



Monday, Mar. 22, 1954

Bringing Up Parents

When a child in an apparently normal family of good reputation develops such habits as setting fires, stealing, truancy, vandalism or sexual misconduct, the chances are that he was stimulated by his parents' unconscious approval. This is the conclusion set forth in the A.M. A. Journal by two psychiatrists, the Mayo Clinic's Dr. Adelaide M. Johnson and the University of California's Dr. Stanislaus A. Szurek, after a ten-year study. Their explanation: in such cases the parents have not been able to resolve their own antisocial impulses, so they cannot deal firmly with their children's. In fact, they get vicarious satisfaction from them. The result is tacit approval and implied encouragement of the budding delinquent.

On the surface, delinquency in "good" families (where slum conditions and juvenile gangs are not a factor) seems hard to explain. But where the two psychiatrists were able to study both child and parents, they reported, the child's "defect" was always traceable to one parent or both.

"A child's conscience is made, not born," and during his first six years of life, his conscience is molded chiefly by the parents. A defective conscience in the child is often allowed to develop "so that the parents unconsciously can achieve pleasure by permitting the child to misbehave seriously." And a child is only too quick to sense parental pleasure.

Such sanctioning ranges from encouraging a child to lie about his age, so as to enter a movie at cut rates, to more profound forms of implied approval, e.g., "inordinate maternal curiosity regarding daughter's experiences with boys . . . misguided, too exciting discussions about sex . . . encouragement of display of undue degrees of nudity at home." In many "respectable" families, an attitude of "frankness" about procreation "is carried far beyond the needs of the curious child . . . [and] much of this spuriousness is perpetrated in the name of Freud, who [advocated] moderation and restraint; the parent was to answer the child's specific questions about sex but not deliver a lurid oration . . . He never encouraged exhibitionistic displays of nudity."

Treatment for the parent in cases where his bad influence is more or less conscious is usually impossible, say Psychiatrists Johnson and Szurek. Where the influence is unconscious, the parent can be helped to understand what he has been doing. This may lead to parental shock and neurosis, but, say the researchers, such conditions can be treated more easily than antisocial behavior, which can be transmitted from generation to generation.

 [Click to Print](#)

Find this article at:



Monday, Apr. 07, 1958

The Shook-Up Generation

Of all the pains that plague a modern city, none is more corrosive than juvenile delinquency, and the one city in the U.S. that has a giant's share of pain is New York. There, in the weltering tenements and public-housing complexes that pimple district upon district of the city's 299 sq. mi., roam the "bopping clubs," the teen-age street-fighting gangs. They call themselves Centurians, Demons, Villains, Stonekillers and Sand Street Angels, organize themselves with the precision of military combat teams, with an officer hierarchy (president, war counselor, armorer, etc.). Their code of ethics is a distorted boy's-eye view of the underworld, laced with real touches of bravado and evil that are gleaned from television and the movies—and from relatives who have firsthand experience. They prowl the dark streets, kill and maim one another, dabble in narcotics, drink themselves into a rage with cheap wine called "sneaky pete."

In Search of Defense. Last week the New York Times took a long, authoritative look at the city around it, reported its findings in a seven-part analysis of the street-gang cancer and the damage that it produces. The series, written by Harrison E. Salisbury, for five years the Times's Moscow correspondent, dramatized by understatement the grim, everyday facts of warfare on the streets of the big city.

Typical of the 75 to 100 gangs in the city are the Cobras, half of whose 40 to 50 members live in a Brooklyn housing project. All but a few of them are Negro; there are separate Puerto Rican gangs, and thoroughly integrated ones. The members are, in their own language, all "shook up" and cling together for defense against others as well as for the comradeship they can find nowhere else. They range in age from eleven to 20, occupy themselves chiefly with the protection of their own "turf" (territory). Trespassing on one gang's turf by another gang—or the stealing of another's property or girl, even an insult—may bring on councils of war, choice of a battleground, scouting forays. Finally comes the "rumble," a bloody combat with knives, machetes, guns, rugged garrison belts and—a favorite weapon—skin-slashing automobile-radio aerials stolen from any handy car.

Heart Above All. Most gang members cannot envision a time when there will be no warfare. The only way to stop it, says one leader, would be "for you to be free to go anywhere in the city and nobody would touch you." Throughout the flock of boys he interviewed, Reporter Salisbury found the same theme: hatred for the life they lead, bitter frustration at being unable to cope with it. In Salisbury's gallery:

THE CHIMP, 18, nephew of a "famous Brooklyn gangster," belongs to a gang that is largely Italian and Irish, was expelled from parochial school for bad conduct, was arrested once for larceny, will probably gravitate to the Brooklyn docks where, as he well knows, big-time crime is rampant. "Sometimes guys

come to work on the docks," he says. "They hope to make money, save it and get away and go into business. But they never make it. How can they? Where else can you earn that kind of dough?"

PEPITO, 14, valued in his gang for "heart" (courage), lives with his grandmother, who is on relief. He is on probation for shoplifting, smokes marijuana cigarettes. His world, beyond his gang's turf: comic books, gunplay movies.

CHOCOLATE, 16, comes from a poor home, is—like many gang boys—illiterate, avoids the subway because he cannot read the station names, is usually half-drunk, has tremendous heart.

SEVEN UP, 16, is an orphan from South Carolina, lives, at the moment, with an elderly aunt who is on relief. Essentially illiterate, he is looked after by no one, says Salisbury, "and no one except his fellow gang members cares for him."

SMOKEY, 17, like most leaders of gangs, is alert, intelligent. "People don't understand," he says. "I would much rather not bop. It isn't any fun. You don't know what will happen. You may be killed. Or you may kill someone. Would you think it funny if I said that my real ambition was to become a policeman?"

Sex & Slums. Heart is a gang member's most valued attribute, says Reporter Salisbury, and the coward who "punks out" is likely to be punished by his own gang; the "cheesy," or traitorous, may well be killed. Some gangs sport ladies' auxiliaries, called "debs," who not only supply sexual favors but carry their gangs' weapons as well. In times of peace, the gangs and their debs frequent neighborhood community centers and candy stores. Their favorite pastime: a slow-tempo, pelvis-to-pelvis dance called "the fish."

