

Federal Probation During the Second World War—Part Two

Miguel A. Oviedo

United States Probation Officer, Northern District of Indiana

THE FEDERAL PROBATION service came into being rather late in the history of criminal justice. Within the scope of American history, probation had already been established in at least 35 states and the District of Columbia by the time the federal probation law was enacted in 1925.¹ (The history of parole in America goes back further.)² In the 50 years prior to the creation of the federal probation service, as probation evolved into a viable alternative to incarceration, America underwent an industrial revolution, domestic turmoil, several small military conflicts and one terrible world war. As a reflection of its society, American corrections confronts many of the same national difficulties other institutions meet, but societal upheaval always raises particular challenges unique to criminal justice.³

This was the case for the federal probation system. In its first decade of existence, federal probation filled a need in federal jurisprudence, but the growth needed to respond to the demands upon it was constrained by the harsh economic realities of the Great Depression.⁴ Within 20 years of its creation, federal probation—like the rest of the nation—grappled with the challenges of another global conflict. The problems that challenged federal probation and parole mirrored what other state and local community corrections agencies were facing at the time.⁵

In an article published in the June 2003 issue of this journal, I examined the history of the federal probation service in the context of the Second World War. Focusing on the years between 1940 and 1945, I detailed how federal probation officers expanded their

roles as advocates for offenders by working with induction agencies, courts, parole boards and various other agencies to secure military service for men with criminal records. This was just one of the specifically wartime duties the federal probation service adopted in addition to their normal duties to the community and the offender.⁶ The earlier article also considered the impact offenders had on the war, and highlighted how the war called upon the services not only of offenders but also of federal probation officers, many of whom interrupted their careers to become soldiers. Finally, the article took a look at how the federal probation service became responsible for a new class of offender, the military offender.

There were other correctional concerns related to the war that federal probation had to address. The Second World War presented American corrections with challenges that either hadn't existed or had not previously been given as much attention. As one Chief U.S. Probation Officer from Ohio said in 1943, "the kinds of problems encountered [today] are for the most part different from those of several years ago."⁷ That same year, Henry P. Chandler, director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, the agency responsible for the federal probation service, noted that "more and more the time of Federal probation officers, as of many other persons, is being given to activities connected rather directly with the prosecution of the war."⁸ This article will continue the examination of the federal probation service during World War II by focusing on three supervisory issues arguably peculiar to the war.

First, World War II provided America with

an employment boom, with manpower shortages leading to opportunities for rehabilitation that probation and parole officers across the country would never have thought possible. Less positively, prostitution became a primary concern for governmental, military and correctional personnel during wartime. Finally, paralleling federal probation's responsibility for military offenders covered in my previous article, probation officers dealt with selective service violators and the impact they had on the system. "We are on new frontiers," another Chief U.S. Probation Officer wrote in 1943, demonstrating the commitment federal probation brought to this time in American history. "[B]ut we have all been on new frontiers before and know the effectiveness of sincerity of purpose, perseverance, tact and courtesy together with a definite knowledge of our work and what it will accomplish."⁹

Employment

In his comprehensive survey of American history, George Brown Tindall stated that after the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, "there was no doubt that the war effort would require all of America's huge productive capacity and *full employment of the workforce*" (emphasis added).¹⁰ This is an extraordinary idea, considering that America was still coming out of the Great Depression; in 1940 eight million people—six percent of the population—were still without work.¹¹ Within only a couple of years, there was such an "extraordinary demand for labor" that unprecedented opportunities arose for everyone, including

women and minorities.¹² While a wartime economy would require sacrifices no less significant than those endured during the Depression, in the end, most people subscribed to the hope that peace and prosperity would most certainly follow.¹³ For federal offenders, however, the promises of a recovering economy and the rewards of full employment would require assistance from, and in some cases coercion by, federal probation officers.

“One of the first concerns of a probation officer at any time,” the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts stated in 1943, “is to aid those who are under his supervision in procuring employment.” From national administrators to line officers, it was firmly believed that a vital component of offender supervision was aiding the offender in finding work.¹⁵ The importance of employment in general could not be overemphasized in the literature of the time. “A job cannot be measured solely in terms of wages and hours,” wrote one researcher in 1940. “It must also be considered from the standpoint of a person’s interests, his personality traits and his realization of opportunities for growth and advancement.”¹⁶ The warden of the federal penitentiary in Atlanta, Georgia, stated in 1943 that “suitable, productive employment is one of the greatest aids to rehabilitation.”¹⁷

Thus, federal probation officers were expected to network with employers and employment agencies in their communities. They were to foster the needed confidence within their offenders and the community and be versed in vocational guidance counseling to the degree necessary to know where job opportunities were.¹⁸ Yet despite the rehabilitative model of corrections prevalent in this era and what the literature aptly pointed out was integral to an offender’s successful reintegration with society, *and* in spite of the ardent work of federal probation officers on their behalf, federal offenders continued to face frequent disappointment.¹⁹ America’s entry into the war against fascism might have united the nation towards a common purpose, but it certainly did not soften the public’s intolerance of criminals, federal and otherwise.²⁰ To remedy this, the government became more active in educating employers about the law. In doing so, a significant segment of the population contributed to the war effort.

