

10/19/99

## MIKADO REDUX

Twenty four years ago next month, I stood here at this lectern, with traditional nervousness and shaky knees to present my "maiden" essay for Kit Kat.

The appropriately cryptic title was, "Was The Mikado Right", and it dealt with prisons (or the more euphemistic phrase "corrections") here in Ohio.

A few years earlier I had served, along with a host of distinguished professionals, (including my guest this evening, Si Dinitz) on The Ohio Citizens Task Force on Corrections, a team put together by the Governor to study the system and make recommendations for the future. There had been a great deal of unrest throughout the department on the part of both inmates and employees including a guard strike at Lucasville, and a mini-riot at Ohio Penitentiary. There was severe overcrowding, poor pay for correction officers and other professionals and a host of other problems. The 30+ people appointed to the task force by the Governor included representatives from corrections, law enforcement, the courts, the academic community, and others who had been involved in community service activities surrounding the criminal justice area.

It was from this background and the sort of "hot button" topic of crime and prisons that led me to my subject for that evening.

Now almost 25 years later, I thought it might be interesting to do an update. Politically, "get tough on crime" has replaced the "get tough on Communists" of earlier times. Seldom a day goes by that we do not see something in the newspaper about swelling prison populations, new features such as boot camps, problems with sentencing and parole and so on. Not too long ago we had the truly nasty riot at Lucasville - interestingly enough, following that there was another Governor's committee established, chaired by my guest Dr. Dinitz.

Thus grew, Mikado Redux, my title for tonight.

I will refer to crime figures rather generally and will not deal with random violence like Columbine High School or individual acts by psycho/sociopaths. At the start let me give you just one fact and then I will proceed with some general background.

In 1975 the total population of Ohio was a little over 10 million. The most recent figure I could get for today was a little over 11 million. That's about a 10% increase.

During that same time period our prison population in Ohio has grown from about 11,000 to 48,000. That's about 400%. What in the world is going on here?

Now back to the Mikado. Here is how I began my 1975 essay.

"My object all sublime  
I shall achieve in time --  
To let the punishment fit the crime --  
The punishment fit the crime;"

With these rhymed couplets and those which occur in the following stanzas of the Mikado's musical discourse on crime and punishment, Sir William Schwenk Gilbert, English playwright, humorist, librettist and lawyer, develops one of his many general burlesques on contemporary behavior of the time. It was over 100 years ago that these words first came across the footlights of the Savoy Theater in London, and it is obvious that the subject matter is as contemporary today as it was then. Contemporary, in fact, as far back as we have recorded history.

In Babylon around 2000 BC the Code of Hammurabi became the antecedent model for much of civil and criminal law of today. Crime was evidently a serious problem in Sumer because the Code treats the subject in considerable detail. In those days, they did indeed try to "let the punishment fit the crime". The hand that struck the father was cut off. The father of a son who was murdered could demand the life of the son of the perpetrator. The death penalty was freely used for various forms of theft, disorder or criminal negligence. For adultery, both guilty parties could be drowned. But woe to the false accuser on a capital account! He too was put to death. Corrupt judges were permanently deprived of office. And all our esteemed physician colleagues who are concerned with malpractice suits should be thankful they are not citizens of Ur where a man could lose his hands as punishment for a surgery mistake.

The rule of *lex talionis* applied. It was pure retaliation and simply corporal - no imprisonment or forced labor. The Hammurabic code of justice seemed, for its time, to be swift, fair, tough, and practical.

There is no record that it stamped out crime.

For a more theoretical viewpoint we can study Book IX of the Laws in the Dialogues of Plato. Here too the punishment fits the crime. "No criminal shall go unpunished, not even for a single offense. Let the penalty be according to his deserts - death, bonds, blows, removal to the borders of the land."

We can sense a change, though, from *lex talionis*. The murderer must leave the area of his victim for one year and repent. He can then return and be forgiven. Corporal punishment seems to have change as its goal rather than pure retaliation. Death is reserved only for crimes that adversely affect the very framework of the civilization, namely crimes against the State or the established religion.

The Bible, of course, is overwhelmingly concerned with crime, given the name of sin, and rehabilitation in the form of salvation. As in the Laws, the most severe punishments were meted out for crimes against God. Everything from boils to flood, famine, pestilence and everlasting hellfire damnation. The punishment still fits the crime as the Lord God says to Ezekiel, "Therefore I will judge you, O House of Israel, every one according to his ways."

Here in the Old Testament the sages answered the fundamental "why" of crime in the ringing judgments of Genesis. To the serpent: "Because you have done this, cursed are you above all cattle and above all wild animals." To the woman: "I will greatly multiply your pain in childbearing; in pain you shall bring forth your children." To Adam: "Cursed is the ground because of you; thorns and thistles it shall bring forth to you; you are dust and to dust you shall return." Whereupon Adam was told to get out and stay out . . . The ultimate exile!

Then we see the coming of perhaps the most renowned of radicals who, flying in the face of thousands of years of *lex talionis* says in reply to the 'eye for an eye' philosophy, "Do not set yourself against the man who wrongs you. If someone slaps you on the right cheek, turn and offer him your left." Certainly there is some ambivalence because we hear Paul say, "There will be grinding misery for every human being who is an evil doer." But overall, there is the theme of repentance, forgiveness, and the love of God.

But in the end, this revolutionary and his followers became a threat to the establishment and He became the world's most famous victim of capital punishment.

The point is amply made, I believe, that crime, its causes and what to do about it, has wonderfully concentrated man's mind throughout the ages.

We are no different today. Headlines scream daily of an assortment of holdups, assaults, kidnappings and killings. Cries are heard for tougher laws, longer prison sentences, abolition of programs seen as coddling criminals, and

even overwhelming public support for hand gun control. Our entertainment shows an almost macabre fascination with crime and violence in cinema and television. (I find it rather appropriate that the cop and robber gun battles are often followed by a trip to ER or Chicago Hope).

How, in today's American society, do we perceive the fact of crime, its causes, and possible cures? Are these perceptions realistic, <sup>IMAGINE,</sup> ~~imaginative,~~ paranoid or wishful thinking?

Well, first of all, the fear of crime has become quite pervasive and especially concentrated on the prevalence of "street crime". In other words, the crimes that seem to concern Americans the most are those that affect their personal safety at home, at work, or in the streets. The most frequent and serious of these crimes of violence against the person are willful homicide, forcible rape, aggravated assault, and robbery. The interesting fact, however, is that the portion of our society that is most afraid, if indeed decibels of outcry are directly proportional to fear, are not the people who are generally the victims of these kinds of crimes. It seems to be the white middle class and upper class, the molders of public opinion and the influencers of political action, who are the loudest, yet the vast majority of the crimes of violence occur most often in the lower socioeconomic levels in city centers. Thus, for most citizens, the fear of becoming a victim of a crime of violence is irrational.