Surprisingly, 75% of New York's juvenile delinquency is attributable to 20,000 so-called "multiproblem" families. Of these, 2,000 families live in the city's 100,000-family, low-rent housing projects. Brooklyn's famed Fort Greene Houses, one of the world's biggest housing projects (3,500 families: 57% Negro, 18% Puerto Rican) is a \$20 million slum with a third of its families on relief. At Fort Greene some residents prefer to use the stairs rather than face the "stench of stale urine that pervades the elevators." "Nowhere this side of Moscow," writes Salisbury, "are you likely to find public housing so closely duplicating the squalor it was designed to supplant." A heavy portion of the 300,000 Puerto Ricans and many of the 300,000 Negroes who have arrived in the city in the past seven years have settled in such projects and in older tenement slums.

"Kids Have Eyes." How could these expensive new monuments to good intentions turn into new slums? Chiefly because admission to low-rent projects is controlled by the city, which sets an arbitrary income level for tenant families. As they rise on the economic ladder, the better-off families must move out, making room at the bottom for those whose economic and social levels are ever lower. There the gangs thrive, for as one Youth Board official says: "Wherever you have great population mobility and disrupted population areas, gangs spring up to replace the broken stability of the group." Adds a Brooklyn junior

high school assistant principal: "The kids reflect the adults and the world they live in." Says another school official: "We try to make them act the way we don't. We try to teach them to be generous, to believe in the sacredness of human life, to respect the rights of others. But the kids have eyes."

In fitful attempts to wean the youngsters away from such influences, the New York City school system fights an uphill battle, succeeds to a fairly high degree. The city runs five "600" schools especially for the shook-up, but even these schools lack the necessary facilities for coping with the job alone. Many experts agree that these schools—as well as a new category, "700" schools for the worst troublemakers (TIME, Mar. 17)—are going to need more support from the tangled web of the city government's bewildered bureaucracy. Police and churches, too, come in for a share of the blame. The work of police youth squads has been criticized by many specialists. Says the Rev. George B. Ford, pastor of the Corpus Christi Roman Catholic Church: "There is a failure of the churches to reach out and seize the opportunity which exists. Segregation in the congregation enhances segregation on the streets. We segregate our housing projects by income. We drive out the more successful members, and we end up by encouraging concealment and fraud. No wonder our children are in trouble."

Still worse is the fact that, as Salisbury says, "for most New Yorkers, the problem of delinquency does not seem to be immediate or personal."* One who knows the problem from all sides is a 23-year-old (now married) former gang member named Stoney. Says he: "We older fellows —we've got to go cool. But those little ones coming up. They're the real problem. Something's got to be done about them, or I don't know where we'll be at." Stoney, a leading bopper in his day, was not fooling. Only recently, he was attacked by three shook-up gang members.

-Addressing the Arizona State Conference of Social Welfare last week, Denver's Juvenile Court Judge Philip B. Gilliam warned that 20 million youngsters will be moving into the delinquency-age field by 1968. Asked Gilliam: "Can you handle this load with your present facilities for welfare, recreation, police and education? . . . We don't understand juvenile delinquency. We've been told there is no such thing as a bad boy. Well, we're wrong. Most juvenile delinquents are meaner than hell."

 [Click to Print](#)

Find this article at:

<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,863225,00.html>

Copyright © 2008 Time Inc. All rights reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission is prohibited.

[Privacy Policy](#) | [Add TIME Headlines to your Site](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Customer Service](#)

What Price The Fatted Calf?

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY APPROACHING EPIDEMIC PROPORTIONS

By DR. RUTH ALEXANDER, *Editorial Columnist and Lecturer, Canaan, New York*

*Delivered at a meeting of Educators, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, February 28, 1956
(All rights, including book and magazine publication, reserved by the author)*

THOSE who have heard me speak at state conventions associate my work exclusively with the fight against communism. You may wonder why one who has persisted doggedly on that firing line since 1930 should turn her attention to crime. But communism and crime are not as far apart as they appear to be. Both are threats to our peace and security and both will bankrupt us if they continue unchecked.

The reason for our present precarious position *vis à vis* the communist world is because we did not take communism seriously enough soon enough. We were warned and warned and warned. But we found it less disturbing to call those who gave these warnings, contemptuously, "Alarmists." I was one of those "Alarmists." But it is cold comfort today to be able to say, "I told you so."

In the field of juvenile delinquency, we have not been warned. A cunningly conceived conspiracy of silence has surrounded the young criminal, allegedly on his behalf, for thirty years. I am here to break that silence. I am here to tell that story, let the chips fall where they may. I am here to urge you to take juvenile delinquency seriously enough soon enough.

I am here to sound that alarm. You take it from there.

As a humanist, the suffering caused by crime concerns me. As an economist, the money spent on crime concerns me. If you educators wonder why your purse has a lean and hungry look, remember that our annual bill for crime is "reasonably" estimated at more than twenty billion dollars. In the teen-age brackets, it costs between four and five thousand dollars a year at state schools to feed, clothe, shelter and analyze each boy, whose sole claim to our time and our taxes is that he broke our laws. At semi-private tax-exempt institutions, euphemistically called industrial farms, it costs more per inmate per year than to send a boy through Yale or Harvard. Delinquency comes dear.

Yet a thousand sociologists plead the cause of the delinquent. I plead the cause of his victims, the cause of society, his market place, of you and me, each, an actual or potential victim of juvenile violence. For these dangerous youngsters are found everywhere. They have long since left the squalid ante-rooms of the slums where crime used to be concentrated and confined. Night and day they now stalk the streets, the parks, the playgrounds, the corridors of public schools, as

"concealed" delinquents, "probationary" delinquents, or "delinquents at large," whose cases have been "dismissed," "adjusted" or "held open" by an indifferent judge in a hush-hush court. If your turn hasn't come to cope with juvenile violence it likely will. Once it does, you will learn how it feels to live behind bars. You will never know peace of mind again.

Our nation is presently engaged in a struggle for survival. It costs money to provide defense at home and to wet-nurse a large part of the world abroad in the hope of friends when the chips are down for the final count. We can no longer afford billions for crime as well. Since we cannot divest ourselves of our relentless enemy, communism, we must curb our criminals. It is estimated that more than half of all adult criminals were juvenile delinquents. We must begin stern and comprehensive measures of correction, therefore, in the age group, ten to seventeen. "Youth is the key to Crime Rate."

