreation type of program is helpful to certain types of youngsters, especially those who come from homes whose parents are affectionate and interested in the welfare of their children but who are unable to provide them with all the necessities of life. These children, basically healthy, will respond positively to offered assistance.<sup>88</sup>

<sup>85</sup> United States Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Children's Bureau, "Helping Children in Trouble" (1947), p. 1. In addition, see Chwast, "Perceived Parental Attitudes and Predelinquency," 49 *J. Crim. Law, Crim., and Police Science* (1958), p. 116.

<sup>86</sup> New York City Youth Board, "New Directions in Delinquency Prevention: 1947-1957," at p. 16.

<sup>87</sup> Wiley, "Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on Judiciary," 85th Congress, 2nd Sess. (1958), at p. 8. See also Beck, "Five States: A Study of the Youth Authority Program as Promulgated by the American Law Institute," (1951), p. 131.

<sup>88</sup> Rosenfeld, "A Research Based Proposal for a Community Program of Delinquency Prevention," *Annals* (March, 1959), p. 139; Witmer, "The Effectiveness of Delinquency Prevention Programs," *ibid.*, p. 49.

But there are other children who are not reached by these programs or who, when reached, resist the services offered. Many of these children are socially maladjusted and in serious danger of becoming persistent delinquents. Their behavior patterns are in the process of formation and an occasional or indirect contact with the general community welfare program is likely to be insufficient to have any substantial effect on their development.<sup>89</sup> To save this type of child, early detection and a concentration of special services appropriate to each individual case are both necessary.

Both general community co-ordination and organization as well as early detection and concentrated treatment perform vital services in these specific areas, but neither will go far in reducing total delinquency without the reinforcing contribution of the other. Both are needed for an effective prevention program.

#### D. STATE LEADERSHIP

It should require little demonstration to show that a comprehensive and realistic prevention program needs leadership at the state level. Autonomous community organizations cannot provide the leadership, the self-stimulation, the funds, the resources, the trained personnel, or the research necessary to carry on a total attack on delinquency.<sup>90</sup> A state agency, however, can be given the responsibility, authority and materials necessary to devise and initiate a state-wide prevention plan and then to direct the application of appropriate services where they are most needed. Prevention activities must be carried out on the community level by the community, but a state agency is required to show what must be done and to assist a community where its own resources prove to be inadequate.

<sup>89</sup> See Stulken, "Chicago's Special School for Social Adjustment," 20 Fed. Prob. 36 (March, 1956).

<sup>90</sup> Commonwealth of Massachusetts, "Annual Report of the Advisory Committee on Service to Youth: Appendix II," (1958), p. 20; New Mexico Commission on Youth, "Youth in Need: Annual Report," (1958), p. 3.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

The four concepts outlined above being essential to any program intended to achieve a significant reduction in juvenile delinquency, it is now possible to estimate the potential effectiveness of the several state statutes and programs described earlier in this article according to the extent to which such statutes and programs embody one or more of these four concepts. Into the first group fall those states whose legislation has been labelled as being ineffective.<sup>91</sup> They have failed to employ any of the concepts deemed necessary to an effective preventive program. Their activity being limited, it is difficult to see how their measures could have an appreciable effect on delinquency or could be expected to accomplish any reduction thereof.

The second group of states includes those where the legislation was characterized by "advice, study and recommendation" provisions.<sup>92</sup> Such legislation, of course, fails to confer upon an appropriate state agency adequate power either to create or to stimulate effective preventive efforts. These programs have not produced any concentrated individual remedial treatment, nor have they made any attempt to locate and treat young potential delinquents. The information available on these states would also indicate that it is highly doubtful that any among them have been able to reduce delinquency significantly.

The third group of states, consisting of California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Texas, and Wisconsin, are characterized by legislation deemed most likely to be effective. With the exception of New York, however, their programs have been primarily concentrated in the area of community education, in organization, and in research so that in six of these states, only one of the two functions of a total preventive program has been utilized. They have emphasized community organization and the improvement of community services to the exclusion of

<sup>91</sup> See notes 13 to 20, ante.

<sup>92</sup> See notes 21 to 25, ante.

getting treatment to the potentially persistent delinquent child. Wisconsin, it is true, has a highly developed system of surveying community problems and needs; Illinois has succeeded in stimulating an unusual amount of local participation in delinquency problems; the four other states have increased community services, awareness and co-ordination; but they have failed to focus upon specific preventive treatment. They have not provided a corps of special treatment services poised to operate on individual cases or areas when trouble is first detected. They have not designed services to reach those children and families especially vulnerable to social illness and before their anti-social behavior patterns have developed into delinquent acts. Instead, their services have been limited to providing general services and activities which only reach children who are not in great danger of becoming persistent delinquents and to treating only those acute and advanced cases of social breakdown which are brought to their attention.<sup>93</sup>

With the exception of New York, these states have failed to capitalize on the parent-child relationship as a likely area for prevention activities although many are aware of the association of certain types of families with delinquency. Specific programs designed to reach the parent-child interaction, especially in those families that are seriously disorganized, have not been developed. Despite the publication of the New York City Youth Board findings, efforts have not been made in these states to locate and treat the multi-problem, hard-core families which are the source of so much delinquency. They have failed to focus on the family and to provide their officials with adequate resources and a philosophy of reaching out to help those in need.

