

University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1-1948

The administration of the Lotta Fund for aiding discharged convicts at the Family Service Organization, Louisville, Kentucky, 1931-1946.

Cora Graf Lucas
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lucas, Cora Graf, "The administration of the Lotta Fund for aiding discharged convicts at the Family Service Organization, Louisville, Kentucky, 1931-1946." (1948). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 2005.

<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/2005>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LOTTA FUND FOR
AIDING DISCHARGED CONVICTS AT
THE FAMILY SERVICE ORGANIZATION
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY,
1931-1946

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty
Of the Raymond A. Kent School of Social Work
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
Of Master of Science in Social Work

By

Cora Graf Lucas

Year

1948

NAME OF STUDENT: Cora Graf Lucas

TITLE OF THESIS: The Administration of the Lotta
Fund for Aiding Discharged Con-
victs at the Family Service
Organization, Louisville, Ken-
tucky, 1931-1946

APPROVED BY READING COMMITTEE COMPOSED OF THE
FOLLOWING MEMBERS:

Howell V. Williams

Chairman

Katharine Belzer

DATE: January 27, 1948

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Appreciation is expressed by the writer to all persons assisting in this study. Particularly does she wish to acknowledge her gratitude to Miss Esther Taylor, Executive Secretary of the Family Service Organization, for her interest and helpfulness in making available case material and other material for this study; to Mabel Mason Ludwig, Controller, for her assistance with the financial figures of the Agency; to the executives of the other agencies administering the Lotta Fund for their helpful information about their own experiences in its use; and to the trustees of the Lotta Crabtree estate for providing a copy of the section of the will dealing with the Ex-Convict Fund.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES.	v
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	vii
INTRODUCTION.	1
CHAPTER	
I. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND AGENCY TRENDS.	11
The Lotta Fund. Family Service Organization Assumes a New Service. Depression Years and Use of the Fund, 1931-1932. Clearer Definition of the Service, 1935-1939. Service Related to the Individual, 1940-1946.	
II. PRACTICE IN OTHER AGENCIES PARTICIPATING IN USE OF FUND.	43
Prisoners Relief Society of Washington, D. C. The Prison Association of New York. Central Howard Association of Chicago.	
III. CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS AIDED.	52
Data from 92 case-records. Penal Records. Who is the Client?	
IV. USE OF THE FUND FOR RELIEF AND SERVICE.	88
Coverage of Maintenance Items. Use for Special Relief Items. Use for Emergency Needs. Forms of Relief - Giving: Cash, Requisition, etc.	
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	102
APPENDIX	114
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	118

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Number of Ex-Convicts Assisted by Year, As Compared to Total Case- load by Year, with Expenditure, Income and Yearly Balance of Lotta Fund.	21
2. Data from 92 Ex-Convict Case-Records As to Sex, Race, Religion, Resi- dence, Family Status and Birthplace . .	58
3. Educational Ratings and Training of 92 Ex-Convicts Assisted with Lotta Fund by the Family Service Organization.	63
4. Employment Records of 92 Ex-Convicts Assisted with Lotta Fund by the Family Service Organization	63
5. Age Range of 92 Ex-Convict Clients Assisted with Lotta Fund by the Family Service Organization	67
6. Extent of Diagnosed Mental Illness and Physical Illness or Handicap Among 92 Ex-Convict Clients	68
7. Extent of Verifications of Penal Records and of Inclusion of Material about Ex-Convict from Penal Institutions.	70
8. Number of Prison Sentences Per Ex- Convict Client with Accompanying Juvenile Delinquency, Jail, or Workhouse Records	73

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
9.	Number of Offenses Committed Within Listed Crime Classifications.	76
10.	Selection of Client by Agency as Shown by Number, Frequency, and Content of Interviews	81
11.	Nature of Referral Sources of 92 Ex-Convict Cases Studied.	83
12.	Number of Other Family Service Or- ganization Contacts by Ex-Convicts Studied	86
13.	Total Amounts of Lotta Fund Used from 1932-1946.	90
14.	Chief Forms of Relief from Lotta Fund and Chief Recipients of Fund in 92 Ex-Convict Cases	95

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FIGURE		PAGE
1.	Lotta Crabtree, A Portrait from the '70's.	viii



Lotta Crabtree - A Portrait from the '70's.