Looking at it another way, the personal injury that Americans risk daily from sources other than crime are enormous. The annual rate of all offenses

involving either violence or the threat of violence when compared to the number of Americans who are injured each year in automobile accidents is minute.

The man in the street, however, is afraid. So, while most people are not themselves victims of crime and do not know anyone who has been the victim of a crime of violence, they feel threatened because they have seen on television or read in the newspapers and magazines descriptions of violent crime. Their emotions and anxieties become aroused and fed with each day's reports of new crimes, and although the chances of becoming a victim might be statistically remote, the prevailing reaction seems to be, "Next time it might be me."

The fearful citizen also looks at crime as though it were a unique species of predatory beast or as a single disease, such as smallpox. Reality is, of course, different.

A skid-row drunk lying in the gutter is a crime. So is the killing of an unfaithful husband. Mafia loan sharking is crime. So is a filling station holdup by a 15-year-old boy. In many places the possession of marijuana cigarettes by a student is crime. So are illegal political contributions by a corporate executive.

These crimes can no more be lumped together for purposes of understanding than can measles or schizophrenia, or lung cancer and a broken ankle. As with disease, so with crime: if causes are to be understood, if risks are to be evaluated, and if preventative or remedial actions are to be taken, each kind must be looked at separately. Thinking of "crime" as a whole is futile.

What we do know is that the number of reported crimes almost doubled between 1970 and today; from 2375 per 100,000 residents to a peak of over 5000 in 1981 and lowered to about 4000 in recent years. The largest increases came in 1973-75.

The most rapid rise was in crimes against property. Of course, large cities have the highest rates, although rural sheriffs were reporting increases. More women are involved and their crimes tend to be more violent than before. The published murder rate in Ohio in 1974 was about 9 / 100,000 population. That, by the way, was 25 times the rate in England and 15 to 20 times that in other West European countries. ~~In the '60s the rate was about half that and has been steadily declining since the mid '70s to about 5 / 100,000 in recent years.~~

Highest in  
STATES  
MADE DEPT  
PENNA

I am reminded of the remark made by a British criminologist who was addressing a group here in Columbus to the effect that he would reluctantly admit that for the most part America was "the land of the free", but after seeing our crime rates, he had no doubt that we were the "<sup>HOME</sup>land of the brave".

Two outstanding facts become apparent in any study of American crime. The first is that most crimes, wherever committed, are committed by males in the 15-24 age group, and that most crimes, by whomever committed, occur in the cities.



Crime, then, is evidently associated with four powerful social trends: the increasing urbanization of America, the increased number and restlessness of American youth, the general economic condition of the larger city centers, and last but not least the devastating impact of the drug culture particularly crack cocaine.

Another relevant occurrence throughout the country, regardless of wealth and regardless of location, is that the relationship between young people and their parents is changing. The community is accustomed to rely on parental influence to help mold children into society in an orderly and peaceful manner.

*WVIV  
Rock* →  
Social institutions, while they help and provide services, are not equipped to provide moral standards. Young people who have not had strong and loving parental guidance or whose experience leads them to believe that all of society is callous at best, or a racket at worst, tend to be unmotivated people. They have become bored and cynical and are unprepared to cope with the many problems they will naturally face in any community.

Poverty, racial discrimination and bad housing are additional crime breeders. Added to this is the suffering, terror and rage that surface when the American promise that we can have it all, or are entitled to it all, meets implacable limits.

Although there certainly is crime in well-to-do neighborhoods and on campuses, there is no doubt that there is more in the inner city. The conditions of life there conspire to make crime not only easy to engage in, but easy to invent

justifications for. A man who lives in the country or in a small town is likely to be conspicuous and therefore under its control. A city man is often nearly invisible, isolated from his neighborhood and therefore incapable in being controlled by it. He has more opportunities for crime. At the same time, in the city, much more than in a small community, he rubs constantly, abrasively, and impersonally against other people. He is likely to live his life unnoticed and unsuspected, his hopes unfulfilled. He can fall easily into resentment against his neighbors and against society, into a feeling that he is in a jungle where force and cunning are the only means of survival.

There have always been slums in the cities, and they have always been places where there was the most crime, particularly drug related crime.

Thus, it is primarily with the young people and the poor that the criminal justice system deals. Unfortunately, the criminal justice system, while it has great potential for dealing with individual instances of crime, was not designed to eliminate the conditions in which most crime breeds. It needs help. Providing employment, adequate housing, and adequate incomes is warring on crime. A civil rights law is a law against crime. Money for schools is money against crime. Medical, psychiatric and family counseling services are services against crime.

Finally, no system, however well staffed or organized, no level of material well-being for all, will rid society of crime if there is not a widespread ethical motivation and a widespread belief that by an large, the government and the social order deserve credence, respect, and loyalty.

I think that we have, by this time, had as deep an exploration of the crime phenomena itself as time permits and should move on to a look at the system of criminal justice extant in America.

The philosophic core is that a person may be punished by the Government if, and only if, it has been proved by an impartial and deliberate process that he has violated a specific law. The entire procedure represents an adaptation of the English Common Law to America's peculiar structure of government which allows each local community, including the Federal Community, to construct its own criminal justice system. All of them operate somewhat alike. No two of them operate precisely alike. The purpose is to enforce the standards of conduct necessary to protect individuals and community.

There are two primary features that distinguish the American criminal justice system from that used in other parts of the Western world. The first is the great amount of protection that the American system offers individuals in the process of determining guilt and imposing punishment. We deliberately sacrifice some efficiency and effectiveness in order to preserve local autonomy and to protect the individual. That is part of what America is all about.

The second feature distinguishing us from our neighbors is the harshness of our punishments. Criminal courts in the United States regularly impose the longest sentences of any of the Western countries. Somehow along with our desire to be just, we have maintained the Puritan's high degree of moral indignation against those members of society who do not conform, and thus we

find that punishments are often seen as purely retribution rather than deterrents or rehabilitation.

The criminal justice system generally has three separately organized parts, namely the police, the courts, and corrections. Obviously they are not independent of each other and what each does and how it does it has a direct effect on the work of the others.

RAUSE

At this point, if we were in an academic setting, I would say that the introductory lecture is over and the rest of the quarter would be spent on an intensive examination of these three parts of the criminal justice system. However, in a single sitting, the mind can absorb only what the seat can endure, so we must make some choices for the evening. Obviously we could spend weeks talking just about the police function. Let me just mention a few problems. Police Departments are notoriously hierarchical with all promotions coming from within; very few lateral transfers; and practically no entry from outside into the upper echelons. This tends to make them ingrown, internally political, and unattractive to strongly motivated, well-educated people.