Again, with the exception of New York, these states have not developed techniques of early detection. Wisconsin has had authority to set up an early detection and treatment demonstration project only since January 1, 1958. The Massachusetts school adjustment program is based on crude detection and limited treat-

<sup>93</sup> Wiley, "Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on Judiciary," 85th Congress, 2nd Sess. (1958), at pp. 7-8.

ment. Outside of these projects and the attempts of a handful of schools to develop prediction formulas, there have not been any serious attempts to experiment with early detection and to develop accurate methods of discovering predelinquent children. Consequently, it has not been possible to treat individual predelinquents in their early years when there is a good chance for reformation. The only preventive treatment to reach young children comes indirectly from the general community-type program which does not have sufficient direction to focus on the predelinquent and whose effects are not usually felt by the chronic cases of predelinquency.<sup>94</sup>

Finally, while these seven states have conferred upon one state agency the responsibility for delinquency prevention, not one of these agencies has sufficient authority or resources to lead or to direct a prevention program comprehensive enough to have a substantial opportunity to significantly reduce delinquency. The only such program in existence in the United States today is that of the New York City Youth Board. Credit for this program belongs primarily to the Youth Board itself, because it has been the Youth Board that has designed and developed its program with only limited assistance from the state agency. The inability of communities generally to carry out a comprehensive prevention plan by themselves has been noted. The state legislatures have failed to compensate for this inability by providing a state agency capable of producing authoritative leadership and with needed resources for those areas in which communities are unable to function successfully by themselves. The primary fault lies not with the community or state organization which is carrying out the preventive activities, it lies with the legislatures. They have enabled their instrumentalities to cope with borderline delinquents but they have not given their responsible officials sufficient power to reach the socially maladjusted children who are in serious danger of becoming persistent delinquents.

<sup>94</sup> Glueck, S. and E. T., *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* (1950), p. 287.

If the concepts discussed here are valid, and if, as has been demonstrated, existing plans are generally inadequate, it should be possible to draw up the outline of a long-term, comprehensive, state-sponsored prevention plan that would have a chance to achieve a substantial and permanent reduction in juvenile delinquency. From the Glueck Social Prediction Table, it has been reasoned that a predominant source of delinquency lies in deteriorated child-parent relationships. The New York City Youth Board has discovered that there are definite, identifiable families who are a source of well over half of the city's delinquency. The characteristics of these hard-core families have, in many instances, been passed on from one generation to the next.

Assuming, then, that an accurate and practical prediction table can be devised to identify potential delinquent children and that present clinical and social services are effective in arresting antisocial behavior patterns when applied to predelinquents, pre-delinquent parental relationships and to the families of pre-delinquents, it should be possible to reduce the incidence of delinquency by locating and treating the children raised in these hard-core families and in families characterized by chaotic child-parent relationships. The application of detection and treatment techniques could be reinforced by continued efforts on the part of the general community organization type of program to improve the general conditions and services available in the community and to keep borderline delinquents out of trouble. If, in a given area, these efforts could be continued on a sustained and concentrated basis for a period of thirty years, it should be possible to prevent borderline children from becoming delinquents, to prevent offspring of "identifiable" families from raising new generations of hard-core families, and to save the offspring of families with deteriorating inner-relationships. If this could be accomplished, the result should be a substantial and permanent reduction of delinquency.

This general proposition may not be as far-fetched as it might seem to some. The New York City Youth Board believes that

even among the hard-core families there are many people who can be helped out of their difficulties if only they can be reached.<sup>95</sup> If such people re-establish themselves before their children have passed through their formative years, the conduct of their children may follow along more socially accepted lines. Furthermore, in concentrating treatment on the child-parent relationships, more and more may be learned about the precise causes of antisocial behavior with the result that the effectiveness of subsequent treatment may be increased.

Even if a state should make sufficient resources and adequate personnel available to carry out a long-term plan of this nature, it would not be expected that delinquency would totally disappear. There will probably always be a small central group composed of individuals who cannot, or will not, conform to society's minimum standards. There will probably always be children who, through carelessness or adventuresomeness, will break the law. But it is to be expected that heavy inroads would be made into the occurrence of delinquency. The long-term benefits of such a reduction, in terms of individual human lives and in economic savings to society, would make the initial expense of such a total program insignificant indeed.