INTRODUCTION

A beautiful and successful actress, Lotta Crabtree, included as part of her will, the following statement: "I have given much thought to the sad conditions of those who may have erred in life, both men and women, who suffered punishment therefor in our state prisons and reformatories, and who find themselves after their release in an almost helpless condition in which to begin the world anew." To express the interest inherent in this statement she bequeathed to her trustees the sum of \$100,000, the income from which would be for the purpose of aiding discharged convicts. As soon as the estate was settled, in early 1931, Louisville, Kentucky, was designated as one of seven cities to receive a share of this income. The mayor of Louisville--at that time Mr. William Harrison, an unusually progressive and socially-minded person--at once appointed a committee of three citizens to supervise the fund and to find the proper agency to carry out the intent of the benefactor. The President of the Committee, Mr. Grover Sales, was, and is again at this time, also the President of Family Service Organization, the community's

private family agency; Mrs. Reuben Post Halleck, Vice President, was for years a board member of the Agency (deceased, 1946); Mr. Charles Roser, Secretary-Treasurer, was one of the city officials in the Public Utilities Bureau. The Family Service Organization was selected as the agency to administer the Lotta Fund according to the terms of the will. At present the Committee still consists of Mr. Sales and Mr. Roser; as yet no one has been selected to fill the vacancy created by Mrs. Halleck's death.

The procedure set up to handle the Fund was, and is at present, as follows: Louisville's share of the income from the Lotta Crabtree estate--averaging around \$800 per year--is sent to Mr. Roser, who deposits the sum in the Committee's name and in turn sends the Family Service Organization a check for four or five hundred dollars at irregular intervals. Any check drawn on this fund by Mr. Roser must also be signed by Mr. Sales. In general, the total amount of the fund is given to the Family Service Organization for distribution, but occasionally Mr. Roser has given relief directly to an ex-convict who may come to his office. (Due to a recent political party change in the city administration, Mr. Roser no longer holds an official position.) The occasions of such direct relief-giving have been extremely rare, as

the President, Mr. Sales, feels that the money should be given by a caseworker. Even so, the checks given by Mr. Roser must also be signed by Mr. Sales.

The checks from Mr. Roser are deposited to the Family Service Organization's Lotta Crabtree Special Fund and the money is used in the agency like any other special fund which is designated for a particular purpose-- i.e. the Veech Fund for milk, or money deposited by individuals for assistance to their relatives, etc.

Family Service Organization's beginning use of the Fund was in May, 1931. From 1931 through 1946 the Family Service Organization has assisted 92 ex-convicts and often, as described in the present study, their families as well. During this fifteen year period, no study has been made of the 92 cases handled, nor has there been any over-all review of any kind made of the types of individuals assisted, services rendered ex-convicts, duration of contact, etc. The first purpose of the present study is, therefore, to evaluate these cases, not primarily from a case-work point-of-view, since the Agency has no established precedent for the handling of ex-convicts, but rather with the objective of seeing how accurately the administration of the Fund follows the purpose of the benefactor, as stated in that section of

her will; how the criteria for the acceptance and continuance of these cases can be reconciled with some of the flexible, but defined, criteria for the handling of all other Family Service Organization cases, i.e.: consideration of the client's legal residence; evidence of some hopefulness within the client and his situation so that there is expectation of progress, as well as his participation in effecting this progress, etc. Relief to this latter group is administered with continuous case work evaluation. On the other hand, the group of ex-convict cases is the only one within the Agency where relief, in general, has been given without too much consideration of end results, since discharge or parole from local, state, or federal penal institutions, and financial need have been, in practice, the only two requirements for the acceptance of such cases. Perhaps it will be found, however, that some of the criteria for acceptance of any individual as a client, have been applied to ex-convicts as well, since trained caseworkers tend to use generic principles in the handling of any and all individuals. Perhaps, as the history of the Agency's use of the Lotta Fund emerges through the study of its 92 cases, contradictions and confusion will inevitably be expressed as to whether or not an ex-convict is categorically very much

different from other clients. In its exposure to fifteen years' handling of this group, the Agency may show definitions of policy stated with more conviction and assurance as the years go by and staff skills increase.

The second purpose of the present study is to give a picture from these 92 case records, of the types of cases handled through the use of the Ex-Convict Fund. It is hoped that the study will answer certain questions, i.e.:

How old are these men and women? What were their offenses? Are they, in general, unattached individuals? What is the proportion between male and female clients? White and Negro? Are these ex-convicts primarily residents of Louisville or largely transients? What is their background with regard to education, training, employment? Are there many physically and mentally ill individuals among the group? Do they seem to be recidivists?

The study should give us, further, a picture of the origin of these cases. How did they originally come to the Family Service Organization? Who directed them to the Agency? How long did Family Service Organization carry the cases under the Ex-Convict Fund? Were they reaccepted, as ex-convicts, a second or third time? On what basis? How was the relief administered: to cover maintenance items? For special needs: business equipment,

transportation, union dues, etc.? For emergency needs, primarily met at the point of intake? As wage-relief? Were relief negotiations made, for the most part, with the ex-convict directly or with a member of the family? What community resources were used in handling the cases: psychiatric consultation, vocational adjustment, securing of recreational opportunities?