The massive industrial conversion experienced during the Second World War provided many employers with government contracts. Within months of Pearl Harbor, “auto mak-

ers switched to producing tanks, makers of shirts switched to mosquito netting, model train plants to hardware and the makers of refrigerators, stoves and cash registers to munitions.”²¹ To bolster production, government contracts specifically contained provisions prohibiting discrimination “on the basis of race, color, creed or sex.”²² However, as previously stated, federal probation officers found it difficult to convince employers to hire offenders, even during a national labor shortage. A criminal record proved to be a sure path to a “cold reception” and “the door.”²³ What federal probation officers learned, however, was that one reason contracted employers were reluctant to hire offenders was because they misinterpreted certain clauses of their contracts as prohibiting employment of convicted offenders.²⁴

It was not only supposed contractual provisions that barred federal offenders from finding work. At the same time that the federal government was urging people to work, long-standing civil service requirements made it impossible for offenders to do precisely that. In the war economy of World War II, the federal government controlled many industries needed for defense through its War Production Board.²⁵ Chandler recounts that before the war, civil service requirements prohibited any person from obtaining a job in any factory producing war-related goods for at least two years after their “release from prison, parole or probation.”²⁶ This meant that offenders on federal probation and parole could not hope to find good-paying jobs assembling aircraft and naval vessels. For example, in the city of New York alone, at least a half dozen naval shipyards needed tens of thousands of employees to continuously work “under emergency schedules.”²⁷

These concerns were eventually brought to the attention of the Secretary of Treasury as well as the Attorney General, who issued simultaneous statements in 1942 clarifying that the prohibition in contracts (which actually read: “the contractor shall not employ any person undergoing sentence of imprisonment at hard labor”) did not apply to probationers and parolees.²⁸ Furthermore, a year later, the U.S. Civil Service Commission amended its rules to allow *federal* offenders on probation or parole to work in government-contracted positions, *provided* they received “favorable” recommendations from federal wardens or federal probation officers.²⁹

However, these actions on the part of the government did not mean it was opening its doors completely. The federal government

still wanted a measure of screening to be done by employers as well as federal probation officers. The Director of Procurement within the Treasury Department wrote that “persons with tendencies toward arson or the malicious destruction of property should not be admitted to war production plants.”³⁰ As well, offenders displaying “mental or emotional instability” were not to be hired. Notwithstanding these prohibitions, such government support eventually diminished resistance to the hiring of federal offenders so that midway through the war, most federal probation officers were reporting to the Administrative Office that the war industry was at last cooperating with their efforts to fill job vacancies.³¹ In the meantime, the Civil Service Commission was looking to extend the privilege granted federal offenders in community corrections to offenders under state or local jurisdictions.³²

As critical as employment was to the rehabilitative model of the time, federal probation officers still encountered some offenders who did not want to take advantage of full employment. Federal probation officers needed to be aware that some offenders would have “difficulty in adjusting” to wartime sacrifices. “In this group,” wrote Milton Lessner, an adult probation officer from Oakland, California, “is the selfish, egocentric probationer with individualistic and antisocial tendencies” who will simply not work with others.³³ In addition to general offender obstinance, federal probation officers had to keep in mind that some maladjustment would arise from the unfamiliar territory in which offenders were finding themselves. Where finding work was continuously difficult for some, full employment meant these hard-luck cases not only had jobs but more money than ever before.³⁴ Consequently, securing an offender a job became the first part of the federal probation officer’s task.³⁵ They needed to remain involved.

Federal probation officers kept in contact with employers about the conduct of offenders under their supervision and made sure those offenders kept working. In some cases, federal probation officers went so far as to arrange for transportation to and from work to reduce absenteeism. Others helped offenders manage their finances by urging them to buy war bonds or to start savings accounts or to find proper investments for their excess funds.³⁶ The types of problems federal probation officers encountered because of employment were diverse. In addition to financial matters, long work hours or reloca-

tion caused strain in offenders' lives and federal probation officers reported having to provide "on-the-spot" counseling for harried offenders, their spouses and their families.³⁷ Probation officers also had to make worktime adjustments—longer work hours for more offenders meant officers changed their own work schedules to be accommodating.