We expect our policemen to be a combination of "father" figure, disciplinarian, social worker, traffic director and obstetrician. As a matter of fact, he probably does more face-to-face 'social work' than many MSW's. Yet we give him little training in these skills and because of the level of pay, we find it difficult to attract as high a quality person as industry. They are often frustrated when they see known law breakers quickly back on the street again. They often get the impression that the community feels the phrase "dumb cop" is a

redundancy. When this frustration peaks it often takes its revenge on the weaker members of society who may then themselves become over-sensitive leading to very difficult community confrontations.

The court system suffers from many similar woes. Most judges are elected and while this may be better than political appointment, it certainly reinforces the need for such unrelated qualification as a photogenic face, a memorable name, and a charismatic manner. Here, too, we find inadequate pay. Thus we find the criticism being made that criminal court judges are lawyers who couldn't make it or lawyers who are using the position only as a stepping stone to bigger and better things, particularly in the political arena. This is not to say that there are not many dedicated, highly competent men on the bench who really hold together the fabric of the entire system.

Our judges are often confounded by the laws passed on by our legislature and, in addition, are caught in the vise between public fear and the requirements of the law. For example, most judges are well aware that lengthening prison sentences is often counter-productive to rehabilitation and of questionable deterrent value. However, legislatures have enacted lengthy and sometimes mandatory sentences in response to the emotion expressed by their constituents.

DISPARATE  
PHYSICAL  
CONSENT  
LAWYERS  
FACTS

In this same area of the courts comes the all-important and much maligned plea bargaining function. Again, judges and prosecutors understand that plea bargaining is almost essential to many convictions and serves as a necessary tool to keep our court system from being completely overwhelmed by case loads. And yet I think if a poll were to be taken, the public would overwhelmingly

abolish plea bargaining not because it is sometimes unfair to the defendant, but because they want to see the full retribution of the law enacted on the prisoner.

Considerable time could also be spent in discussing the plight of the prosecuting attorney with reference to the level of pay and the work load. Still more could be said on the same topics about the public defender.

What I would like to spend just a little time on is the prison system because, for an outsider, I seem to have had more contact -- voluntarily -- with this function of the criminal justice system than any other.

First of all, it is worthwhile to note that the use of prison sentences and the construction of large prison institutions in nearly all parts of the world is largely an American development having its origins in the 18th century. Prior to that time prisons were used primarily for debtors, political enemies, and religious non-conformists. Corporal punishment and exile faced the thief or murderer. It soon became apparent, however, that decapitations, hangings, and member severing did little to deter others from committing like crimes and it was this loss of faith in the concept of retributive vengeance that led to considerations of rehabilitation. There came about the concept that criminal behavior can be regulated by a system of lesser punishments administered in an objective and impartial manner by specialized agencies of government.

In the United States we could look first at the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1776. This, of course, reflected the Quaker outlook and the main forms of punishment were fines and imprisonment.

In 1825 the New York State penitentiary at Auburn was built and became a model for prison operation through the United States for many years to come. It was the hard labor, silent system with all verbal contact between prisoners prohibited. I am sure you all recall the old movie scenes of men in striped uniforms, each with his hand on the shoulder of the man in front, walking in lock step. This was the Auburn model.

In the United States the "mark system" was first used with youthful offenders in the Elmira, New York Reformatory in 1876. Their system advocated classification, segregation of various types of offenders, individual treatment emphasizing vocational training, rewards for good behavior, parole, and conditional release.

At this point, I think it would be worthwhile to transfer our attention to Ohio to see how our system has followed these trends; where it has gone in the last hundred fifty years; and where it seems to be today.

The first settlers came to what is now Washington County in 1788 bringing with them strong New England Puritan ideals. For a few years there was virtually no crime. (Mere existence kept the mind firmly occupied.)

Records show the first jail being built in 1799, but the major punishments were whipping, stocks and pillory, binding out to service and fines.

As population grew in the fledgling state, crime increased and Governor Return Jonathon Meigs sent a message to the State Legislature in his 1811-1813 term suggesting that a state prison be built. The response was favorable, and the three story 60' by 30' structure was completed in Franklinton in 1815. With this came a change in modes of punishment whereby crimes formerly calling for whipping now drew prison sentences from 1 - 15 years.

The first prisoners were Jack and David Evans who were convicted of assault and battery with intent to murder and rob. Interesting in its correlation with today is their ages - 19 and 20.

In short order the facilities became inadequate and a new building was erected in 1818. Within a few years this too became badly overcrowded. Governor George McArthur in 1821 called it "a school for vice" and a citizens committee was established to evaluate the situation and make recommendations. They found that the reason most often cited for releasing prisoners was the need to find space for new convicts. They reported that "it was insufficient as a place of confinement and safekeeping or of punishment and reformation" and suggested that rather than a new large institution, two smaller prisons be built in different parts of the state. The State Legislature did not agree, and voted to build just one, in Columbus.

The site was purchased in 1832 from Philadelphia owners and O P, as it became known, was completed with 700 cells in 1837 at a cost of some \$93,000 plus 1,113,462 man days of convict labor.



In planning for the operation of the institution, the Board of Directors visited a number of other state prisons and settled on the Auburn Model, which you will recall consisted of silence and solitude, lockstep, very severe rules and regulations, and hard labor.

In these days convict labor was contracted out to private industry to manufacture, among other items, shoes, brooms, and shovels. Convict labor built a great deal of our State House and the Central Lunatic Asylum.

For several years to come the policy of reforming prisoners remained secondary to the policy of using prison labor to yield financial return to the state.

Political maneuvering, as always it seems in this arena, was commonplace.

During the period from 1850 to 1900 there continued to be extensive efforts on the part of Ohio prison reformers to recast the penal system so that it would rehabilitate criminals and restore them to productive citizenship.

Finally, in the mid-1880's, a bill was introduced to abolish contract labor and empower the prisons to produce convict-made goods for state institutions with prison industries restricted to prevent unfair competition with private manufacturers. At the same time it would be required that convicts be trained in employable skills. Again we see a move toward the indeterminate sentence which set a minimum and maximum term, permitting prison officials to release when they felt the convict had been "reformed". The Cleveland Plain Dealer characterized this legislation as "most practical reform" and stated that the bill

"goes a great way, if not the entire distance, to a solution of the problem as to what is necessary to punish and reform criminals, protect society and lessen crime". The most difficult obstacle facing these reformations was, as it always been, the accusation that the intent was to coddle inmates.

There does not seem to be much written about the Ohio system in the first half of the present century, but the few allusions indicate that the past was prologue. Rising populations have necessitated the construction of new institutions, but unfortunately Parkinson's Law is always operational so the populations rapidly fill the space available.

