Tmr-0087.067.018.010

HEARSAY / Criminal Justice News

Published by The San Diego Regional Criminal Justice Planning Board
Room 268 - County Administration Center - San Diego - California 92101 - Phone No. 236-2844

Volume I Issue 10 September - October, 1973

CENTER FOR THE STUDY AND REDUCTION OF VIOLENCE

In the fall of 1972, the Department of Psychiatry at UCLA, in conjunction with the California Health and Welfare Agency, submitted a grant application to the California Council on Criminal Justice seeking $750,000 to establish a Center For the Study and Reduction of Violence. Due to the controversial nature of the project, CCCJ delayed action on the application for several months, directed State staff to conduct an intensive evaluation of the proposal, and solicited an expression of views from individuals and organizations supporting or opposing the Center concept. At a recent meeting of the Council, the months of evaluation and discussion culminated in a "show-down" decision on the proposal.

Basically, the UCLA application proposes to move the research and educational programs of psychiatry from a limited, esoteric sphere into an area of general public concern; specifically, crime prevention. Critical reaction to the proposal was swift and intense, with critics generally focusing on the "Clockwork Orange" implications of the experimentation outlined in the original application. Serious concern was expressed by many groups regarding the prospective use of psycho-surgery on prisoners and abuse of inmate populations for experimental purposes in general. Prior to the decisive vote on the application, Charles E. Young, Chancellor of UCLA, countered the project's critics with a review of the basic purpose of the project and assurances regarding the University's internal controls on experimental designs and objectives. Chancellor Young assured the Council that the Center did not plan to engage in psycho-surgery, and furthermore, that the Center had no plans for experimentation on prisoners. The Chancellor' remarks were followed by a series of statements from spokesmen representing a variety of concerned groups including the Committee Opposing Psychiatric Abuse of Prisoners, Public Advocates, Inc., the United Prisoner's Union, the Medical Committee for Human Rights, Citizens' Commission on Human Rights, and the Criminal Justice Committee, American Friends Service Committee. Generally, opponents of the Center described the proposal as an "unholy alliance" between a law and order administration and professional psychiatric researchers who were turning to Safe Street Act funds for support due to the evaporation of other sources of Federal funding. Opposition spokesmen expressed concern about the use of medical research techniques to shift attention from the social roots of violence, the social pathology represented by poverty, unemployment, inadequate health care, etc., to an exceedingly narrow vision of violent behavior, the organic pathology of the individual. Dr. Phillip Shapiro, a psychiatrist in private practice summed up the opposition as follows: "The proposed Center would call up psychiatry and related disciplines to devise models for the prediction, detection and control of violent behavior, a function for which they are not qualified and which would bring about an abridgement of human and constitutional rights and traditional medical ethics."

In rebuttal, Dr. J. L. West, Professor and Chairman of the Department of Psychiatry at UCLA, acknowledged that most of the violence in the world was not caused by sick individuals, but stated that this kind of violence had nothing to do with psychiatry. There is, however, he claimed, a great deal of violence - individual and self-inflicted violence - that is the responsibility of psychiatry.

After a lengthy debate over a variety of issues related to the proposal and the options open to the Council, the Council voted 16-0 to fund the Center "contingent upon satisfactory resolution of program and budget issues between the Council staff and project staff."

1974 ACTION PLAN

The San Diego Regional Criminal Justice Planning Advisory Committee, at its September 26, 1973 meeting, recommended that San Diego's 1974 allocation of federal crime control funds be awarded to the following twenty-one projects:

	PROJECT	GRANT AMOUNT
1.	Escondido Burglary Specific	$80,187
2.	Chula Vista Burglary Specific	26,800
3.	Oceanside Burglary Specific	25,268
4.	Carlsbad Burglary Specific	28,424
5.	San Diego County Deferred Prosecution Project	111,311
6.	San Diego Regional Consumer Fraud Task Force	154,200
7.	Regional Strike Force Robbery	349,200
8.	Sheriff's Juvenile Diversion Program	100,800
9.	Chula Vista Juvenile Counseling & Education Unit	27,600
10.	Neighborhood House Association, Youth Service Center	107,197
11.	Southeast Involvement Project	26,099
12.	Women's Detoxification Center	63,613
13.	Oceanside Narcotics and Dangerous Drug Apprehension	31,228
14.	P.C. 1000 Evaluation Project	31,500
15.	Sheriff's Releasee Aid Project	111,249
16.	Regional Correctional Program Evaluation	90,000
17.	Carlsbad Community Service Officer Project	28,637
18.	Sheriff's Consolidated Offender Classification System	48,000
19.	Volunteers In Probation Minority Recruitment and Retention Project	29,917
20.	S.D.P.D. Control of Crimes Against Property	292,883
21.	Causative Factors of San Diego's Unique Crime Problem	76,500
	TOTAL	$1,838,613

Collectively, the above projects constitute the San Diego Region's 1974 Criminal Justice Action Plan. Upon approval of each project by its local unit of government sponsor, formal grant applications will be submitted to the California Council on Criminal Justice. Funds will be available for project implementation beginning July 1, 1974.

C.P.P.C.A. PUBLISHES NEW JOURNAL

The California Probation, Parole and Correctional Association has recently published the first issue of its biannual journal titled Crime and Corrections. Dr. G. Thomas Gitchoff, the journal's editor, indicates that Crime and Corrections is a joint effort by the academic community and the California Probation, Parole and Correctional Association to awake both practitioners and the public to the dynamic changes, issues and controversies in the area of crime and corrections. For information regarding journal publication contact: Editor, Journal of Crime and Corrections, Criminal Justice Administration Program, San Diego State University, 92115.