A general philosophy adopted by many correctional officers was not only to relate an offender's work to the war effort but to understand that what they themselves were doing for their offenders was helping win the war.³⁸ Beyond this general sense of patriotic duty, how were these efforts measured? One approach taken by the Administrative Office was to regularly report how much federal offenders were earning. In the first fiscal year following Pearl Harbor, approximately 35,000 offenders were under federal probation supervision. Of these, 17,500 reported they were working and earned a total of \$17.3 million by July 1942. By 1944, federal offenders had earned nearly \$25 million. Chandler qualifies these substantial figures by stating that "[these] earnings cannot include the value of compensation in other forms than money for certain kinds of labor, such as the living of farm workers, and undoubtedly therefore fall short of the true total."³⁹

The war created an employment boom, but correctional officials at the time were realistic enough to know that it would not last forever.⁴⁰ Subsequent economic demobilization "brought sharp dislocations" which translated into considerable unemployment.⁴¹ In fact, within months of Japan's formal surrender on September 2, 1945, practically "every war contract [had] been canceled or terminated."⁴²

By the fall of 1945, there were serious fears that millions would once again find themselves without work. There were also concerns about decreased wages and lowered standards of living.⁴³ Things looked bleak for federal offenders and once again it would be their probation officers who would have to help them through this time. Fortunately for everyone, the federal government had instituted what Tindall called economic "shock-absorbers" such as "unemployment pay and other Social Security benefits" to prevent America from slumping into a postwar depression.⁴⁴

Prostitution

During the Second World War, the quarterly correctional journal *Federal Probation* continued to provide corrections professionals with

timely articles concerning such important issues as juvenile delinquency and drug abuse.⁴⁵ However, there was another crime that concerned those within criminal justice as much as it worried military, medical and social services. Prostitution and the transmission of venereal disease during the war were recognized early on as problems not confined to the military and criminal justice agencies but bearing significance for the general community.⁴⁶ In the spring of 1943, *Federal Probation* devoted an entire issue to these related topics. The editorial preface to the issue stated that prostitution and venereal disease were "costing the country millions of hours of service on both the war and industrial fronts. Large amounts were being paid by the taxpayer for the treatment of those infected. But the greatest cost of all was the breakdown in health, happiness, and self-respect of those who are victims" of these problems.⁴⁷

During the First World War, it was reported that 338,746 U.S. service men were treated for venereal disease—100,000 more than those killed and wounded in combat. With these many men infected, it was calculated that over seven million "man-days" of service were lost during that conflict.⁴⁸ To avoid a repeat of such a calamity, local, state and federal agencies responded during World War II with a variety of tactics to combat prostitution. A few that impacted federal probation will be reviewed here. First and foremost, the federal probation service was directly involved with the war on prostitution with the passage of Public Law 76-163 on July 11, 1941.⁴⁹ Commonly referred to as the "May Act," the law granted the Secretaries of War and of the Navy authority to designate specific military installations as locations where the Act would be in force. Upon doing so, it became a federal offense punishable by imprisonment to engage, solicit in or aid and abet prostitution. Furthermore, the Army and Navy were directed by Congress to actively suppress prostitution by seeking assistance from local and state authorities.⁵⁰ This meant federal probation officers would have to prepare presentence reports on any violators and subsequently supervise any offender given a suspended sentence and probation or released on parole.

In the space of two years, over five hundred people had been convicted of violating the May Act.⁵¹ This number included not only prostitutes but "panderers, madams, taxicab drivers and property owners who made prostitution possible."⁵² Of the total number arrested, over a hundred women had been

incarcerated within 24 months of the law's passage.⁵³ These are astonishing figures given that by 1943 only *two* military bases had invoked the provisions of the May Act: Fort Bragg in North Carolina and Camp Forrest in Tennessee. The Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, reported that in one town alone, 25 of 27 people charged with violating the May Act were infected with venereal disease.⁵⁴ When details were gathered about these violators, particularly about the prostitutes themselves, even Hoover seemed surprised by what was found.⁵⁵

In one survey of the first 100 women imprisoned under the May Act at the Federal Reformatory for Women in Alderson, West Virginia, federal probation officers learned that most of these women were younger than 25, had less than an eighth grade education and many had less than an I.Q. of 70. In keeping with the location of the military bases, federal probation officers were told that all but nine of the first 100 prisoners grew up in rural areas and came from poor families "replete with recitals of domestic difficulties."⁵⁶ The survey also revealed high rates of divorce and numerous children born out of wedlock. Furthermore, 64 out of the 100 women studied had been previously arrested. More surprising to researchers was that of the women incarcerated for prostitution, a majority were not involved in prostitution prior to the war.⁵⁷ It was this last finding that guided federal agencies in developing strategies in combating prostitution and venereal disease.