In 1975 our Ohio prison system was just beginning its move toward professionalization under Dr. Bennet Cooper. Up until then each institution was run by its warden much like a personal fiefdom and there were turf wars as the central office became more dominant and performance standards were applied.

Pay structures were sadly low and it was almost impossible to attract professionals and consequently there was chronic understaffing and sometimes questionable quality. The guard job was often a third or fourth choice job for what applicants that could be found and turnover was very high. Labor problems were rampant.

There was little vocational training and treatment staff was marginal. Institutions were overcrowded and racial tensions were mounting.

During that same period of the early 1970s we saw the largest rate of increase in reported crimes since recording began. The Ohio Uniform Crime rate rose 48% in 1973, 21% in 1974 and 16% in 1975. I'm told that much of this was due to the onset of the drug crisis and better reporting provided by funding from the Law Enforcement Assistance Act from about the same time.

As these crimes' perpetrators began to come through the court system we began to see our prison populations start to swell. Bringing this more up to date now, we find that the overall crime rate had a downward blip in the early 80s followed by another upward trend for 6 years, but a steady downward move since then. In fact the overall Ohio crime rate has dropped by 20% since 1992. Although the murder rate has dropped substantially, aggravated assault is about the same. Also dropping were the so-called "property crimes"; robbery and burglary are down but larceny and theft have not changed all that much.

Keep in mind here that we still see an overall crime rate of forty five felonies for about every 1000 of us here in Ohio. *ABOUT THE SAME AS 1972*

But the question to be addressed is what has caused the overall drop of 20%. *FROM THE ALL TIME HIGH OF 54 IN 1981*

My research from reliable sources both within and outside the criminal justice system points to many factors, rather than just one. Most citizens hear about our burgeoning prison population and newspaper articles about so-called

"truth in sentencing" laws and assume this is the major deterrent. (As we will see, it certainly has had an effect.)

Likewise, perhaps the ability to fry more felons is behind the drop in the murder rate. Here again, reality is that in Ohio we really don't do much of that so the impact on Ohio crime is probably marginal.

One factor coming out of all research is the tremendously successful economy we have had in the 90s. Unemployment is at an all time low. As always, opportunities become "more equal" during good times so even those at the margin in education and work experience can get trained and hired. Even ex-convicts find it easier to get jobs. As the country church announcement board that I saw recently said, "when you're rowing hard you don't have time to rock the boat".

Another powerful force is the police. Large amounts of Federal, State, and local monies are finally being spent to not only increase the number of police but to install programs that are more preventative in nature than just the number of arrests. Having enough cops to make a visible presence and become known as a peace keeper has a significant impact. If vandalism, graffiti, and loitering can be prevented, so are lots of other bad things. It's like the "first broken window" syndrome. Once property and neighborhood deterioration sets in, trouble is on the way fast.

An example of this is the attempt to improve the overall safety of the OSU area. I was driving up High Street the other day and was pleasantly surprised to see a meaningful presence of un-armed, casually dressed patrol people. As far as I could see, they were younger than most formal police and were carrying radios and what was probably Mace on their belts.

RECENT  
M. P. S. I. V. E.  
P. R. O. T. E. C. T. I. O. N.

In some formerly blighted neighborhoods, residents have made great progress, with the help of police and other agencies, in closing down crack houses, rooting out prostitution and drug dealing.

Interesting things have been happening on the drug front as well. Dr. Dinitz and others have told me that much of the credit for the rise in violent crimes in the early 80s was due to what they call "the drug wars". This often involved violent criminal activity to get and retain "turf", collect for drug sales, and punish their non-compliant brethren. Drive-by shootings were common. The drug was crack cocaine.

Today, in communities that used to have more open-air crack markets than grocery stores, where children grew up dodging crack vials and gunfire, the change from a decade ago is startling. On the surface, crack has all but disappeared from much of New York, for example, taking with it violent part of street life. And this has happened in every major city almost regardless of how law enforcement responded. Crack users, it seems, have grown older and the younger generation of drug users have spurned the drug. Many have seen the devastation in family and community and now look on crack users as losers. The

old turf wars are almost gone although there is still violent crime connected with cocaine and other drugs just as there was during prohibition of alcohol.

Thus the drugs of choice have evolved away from the violence producing crack cocaine, to heroin and cocaine powder. In New York, the Phoenix House, the major drug treatment center reports that the young now get their highs from a "40 oz. can of malt liquor and a "blunt", which is a hollowed out cigar filled with marijuana. Of course, marijuana is the number two choice on campus following alcohol.

Certainly the increased police and incarceration had its impact on the drug culture but according to the National Institute of Justice, "Mandatory prison terms and hundreds of thousands of arrests appeared to have no major deterrent effect".

Then we come around to where we began - - in the slammer.

Early on this evening I told you that although the population of Ohio had grown by about 10% since 1975, our prison population has gone up by 400%, from about 11,000 inmates then to over 48,000 now. There were 7 state prisons in 1975 and today there are 31.

At the same time, the overall crime rate in 1991 <sup>IN RECENT YEARS</sup> was about the same as in 1975. <sup>ARE SIGNIFICANT</sup> There were some ups and downs, of course, but in the main it <sup>16</sup> stayed about the same. Did it take putting that many more people in prison just to maintain the status quo?

The answer seems to lie in changes in sentencing, probation and parole policies - particularly in respect to drug infractions.

The Department of Rehabilitation and Correction tells me that the big prison population increases began about 1979 with the imposition of felony charges for low level drug possession and the theft that often goes with it.

STILL 50% OF  
PRISON POPULATION  
IS DRUG OFFENSE.  
WAS 90% MOST  
SERIOUS OFFENSE.

This is also about the time that homelessness really began to hit hard. There were many people in some truly ghastly mental hospitals that could do pretty well under community supervision and ~~the~~ consequently hospitals were closed down and the patients released back into the community. Unfortunately, communities did not respond with local treatment centers, or much help at all, and thus we found ourselves with a growing number of sometimes frightening street people. Many had alcohol, drug, and behavior problems. While most of the troublesome ones wind up in city and county jails, some find their way into our state prisons - enough to warrant a psychiatric facility at Orient.



Better policing was also resulting in more arrests and the courts were becoming less lenient with probation and parole. There was also a rise in mandatory sentencing.

As I mentioned earlier, the crime rate has dropped a little over 15% since 1991 and no doubt the rate of incarceration has had a substantial impact.

What has happened in the corrections area since 1975 is an enormous leap in professionalism. The top positions are filled by fine professionals such as Dr. Wilkinson who heads the department, and others throughout. Pay at all levels has increased in order to attract and retain higher quality people. The correction officer training facility at Orient is <sup>excellent</sup> ~~one of the best~~ in the country. Inter-county community based correction facilities have been built to help rehabilitate low level, non-dangerous offenders. Prisoners are being assigned to facilities in keeping with their crimes and behavior. Serious attempts are being made to educate and train since so often inmates have few skills and education. In many places prisoners are doing volunteer work in communities. Institutions of higher learning have been recruited to help in the teaching process.