Gaps in needed information may be determined: Is there uniformity in checking on the actual incarceration, and what means have been used to do so? Have reports been secured from the penal institutions and how have these been used?

As part of the background picture of the study, and subsidiary to it, a brief survey of the practice of the seven other designated cities' agencies in handling their portion of the Ex-Convict Fund will be included, insofar as it has been possible to obtain such information from the sources. The reader may find it of some interest, also, to know something about the benefactor and her apparent motivation for setting aside such a generous sum for assistance to discharged convicts.

It is hoped that certain conclusions will arise from the study: By clarifying the real motive for aiding ex-convicts, and by examining the types of cases and

Agency handling of these, can the Family Service Organization formulate for itself a written policy for administration of the Ex-Convict Fund? Can the Agency determine, as part of this policy, the best use of the limited yearly share of the income, either by a decision to help a greater number of individuals for shorter periods, or a fewer number with greater assistance for a longer period? Can the Agency accept, as part of its stated function, the granting of relief on merely an emergency basis to relieve outside pressure for the ex-convict, without too much consideration of long-range results? Should there be selectivity in accepting ex-convict cases--on the basis of residence, consideration of the client's potentiality for rehabilitation, etc.? Has the opportunity to help in the rehabilitation of ex-convicts through the giving of relief from a special fund been a "door-step baby"--perhaps looked upon with mixed rejection and welcome acceptance--yet capable of growing into a mature part of the Agency's group of services?

The method of making the present study involves several steps: Primarily, the study rests on detailed perusal of the entire number of ex-convict cases (92) carried by the Agency from 1931 through 1946. A comprehensive schedule was used with each case read. Relief

figures were obtainable from the book-keeping department of the Agency, and Agency files of yearly statistics from 1931-1946 served as basis for tables. Use was made of six volumes of Agency files pertaining to the Ex-Convict cases and containing memoranda to the staff from the Agency's Executive Secretary, who supervises the expenditure of the Fund within the Agency; required monthly narrative reports on individual cases from the caseworkers to the Executive Secretary, to be used in periodic reports to the Treasurer of the Fund, Mr. Roser; correspondence to and from the Executive Secretary to the Treasurer and occasional correspondence to and from other sources. Individual interviews with the Executive Secretary, Miss Taylor, were very helpful. Letters have been written the executives of the seven other agencies who are recipients of the yearly income from the estate of Lotta Crabtree, and the replies, which are on the whole understandably unsatisfactory in giving the comprehensive picture desired, are included in the present study.

Many unsuccessful attempts were made to talk directly to the local Treasurer of the Fund, but the pressures of a busy position in the City Hall did not permit his granting the request for a personal interview.

A copy of the section of the will of Lotta Crabtree which deals with the Fund for Aiding Discharged Convicts

was requested and this was expeditely and most cooperatively returned, with an expression of interest in the study's being done.

Although case-material and Agency files form the bulk of the material used, some general background reading was done, both regarding some current thinking in the field of criminology with special emphasis on treatment of convicts, and regarding the career and interests of the benefactor as these might have some bearing on her philanthropic bequests.

The present study is part of a series of studies already made of the history of the Agency and its services, including a "History of the Family Service Organization" by Mrs. Bernice Ellis; "Lay Participation in the Private Family Agency, Louisville, Kentucky, written by Miss Mildred Bateman; "A Study of the Family Service Organization, Louisville, Kentucky, in Reference to Intake", by Miss Marian E. Prinz, and similar studies concerning the Agency's services to Waverly Hills Tuberculosis Sanatorium, working mothers' problems as shown by the Agency's cases, the history of the financing of the Agency, etc. Helpful assistance was secured through use of some of these theses for their bearing on the present material.

The present study combines the historical and statistical approaches in its adaptation of the source

material. Throughout the text the terms "Lotta Fund" and "Ex-Convict Fund" are used interchangeably.

CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND AGENCY TRENDS

The Lotta Fund

It is highly conceivable that in the busy history of an agency, dedicated principally to the present and the future, many outlines of the background and original purpose of a special fund, like the "Lotta Fund for Aiding Discharged Convicts" should be blurred. At one time the Agency had, in its files, magazine clippings of the famous Lotta Crabtree and her benevolent bequests. The material was used once in a caseworker's presentation to a lay committee of the Agency's services to ex-convicts. Misplaced or lost, the slight folder has been missing for some years, and rapid staff turn-over, increasing pressures and serious concerns have seemingly erased the picture of the benefactor even more. In the six volumes of reports, letters, and financial statements--all indicating considerable painstaking effort in giving an accurate accounting to the treasurer of expenditures for, and services to, the ex-convict group from 1931-1946 and in attempting to refine techniques of handling and reporting, there is no statement

regarding Lotta Crabtree and probable interpretation of her will. This interpretation emerges, it seems, of itself, and becomes--at least in recent years--more self-consciously and studiously applied than perhaps the brief original Clause 9 of her will, recently secured, had intimated:

I give, devise and bequeath to my trustees hereinafter named in trust, the sum of one hundred thousand dollars, to be known as the "Lotta Fund for Aiding Discharged Convicts," and to semi-annually pay over the income thereof pro rata to the Massachusetts Society for Aiding Discharged Convicts, in Boston, Massachusetts, and to any society or societies whose object it is to aid and endeavor to give employment to discharged convicts in the cities of San Francisco, in the state of California; St. Louis, in the state of Missouri; Chicago, in the state of Illinois; New York, in the state of New York; Washington, in the District of Columbia; Louisville, in the state of Kentucky; and New Orleans in the state of Louisiana. If there does not exist in any of the said cities herein named a society for such purpose to receive the benefit of this fund, I authorize and direct my said trustees to form in such city or cities a society for this purpose, to receive its pro rata share of the income of this fund.

(A) I make this bequest as I have always been deeply appreciative of the generous support that was accorded me as an artist in all parts of the country in which I appeared before the public with sincere desire to give pleasure and entertainment, and I desire to express my appreciation of the cordiality and good-will manifested toward me by showing my remembrance thereof by aiding and encouraging the furtherance of some philanthropic work that would be of real help to the unfortunate in some of our leading cities. I have given much thought to the sad conditions of those who may have erred in life, both men and women, who suffered punishment therefor in our state prisons and reformatories, and who find themselves after their release in an almost helpless condition in which to begin the world anew.

It is perhaps of somewhat small importance that the original "Lotta" is known only slightly as a descriptive term of the special fund, much less individualized as a real person. Her identity is lost in the practical application of the fund she left. Undoubtedly the emphasis is best, yet some knowledge of the origin of the Fund and of Lotta Crabtree as a person lend interest and undeniable color to a service, of itself interesting and colorful.

"Lotta", as she insisted on being informally addressed, personified the successful actress of her era, pioneering, as she did, into a rather daring field--for women--of broad comedy, dancing, and singing. Born in New York in 1847, her early life was a parallel to the surging American scene of the "Gold Rush" period. Not many actual details of her life are known, but her career is traceable by the records of her successes and by stories of her friends. Constance Rourke weaves the fragments of her life into her account of the Gold Coast troupers¹, and brings out facts from her research of that period that may have more than a coincidental bearing on Lotta Crabtree's later philanthropies. Tutored by an astute mother, who soon found she could not

¹Constance Rourke, Troupers of the Gold Coast or the Rise of Lotta Crabtree (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1928).

depend on her handsome husband for support, and moved with her little daughter to California, Lotta Crabtree became, at the age of eight, a child performer who soon attained great popularity. Her early associations were with the tireless troupers of the period--actors who lived on the road and endured many physical hardships. Her audience was chiefly the rough crowd of miners and prospectors. Something of the violence of the period and of the motley audience are expressed in the descriptive passage:

Suicides were frequent then, as elsewhere in the gold regions. Men were constantly drifting in who had suffered disappointment, loneliness, cold, hunger, beyond the limit of human endurance.¹

Lotta Crabtree achieved success in creating a close bond between herself and her audience, no matter how rough or exacting they might be, although in her personal relationships she was consistently lonely. She was often referred to as "Miss Lotta the Unapproachable". After unique success in the field of comedy and variety, she retired in her mid-forties, and lived a solitary life until her death in 1924. One senses the strength and will of her mother's personality in all of her career. Her mother had become her manager and shrewdly handled their great wealth--consistently garnered since the days when the miners, in

¹Ibid., p. 45.

their enthusiasm for the child actress, threw gold nuggets and pocket watches on the stage.

Since Lotta outlived her two brothers, and never was married, there were no direct heirs to her estate. The Crabtrees had continued to live a frugal existence despite their great wealth. Fabulous attempts were made to break Lotta Crabtree's will, but her solitary and personally circumscribed life was so patent that stories of a secret marriage and a mysterious child were easily disproved.