Experts in disease control were very conscious during the war of the futility of trying to eliminate prostitution altogether.⁵⁸ One researcher put it succinctly in 1943: "No one will contend that sexual promiscuity and vice are produced by . . . war. They were here with us before Pearl Harbor; they will remain with us after the peace is signed."⁵⁹ Instead, victory would be declared in decreasing the incident rates of venereal disease among men and women.⁶⁰ Federal probation officers were instructed to view prostitution as a "social disease" which required a multi-lateral approach and the assistance of public health organizations at every level of government.⁶¹ More important, the literature of the period argued that to effectively reduce prostitution, and consequently venereal disease, attention had to be given to more than just the prostitute. Law enforcement and correctional strategies had to focus on the solicitor and the "facilitator" or "pimp."⁶²

In 1941, the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services created the Social Protection

Section, whose wartime director was none other than former organized crime-fighter Eliot Ness. Ness noted the Social Protection Section was “concerned with promoting legal repression of prostitution by local authorities, and with attendant problems of prevention and redirection.”⁶³ Combining the May Act with the Mann Act (which prohibited the “interstate and international traffic of women”), as well as with the Bennett Act (which prohibited the “importation of aliens for prostitution”), the federal government provided local governments additional resources to become more aggressive in fighting organized prostitution.⁶⁴

The Army’s Venereal Disease Control Branch concurred with Ness. Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Turner, who was the Branch Chief, stated that to severely curtail prostitution, concerted efforts had to be made against the profiteer of this crime.⁶⁵ Eliot Ness called for a crackdown on “commercialized prostitution” by clamping down on “dance halls and taverns, cheap hotels, taxicabs, and other ‘third party channels of assistance for prostitution activities.’”⁶⁶ Meanwhile, there was strong community activism for local ordinances barring “red-light” districts. Of all the different suggested programs for prostitution repression, community involvement attracted the greatest consensus as the strongest weapon.⁶⁷ “Citizens must be convinced,” Walter Clarke of the American Social Hygiene Association wrote, “that it is desirable at all times, in peace as well as in war, to reduce prostitution to a minimum and keep it there.”⁶⁸ By the end of the war, police administrators were adopting early styles of community-oriented approaches in dealing with the problem of organized prostitution.⁶⁹

As for the individual prostitutes who found themselves under presentence investigation by federal probation officers for violating the May Act, sociologist Walter Reckless ventured to guess in the special 1943 issue of *Federal Probation* that prostitutes were women “with previous sex experience who lack resources and respond to prostitution as a vocational opportunity by way of suggestion or help of [other] prostitutes.”⁷⁰ Sixty years of subsequent research may paint this impression as simplistic and sexist, but Reckless defends his position by claiming that “in the absence of a body of reliable information on prostitutes, it might be pardonable to make [such] observations.”⁷¹ Prior to the Second World War, Reckless asserted that the rehabilitation of prostitutes was particularly difficult because “American social work [had] paid little atten-

tion” to prostitution.⁷² Furthermore, there were simply fewer “rehabilitative resources” at the time that supposedly could convince a prostitute to end her career.⁷³

We have already looked at suitable employment as an important strategy in rehabilitation and the federal government advocated that probation and parole agents stress this strategy in supervising prostitutes in the community.⁷⁴ In fact, general rehabilitative treatment approaches used with other criminal offenders were extended to prostitutes.⁷⁵ A “complete program of prevention” normally included educating prostitutes about sexuality and health, finding prostitutes adequate housing, “suitable and wholesome recreation,” and addressing such psychological issues as self-esteem.⁷⁶ For rehabilitation to succeed with women convicted of violating the May Act, federal probation officers were also urged to involve “the school, the family, the church, industry, commerce and [the] government.”⁷⁷

Likewise, federal probation officers were required to be sensitive to what issues men convicted of the May Act brought with them. Police captain Rhoda Milliken of the DC Metro Police Women’s Bureau reminded correctional professionals that prior efforts to curb prostitution often accomplished little more than to “persecute” women, “forgetful of the great network of which their activities are a part.”⁷⁸ During the war, the Army made it an important strategy “to keep the number of extramarital sexual exposures to a minimum by emphasizing the importance of adhering to the established moral code and practicability of continence.”⁷⁹ This was to be accomplished by “hard work, athletics, entertainment, and other recreational facilities, and by supporting such measures as will decrease the availability of sexually promiscuous women.”⁸⁰ The Army also stressed the use of condoms and regular medical testing for those who engaged in sex.⁸¹ Education was the key factor stressed in preventing men from soliciting prostitutes.⁸²

When all was said and done, rehabilitation for the federal offender involved in prostitution was based on inclusion rather than isolation.⁸³ It is certainly a valid argument that prostitution will continue to plague society, but correctional professionals during World War II were urged to educate and inform the public in “reasonable and practical” approaches in repressing prostitution. As prostitution and venereal disease ultimately reduced the military’s ability to fight the war and industry’s efforts to support it, the feder-

al government’s overall philosophy was to urge “law enforcement agencies to repress the facilitator [of prostitution], and let the health and welfare workers take care of the girl.”⁸⁴