The latest move in prison management is the use of the private sector of the prison industry. There are a number of companies that will build and manage a prison. Usually the State contracts to keep a certain minimum number of beds filled on a per diem basis but the private prison has the option of accepting prisoners from other venues outside the state. Sometimes this leads to trouble as happened here in Ohio recently when the private operation brought in pretty violent out of state offenders and mixed them in with less violent folks. Needless to say, violence ensued and the private operation agreed not to do this.

Another option is to hire a prison management company to operate an institution built by the State and it is my understanding that Ohio is set to do this in at least one instance.



It would seem that the jury is still out on the effectiveness of this approach. There are many hazards in releasing control of prison operations and some private operators have been criticized for being too "bottom line oriented" at the expense of security or rehabilitative programs.

It is important to note that the average sentence is about 27 months. Thus, by far the majority of inmates will soon be back in the community again and if we truly believe the title "Department of Rehabilitation and Correction", what we do with these people while we have them has profound influence on how they behave when released.

37%  
back  
IN PRISON  
5 YRS

Many problems still exist in corrections generally and all apply to Ohio. Prisons are still overcrowded often leading to double bunking which usually leads to conflict, and to putting beds in hallways and common rooms. This calls for more supervision and still often creates disturbances.

Politicians often get shrill about "getting tough on crime" and create pressure to curtail rehabilitation programs. In order to recruit qualified persons at all levels, pay levels have to keep up. As alternatives such as community corrections centers, half-way houses, probation, and parole are used more effectively, the residual prison population gets tougher and tougher to deal with. Prison industries which are very necessary to teach skills (and bring in some income) often run into objections from private industry. Drug and alcohol treatment programs are still woefully underfunded and inadequate. Energy costs

are rising. The list seems to run on forever. However, as mentioned before, populations seem to be on a downward trend.

Now the bad news!!

Waiting in the wings is a huge new population bulge, called the Gen Xers. They are the offspring of the baby boom which was, if you will recall, the main demographic of the last sharp rise in crime in the 1970s and 1980s. This new crowd is just on the cusp of the crime years and will undoubtedly contribute to a new wave in some manner. And they are different in many ways.

We have more single parent families than ever before. The previews of the new television season are absolutely repulsive, in this old codger's opinion. But, the entertainment industry has found that sex and violence sells. General civility has deteriorated into road rage and an "I've got mine, Jack", attitude.

And, those of us here have long enough memories to know that the economy goes in cycles and thus these very good times of the past few years are bound to slow down. With so many jobs now farmed out to contract agencies, layoffs will come swiftly and unemployment will rise. This, plus the demographics will look much the same as during the last big increase in crime.

So, here are some questions to ponder;

TARGET  
14-50

1. What can be done in our society to reduce the chances that another big surge in crime and prison population will occur with the expected increase in the youth population? Is it enough that the crack cocaine wars are over?

2. What really is causing the present drop in crime and prison population. Do stiffer sentences really make sense in terms of cost effectiveness? How much do we want to spend on prison construction versus education, for example?

3. Why does the US have so many more of its citizens incarcerated than other western, industrialized countries?

4. Why do we seem to be so violent, as a country, compared to others?

5. How can we balance rehabilitative efforts with punishment and not run afoul of political demagoguery?

WITH A 400% INCREASE IN PRISON POPULATION  
MORE POLICE AND TOUGHER SENTENCING, WE HAVE  
CRIME RATES ABOUT THE SAME AS 20 YEARS AGO

NETT 01920

AT LEAST

In closing, I would be remiss in not mentioning ~~the most profound question~~  
~~in front of our highest court today~~, the death penalty. Few issues so controversial  
exist. So, if I may, I would like to return to the Savoy Theater and give you the  
Mikado's wisdom:

Resolved to try  
A plan whereby  
Young men might best be steadied.  
So he decreed, in words succinct,  
That all who flirted, leered or winked  
(Unless connubially linked),  
Should forthwith be beheaded.

This stern decree, you'll understand,  
Caused great dismay throughout the land!  
For young and old  
And shy and bold  
Were equally affected.  
The youth who winked a roving eye,  
Or breathed a non-connubial sigh,  
Was thereupon condemned to die --  
He usually objected.

And so we straight let out on bail  
A convict from the county jail,  
Whose head was next  
On some pretext  
Condemned to be mown off,  
And made him Headsman, for we said,  
"Who's next to be decapitated  
Cannot cut off another's head  
Until he's cut his own off."