I need not remind this brilliant and knowledgeable audience of the decisive part semantics has played in the social, political and economic revolutions of the twentieth century. It is defined by its disciples as new meanings for old words "in keeping with the times." But so-called semantic "expansion" can be deliberate falsification as well. And we have often been led to support or condone the very things we abhor, either because the old word made the old *sound* which concealed its new and opposite meaning, or because meliorative words were substituted to cushion the harsh impact of the original.

Take the word "crime," for instance. Traditionally, whether we thought of crime as sin in the generic sense, or as vice in the sense of degrading appetites, or in its specific sense as violation of law with attendant punishment, we regarded crime as cruel, and intolerable.

Came the revolution in semantics, and the meliorative word "delinquency" was substituted to take the heat off crime. Traditionally, a delinquent was merely one who failed to perform a duty or obligation, such as a delinquent tenant. His failure was an offense of sorts but it was not severe enough to arouse public indignation. Thus "delinquent" seemed the answer to the semanticist's prayer. It alluded to an offensive act by an inoffensive word. It was custom made to fit young criminals when they were taken over by professional welfare workers as a by-product of our social revolution.

This semantic device changed nothing and changed everything. The crime was still a crime but the criminal gained good public relations by being called a delinquent. A young criminal who kills a baby sitter arouses public anger. But a delinquent child who does the same arouses public pity. The offenses are identical but the offenders are given different treatment because they are called by different words. We send the criminal to jail. We give the delinquent a good hot bath and send him to bed. We reason that children must be good because they are young. The logic is faulty but the emotional impact is irresistible.

Not only is youthful crime softened by the meliorative word delinquency, but the plot thickens when crime is called sickness. Child "experts" tell us that when a boy is a criminal he is sick. And when he is sick he is not a criminal. Play that on your tape recorder! It comes out that crime is universal, that everybody is a criminal, because everybody is sick most of the time with fear and anxiety and depression and frustrated rage at the disappointments of life that are the common lot of mankind.

These are given as excuse for youthful crime but they are moods none can escape. Yet few dare risk indulgence of the impulses to which these moods give rise. We fear the consequences of lashing out at people and circumstances and blaming them for our conflicts or wrong doing.

But the over-privileged, officially-certified delinquent fears no consequences. He alone rates the red carpet treatment for acting out his moods of rage and despair. For him, and none other, is the fatted calf killed, drawn, sweetened, and spoon fed in the presence of an impressive array of high-priced specialists, to whom money is, after all, the taxpayers' worry. They record his every expression of defiance and cynicism as a proof of his innocence. They soothe him by telling him he is not the criminal but the victim, the immortal victim of society, entitled, therefore, to do violence against members of society, now and then, by way of revenge.

The name we give to youthful crime is important but I'll go along with "sickness" for the moment. So let's call crime cancerous. Like cancer it affects a relatively small proportion of the total population. Like cancer it is alarmingly on the increase. And like cancer, it metastasizes and spreads from one part of the body politic to the other. Unlike cancer however, which is under constant experiment, we persist in the old therapy for crime year after year, even when our cures prove fruitless because they are based on wrong diagnoses.

It is time to change doctors and prescriptions. It is time to take young criminals out of the hands of professional welfare workers, whose function is to devise ways and means of protecting the lawless and put them back in the hands of professional law enforcement officers whose function is to protect the law-abiding. It is time to crack down on the dangerous "open treatment" for young criminals, which means no fence, no bars, no gates, no guards, but hundreds of runaways, each with one or more court convictions for violent crimes. A runaway delinquent is not a statistic. He is an habitual criminal intent on escape and none is more desperate. He is a clear and present danger on the highways and to all who live along the route of his attempted get-away.

It is drummed into our ears that these are "not bad boys" but "sick children." So far so good. We confine sick children, whose disease is obnoxious and communicable. We do not turn them loose and give them the "open treatment." We confine them regardless of whether or not they feel "hostile" or "rejected" in their quarantine. Nor does the law inquire into age, income bracket, or causes said to be not of the patient's making, such as poor home conditions. *The law is concerned exclusively and correctly with the threat of epidemic, with the threat of injury to others.*

It would be unfair and untrue to claim that no allegedly "sick" boy is ever cured. Every once in a while, a confirmed delinquent goes straight with a bang and becomes a movie star overnight. The point is that during his illness and convalescence, and until his cure has made him safe for society, he should be confined, just as a boy with polio is confined while doctors work over him. How would you like the "open treatment" for polio? How would you like a boy actively sick with polio running around loose, infecting you and your children? If crime is to be called "sickness," it must be treated as sickness—and as *contagious sickness*, because it affects others than the patient himself.

Regardless of rare instances of reform, however, juvenile delinquency is rapidly approaching epidemic proportions. Our last complete statistics (1954) showed one out of every 38 boys and girls was arrested in the age group 10-17. "The crime problem is essentially a youth problem."

The purpose of this little talk is to diagnose it anew and prescribe new remedies, before it breaks more hearts and bankrupts more pocketbooks. To that end, we shall reveal the falsity of some cherished myths, expose the irrelevance of some presently held causes, suggest new and relevant causes, and finally explode three ideological bombs—the I bombs—for your consideration.

I shall use the terms "criminal" and "delinquent" interchangeably. I define the term "child" as "any person actually or apparently under the age of sixteen," as in New York, though the age varies slightly elsewhere. I define "delinquent" as one who commits an offense that would be a crime if he were older than sixteen. Again the age varies, so that a boy may be a juvenile delinquent, in one state and not in another. Some states do not even set any age. The over-all picture of juvenile legislation (which comes under welfare law) is one of confusion and contradiction. "Only on the Federal level does uniformity of procedure exist."

I limit delinquents to graduate delinquents, holding one or more degrees from the court. Pre-delinquency and preventive delinquency are so important that they merit separate and special study. I confine the discussion to boys, as males outnumber females four to one. Reluctantly, I omit the hundreds of case histories in my files from which I have drawn my conclusions. I use the biblical reference of the fatted calf as symbolic of reward for evil-doing and compassion for crime. I purposely exclude the connotation of penitence as not commonly characteristic of delinquents.

First, then, to examine two long cherished myths. These are "crime does not pay" and "childhood is sacrosanct." True or false?