Constance Rourke sums up the content of her will as follows:

The will which the gold-seekers tried to break had a noticeable character. Over half of Lotta Crabtree's fortune was given to a foundation for the relief of needy veterans of the Great War; she provided for the care of the sick in hospitals, and for prisoners on their emergence into the world; she left money for an actors' relief fund; she created a fund for students of music, another for students of agriculture, for good cheer at Christmas, and for the promotion of laws against vivisection. She left money for the care of worn-out horses and stray dogs. The strands of many genuine interests appeared in her will: but an outstanding circumstance was clear. She made only a few small personal bequests. There could be no doubt that she preferred not to share that great heap of money--nearly four million dollars--with people whom she knew. The bulk of her estate went to strangers. The provisions were complicated; one hates to think of her toiling over them. It was perhaps a pity that her money had to be disposed of at all; her fortune should have become a legend like her mirth. Yet logic remains in that final document, from Lotta, who seldom bothered about logic. There was fitness in the circumstances that she gave her great rewards to strangers. From strangers she had gained them; and she seemed to have only conventional reasons for personal bequests. Few persons had become an essential part of her life, out

of the multitude she had known..... So her will, with its effect of withdrawal, its survey of distances, may stand as an emblem of a long and bright efflorescence.¹

Thus "strangers" today both administer and receive the investments of her fortune. It would, however, conceivably add a touch of warmth and a spark of greater enthusiasm in the actual handling of the "Lotta Fund for Aiding Discharged Convicts", occasionally to remember the benefactor and her unrepining interest in people, whatever their origin, status, or destination.

Family Service Organization Takes Over A New Service

In May, 1931, Louisville's first check from the Lotta Fund was deposited in the bank. The staff was notified about the existence of the special fund, although the original memorandum explaining its use cannot be located at present. Case loads were combed to suggest possible candidates for this assistance. Apparently, no more than a very general type of interpretation had been given the Agency as to the use of the Fund, and the staff was, to some extent, groping to fit the new service into its function, at an extremely pressing period. The new Fund meant additional money at a time when half the 1931 budget had already been spent, in March of that year. The Agency was trying to meet

¹Ibid., pp. 254-256.

overwhelming demands for assistance in the community--demands already legitimately met in many cities of Louisville's size by public, tax-supported agencies. There was pressure of high case loads for the staff, and there was some initial slowness in the caseworker's becoming aware of the Fund as an additional resource--as the Executive Secretary's memorandum to the three district supervisors of July 11, 1931 indicates:

Will you please go over with your visitors again the families where there are ex-convicts. We have \$1100 we can draw for the care of ex-convicts and their families. We are trying to find out if we can use any of this money for the families of ex-convicts who have deserted, but at present we shall have to exclude them from the list. Will you send to me immediately any families who are possibilities as this will mean leaving more money free for your other families.

From the earlier lists submitted, the majority of the proposed candidates had had only jail and workhouse sentences. Hence, an early memorandum of June 5, 1931, to the staff from the case-work Supervisor attempted to set up some further basis for selection of a small group of families: "First of all, consider ex-convicts only those who have served sentences in penitentiary and are now released. This does not include jail or workhouse sentences." The following specific information was requested: (1) Names of families, number of dependents and ages; (2) whether they are chronic Family Service Organization families or whether

unemployment following the release from the institution is the major problem; (3) where the sentence was served, and date of release, if known; (4) whether relief is being given the family at the present time and the amount; (5) name of visitor.

The first two ex-convict clients to receive part of the special fund were, logically enough, sent to the Agency by Mr. Roser, treasurer of the Fund, and by a community person, interested in Mr. Grover Sales' letter explaining the Fund and its location, in the point-of-view column of the local paper, May 27, 1931. The former client, a family man, was given one rent order from the Lotta Fund, while other relief needs were met from the Agency's general fund for a short contact of one month's duration. He had been paroled from a federal prison the previous September on a charge of "Conspiracy and Violation of Prohibition Act", with no other penal record. He was unemployed, and in need of financial assistance. Interestingly enough, this same client was again assisted in 1935 with special needs of clothing, dishes, utensils, and bedding for the family (again in connection with general funds) prior to his going on a public made-work program, where his income would prohibit filling such needs. No other imprisonment had

intervened from the period of first closing of contact to the beginning of the next on 10/19/34.

The second ex-convict referred by the community person and the client's former employer, had been out of prison for one year, after having served three years and five months at a state penitentiary for embezzlement. A single man, living with his mother, he was given a small amount of assistance with food and with a Y.M.C.A. membership, pending his receiving employment.

A precedent was immediately set in reporting to the treasurer the families selected, use made of the fund, and actual expenditures, on a monthly basis. This procedure has remained constant throughout the fifteen year period of the use of the Fund, with amplifications as caseworkers became surer of what they themselves were doing. A congratulatory letter from the treasurer followed the first reports, and thereby fixed the trend for all future reporting. Agency reports are periodically sent by Mr. Roser to the trustees in Boston.