| Ohio Uniform Crime Rates (Years 1970-1996)  |             |           |             |           |             |           |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
|   | Violent     |           | Property    |           | Total       |           |
|   | Change from |           | Change from |           | Change from |           |
| Year  | Violent     | ar before | Property    | ar before | Total       | ar before |
| 1970  | 284.3       | NA        | 2092.4      | NA        | 2376.7      | NA        |
| 1971  | 298.4       | 5.0%      | 2181.5      | 4.3%      | 2479.9      | 4.3%      |
| 1972  | 299.4       | 0.3%      | 2061.7      | -5.5%     | 2361.1      | -4.8%     |
| 1973  | 291.7       | -2.6%     | 3204.1      | 55.4%     | 3495.8      | 48.1%     |
| 1974  | 364.1       | 24.8%     | 3859.3      | 20.4%     | 4223.4      | 20.8%     |
| 1975  | 408.0       | 12.1%     | 4506.4      | 16.8%     | 4914.4      | 16.4%     |
| 1976  | 388.7       | -4.7%     | 4559.5      | 1.2%      | 4948.2      | 0.7%      |
| 1977  | 406.7       | 4.6%      | 4313.2      | -5.4%     | 4719.9      | -4.6%     |
| 1978  | 412.7       | 1.5%      | 4246.2      | -1.6%     | 4658.9      | -1.3%     |
| 1979  | 457.5       | 10.9%     | 4672.3      | 10.0%     | 5129.8      | 10.1%     |
| 1980  | 498.3       | 8.9%      | 4933.1      | 5.6%      | 5431.4      | 5.9%      |
| 1981  | 496.6       | -0.3%     | 4950.8      | 0.4%      | 5447.4      | 0.3%      |
| 1982  | 436.7       | -12.1%    | 4498.8      | -9.1%     | 4935.5      | -9.4%     |
| 1983  | 397.9       | -8.9%     | 4107.2      | -8.7%     | 4505.1      | -8.7%     |
| 1984  | 385.3       | -3.2%     | 3887.8      | -5.3%     | 4273.1      | -5.1%     |
| 1985  | 381.6       | -1.0%     | 3805.7      | -2.1%     | 4187.3      | -2.0%     |
| 1986  | 420.9       | 10.3%     | 3937.8      | 3.5%      | 4358.7      | 4.1%      |
| 1987  | 421.3       | 0.1%      | 4154.0      | 5.5%      | 4575.3      | 5.0%      |
| 1988  | 452.0       | 7.3%      | 4193.2      | 0.9%      | 4645.2      | 1.5%      |
| 1989  | 468.6       | 3.7%      | 4264.6      | 1.7%      | 4733.2      | 1.9%      |
| 1990  | 506.2       | 8.0%      | 4337.3      | 1.7%      | 4843.5      | 2.3%      |
| 1991  | 561.8       | 11.0%     | 4471.2      | 3.1%      | 5033.0      | 3.9%      |
| 1992  | 525.9       | -6.4%     | 4139.6      | -7.4%     | 4665.5      | -7.3%     |
| 1993  | 504.1       | -4.1%     | 3981.2      | -3.8%     | 4485.3      | -3.9%     |
| 1994  | 485.8       | -3.6%     | 3975.7      | -0.1%     | 4461.5      | -0.5%     |
| 1995  | 482.5       | -0.7%     | 3922.7      | -1.3%     | 4405.2      | -1.3%     |
| 1996  | 428.7       | -11.2%    | 4027.0      | 2.7%      | 4455.7      | 1.1%      |
| *Rates per 100,000 Residents  |             |           |             |           |             |           |
| Figures are taken from Crime in the U.S. 1970 -1996   |             |           |             |           |             |           |
| 91/ 86 crime  | 47.2%       | up        | 17.5%       | up        | 20.2%       | up        |
| 96/ 91 crime  | 23.7%       | down      | 9.9%        | down      | 11.5%       | down      |
| Ohio prison population  |             |           |             |           |             |           |
| Jan. 1, 1986  |             | 20539     |             |           |             |           |
| Jul. 1, 1991  | 86-91       | 33353     | 62.4%       | up        |             |           |
| Jan. 1, 1997  | 91-97       | 45962     | 37.8%       | up        |             |           |
| Note that in the earlier period prison population and the crime rate both go up, and by proportions greater than the drop in crime and rise in prison population in the later period. |             |           |             |           |             |           |

## Ohio Crime Index Rates Per 100,000 Inhabitants

| Year | Population | Index   | Violent | Property | Murder | Forcible rape | Robbery | Aggravated assault | Burglary | Larceny-theft | Motor vehicle theft |
|------|------------|---------|---------|----------|--------|---------------|---------|--------------------|----------|---------------|---------------------|
| 1960 | 9,706,397  | 1,558.8 | 83.7    | 1,475.2  | 3.2    | 5.9           | 40.1    | 34.5               | 383.9    | 956.7         | 134.6               |
| 1961 | 9,876,000  | 1,583.6 | 80.9    | 1,502.7  | 3.1    | 5.6           | 39.6    | 32.5               | 401.8    | 979.0         | 122.0               |
| 1962 | 10,097,000 | 1,565.8 | 82.9    | 1,482.9  | 3.2    | 5.2           | 37.9    | 36.6               | 396.3    | 950.2         | 136.5               |
| 1963 | 10,173,000 | 1,741.1 | 89.3    | 1,651.8  | 3.0    | 6.1           | 40.7    | 39.5               | 431.5    | 1,072.4       | 147.9               |
| 1964 | 10,100,000 | 1,969.7 | 114.7   | 1,855.0  | 3.5    | 7.1           | 46.2    | 57.9               | 466.3    | 1,205.2       | 183.4               |
| 1965 | 10,245,000 | 1,946.1 | 124.8   | 1,821.2  | 3.6    | 8.9           | 51.6    | 60.7               | 470.5    | 1,160.8       | 189.9               |
| 1966 | 10,305,000 | 2,098.7 | 151.6   | 1,947.1  | 4.5    | 9.3           | 70.0    | 67.8               | 490.7    | 1,220.9       | 235.5               |
| 1967 | 10,458,000 | 2,518.4 | 185.0   | 2,333.4  | 5.2    | 10.3          | 95.0    | 74.5               | 607.6    | 1,400.2       | 325.6               |
| 1968 | 10,591,000 | 2,780.9 | 200.4   | 2,580.5  | 5.3    | 12.4          | 102.0   | 80.7               | 659.4    | 1,540.9       | 380.2               |
| 1969 | 10,740,000 | 3,134.2 | 248.1   | 2,886.1  | 6.4    | 15.3          | 126.7   | 99.8               | 740.1    | 1,663.9       | 482.1               |
| 1970 | 10,652,017 | 3,574.4 | 284.3   | 3,290.1  | 6.6    | 16.0          | 145.9   | 115.9              | 853.9    | 1,943.5       | 492.8               |
| 1971 | 10,778,000 | 3,666.2 | 298.4   | 3,367.8  | 7.5    | 18.4          | 163.7   | 108.7              | 932.6    | 1,938.8       | 496.4               |
| 1972 | 10,783,000 | 3,439.4 | 299.4   | 3,140.0  | 7.5    | 19.9          | 160.6   | 111.4              | 901.3    | 1,796.1       | 442.6               |
| 1973 | 10,731,000 | 3,495.9 | 291.7   | 3,204.1  | 7.3    | 21.4          | 143.5   | 119.5              | 943.0    | 1,884.3       | 376.9               |
| 1974 | 10,737,000 | 4,223.4 | 364.1   | 3,859.3  | 8.9    | 23.9          | 191.2   | 140.2              | 1,171.8  | 2,285.1       | 402.4               |
| 1975 | 10,759,000 | 4,914.4 | 408.0   | 4,506.4  | 8.1    | 25.3          | 220.0   | 154.6              | 1,271.4  | 2,808.6       | 426.4               |
| 1976 | 10,690,000 | 4,948.2 | 388.7   | 4,559.5  | 7.4    | 25.8          | 183.8   | 171.7              | 1,203.2  | 2,978.2       | 378.1               |
| 1977 | 10,701,000 | 4,719.9 | 406.7   | 4,313.2  | 7.8    | 27.3          | 190.5   | 181.1              | 1,216.0  | 2,696.8       | 400.4               |
| 1978 | 10,749,000 | 4,658.8 | 412.7   | 4,246.2  | 6.9    | 27.4          | 182.6   | 195.8              | 1,214.5  | 2,629.7       | 402.0               |
| 1979 | 10,731,000 | 5,129.8 | 457.5   | 4,672.3  | 8.1    | 31.8          | 194.8   | 222.8              | 1,287.2  | 2,946.2       | 438.9               |
| 1980 | 10,766,808 | 5,431.4 | 498.3   | 4,933.1  | 8.1    | 34.3          | 223.7   | 232.2              | 1,466.3  | 3,040.1       | 426.7               |
| 1981 | 10,776,000 | 5,447.4 | 496.6   | 4,950.8  | 7.4    | 31.0          | 236.9   | 221.3              | 1,493.6  | 3,032.4       | 424.8               |
| 1982 | 10,791,000 | 4,935.5 | 436.7   | 4,498.8  | 6.3    | 29.9          | 183.6   | 217.0              | 1,309.6  | 2,807.5       | 381.7               |
| 1983 | 10,746,000 | 4,505.1 | 397.9   | 4,107.2  | 5.6    | 31.5          | 159.4   | 201.4              | 1,155.6  | 2,607.1       | 344.6               |
| 1984 | 10,752,000 | 4,273.1 | 385.3   | 3,887.8  | 5.1    | 34.7          | 145.6   | 199.9              | 1,049.9  | 2,475.3       | 362.5               |
| 1985 | 10,744,000 | 4,187.3 | 381.6   | 3,805.7  | 5.2    | 36.9          | 133.1   | 206.4              | 976.5    | 2,476.4       | 352.7               |
| 1986 | 10,752,000 | 4,358.7 | 420.9   | 3,937.8  | 5.5    | 38.6          | 142.1   | 234.7              | 987.8    | 2,574.2       | 375.7               |
| 1987 | 10,784,000 | 4,575.3 | 421.3   | 4,154.0  | 5.8    | 39.9          | 153.1   | 222.5              | 1,062.5  | 2,708.6       | 382.9               |
| 1988 | 10,872,000 | 4,645.3 | 452.0   | 4,193.2  | 5.4    | 42.6          | 161.4   | 242.7              | 1,031.4  | 2,762.6       | 399.2               |
| 1989 | 10,907,000 | 4,733.2 | 468.6   | 4,264.6  | 6.0    | 44.7          | 170.9   | 247.1              | 1,018.2  | 2,811.1       | 435.3               |
| 1990 | 10,847,115 | 4,843.4 | 506.2   | 4,337.3  | 6.1    | 46.8          | 188.5   | 264.7              | 982.5    | 2,864.1       | 490.6               |
| 1991 | 10,939,000 | 5,033.0 | 561.8   | 4,471.2  | 7.2    | 52.5          | 215.2   | 287.0              | 1,055.2  | 2,915.6       | 500.4               |
| 1992 | 11,016,000 | 4,665.5 | 525.9   | 4,139.6  | 6.6    | 52.1          | 199.0   | 268.2              | 947.3    | 2,721.3       | 471.0               |
| 1993 | 11,091,000 | 4,485.3 | 504.1   | 3,981.2  | 6.0    | 49.1          | 192.7   | 256.3              | 878.1    | 2,667.7       | 435.3               |
| 1994 | 11,102,000 | 4,461.4 | 485.8   | 3,975.7  | 6.0    | 47.1          | 187.5   | 245.1              | 866.3    | 2,682.3       | 427.1               |
| 1995 | 11,151,000 | 4,405.2 | 482.5   | 3,922.7  | 5.4    | 43.4          | 178.7   | 255.0              | 838.8    | 2,669.0       | 414.9               |
| 1996 | 11,173,000 | 4,455.7 | 428.7   | 4,027.0  | 4.8    | 41.3          | 164.1   | 218.4              | 835.4    | 2,784.1       | 407.5               |
| 1997 | 11,186,000 | 4,514.6 | 435.4   | 4,079.2  | 4.7    | 40.8          | 158.7   | 231.2              | 849.0    | 2,824.1       | 406.0               |