Practically everybody parrots the wishful thought that crime does not pay. But the juvenile delinquent knows better. It is the road to importance, a form of achievement, mission accomplished. Since he is free from the fear of the consequences of his acts the sky is the limit. Why not? If he should get caught he can count on a thrilling arrest and on becoming overnight an object of profound public concern where he was only a punk before. More likely than not, the judge of the children's court will let him off with a fatherly pat on the back, partly from boredom and partly under pressure from welfare workers, parents, pastors, priests or teachers, to be a little "soft" on the boy, who is, they maintain, "only a child,"—a child who may be over 6 ft. tall, weigh over 180 lbs. and who fights with knives and lengths of chain wrapped around his fists.

Not only does crime pay for him, personally, but it rolls up the long green for grown-up criminals in movies, radio, comics, and TV whom he aspires to imitate.

The boss criminal has the girl with the biggest bust, the house with the deepest swimming pool, the cigar with the loudest name plate and the coat with the most mink collar. At the end of his long and thrilling life he may be done in by some rat who squealed to the cops and to get by the censor. But meanwhile, he had a lot of fun and everybody has to die once. Nor is hero worship in pictures the only way adult criminals recruit rookies for their ranks. In real life, they pass out narcotics at candy stores, and they know the address of the nearest abortion mill where a quickie can be done during lunch or recess. If the cost is high they pick up the tab and win eternal gratitude from the illegitimate parents of the obtrusive embryo. If one of their young proteges should get caught, they devise ways and means of beating the rap—that is, of preventing him from shouldering the consequences of his own acts. Which is exactly what the welfare workers do.

"Crime does not pay"? It's a myth to be discarded if we are serious about licking juvenile delinquency—if we really want to *do* something about it instead of just *talking* about it.

The second myth concerns the universal sanctity of childhood. For centuries we have clung to a blind irrational belief in the innate goodness of children, despite repeated evidences of their natural wanton cruelty. Little children are little animals and like animals and primitives must be disciplined

incessantly to achieve the self-control demanded by organized society. I realize these are fighting words to doting mothers. And if any mother can show me a child who is not an animal but a vegetable or a mineral I'll take it all back. Animals and primitives live by jungle law until they learn they have to pay and pay and pay for anti-social behavior.

Only an unrealistic and idealized concept of childhood could deny that the dark strains of primitive cruelty are ever far beneath the surface. Yet the ancient superstition persists. It still goes against the grain for us to think of a little person as cruel or a child as a criminal. But until we can shake off the shackles of sentimentality that have held us captive for generations, we shall make no successful inroads against juvenile delinquency.

Case histories show that some children have an innate predestined aptitude for crime just as some have an innate aptitude for playing the violin. They are often highly intelligent and occasionally deeply religious but they have the narcissistic arrogance of the true criminal—cold, pitiless, remorseless. Hence they find nothing distasteful in knocking off someone whose possessions they covet or who gets in the way of their goals. The irony is that they can commit the supreme violence but they cannot be punished by violence.

Furthermore, it is possible to predict criminal tendencies at an incredibly early age. The Jewish Board of Guardians at the Hawthorne Cedar Knolls School has made an exhaustive study of the prediction of probable delinquents, and "recidivists" or repeaters with two or more arrests. Mr. Hoover rates recidivism as one of the most shocking aspects of delinquency.

A study of a thousand delinquents by the children's bureau of our government also reveals *personal motivation towards crime well defined almost in infancy*. "Although the age at which the largest number of delinquents are first apprehended by the police or referred to the courts is between thirteen and fifteen, nine tenths of these children were having marked difficulties before they were eleven years old and *more than a third were showing noticeable signs of becoming delinquent at the age of eight and under*." Another myth vanishes. Now for the currently held causes of delinquency.

Those who make their living servicing delinquents have blamed delinquency on capitalism, socialism, war, peace, flood, drought, depression, inflation, the Republicans, the Democrats, the Communists, the Fascists, the movies, the radio, the comics, the television, the family, the school, the neighborhood, an only child, a sibling, deficient diet, excess fat, too little money, too much money, too little loving, too much loving, parental protection, parental rejection, nuclear fission and nuclear fusion.

Each is alleged to be a cause. But they cannot all be causes for each is a contradiction of its polar opposite. Yet each is defended stubbornly by its disciples. *But only one single cause, personal motivation*, admittedly aggravated by other factors, is the unanimous conclusion of scholarly and objective research.

It is vigorously rejected however by professional welfare workers who prefer, willy nilly, to blame delinquency on retardation in school: on poverty: and on a broken home. Let us examine these alleged causes in order.

The popular notion that the slow learner, the dull-witted, or "retarded" boy tends, *ipso facto*, toward delinquency does not stand up. You are all familiar with the monumental study made by Drs. Eleanor and Sheldon Glueck on delinquents and non-delinquents paired for comparable heredity and environment. Their reasoned conclusion is that "delinquency is not related to retardation in school." As a rule, these children are mentally bright and physically strong, agrees Mr. Hoover.

Furthermore, they lack those worries and anxieties that characterize their non-delinquent brothers and sisters who resist the temptations of their common environment. They must wonder why the bad boy is bundled off to a luxurious country club for crime, the ubiquitous "industrial farm," while they must remain and sweat out satan in the slums or the suburbs with *no reward for good behavior*. Much is made of the problems of the sibling, but each child is a sibling, in his turn, as others are born. Only that one, (or ones) with an innate pre-disposition for crime reaches the courts.

Far from being retarded, delinquents are more likely to be brilliant. They are resourceful, adventuresome, impulsive, destructive, and sadistic. They do not *break* the law in quite the same sense as they *ignore* the law, feeling, in their gargantuan egotism, that they are *above* the law. And frankly, since their lawlessness results in no punitive consequences their reasoning is completely realistic. Free-wheeling and lone-wolf in their attitudes, they resist remedial efforts at social rehabilitation, such as organized recreation.

In my opening remarks, I confined this talk to crime and punishment—or, rather, lack of punishment. Discussion of the magnificent job done by various organizations working with all children, with special emphasis on potential delinquents and marginal cases, is something else again. But as the only encouraging sign on the delinquent horizon I must mention a few, in passing, at least.

You are all familiar with our boys clubs, of which Mr. Herbert Hoover is Board Chairman. Most of you know the American Viewpoint, Inc., whose excellent flyer, "Who, Me?" is used in some five hundred school systems.

The American Economic Foundation concentrates its efforts at preventive delinquency on incentives for citizenship, through short motion pictures, designed to spark discussion on how and why man makes his living, through tools, human energy and natural resources.