Selective Service Violators

Prostitution on or near a military installation was one of among many war-related crimes that required the involvement of the federal probation service during World War II. Others included “espionage, sabotage, failure to register as an alien, violation of selective service, violation of OPA (Office of Price Administration) regulations, theft of government property [and] illegal wearing of uniforms.”⁸⁵ In fact, the Chief U.S. Probation Officer of the Eastern District of New York calculated in 1943 that investigating offenders of these specific offenses increased workloads by at least 25 percent in the preceding year.⁸⁶ We will conclude this review of federal probation’s activities during World War II by looking at violators of the Selective Service Act and the impact they had on the service.

Public Law 76-783 was enacted on September 16, 1940, only days before Japan formalized its alliance with Germany and Italy.⁸⁷ The act specifically provided for the build-up of the country’s military personnel, noting that “in a free society the obligations and privileges of military training and service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selective compulsory military training and service.”⁸⁸ Before America entered the war, its army stood at 1.4 million. As a result of mobilization efforts, including the Selective Service Act of 1940, the U.S. Army grew to 8 million by the end of the war.⁸⁹ Among the many provisions the Act covered were age limitations and quotas for induction, fitness requirements, notification procedures, pay, promotions, deferments, conscientious objectors, job retention and restoration, and the organization and structure of the national, state and local registration boards.⁹⁰

Section 11 of the Selective Service Act of 1940 provided, in part, that those who failed to register or report for induction could be imprisoned for up to five years or fined up to \$10,000.00.⁹¹ The law specifically directed that any violations thereof were to be tried in U.S. district courts “unless such person has been actually inducted,” in which case the person was tried by a military court.⁹² Nonetheless, compulsory service has always met with some resistance. In fact, one author contends that “draft resistance is one of the largest, longest

and most successful campaigns of civil disobedience in American history.”⁹³ On the other hand, the importance of ensuring that eligible men complied with the law was taken very seriously during World War II. With as many as 36 million men subject to registration and 10 million actually inducted throughout the war, “there was too much at stake to countenance violation.”⁹⁴

Whenever a local selective board believed an individual was delinquent in his responsibilities to either register or report for induction, detailed regulations dictated what had to be done, including notification to U.S. district attorneys.⁹⁵ While enforcement was taken seriously, the Selective Service System promoted a philosophy of “persuasion” rather than “penalizing.”⁹⁶ It was the official position of the Selective Service System to take every possible measure to convince a willful violator to enlist rather than face prosecution and conviction; and this tact was urged upon the numerous U.S. attorneys offices across the country.⁹⁷ A foundation of this philosophy is found in the Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended. In addition to compulsory service, it provided alternatives to military duty, such as specialized work camps, for legitimate conscientious objectors, and contained other provisions for deferments, exceptions and emergencies.⁹⁸

Nevertheless, in some cases prosecution became necessary. A circular prepared by the Department of Justice on January 9, 1942, advised all U.S. attorneys that “while every effort should be made to secure compliance with the provisions of the law and to maintain intact the availability of service for those persons having obligations to discharge, willful violators should, of course, be vigorously prosecuted.” Whenever cases were prosecuted, the U.S. district courts and the federal probation service as a component thereof supported the general philosophy espoused by the Selective Service, that “every effort” be made “to persuade such offenders to accept their duty of military service rather than convict them and send them to prison.”⁹⁹ As opposed to other federal offenses, however, federal probation officers were reminded that violators of the Selective Service Act were “not ordinary criminals.” Many had “never committed a criminal offense before” their violation.¹⁰⁰ This common factor functioned as leverage in coopting compliance. The personal opinion of the Director of the

Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts was echoed by many federal probation officers: “The country gains a soldier and the man is saved from a criminal record” when a violator is persuaded to register or report for induction.¹⁰¹

During the war years, federal probation officers were more involved in investigating Selective Service violators than in supervising them.¹⁰² Federal probation officers entered the judicial process shortly after the district U.S. attorney was informed of the crime.¹⁰³ Federal probation officers assisted by conducting background investigations of the defendants and provided the U.S. attorneys and district courts with courses of action. In one “metropolitan district” during 1943, there were as many as 150 Selective Service violation cases a month.¹⁰⁴ In this particular district, federal probation officers investigated “more than half” of those cases. Fortunately, the majority of these violators often agreed to serve in the military and have their charges dismissed.¹⁰⁵ A year after America entered the war, federal probation officers had completed 2,839 presentence and 791 postsentence investigations of Selective Service cases across the country.¹⁰⁶ By the end of the war, the Selective Service System reported that there were nearly 16,000 convictions under the Selective Service Act of 1940.¹⁰⁷