Yearly Intake and Population on January 1,  
by Sex, with Percentage Change from Preceding Year,  
1972-1999

Updated 6/14/99

|        | <u>Male</u> |          |            |         | <u>Female</u> |          |            |          | <u>Total</u> |          |            |          |
|--------|-------------|----------|------------|---------|---------------|----------|------------|----------|--------------|----------|------------|----------|
|        | Intake      | % Change | Population | %Change | Intake        | % Change | Population | % Change | Intake       | % Change | Population | % Change |
| 1972   | 4677        | NA       | 8846       | NA      | 236           | NA       | 275        | NA       | 4913         | NA       | 9121       | NA       |
| 1973   | 4635        | -0.9%    | 8049       | -9.0%   | 253           | 7.2%     | 271        | -1.5%    | 4888         | -0.5%    | 8320       | -8.8%    |
| 1974   | 5538        | 19.5%    | 7449       | -7.5%   | 367           | 45.1%    | 268        | -1.1%    | 5905         | 20.8%    | 7717       | -7.2%    |
| 1975   | 7014        | 26.7%    | 8978       | 20.5%   | 442           | 20.4%    | 348        | 29.9%    | 7456         | 26.3%    | 9326       | 20.9%    |
| 1976   | 6859        | -2.2%    | 10985      | 22.4%   | 493           | 11.5%    | 436        | 25.3%    | 7352         | -1.4%    | 11421      | 22.5%    |
| 1977   | 6317        | -7.9%    | 12086      | 10.0%   | 627           | 27.2%    | 542        | 24.3%    | 6944         | -5.5%    | 12628      | 10.6%    |
| 1978   | 5993        | -5.1%    | 12269      | 1.5%    | 558           | -11.0%   | 577        | 6.5%     | 6551         | -5.7%    | 12846      | 1.7%     |
| 1979   | 6849        | 14.3%    | 12768      | 4.1%    | 583           | 4.5%     | 582        | 0.9%     | 7432         | 13.4%    | 13350      | 3.9%     |
| 1980   | 7698        | 12.4%    | 12762      | 0.0%    | 631           | 8.2%     | 598        | 2.7%     | 8329         | 12.1%    | 13360      | 0.1%     |
| 1981   | 9046        | 17.5%    | 12557      | -1.6%   | 792           | 25.5%    | 581        | -2.8%    | 9838         | 18.1%    | 13138      | -1.7%    |
| 1982   | 9530        | 5.4%     | 14071      | 12.1%   | 919           | 16.0%    | 725        | 24.8%    | 10449        | 6.2%     | 14796      | 12.6%    |
| 1983   | 9293        | -2.5%    | 16272      | 15.6%   | 917           | -0.2%    | 875        | 20.7%    | 10210        | -2.3%    | 17147      | 15.9%    |
| 1984   | 8855        | -4.7%    | 16795      | 3.2%    | 780           | -14.9%   | 971        | 11.0%    | 9635         | -5.6%    | 17766      | 3.6%     |
| 1985   | 9132        | 3.1%     | 17382      | 3.5%    | 868           | 11.3%    | 969        | -0.2%    | 10000        | 3.8%     | 18351      | 3.3%     |
| 1986   | 9436        | 3.3%     | 19416      | 11.7%   | 1002          | 15.4%    | 1123       | 15.9%    | 10438        | 4.4%     | 20539      | 11.9%    |
| 1987   | 9871        | 4.6%     | 20981      | 8.1%    | 1071          | 6.9%     | 1194       | 6.3%     | 10942        | 4.8%     | 22175      | 8.0%     |
| 1988   | 11170       | 13.2%    | 22659      | 8.0%    | 1296          | 21.0%    | 1284       | 7.5%     | 12466        | 13.9%    | 23943      | 8.0%     |
| 1989   | 14673       | 31.4%    | 24373      | 7.6%    | 1833          | 41.4%    | 1476       | 15.0%    | 16506        | 32.4%    | 25849      | 8.0%     |
| 1990   | 15423       | 5.1%     | 28346      | 16.3%   | 1986          | 8.3%     | 1954       | 32.4%    | 17409        | 5.5%     | 30300      | 17.2%    |
| 1991   | 17450       | 13.1%    | 29605      | 4.4%    | 2196          | 10.6%    | 1896       | -3.0%    | 19646        | 12.8%    | 31501      | 4.0%     |
| 1992   | 18209       | 4.3%     | 33189      | 12.1%   | 2385          | 8.6%     | 2257       | 19.0%    | 20594        | 4.8%     | 35446      | 12.5%    |
| 1993   | 17460       | -4.1%    | 35627      | 7.3%    | 2374          | -0.5%    | 2364       | 4.7%     | 19834        | -3.7%    | 37991      | 7.2%     |
| 1994   | 16546       | -5.2%    | 37715      | 5.9%    | 2346          | -1.2%    | 2538       | 7.4%     | 19198        | -3.2%    | 40253      | 6.0%     |
| 1995*  | 17395       | 5.1%     | 39065      | 3.6%    | 2520          | 7.4%     | 2544       | 0.2%     | 19915        | 3.7%     | 41609      | 3.4%     |
| 1996   | 16753       | -3.7%    | 41595      | 6.5%    | 2431          | -3.5%    | 2743       | 7.8%     | 19184        | -3.7%    | 44338      | 6.6%     |
| 1997   | 15589       | -6.9%    | 43183      | 3.8%    | 2011          | -17.3%   | 2779       | 1.3%     | 17600        | -8.3%    | 45962      | 3.7%     |
| 1998   | 16076       | 3.1%     | 44997      | 4.2%    | 2177          | 8.3%     | 2811       | 1.2%     | 18253        | 3.7%     | 47808      | 4.0%     |
| 1/1/99 |             |          | 45285      | 0.6%    |               |          | 2886       | 2.7%     |              |          | 48171      | 0.8%     |