In looking back over the history of the Agency's use of the Lotta Fund and the selection of cases, there appear to be three phases of handling and assimilating the new service--all predetermined to a large extent by the prevailing economic and social temper of the period. Roughly,

these periods seem to subdivide themselves into those of the economic "depression" years of 1931 and 1932; of the years of economic resurgence, accompanied by the Agency's continual redefining of its function and more self-conscious adaptation and increase of skills, beginning in the early 30's and extending to, roughly, 1939; the final years of 1940-1946, when defense industries and the problems of war changed the economic setting and inevitably altered concepts of relief-giving and service. Briefly, these periods will be sketched as they have bearing only on the use of the Ex-Convict Fund, and no attempt will be made to give a full historical picture of each period. Unless otherwise specified, the use of the term "total number of ex-convicts" in each of the following three periods, 1931-1932, 1935-1939, 1940-1946, refers to the total number of the period discussed, and not to the total number of 92 cases carried over the entire fifteen year period 1931-1946. Reference to table 1, page 21, will show that the Lotta Fund was overdrawn in Louisville during 1933 and 1934, so that the fifteen year review excludes that period, except for some correspondence between the Agency and the treasurer of the Fund.

TABLE I

NUMBER OF EX-CONVICTS ASSISTED BY YEAR, AS COMPARED TO TOTAL CASELOAD BY YEAR, WITH EXPENDITURE, INCOME AND YEARLY BALANCE OF LOTTA FUND

Year (1)	Total Agency Caseload receiving Service and Relief (2)	No. Ex-Convicts Assisted (3)	Total Agency expenditure from Lotta Fund (4)	Agency Income from Lotta Fund (5)	Balance of Lotta Fund at end of year (6)
1931	4319 ^a	13	\$ 850.16	\$570.45	-
1932	4392 ^a	20	1821.69	893.51	-
1933	2455 ^a	-	-	300.00	-
1934	2044 ^a	-	-	800.00	-
1935	1800 ^a	8	162.83	600.00	\$329.28
1936	1211 ^a	13	288.46	100.00	140.82
1937	801 ^b	4	174.11	400.00	393.71
1938	868	18	945.14	800.00	248.57
1939	1619	12	464.18	400.00	184.39
1940	1561	10	281.27	101.13	4.25
1941	1410	5	167.35	300.00	136.90
1942	2363 ^c	6	230.67	500.00	406.23
1943	2516	4	160.60	-	245.63
1944	2591	4	198.69	-	46.94
1945	2058	4	200.44	500.00	346.50
1946	1377	14	1,051.46	1,000.00	295.04

^aCaseload reflects period during which Agency carried major relief responsibility in the community.

^bDrop in caseload reflects increased referrals to public agency and withdrawal of tax subsidy.

^cIncrease in caseload reflects agency's assumption of war-time activities; draft-board reviews, etc., and inclusion of short-term cases in total count.

Depression Years and Use of Ex-Convict Fund
(1931-1932)

Table 1 (page 21) shows that at no other consecutive two-year period were there as many recipients of the Lotta Fund as in 1931 and 1932, although the years of 1938 and 1939 approximate the number. A total of 13 ex-convicts and their families were assisted during 1931 and 20 in 1932, with a total expenditure, for the two years, of \$2671.95. For the only two comparable years 1938-1939--insofar as total numbers of ex-convicts are concerned--a total of \$1409.32 was spent--only \$246.79 more than half the amount spent in 1931 and 1932. Since the above figures of 13 for 1931 and 33 for 1932 represent totals in years and not the unduplicated count, the figures overlap to some extent. Nine clients received assistance during both years; five were assisted only in 1931, and ten were assisted only in 1932. The unduplicated total receiving assistance for the two year period is therefore 24.

A clue to the approach used by caseworkers of that period with the ex-convict is immediately shown in the selection of client or clients in the family for direction of treatment. In 11 of the 24 cases the major contact--that is the actual preponderance of interviews--was had with the family as a unit, that is, with both man and wife

and other members of the family. In less than half the total number of cases of this period was the casework directed toward the ex-convict, himself, as the client, and in two of the cases, the ex-convict was a shadowy figure, in and out of the family between long periods of desertion. In these two cases relief was directly handled with the wife, and the Ex-Convict Fund woven into the general relief plan, under the general fund of the Agency.

In going over the total number of cases, one is instantly struck with the fact that the Fund came as a welcome addition to a tight relief budget, continually threatened with termination, due to the Agency's straitened circumstances. Since the time of beginning and ending of the use of the Fund is not clearly drawn in the running record or posted on the relief sheets, it is impossible to see the total relief plan very clearly; however, in 13 of the 24 cases it is definitely seen that the Ex-Convict Fund was used together with the Agency's general fund--sometimes to supplement a maintenance item, sometimes to carry the family over a period of low relief, sometimes to grant a special item felt to be out of keeping with the necessarily meager "maintenance relief"--i.e., special Christmas assistance for toys, etc. Although there is evidence throughout these records that the money was gratefully used to tide over a

plan of assistance momentarily ready to fold up, the caseworkers generally did not explain the injection of the new source of funds to the clients. The problem of the hour was unemployment and stark need. It is to be expected that the needs of the ex-convict himself would be submerged to the most flagrant want of the times. Slightly humorous, as well as sympathy-arousing, is the illustration of the caseworker's frantic search for a penal record in one of her maintenance families and coming up with an old sentence of the client's of 410 days in 1916 for chicken stealing. In this situation the caseworker gave the client some interpretation of the use of the Ex-Convict Fund, since the family had previously been told assistance would have to end. She registers, quite frankly, the family's surprise: "They pretended to be considerably amused at the rather unusual source through which the assistance had come to them."