The investigations made by federal probation officers also benefitted the military by pointing out which Selective Service violators were actually unfit for service.¹⁰⁸ Early in the war, the federal probation service aided the Federal Bureau of Prisons in determining that many Selective Service violators “were of such mental makeup that they could not be cared for by the regular institutional authorities.”¹⁰⁹ This made the information contained in presentence reports very important and required federal probation officers to make extra efforts to obtain any and all “medical and psychiatric information” available on an individual violator.¹¹⁰ For those who truly had mental health problems, charges were often dismissed and the individuals released to state hospitals or other local agencies.¹¹¹ Midway through the war, almost 300 Selective Service violators required psychological evaluation and approximately one in four was actually impaired to the point that he could not serve.¹¹²

Aftermath

The war ended as dramatically as it had begun for America and offenders and federal probation officers alike eventually returned home.¹¹³ Some of the war’s aftereffects on the federal probation service were discussed in my previous article, particularly the pardoning of federal offenders who served in the war. Public and criminal justice professionals, however, shared a real concern that the war’s end would spell disaster for American society. Prominent researchers predicted that “trigger-happy” soldiers would come home and lead displaced workers in an unparalleled crime wave to compensate for a crumbling economy.¹¹⁴ Others, like James V. Bennett, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons during the war, dismissed such claims as “mirage[s] created by a few sensational crimes and a hysterical press.”¹¹⁵ Bennett hoped the war would lead people to realize what they could accomplish for themselves and their society.¹¹⁶ The hope of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts was that through the activities of federal probation officers, society would “come to realize that men with criminal records are not all bad; [and] that many of them given a chance can correct their mistakes.”¹¹⁷

The Second World War gave federal probation an opportunity to demonstrate how well a probation agency could accomplish its mission of protecting society and rehabilitating offenders during times of historic challenges. With federal probation’s 25th anniversary approaching in 1950, post-war America would pose internal challenges for federal probation and corrections in general.¹¹⁸ Federal probation standards were still not what its advocates had hoped for after 20 years, and caseloads were still viewed as being too high.¹¹⁹ In fact, the end of the war would see caseloads building still higher. Nevertheless, the reputation of the federal probation service had been significantly strengthened through the work of individual federal probation officers with induction boards, employers, the military, treatment agencies and the community, and would become the standard by which other community corrections agencies would be judged for decades to come.¹²⁰