\*As of July 1, 1994, a change in policy no longer counts inmates AWL to court as prison population

18

PERCENTAGE OF INMATES INCARCERATED IN POPULATION  
WITH ANY DRUG OFFENSE AND WHOSE MOST SERIOUS OFFENSE WAS A  
DRUG OFFENSE

|        | MOST<br>SERIOUS | ANY<br>OFFENSE |
|--------|-----------------|----------------|
| 1/1/89 | 8.8%            | DK             |
| 1/1/90 | 12.8%           | DK             |
| 1/1/91 | 14.1%           | 18.7%          |
| 1/1/92 | 14.5%           | 19.3%          |
| 1/1/93 | 15.6%           | 20.7%          |
| 1/1/94 | 14.7%           | 20.1%          |
| 1/1/95 | 14.2%           | 20.0%          |
| 7/1/96 | 13.8%           | 19.9%          |

PERCENTAGE OF YEARLY INTAKE WITH ANY DRUG OFFENSE AND THOSE  
WHOSE MOST SERIOUS OFFENSE IS A DRUG OFFENSE

|         | MOST<br>SERIOUS | ANY<br>OFFENSE |
|---------|-----------------|----------------|
| CY 1985 | 12.2%           | 15.0%          |
| 1986    | 13.7%           | 16.8%          |
| 1987    | 14.5%           | 17.7%          |
| 1988    | 18.9%           | 22.5%          |
| 1989    | 26.5%           | 31.7%          |
| 1990    | 29.7%           | 34.5%          |
| 1991    | 29.7%           | 34.0%          |
| 1992    | 31.4%           | 36.1%          |
| 1993    | 30.9%           | 35.1%          |
| 1994    | 31.3%           | 35.9%          |
| 1995    | 31.3%           | 36.1%          |

1996

31.06%

1997

30.24%

1998

30.66%



## RECIDIVISM OF DRC RELEASES

ALL INMATES RELEASED IN CALENDAR YEAR 1989\*  
(BY TYPE OF RELEASE)  
FOLLOWED-UP FOR THREE YEARS AFTER RELEASE

| TYPE OF RELEASE                 | PAROLE/PROBATION VIOLATOR RECOMMISSIONED <sup>1</sup> | NEW CRIMES <sup>2</sup> | TOTAL NEW CRIMES <sup>3</sup> | TECHNICAL PAROLE/PROBATION VIOLATORS <sup>4</sup> | TOTAL RETURNED <sup>5</sup> |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| EXPIRATION OF DEFINITE SENTENCE | N.A.  | 33.3%                   | 33.3%                         | N.A.  | 33.3%                       |
| PAROLE                          | 18.2%   | 5.7%                    | 23.9%                         | 22.4%   | 46.3%                       |
| SHOCK PAROLE                    | 7.9%  | 9.2%                    | 17.1%                         | 2.7%  | 19.8%                       |
| SHOCK PROBATION                 | 2.0%  | 14.8%                   | 16.8%                         | 22.0%   | 38.8%                       |
| TOTAL                           | 5.5%  | 21.9%                   | 27.4%                         | 10.1%   | 37.5%                       |

<sup>1</sup>Re-incarceration for the conviction of a new crime while under supervision

<sup>2</sup>Re-incarceration for the conviction of a new crime after end of supervision - or after release from prison (for EDS releases)  
total reincarcerated for a **new crime** within three years of release

<sup>4</sup>Return to prison for violation of a technical condition of parole or probation

<sup>5</sup>Total returned to prison within three years for new crime or technical violation

\*There were 12,286 releases in calendar year 1989

- Expiration of Definite Sentence (6,460)
- Parole ( 3,380)
- Shock Parole (293)
- Shock Probation (2,153)

**WHILE YOU WERE OUT**

To SVO Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time 8:50

M \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_  
 Phone 9-1279

TELEPHONED  
 CALLED TO SEE YOU  
 WANTS TO SEE YOU  
 RETURNED YOUR CALL

PLEASE CALL  
 WILL CALL AGAIN  
 URGENT

Message on call card  
Upchurch  
1197  
1166  
1100

Operator \_\_\_\_\_