Most metropolitan police maintain Police Athletic Leagues and most metropolitan newspapers support fully equipped summer camps for economically underprivileged boys. The most comprehensive, year-round, youth program of any agency in any city in the country is that of the New York *Mirror*. Launched in 1942, it now ranks first in the scope of its activities and in the number of young participants and spectators. Its purpose is to prepare children for the stern responsibilities of adulthood by drawing them into the adult orbit of the community at large while they are yet in school and on playgrounds.

Admirable as these efforts are, they are beamed at all children regardless of their mental, moral or physical status. They could well prove the turning point for marginal delinquents. But it is doubtful if they could reach the innate, purposive graduate delinquent—hostile, self-centered, and remorseless, for "a boy of sixteen" can be as hardened and confirmed a criminal as a man of forty-six.

As Judge Leibowitz says—"Today is the era of the juvenile criminal and I emphasize the word 'criminal' . . . mere youngsters are holdup men, armed with loaded guns, iron knuckles, switch blade knives, daggers . . . crimes such as rapes, burglaries, felonious assault, arson, dope peddling," are committed by youngsters "from twelve years [of age] and upwards." And he adds, "The really alarming feature is that these dangerous youngsters [are] turned loose time after time with hardly a slap on the wrist."

Regardless of the billions squandered on them during "treatment" in state schools or tax-exempt industrial farms, no adequate appropriations are made for follow-up after release to find out what the harvest of humanitarianism really

is. But verification of the inherent tendency of criminals to repeat crime, is the shocking statistic that more than 71% of all arrests are repeats, based on fingerprint impressions in the central repository. What proportion of these were juvenile offenders is difficult to determine. Of the more than half million youngsters (10-17) who were arrested in 1954, "this group accounted for nearly 40% of the arrests for all serious crimes reported by 1,389 cities."

"The exact magnitude of juvenile crime is unknown," due to the fact that records of children's courts are impounded and fingerprinting is prohibited in many states: the irony is that "communities which establish a law enforcement agency, only to hamper it in its performance of duty truly cast their seed upon the rocks. Handcuffing the law enforcement officer in his dealings with juvenile offenders does not solve the problem of delinquency."

Now to return to the second alleged cause of delinquency, which, like retardation in school, is discredited by the facts. I refer to poverty.

For years, we have coasted along on the notion that a highly industrialized neighborhood, with adjacent slums and widespread poverty, drove children to commit crime. This despite the fact that many of our finest citizens came from the wrong side of the tracks and publicly attribute their achievement to the challenge posed by poverty. No one holds a brief for poverty and it is virtually inexcusable in this amazing country where everyone who applies himself with diligence, perseverance, ingenuity, thrift, sobriety and skill to his chosen task, can reap an adequate reward.

But today, one of the most alarming aspects of delinquency is that poverty as a cause of crime is all washed up. The slums have moved over to make room for the suburbs and the children of some of our so-called best people are in trouble. Thus, juvenile delinquency can no longer be classified as a revolt against poverty with the related assumption that if we could lick poverty, we could lick crime. The poverty theory of delinquency, like the misery theory of communism, is emotional indulgence in wishful thinking but does not stand up under the facts. Both are fraudulent, and dissemination of either is fraudulent misrepresentation.

The Gluecks found that the innate purposive character of the boy himself was more important and influential than environment. And an exhaustive study, made by the city of Baltimore, bears out the findings. Its conclusions are "*there is no correlation between the delinquent rate and poverty; there is no really significant correlation between high delinquency and ethnic groups; there is no relation between the industrialization of a neighborhood and its delinquent rate; but there is a definite correlation between the delinquency rate and personal motivation and family life.*"

There is so much wrong with the family in relation to delinquency that I can mention only a few skeletal points. We are all familiar with the biblical injunction to "visit the sins of the fathers upon the children." Substitute the word "mothers" for "fathers" as the most important secondary cause of delinquency and I am with you all the way.

Half of the families in the United States own their own homes, an achievement no other economy in history has even approached. We have the highest scale of living on earth and one of the highest crime rates. So what price own-your-own-home? At the price of working mothers in many instances. In July 1955, the number of women and teen-age girls, employed, reached over twenty million, two million more than the peak during World War II.

Millions of these are mothers. Many work because the

income tax makes their husband's earnings inadequate for the scale of living they desire. But the cost of crime is "reasonably" estimated at some five hundred dollars per year per family. Thus a vicious circle is established in the case of a working mother, whose child or children show a predictable well defined tendency toward crime. Her employment contributes to their delinquency, but part of her earnings are taken in taxes for the high cost of delinquency. She spends part of her wages to correct crime while creating one of the very bases of crime—a motherless home.

A return to a less affluent style of living, to a home not riddled by conveniences, but under the care of a tender, authoritative, and omnipresent mother would solve many problems. I have the utmost sympathy for the child of a broken home. But there are three ways by which a home is broken—death, divorce, or a house made motherless by a woman who calls luxuries necessities and works to that end.

Even in the unbroken home, however, something is wrong. Semantics enters the picture as mother and father are cut to size by "Mom" and "Pop" though familiarity breeds contempt for authority. With the passing of the kindly hired girl, whom I rate as necessary for the continuity of family life, mealtime, which used to be a meeting place has all but disappeared. The whole family eats on the run, in "breakfast nooks," or "snack bars," or "living areas," or singly, on trays, under the deadly visual hypnosis of suspenseful violence on television.

All this plays a part in the restlessness that characterizes the delinquent. Without dignity, discipline is impossible. Children need discipline as guidance, bewildered as they are, trying to find their way through the labyrinth of electrical appliances that passes for a home today and desperately searching for a parent in a pal.

Husbands have become popularly known as "the new servant class." Father has lost face pinch hitting for mom in an apron while she pounds the pavements in slacks. A male child needs masculine authority. He won't accept it from a man in skirts, and he may seek it in the leader of a gang.

But the family, unstable as many families are, cannot, as an institution, take the rap for more than its share of delinquency. There remains the school—or rather, the permissive system of education, which toadies to children even while they are learning their ABCs. No doubt its protagonists and its antagonists sit in this audience. But many distinguished jurists rate permissiveness as a cause of delinquency. Justice Wilfred A. Waltemade, states frankly, "I blame teen-age lawlessness on the current theory of child rearing—permissiveness. It centers in the schools. We are now reaping the consequences of years of permissive education."