Notes

- ¹ United Nations, Department of Social Affairs, *Probation and Related Matters* (New York: United Nations Publications, 1951), 23.
- ² Herbert Johnson, *History of Criminal Justice* (Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing, 1988), 295.
- ³ Todd R. Clear and Harry R. Dammer, *The Offender in the Community* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2000), 12-13; National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Corrections* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1973), 3.
- ⁴ See Moore, Joel, "Early Reminiscences," *Federal Probation* 14, no. 2 (1950): 22.
- ⁵ Conrad Printzlien, "Meeting War Problems in Probation and Parole," in *Delinquency and the Community in Wartime: Yearbook of the National Probation Association, 1943*, ed. Marjorie Bell (New York: National Probation Association, 1944), 18.
- ⁶ Victor Evjen, "The Federal Probation System: The Struggle to Achieve It and Its First 25 Years," *Federal Probation* 39, no. 2 (1975): 15.
- ⁷ F. Emerson Logee, "Federal Probation and Parole in Wartime," in *Delinquency and the Community in Wartime: Yearbook of the National Probation Association, 1943*, ed. Marjorie Bell (New York: National Probation Association, 1944), 34.
- ⁸ Chandler, Henry, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," *Federal Probation* 7, no. 1 (1943): 6.
- ⁹ Printzlien, 26.
- ¹⁰ George Tindall, *America: A Narrative History*, Vol. 2, 2d ed., (New York: Norton & Co., 1988), 1189.
- ¹¹ Bryon Fairchild and Jonathan Grossman, *The Army and Industrial Manpower*, vol. 7 of *United States Army in World War II: The War Department* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1959; reprint, 1970), 155; Tindall, A36.
- ¹² Logee, 32; Chandler, 6; see also Susan Hirsch, "No Victory at the Workplace: Women and Minorities at Pullman During World War II," in *The War in American Culture: Society and Consciousness During World War II*, edited by Lewis Erenberg and Susan Hirsch (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 241. Though this work primarily focuses on probation and parole, prisons were also particularly active in war production. See the annual reports of the Bureau of Prisons between 1941 and 1945 for detailed reports regarding federal prison industries.
- ¹³ Gary Gerstle, "The Working Class Goes to War," in *The War in American Culture: Society and Consciousness During World War II*, edited by Lewis Erenberg and Susan Hirsch (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 105; see also Tindall, 1190-1191. In 1940, the GNP stood at \$100.6 billion, by 1945, it reached \$213.6 billion.
- ¹⁴ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 6.
- ¹⁵ Logee, 32.
- ¹⁶ Pauline Young, "Some Probation Techniques in Rehabilitation: A Case Study," *Federal Probation* 4, no. 4 (1940): 17.
- ¹⁷ Joseph Sanford, "Where Does the Institution's Responsibility for the Prisoner Begin and End?" *Federal Probation* 7, no. 3 (1943): 27.
- ¹⁸ F. Lovell Bixby, "Probation and Parole: A Career Service," *Federal Probation* 4, no. 2 (1940): 25.
- ¹⁹ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 6.
- ²⁰ Joseph Murphy, "Preparation for the Post-War Period," in *Proceedings of the Seventy-Third Annual Congress of Correction* (New York: American Prison Association, 1943), 96.
- ²¹ Tindall, 1190.
- ²² Fairchild and Grossman, 130; Hirsch, 245.
- ²³ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 7.
- ²⁴ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 6.
- ²⁵ Tindall, 1190.
- ²⁶ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 7.
- ²⁷ Printzlien, 18.
- ²⁸ John Landis, "News from the Field," *Federal Probation* 6, no. 3 (1943): 75.
- ²⁹ National Probation Association, "News," *Probation* 21, Dec. (1943): 56.
- ³⁰ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 7.
- ³¹ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 7.
- ³² National Probation Association, 56.
- ³³ Milton Lessner, "War Production," *Probation* 21, June (1943), 26.
- ³⁴ Logee, 32.
- ³⁵ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 7.
- ³⁶ Logee, 32-33.
- ³⁷ Logee, 32-33.
- ³⁸ Lessner, 26; Logee, 34.
- ³⁹ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 8.
- ⁴⁰ Morris Caldwell, "Control of Postwar Delinquency," *Federal Probation* 9, no. 4 (1945): 9.
- ⁴¹ Tindall, 1236.
- ⁴² James Curran, "Adequate Employment of Prisoners—Present and Future," *Proceedings of the Seventy-Fifth Annual Congress of Correction* (New York: American Prison Association, 1945): 75.
- ⁴³ Morris Caldwell, "Control of Postwar Delinquency," *Federal Probation* 9, no. 4 (1945): 9-10.
- ⁴⁴ Tindall, 1236.
- ⁴⁵ Douglas Thom, "The Role of Probation in the Treatment of Delinquency," *Federal Probation* 5, no. 2 (1941): 6-9; Robert Seliger, "Understanding the Alcoholic," *Federal Probation* 5, no. 4 (1941): 19-24; George Lott, "The Juvenile Detention Home," *Federal Probation* 6, no. 1 (1942): 35-39; Frank Loveland and H. Moeller, "The Federal Juvenile Delinquency Program After Three Years," *Federal Probation* 6, no. 3 (1942): 24-29; Seldon Bacon, "The Sociological Approach to the Problems of Alcohol," *Federal Probation* 8, no. 4 (1944): 20-23; Ray Huff, "Is Juvenile Delinquency Amenable to Control," *Federal Probation* 9, no. 1 (1945): 21-24.
- ⁴⁶ Raymond Clapp, "Community Cooperation in Social Treatment of the Prostitute and Promiscuous Girl," in *Delinquency and the Community in Wartime: Yearbook of the National Probation Association, 1943*, ed. Marjorie Bell (New York: National Probation Association, 1944), 77.
- ⁴⁷ Victor Evjen, "This Issue in Brief," *Federal Probation* 7, no. 2 (1943): 1.
- ⁴⁸ Eliot Ness, "Federal Government's Program in Attacking the Problem of Prostitution," *Federal Probation* 7, no. 2 (1943): 17.
- ⁴⁹ *Prostitution Near Defense Centers Act, Statutes at Large* 55, sec. 1, 583 (1941).
- ⁵⁰ *Prostitution Near Defense Centers Act, Statutes at Large* 55, sec. 1, 583 (1941).
- ⁵¹ John Landis, "News from the Field," *Federal Probation* 7, no. 3 (1943): 51.
- ⁵² John Landis, "News from the Field," *Federal Probation* 7, no. 3 (1943): 51.
- ⁵³ Helen Hironmus, "Survey of 100 May Act Violators Committed to the Federal Reformatory for Women," *Federal Probation* 7, no. 2 (1943): 31.
- ⁵⁴ Landis, 51.
- ⁵⁵ Landis, 51.