In the group where apparently assistance came entirely from the Ex-Convict Fund--although among this group this fact is actually not clearly evident in all the cases--the Fund was largely used to supplement the wage-earners' odd jobs. Once it was used for transportation to a legal residence and once it was used to furnish teeth to an ex-convict with stomach trouble.

By far the majority of the cases of this period were not referred to the Agency as ex-convicts, but already were being cared for, together with their families. Most of the ex-convicts were family men--in only a few instances were they unattached, transient individuals. Despite the pressures of the period and the great emphasis on unemployment problems, there was, however, a beginning recognition of certain limitations in a client's eligibility for the Ex-Convict Fund and of services adapted to some of the problems of the discharged convict. All but six of the group of 24 ex-convicts had had prison sentences no farther back than approximately one year. There was, apparently, some feeling that the Fund should be used, as nearly as possible, for those men who were more recently discharged from prisons.

The six cases in which the men had older prison records illustrate both the above mentioned problem of tapping all resources to fill gaps in the Agency relief budget, as well as a kind of experimentation in testing out the new service. One of the six cases is an example of the latter. The client himself had heard of the Lotta Fund (origin unknown), and requested dental care. This service was met by the Agency after verification of the imprisonment period of June 4, 1925--February 23, 1926--five years before--for "Violation of the White Slavery Act".

Other prison records--besides the one mentioned above and the cited case with the record of chicken stealing--were equally remote from the client's current life: one, ending in 1914 for "False Swearing"; one ending in 1928 for Grand Larceny; another ending in 1925 for Malicious Shooting, as part of a rural feud; lastly, one ending in 1925 for army desertion. In one case, however, there was a series of arrests and imprisonments in jail or workhouse, all of which in a sense brought the problem of the client's poor adjustment to society into greater focus.

Accuracy also marked the early cases. Twenty-three of the 24 cases contained verifications of the incarceration. Verification of the imprisonment of the client in the remaining case, however, was done several years later in a subsequent contact. In most instances verification was done by direct correspondence with the penal institution; sometimes by checking local court house records; by examination of papers in the family's possession; by newspaper clippings. A comparison with statistics on the total percentage of verifications on all the 92 cases may be of interest (See table 7, page 70).

In summing up the general approach of this period, one sees the Fund primarily used as a welcome resource for additional relief for clients who would normally have been

assisted by the Agency because of economic need and family problems. Only five of the clients were referred or came to the Agency because of knowledge of the Lotta Fund. Yet the caseworkers made sure of technical grounds for use of the Fund by verifications of prison records. Also, in slightly more than one fourth of the total number of ex-convict cases there is real evidence of the caseworker's conscious attempts directly to deal with some phase of the client's problems of readjustment to the community as a result of his prison record: Efforts were made to have citizenship rights restored; to have the client reinstated in a lodge where he had lost membership because of his misuse of its funds; to assist the client in building up constructive contacts with his church; to locate employers unprejudiced to ex-convicts; to return an ex-convict to his legal residence where his family might stand by him and where employment prospects might be better for him than elsewhere.

Beginning Of Clearer Definition Of Service To Ex-Convicts

Part of the learning process for the Agency's staff in assimilating the new source of funds and using skills with a slightly different emphasis was the inevitable one of its limitations. After slightly more than a year of its existence, the Ex-Convict Fund was overdrawn, and the cases

under care at the time were continued under the general fund of the Agency. A letter, dated May 8, 1934, from the Executive Secretary to the treasurer, sums up the financial status of that period:

You will find in your files a letter from Miss Fike [Case Work Supervisor] dated August 18, 1932, which includes a detailed report of the last expenditures of this fund for individual families. At that time the balance due the organization was \$1207.89. Because we had already overdrawn this amount, we feel that we could not draw further upon future funds until this deficit had been made up.

The summary of the income and expenditures is as follows: From July, 1931, through July, 1932, we spent \$2671.85; from July, 1931, through July, 1932, we received an income from this fund of \$1463.96, leaving a balance, as given you in the letter of August, 1932, of \$1207.89. On March 17, 1932, we received a check for \$300.00, which reduced the deficit to \$907.89. On February 24, 1934, we received another check for \$450.00, leaving a balance due us of \$457.89.