From the bottom of my heart I agree. And although I cannot prove that the rise of delinquency was *caused* by so-called "progressive" educational theories and methods, I can point out that the reduction of violent sadistic crime to mere "self-expression," "sickness" or "severe behavior disorder" is unrealistic and dangerous. This point of view *arose simultaneously* with the amoral and materialistic teachings of progressive education. Whether cause or coincidence is a matter of opinion. But when discipline lost out to "self-expression" and when religion lost out to psychology as a leverage of behavior, crime really got under way and the crop of delinquents reached epidemic proportions.

The third cause of juvenile delinquency, as I see it, is the protective aura thrown about young criminals by welfare law. In many states, it is customary for policemen to doff their uniforms and go in an unmarked car when making an arrest of a juvenile. But this practice handcuffs the law enforcing officer and in effect, protects the one who violates the law.

The idea is not to stigmatize the juvenile. But he has already stigmatized himself by his acts! Moreover, if fear of consequential stigma is removed, what conceivable deterrent remains for those who act out universal conflicts by doing violence to other persons?

Protective arrest is but one of many techniques of clemency that surround the young criminal. But clemency does not control juvenile delinquency. On the contrary, it stimulates crime as the alarming increase in our crime rate shows. "Leniency helps defeat the very end it was designed to accomplish." Many states, for instance, prohibit juvenile fingerprinting, though Mr. Hoover recommends fingerprinting "as a practical step to control juvenile delinquency—just as we fingerprint adult criminals." It seems elementary that the protection of innocent people demands that the identity of all criminals, young or old, be made easily available to law enforcement officers. The taking of fingerprints does not involve any stigma. The stigma comes from the offense committed. "The authority for fingerprinting persons arrested for crime, regardless of age, should prevail as legally authorized procedure by the police." (Int. Asso. of Chiefs of Police).

The protection of criminals reaches its peak in our children's courts. Some judges and many probation officers are dedicated men and women of the highest order. But the conflict between the constitutional requirements of the judicial oath to protect life and property and the pressure of welfare groups to protect those who are a clear and present danger to life and property is fierce and unrelenting.

At best, our children's courts are a law unto themselves. Proceedings are strictly hush-hush and our free press is outlawed, though pitiless publicity is a valuable deterrent to wrongdoing. After all, a newspaper is a mirror of life and it is well for the public to look into that mirror so that it may be alert to conditions as they exist. "Law enforcement in any community is only as good as the people of that community demand that it be."

Records of children's courts are impounded, attendants are not in uniform, and everything is done to make the "little shaver" feel perfectly at home. His Honor slouches casually behind a table, looking like a clerk. He does not wear his robe of State and, on hot days, may even hold court in shirt sleeves. His approach to the criminal is palsy-walsy at best, and maudlin at its worst. Rarely is it the stern voice of the majestic and inexorable law, speaking to the lawless in unforgettable terms. The effect is juvenile contempt for a law without backbone or conviction. One so-called industrial farm, which is partially supported by State and Federal aid, and whose policies are, therefore, the taxpayers' concern, has the arrogance to maintain a "*Committee on Judicial Liaison*". Does this sound like tampering with the Judiciary? In any case, it works out that the judge aims to please the criminals and their sponsors! But it is axiomatic that a judge cannot be all things to all men and uphold his solemn oath of office or his personal integrity.

Even at the risk of discrediting the judiciary itself, everything is done to save the children from the consequences of their acts. I know of no other group that rates such privilege. The rest of us have to pay and pay and pay for wrongdoing. Fear keeps us on the straight and narrow. But the delinquent has no reason to be afraid. As one adorable baby-faced blond said, when asked if he thought he could get away with his fifth armed robbery, aged fourteen,— "Why not? I always have."

But that's the catch. There comes a time when the clock strikes twelve and he can no longer get away with it. It is not fair to the child to let him escape punishment up to a

certain time of day, and then take the protective semantic wraps off delinquency and give him the works for crime. He should have been punished at the start, *according to his act—not according to his birthday.*

To cure juvenile delinquency, we must begin at the beginning. We must begin with first offenders, which rarely means the first offense but the first time the boy is caught. Our practice has been to treat so-called first offenders more lightly than "recidivists". This process should be reversed. If first offenders are punished with sufficient severity, they are unlikely to go on to a second or third offense. Jurists agree that "corporal punishment works wonders with kids". Bodily punishment is effective not merely because it hurts but because it humiliates. The gargantuan ego of a delinquent cannot tolerate humiliation.

Juvenile delinquents are a law unto themselves. They are the overprivileged "Untouchables" of our people. Moreover, those who have served a sentence in a spartan state reformatory or a stretch in an elaborate and expensive 'industrial farm', become heroes in the eyes of their teen-age contemporaries. Read "Party For The Kids", in the September 1955 issue of *Esquire*—if you doubt this. I assume you have all read or seen "Bad Seed", "Blackboard Jungle" and "Desperate Hours", fictionalized treatment of documentary material.

Law enforcement officers agree that "first offenders should be punished, not merely reprimanded. When you have gangs of four or five jumping on another child and killing him, you can no longer be sentimental. The criminal must be taught by punishment."

The purpose of punishment is not revenge. *It is a means of discipline—not an end in itself. It must be used to instill fear of the consequences of criminal acts in order to protect society.* I offer the restoration of fear as the sole deterrent to crime known to history. For crime is not an absolute. It is relative. It is related to the fear of attendant punishment or it does not exist, as such.

Way back when man was just another brute in a world of brutes, there was no such thing as crime. Killing, rape, robbery, and arson were just "doing what comes naturally" in order to survive. That was barbarism. But as civilization slowly and painfully got under way, man's behavior came slowly and painfully under social control. In the long series of conflicts between doing what nature prompts him to do and what society permits him to do, man learned to fear the consequences of running amok with anger or revenge or satisfying his natural hunger for food and sex through means prohibited by the group. Crime was born.

Thus, from the early days of civilization, punishment was implicit in the concept of crime. Ethics, morals, and theologies were remarkably at one in defining certain taboos which could be broken only on penalty of death or social ostracism. Punishment for breaking these taboos,—that is, punishment for crime—was one of the decisive milestones that marked the end of barbarism and the beginning of civilization.