- ⁵⁶ Hironmus, 32.
- ⁵⁷ Hironmus, 32; Landis, 51.
- ⁵⁸ Thomas Turner, "The Suppression of Prostitution in Relation to Venereal Disease Control in the Army," *Federal Probation* 7, no. 2 (1943): 9.
- ⁵⁹ Richard Anthony, "The Girl and the Man in Uniform," *Probation* 21, June (1943): 73.
- ⁶⁰ Turner, 9.
- ⁶¹ Justin Fuller, "Public Health Resources Available to the Probation Officer," *Federal Probation* 4, no. 1 (1940): 37.
- ⁶² Turner, 11.
- ⁶³ Ness, 17.
- ⁶⁴ *An Act to Regulate the Immigration of Aliens into the United States, Statutes at Large* 36, 263 (1910); Miriam Van Waters, "Study and Treatment of Persons Charged with Prostitution," *Federal Probation* 9, no. 2 (1943): 27.
- ⁶⁵ Turner, 10.
- ⁶⁶ Ness, 18.
- ⁶⁷ Walter Clarke, "The Community's Part in the Battle Against Prostitution," *Federal Probation* 9, no. 2 (1943): 39; Wilbur Curtis, "The Prostitute Before the Court," *Federal Probation* 9, no. 2 (1943): 36.
- ⁶⁸ Clarke, 40.
- ⁶⁹ Ness, 18-19; Rhoda Milliken, "The Role of Police Woman's Bureau in Combating Prostitution," *Federal Probation* 9, no. 2 (1943): 20.
- ⁷⁰ Walter Reckless, "A Sociologist Looks at Prostitution," *Federal Probation* 9, no. 2 (1943): 13.
- ⁷¹ Reckless, 12.
- ⁷² Reckless, 14.
- ⁷³ Reckless, 14.
- ⁷⁴ Clapp, 80.
- ⁷⁵ Raymond Clapp, "Social Treatment of Prostitutes and Promiscuous Women," *Federal Probation* 9, no. 2 (1943): 23.
- ⁷⁶ Clapp, "Community Cooperation in Social Treatment of the Prostitute and Promiscuous Girl," 77.
- ⁷⁷ Clapp, "Community Cooperation in Social Treatment of the Prostitute and Promiscuous Girl," 77.
- ⁷⁸ Milliken, 20.
- ⁷⁹ Turner, 9.
- ⁸⁰ Turner, 9.
- ⁸¹ Turner, 9.
- ⁸² Van Waters, 26.
- ⁸³ Mazie Rappaport, "A Protective Service for Promiscuous Girls," *Federal Probation* 9, no. 1 (1945): 36.
- ⁸⁴ Turner, 11.
- ⁸⁵ Printzlien, 19.
- ⁸⁶ Printzlien, 25.
- ⁸⁷ Tindall, 1179
- ⁸⁸ *Selective Service Act of 1940, Statutes at Large* 54, 885 (1940), sec. (a) and (b).
- ⁸⁹ Tindall, 1235.
- ⁹⁰ 54 Stat. 885-894.
- ⁹¹ 54 Stat. 894-895.
- ⁹² 54 Stat. 895.
- ⁹³ Stephen Kohn, *Jailed for Peace: The History of American Draft Law Violators, 1658-1985* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1986), 3.
- ⁹⁴ Earl Kirchner, *Enforcement of the Selective Service Law, Special Monograph No. 14* (Washington, DC: Selective Service System, 1950), 2.
- ⁹⁵ *U.S. Selective Service System, Selective Service Regulations: February 1, 1943 to July 31, 1945* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1945), 315-316.
- ⁹⁶ Kirchner, 3.
- ⁹⁷ Kirchner, 2-3.
- ⁹⁸ 54 Stat. 889, sec. (g).
- ⁹⁹ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 11.
- ¹⁰⁰ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 11.
- ¹⁰¹ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 11.
- ¹⁰² Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 11-12.
- ¹⁰³ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 12.
- ¹⁰⁴ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 12.
- ¹⁰⁵ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 12.
- ¹⁰⁶ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 12.
- ¹⁰⁷ Kirchner, 3.
- ¹⁰⁸ Logee, 29.
- ¹⁰⁹ Logee, 29.
- ¹¹⁰ Logee, 29.
- ¹¹¹ Printzlien, 24.
- ¹¹² Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 12-13.
- ¹¹³ Tindall, 1228-1231; John Landis, "News from the Field," *Federal Probation* 10, no. 1 (1946): 51.
- ¹¹⁴ James Bennett, "Developments in Prisons, Parole and Crime Control: 1945," *Federal Probation* 10, no. 1 (1946): 8.
- ¹¹⁵ Bennett, 8.
- ¹¹⁶ Bennett, 8.
- ¹¹⁷ Chandler, "Wartime Activities of Federal Probation Officers," 13.
- ¹¹⁸ Richard Chappell, "The Federal Probation System Today," *Federal Probation* 14, no. 2 (1950): 40.
- ¹¹⁹ Henry Chandler, "Probation in the Federal System of Criminal Justice," *Federal Probation* 9, no. 1 (1945): 6.
- ¹²⁰ "Federal Probation System Praised," *Federal Probation* 7, no. 4 (1943): 39.