What, then, is needed? From what has been said, it can be concluded that what is needed most to create more potentially effective delinquency prevention programs is state legislation; legislation granting to some appropriate state agency both wide authority and substantial resources for use in the prevention field. The grant of authority should include liberal power for leadership and for creation in the areas of community organization, for early detection and treatment, for research, education and training. The state agency should be given adequate funds to allow for the concentration of activities in these fields. Statutory guides

<sup>95</sup> New York City Youth Board, in "New Directions in Delinquency Prevention: 1947-1957," at p. 22, states: ". . . many families whom the community had given up as hopeless have been enabled to make constructive, satisfactory adjustments. Young children who seemed doomed by the overwhelming pressure of family disorganization to lives of delinquency and crime have been set on the road to responsible contributing citizen."

for state agency action should be set out, as, for example, that the state agency should concentrate on child-parent relationships and should experiment with methods of early detection and treatment. It should be made clear that it is the duty of the communities to carry out these prevention programs and to co-operate with state plans, but that it is the duty of the state to assist the communities in the proper execution of their duties. Community leadership, initiative, interest and participation, as it has developed under the current statutes, should be retained wherever possible, but the final responsibility for creating and organizing a comprehensive plan and seeing to it that it is carried out should rest with the state agency. Above all, the state legislature should grant the state agency wide discretion in its activities in order that it may be free to keep abreast of the latest developments and advances in the juvenile delinquency prevention field.

## VI. APPENDIX

For consideration by legislative authorities, a suggestion as to a state statute embodying these ideas is presented. It should be adequate to enable a state to carry out a comprehensive prevention program.<sup>96</sup> The proposal is complete to the extent that it creates institutions and endows them with the authority necessary to carry out an effective program; it is incomplete in certain of its details, such as the designation of officers, their titles and their specific duties. These may be supplied to fit the local scene. In essence, though, the statute should include the following provisions:

1. *Purpose.* The purpose of this act is to conserve the human resources represented by the youth of this state and to protect society more effectively by establishing a Youth Authority which shall be responsible for the development of a program to prevent juvenile delinquency. The Youth Authority shall be aware of the relationship of certain types of families to juvenile delinquency and of the need to concentrate treatment on the pre-

<sup>96</sup> Some of the ideas and some of the sections of the proposed statute have been taken directly from existing legislation. The second paragraph of Section 6 of the proposed statute, for example, has been taken word for word from McKinney's Cons. Laws N. Y. Ann., Exec., § 421, with no more than a minor change in the text.



delinquent child and to reach out to those people who are unable to respond to ordinary social services. The Youth Authority shall encourage awareness by the people of this state of juvenile delinquency problems in their own communities and neighborhoods and shall encourage their participation in developing and carrying out plans for preventing juvenile delinquency.

2. *Citizens and Legislators Advisory Committee.* There is hereby created a Citizens and Legislators Advisory Committee on the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency. The Committee shall be composed of eight citizens and eight legislators. The legislators shall be appointed by their legislative leaders and the citizens shall be appointed by the Governor. The Committee shall make annual recommendations to the legislature concerning legislation for the prevention of juvenile delinquency. The Committee shall observe the operation of the Youth Authority and shall make annual recommendations to the Youth Authority concerning the operations of the Youth Authority and the prevention of juvenile delinquency. The Committee shall sponsor the annual conference of the Citizens Council on the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency.

3. *Citizens Council.* There is hereby created a Citizens Council on the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency. The Council shall be composed of citizens of the various communities of this state who shall be appointed by the Governor of this state. The Council shall hold annual conferences at which the problems and methods of juvenile delinquency prevention shall be discussed. Each annual conference shall submit recommendations concerning delinquency prevention to the Citizens and Legislators Committee on the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency. The members of the Council shall educate their communities in the problems of delinquency and its prevention.

4. *Interdepartmental Committee.* There is hereby established the Interdepartmental Committee for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency. It shall be composed of the heads of the state departments which provide services for children. The Executive Director of the Youth Authority shall be the chairman of the Interdepartmental Committee. The Interdepartmental Committee shall advise the Youth Authority on the prevention of juvenile delinquency. The Interdepartmental Committee shall coordinate the activities of the represented departments with the activities of the Youth Authority.