But all that is changed now, and subsequent history may well record that the social, political, and economic revolutions of the 20th Century have turned back the clock to barbarism by re-defining crime as "doing what comes naturally" for certain persons of certain ages. Juvenile delinquents are barbarians, living in a barbarous world of their making, in which the rest of us haven't a chance. They commit every conceivable crime with impunity, they cast the shadow of suspicion on their teen-age contemporaries and they devour hard-earned tax dollars by the billions.

According to Milton Bracker's excellent articles in the *New York Times*, you Educators are bearing the brunt of

this problem, as rising delinquency "saps the vitality of the schools". I told your distinguished Secretary that I had three ideological bombs—my "I" bombs—to help cure delinquency by releasing human energy. Some of that energy is yours. But before I explode this fissionable material I would like briefly to recapitulate. In the foregoing, I have proposed the following steps to control delinquency and ultimately, perhaps, to cure it.

Give up the comforting but unreliable cliches that "crime does not pay" and that "childhood is sacrosanct". Admit the falsity of the allegedly primary causes of delinquency—retardation in school, and poverty. Recognize that *personal motivation* is the sole *single* cause established by scholarly and objective research.

Revamp the family by elimination of working mothers wherever compatible with the *necessities* of life, and in those homes where a child shows a marked tendency toward crime. Play down material conveniences and revive a family relationship based on discipline and obedience. Domesticate the Mothers and masculinize the Fathers. Give 'Mom' back her apron, give 'Pop' back his pants and give Junior a collar and tie. There seems to be some esoteric connection between the clothes young criminals wear and the things young criminals do.

Examine critically the effect of 'permissive' education on youngsters with a predictable bent towards crime, regardless of its effect on so-called normal children, for better or worse. Re-appraise humane treatment of criminals in the light of their inhumane treatment of their victims and in the light of the swiftly ascending curve of crime.

Demand a change in atmosphere and procedure in our Children's Courts. *Re-establish fear of the consequences of breaking the law* as the sole deterrent to violence known to history. Insist that our duly constituted legislative bodies—not welfare workers—make the laws for all criminals, young and old, in order to protect the law-abiding. *Make the act, not the age the criterion of crime and punishment.* In a word, resume civilized living, free from fear of the vandalism and sadism of young barbarians, who masquerade semantically as "sick children" that they may win the pity of society, whose members are fair prey for their violence.

Now for the "I" bombs.

I PROPOSE THE END OF SEGREGATION BY AGE IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS, AT BOTH ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY LEVELS, AS A METHOD OF INTELLECTUAL DISCIPLINE, THE KEY TO DELINQUENCY.

We have made a fetish of chronological age in our treatment of crime and in our schools. We have compressed children with widely different heredity and environment, with widely different abilities to learn and to retain, into rigid artificial moulds, called "grades" that are unrealistic and wasteful. Bodies vary little but minds vary enormously. I SUGGEST INTELLECTUAL ABILITY, DETERMINED BY TESTS, AND IRRESPECTIVE OF AGE, AS A NEW BASIS FOR SEGREGATION.

At one fell swoop it would take care of slow learners, fast learners, and disciplinary problems, arising from *heterogeneous groupings of youngsters who have in common only one thing—the year of their birth.* Their employment in adult life will be determined, not by age, but by ability. Their associations and choice of marriage partners will be based not on age but on mutual interests. Why discriminate against ability in favor of age in their early years when it is a false criterion of association in later years, which comprise most of their lives?

Segregation by ability would free the slow learner, in a group geared to other slow learners, from the psychological hazards of competition with fast learners. It would eliminate inferiority complex said to be a cause of crime. It would free fast learners, competing with their own kind, from the psychological hazards of boredom, universally acknowledged to be a prelude to delinquency. Scholastic segregation, in time, might even restore the integrity of the once-coveted diploma, by abolishing the practice of passing along youngsters who do not really "pass" just to get rid of them. Today some earn their diploma and some have it thrust upon them to make room for newcomers in over-crowded school rooms. The effect on intellectual incentive is devastating.

In our present heterogeneous segregation by age, a teacher must be all things to all children. He, or she, must coddle the stupid, coach the brilliant, correct the unruly, and mollify the parents of the whole kit and kaboodle.

Under segregation by ability, teachers who now spend a disproportionate amount of their limited time and strength on slow learners, "because they are sorry for them" could concentrate on being academic philanthropists and welcome to it. Teachers who are highly specialized could concentrate on the fast learners, the brilliant students, who have been pushed around under the false and cruel assumption that a gifted child needs no attention. Left to his own devices, ignored, bored, envied at school and misunderstood at home, the brilliant and perceptive student often takes the line of least resistance and directs his creative energies into evil channels or tests his resourcefulness in criminal activities.

The supreme irony is that the brilliant students now hold the fate of our nation in their hands. In keeping with our social revolution, we have catered to the non-productive, non-creative 'under-dog' for thirty years. Our so-called 'humanitarian' preoccupation with the so-called 'common' man has resulted in the glorification of the common denominator and the lowest common denominator at that. Now, if we are to continue even to exist, we are called upon to produce uncommon men by the thousands. We are racing against time, and scholastic segregation is but the first step in the direction of scientific survival. Rest assured that the sentimentalists will shriek "intellectual snobbery" but from now on we follow the welfare pack at our peril.

Grave concern is voiced, perhaps too late, that few young Americans have equipped themselves for the major professions demanded by the atomic age—mathematician, physicist, chemist, engineer. They chose snap courses instead. Why not? We have made things easy for children all the way in keeping with welfare concepts of child development.

Now Russia is outstripping us in the quality and quantity of young scientists she is turning out and in the development of the ground-to-ground intercontinental guided missile, which will make push button war a reality and seal the everlasting doom of the defeated.

You all recall the recent resignation of Mr. Trevor Gardner, Air Force Research Chief, in protest against economies in the production of this ICBM. He declared it to be imperative for peace that we achieve it first, and advocated a crash program, twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. When asked the cost, over a two or three year period, he estimated *twenty billion dollars, the exact estimate of our annual bill for crime.* Take your choice. A crash program for peace or a crash program for coddling criminals? The choice must be made for we are rapidly approaching our maximum tax tolerance. Remember that what the State gives away it first must take away. And what the State gives for psychiatric probing into the dark and ugly recesses of the criminal mind,

it first must take away from the educational development of normal minds and from our program for defense.