FEDERAL AND STATE LEGISLATION

As reported in the August issue of Hearsay, the Crime Control Act of 1973 has been signed by the President. In addition to provisions which significantly alter the ratio of federal-local financial participation in local crime control projects, the Act mandates major alterations in the operations and composition of State and regional criminal justice planning organizations.

Due to the significance of the new legislation, the National League of Cities/United States Conference of Mayors held a meeting in Detroit from September 17 through 18 to provide state and local planners with an opportunity to communicate local concerns about the new act to the LEAA officials currently drafting the administrative guidelines for implementation of the legislation. Primarily, local representatives expressed concern about the following: (1) The increase in federal participation in grant programs from 75% to 90% is deceptive. In reality local units of government are required to contribute 1.25% more "hard cash" than required under prior legislation. (2) Although the new act includes a 90-day time limit for processing and approving grant applications, the legislation does not specify when the 90-day period commences (i.e., does it commence when the regional board receives the application or when the state planning agency receives the application?) Moreover, local planners felt that the efficiency of the grant review and approval process should be measured by elapsed time between submission of the grant application and receipt of grant funds. (3) The new act requires that local elected officials constitute a majority of the membership of local planning boards. Serious concern was expressed about the justification for such a requirement, the definition of "elected official," and the potential for unnecessary disruption of current planning activities. According to the LEAA representative in attendance, the elected official provision was included in the act almost as an afterthought; nonetheless, he indicated the provision would be strictly enforced.

Shortly after the adoption of the Crime Control Act of 1973, the California legislature enacted AB 1306, a bill granting formal state authorization to local criminal justice planning boards and a State Office of Criminal Justice Planning. AB 1306 also authorizes revisions in the composition of the California Council on Criminal Justice and mandates the creation of a Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee. The provisions of the bill become effective January 1, 1974.

PREVENTIVE DETENTION

At the September 14, 1973 meeting of the Executive Committee of the California Council on Criminal Justice, a position paper on the issue of preventive detention was delivered by a sub-committee composed of Chief Wayne H. Bornhoft of the Fullerton Police Department and Judge Joan Dempsey Klein of the Los Angeles Municipal Court. Basically, the paper outlined what the authors considered the "dysfunction" of the present bail system in California, analyzed preventiv detention as a potential solution to pretrial crime, and proposed amendments to the California Constitution and Penal Code which would allow creation of a workable preventive detention system.

Focusing specifically on the constitutional ramifications of a preventive detention system, the authors suggest that a carefully designed and implemented system need not violate the eighth amendment or due process clause of the U.S. Constitution. In response to the traditional criticism that a criminal conviction based on proof beyond a reasonable doubt is the sine qua non of interference with individual liberty, Chief Bornhoft and Judge Klein cite the routine incarceration of individuals under statutes permitting long-term detention of sexual psychopaths and the mentally ill, in addition to the fact that the arrest which brings a suspect to jail in the first place is based merely on an officer's judgment that there was probable cause to believe the suspect committed an offense.

The authors indicate that the two most difficult questions involved in establishing guidelines for a reasonable preventive detention system are: 1) which classes of people should be detained? 2) how can the hardships of pretrial detention be minimized? Although the authors suggest three classes of people who should be detained (narcotic addicts; those who clearly plan to commit crimes of violence, e.g., a defendant who threatens a potential witness; and persons arrested and on pre-trial release who are re-arrested for another crime), they conclude in fairly tentative terms that the basic ingredient of an acceptable detention program is a judicial hearing at a very early stage after arrest. In order to minimize the hardships of preventive detention, the authors suggest that all other business of the courts be subordinated

to the trial of defendants being held under preventive detention.

Chief Bornhoft and Judge Klein conclude their analysis with the following proposal to amend the California Constitution. Article I, Section 6, which presently reads "all persons shall be bailable by sufficient sureties, unless for capital offenses when the proof is evident or the presumption great. . .," would be amended to read as follows:

"All persons arrested or accused of any crime shall be bailable by sufficient sureties, except in capital cases and in such other cases and in such manner as prescribed by law in which a magistrate shall determine that the safety of the community, the accused or any other person compels the detention of such arrested or accused person pending the completion of the trial of the matter."

After a brief discussion, the Executive Committee unanimously ratified the recommendations of its subcommittee.

NEED TO KNOW?

The National Criminal Justice Reference Service has announced the initiation of a new program which should be of real value to local criminal justice planners, administrators and line personnel. Called "Library Book Catalog," the program offers local personnel an economical, comprehensive guide to the literature of law enforcement and criminal justice. Basically, the program involves publication of author, title, and subject catalogs covering the estimated 6,000 volumes contained in the libraries of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, and the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

The Catalogs are currently for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.,20402. Catalogs should be ordered by major title, LIBRARY BOOK CATALOG, subtitle (e.g., Author Catalog), and Government Printing Office stock number. Catalog prices and stock numbers are as follows:

Author Catalog	GPO #2700-00170	$5.00
Title Catalog	GPO #2700-00169	$5.00
Subject Catalog	GPO #2700-00168	$8.25

Remittance should be enclosed (check or money order) payable to the Superintendent of Documents.

TO SUBMIT NEWS OR COMMENTS TO HEARSAY, CALL
CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING – 236-2844

CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER
ROOM 268
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

3944 E—3 62103

C.U.R.E.
3386 30TH ST.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92104

CJ