5. *Youth Authority.* There is hereby created a Youth Authority. The purpose of the Youth Authority shall be to use all available resources to prevent juvenile delinquency. The Youth Authority shall plan and create prevention programs, stimulate and assist community coordination

and improvement of children's services, promote the early detection and treatment of children who are likely to become delinquents, provide for the training of personnel in the field of delinquency prevention, undertake research concerning delinquency and its prevention, distribute information about delinquency prevention, receive and disburse funds from whatever source available, and do all other things necessary to the prevention of juvenile delinquency. The Youth Authority shall develop treatment services for predelinquent children, their families and the relationship between predelinquent children and their parents. The Youth Authority shall engage in experimental and demonstration projects to develop and/or promote the use of new techniques and programs in community services, in early detection of delinquents, in treatment of delinquents and in what other areas the Youth Authority deems to be appropriate. The Youth Authority shall direct the programs of the Division of Community Organization, the Division of Early Detection and Treatment and the Division of Education, Research and Training.

6. *Disbursing and Withholding Funds.* The Youth Authority may appropriate its funds in the manner described in the sections of this chapter or in any way which the Youth Authority deems appropriate to the prevention of juvenile delinquency. Such appropriations however, are not to exceed any limits imposed by the sections of this chapter.

The Youth Authority may authorize or require the state treasurer to withhold the payment of state aid to any municipality in the event such municipality alters or discontinues without the approval of the Youth Authority the operation of a plan approved by the Youth Authority, or fails to adopt or change a plan as recommended by the Youth Authority, or fails to comply with rules and regulations established by the Youth Authority, or fails to enforce in a manner satisfactory to the Youth Authority laws now in effect or hereafter adopted that relate in any manner to the protection and welfare of youth.

7. *Divisions.* There are hereby created the Division of Community Organization, the Division of Early Detection and Treatment and the Division of Education, Research and Training.

8. *Division of Community Organization.* The Division of Community Organization shall stimulate and assist the communities of this state in the fulfillment of their duties under this chapter, shall promote the enlistment of local people individually and in organized groups in cooperative efforts to attack the problem of delinquency in their immediate neighborhood and may appropriate to communities funds not to exceed 25¢ per child per year or \$15,000 per county per year, provided that such funds are matched by funds raised by the community.

9. *Duties of Communities.* It shall be the responsibility of the various communities of this state to engage in whatever activities are necessary to coordinate and improve their general services to the community and to engage in projects and provide services to improve the living conditions in the delinquency-ridden areas of their community. The communities of this state shall develop projects and services that will improve family life in the community and bring special aid and assistance to those families in need of aid and assistance.

The communities shall coordinate their activities in whatever ways possible with the program of the Division of Early Detection and Treatment.

10. *Division of Early Detection and Treatment.* The Division of Early Detection and Treatment shall use all of its available resources to develop and install a method of detecting predelinquents in the first grade of school; to establish central referral agencies for the purpose of directing predelinquent children to appropriate help; to provide for appropriate help for predelinquent children by contracting with private and public social agencies and child guidance clinics for their services and by establishing a special Youth Authority clinic for problems beyond the scope of existing agencies and clinics; and to reach out to help those families in special need of assistance. The Division of Early Detection and Treatment shall appropriate the funds available to it in the manner best designed to achieve the fulfillment of this program. The Division of Early Detection and Treatment shall concentrate its efforts in those areas of the state where the need for delinquency prevention is greatest or in those areas of the state where the program of the Division is most likely to succeed. The Division of Early Detection and Treatment may engage in other activities relative to detection of predelinquents and the treatment of predelinquents which are consistent with the purposes of this chapter.

11. *Division of Education, Research and Training.* The Division of Education, Research and Training shall

(a) educate the general public in the problems of juvenile delinquency and its prevention by developing a program of speeches and distributing literature, films and other aids to education;

(b) publish and distribute a periodical to people in the field of delinquency prevention for the purpose of interchanging information on the latest developments and techniques in delinquency prevention;

(c) engage in research on the causes of juvenile delinquency and methods for its prevention;

(d) in cooperation with the Division of Detection and Treatment undertake and evaluate projects to demonstrate by actual practice a program of early case finding and family diagnosis and treatment;

(e) collect statistics on the incidence and concentration of delinquency within the state;

(f) at the request of local authorities and in conjunction with the Division of Community Organization assist any community within the state in conducting a comprehensive survey of the community's juvenile delinquency problems and its available resources, public and private, and in drawing up methods of establishing a community program for combatting juvenile delinquency;

(g) evaluate the effectiveness of Youth Authority programs and techniques;

(h) provide for the training and education of special workers in the field of delinquency prevention; and

(i) provide in-service training for those who are already engaged in the field of delinquency prevention.

The Division of Education, Research and Training may enter into contracts with colleges, universities and other organizations for the purpose of fulfilling the Division's programs for education, research and training. The Division may engage in other projects of education, research and training which are consistent with the purposes of this chapter.