In this emergency, our Secretary of Defense sends out one SOS after the other. And who answers our calls of distress?—industry, not the schools.

David Sarnoff proposes that industrial corporations supply mathematicians and scientists from their own staffs for a year, on full salary, to teach in the public schools. I can't wait. When these technicians-turned-teacher move on our classrooms will they find our curricula directed towards a child's mental development or towards the "whole" child—all but his mental development.

Will the technician be free to *teach*? Or will he be bogged down in bookkeeping, bank savings, Red Cross funds, school rings, school pins, ticket sales, membership drives, and the ubiquitous PTA. Will he even be *safe*? What happens when a pupil defies him, or tells him to go to hell, or threatens him with reprisal, or just knifes him in the back? He will be well paid, though regular teachers are cruelly underpaid. But not all the money in the world can pay for indignities against his person or defiance of his authority.

What has all this to do with crime? Everything. It has to do with discipline—the *intellectual discipline from which disciplined behavior is inseparable. The intellectual discipline of an educational system geared to a child's mental age is the key to delinquency and to all behavior under stress.*

One of our top Army psychiatrists, Major William E. Mayer, states unequivocally that the reason one third of our GIs caved in under captivity in Korea, was lack of discipline . . . not externally imposed rules but self-discipline. And Mayer adds "the American educational system is failing miserably", in the development of an internalized system of discipline. (*U. S. News & World Report*)

Thus, discipline is not only the key to delinquency but to survival. And the source of discipline is the very core of the conflict between the communist world and the free world. Under communism, discipline is imposed from without. Under freedom, discipline is imposed from within. Discipline is the basis of organized society, and if it does not come from within, it must eventually be imposed from without—or anarchy results.

In addition to the discipline that would be enormously improved under scholastic segregation, the next two "I" bombs are work. *Discipline and work are the twin keys to delinquency* and our only hope of licking it. **I PROPOSE THE DOUBLE-DECKER "I" BOMB! IMMEDIATE ABOLITION OF UNIVERSAL COMPULSORY EDUCATION AND REPEAL OF CHILD LABOR LAWS AT THE SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL IN OUR NATIONAL EMERGENCY.**

Like prohibition, they were a "noble experiment" but they have outlived their usefulness. Both served a worthy purpose when children were commonly exploited by parents and employers alike. All that is changed now. Yet our irrational attachment to these outmoded practices continues. The slightest relaxation of either, so that a child of high school rank could work if he wanted to, would bring out the welfare pack in full cry. They would predict dire consequences, ranging from a nation of illiterates to resumption of sweat shops and other unrealistic nonsense.

A newer and nobler experiment would be to *let the kids work, not the mothers, and watch the rate of youthful crime go down down down.*

Most youngsters wouldn't miss high school if they could. But thousands, possibly millions, are in school only because the law requires their attendance. They want to go to work and many of these are our problem cases. They are not bad—

at first. They are just bored. They would be content and productive, holding down a job—if the law would let them.

But sitting in a school room, or playing on a school ground, hour after hour, day after day, year after year, seems interminable and irrelevant and finally becomes intolerable. Restless, inquisitive, ambitious, large for their age, they begin their career of crime with truancy. Time on their hands leads to the probation officer on their heels. And so—from bad to worse.

Explosion of these three Ideological Bombs—SCHOLASTIC SEGREGATION, AT BOTH PRIMARY AND SECONDARY LEVELS, ABOLITION OF UNIVERSAL COMPULSORY EDUCATION AND REPEAL OF CHILD LABOR LAWS, AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL, WOULD RELEASE HUMAN ENERGY—the most powerful energy on earth.

It would free the restless and reluctant student from formal education which is detestable to him and which often forces him into truancy, "the bridge to crime". It would free the harassed and over-burdened teacher from unwelcome and unwilling pupils, who present disciplinary problems almost insurmountable in over-crowded school rooms, and who often lead marginal students along the route to evil.

So—WHY NOT GIVE THESE "T" BOMBS A BREAK AS AN EXPERIMENTAL CURE OF DELINQUENCY? Why not segregate by ability to establish that intellectual discipline which is the indispensable ingredient of disciplined behavior? Why not let a boy of high school rank work, if he wants to?

We have tried all else in vain. Under present treatment, cities and counties take more and more of our tax dollar for the mounting cost of crime. Communists and criminals compete for our earnings. And, because of them, we have already lost our economic freedom—the freedom to decide for ourselves what we shall spend and what we shall retain. Today we live on left-overs and we are rapidly approaching the end of our tax rope.

The time has come to make a choice, to stand up and

be counted, to take sides, publicly, for or against crime. The time has come to put away soft semantic substitutes for crime, such as the meliorative word "Delinquency" and to call a boy who does an evil thing by his evil name, a Criminal. The time has come to answer the question—**"WHOSE WELFARE IS AT STAKE IN THIS HISTORIC MOMENT—THE WELFARE OF THE LAWLESS OR THE WELFARE OF THE LAW-ABIDING? THE WELFARE OF THE RUTHLESS INDIVIDUAL OR THE WELFARE OF THE GOOD SOCIETY, AT WHOSE GATES A THREATENING ENEMY NOW STANDS?"**

I have sounded the alarm. You must make the choice.

Will you take juvenile delinquency seriously enough soon enough? And that means NOW. Or must you learn the hard way? Must you wait till my words are translated into your experiences? Must you wait till your little thirteen year old girl is pregnant from a brutal rape, your aged Father kicked to death, your home a ruined heap of blackened ashes? In 1956, one out of every seventeen homes will be victimized by criminals, old or young. That one may be yours.

The hard core of Judaic-Christianity, the basis of our civilization, is resistance to Evil. When we no longer resist Evil, because we might 'hurt the feelings' of one whose own acts have forfeited all claim to our consideration, we tacitly accept Evil. We have tacitly accepted the evil of delinquency. We have incorporated it into our civilization as a matter of course and killed the Fatted Calf in its honor, time and time again.

The semanticists and the sentimentalists have pulled out all the stops. Tricked by words, we weep over criminals, while their victims lie unmourned but bloodied. We have compromised with Evil and pampered Evil-doers, and the fearful prophecy of Woodrow Wilson has come true—

"It will be a sad day for Society, when sentimentalists are encouraged to suggest all the measures that shall be taken for the benefit of the race."