Of course, we want to make it clear that no ex-convicts who apply for assistance and are in need are refused assistance, but are taken care of out of our general fund or by the Municipal Relief Bureau (local public tax-supported agency), according to whichever agency the case would come in under. When the rest of this deficit is taken care of we can again take care of the special needs of ex-convicts from the Ex-Convict Fund.

Therefore, technically, there were no new ex-convict cases during 1933 and 1934, and from the point of view of Agency mechanics, no cases counted as ex-convict case during this period. Late in 1935 the service was officially resumed. On December 13, 1934, the Agency received \$350.00 from the Fund, leaving a balance on the over-expenditures

of \$107.89. On August 1, 1935, another check for \$300.00 was received, leaving a balance of \$192.11 to be spent for ex-convicts. In August, 1935, the staff was again requested to cull from their case-loads a group of ex-convicts who might qualify for financial assistance from the Fund. There is evidence that the selection was thoughtfully done, in view of the limited amount of money available. Five families were selected in August and three additional families were chosen for December. Although it was inevitable that again these were primarily families already receiving assistance, and the Ex-Convict Fund acted as a supplement, caseworkers now began to inform the client more generally of the new source of assistance, and in some instances it was used to cover such special needs as Christmas help, a new suit of clothes, etc., as a boost to the client's morale.

Again, a certain trend is observable by examination of the next group of cases, and the period seems to have a certain character. Roughly, it falls between the years 1935 and 1940, through 1939. Although there is some overlapping in the total number of cases in this period with the early period described above, and with the period extending beyond 1939, only one ex-convict had received assistance also in 1931, and four were assisted during the later period, although the major contact was had with these clients during

1935-1939. In the Agency's history the latter period was characterized by gradual crystallization of its function of primarily meeting service needs, with the major relief responsibility falling to the local public agencies. The Municipal Relief Bureau had come into existence in 1929, and by 1937 was one of the outstanding public agencies in the whole country, although later change in personnel and shortages of funds created a community problem which inevitably affected the private agency. In 1938 Family Service Organization completed its transfer of cases, where the primary need was an economic one, to the Municipal Bureau of Social Service. A newspaper article of the period states: "Family Service Organization will return to its original purpose of social service to the family together with such incidental relief as such work may require." The W.P.A. program became a resource for the unemployed, and the edge was gradually being taken off the acuteness of the needs of the early thirties.

With this background the Agency was generally in better position to increase its casework skills, to deepen its quality of work, and to extend its activities into outpost services. Thirty-five ex-convicts were assisted from 1935 through 1939. A glance at table 1, page 21, shown no danger of threatened deficit of the Ex-Convict

Fund, although a temporary suspension occurred in late 1939, due to a delayed check. Memoranda from the Executive Secretary to the staff and caseworkers' brief monthly summations of the cases carried indicate greater selectivity in case-finding and improvement in regular reporting from the caseworkers, although often the actual rehabilitative function of the Fund is not clearly stated in these reports. A letter from the Executive Secretary to the Treasurer, on March 10, 1937, points to greater assurance in seeing the ex-convict group as one requiring some special distinction from other families:

We have used the Fund only for those ex-convict families where we felt that there was some particular value in having the man have these special funds. Otherwise, the ex-convict families are cared for out of our general relief funds. On the other hand, any unattached ex-convicts who have come to us for assistance have been taken care of entirely out of the Ex-Convict Fund. This was particularly true of _____, who, you will remember, is a young, unattached man.

Here emerges a focus on the ex-convict as an individual. Also, a year earlier, another letter in the files, in response to an out of town ex-convict's point-of-view letter in the local paper, requesting assistance, explains that the Ex-Convict Fund is "primarily for ex-convicts in Louisville." Actual legal residence was not required, as in other cases needing financial assistance, but the individual in absentia was, reasonably enough, ineligible for relief, but rather

directed to his local sources of assistance. Further clarification of the service appears, too, in a statement from a report of December, 1938: "We are trying to help particularly those ex-convicts who are waiting W.P.A. assignments or who have some opportunity in industry as we feel that it is important that they do not get too discouraged and revert to stealing or forgery in order to take care of themselves." Here is expressed concern for the individual ex-convict and the temptation facing him to revert to asocial behavior. This preventive aspect of the service is borne out in the study of the actual cases, where employment was felt so important as a rehabilitative measure and a deterrent to future trouble that wage-relief was sometimes paid with the Ex-Convict Fund. (For a brief period the Agency maintained a small work-shop as a made-work program.) Caseworkers became more sensitive to the perils of discouragement. Experimentation, also, became part of the feeling-out process in integrating a service, which had more or less been an appendage in the earlier years, into the whole range of Agency services. Ex-Convict funds were used for "exploration" periods to learn more about the client's background and potentialities for being helped. Some confusions in differentiating between ex-convicts and other clients and between the purposes of the two sources of relief were to be

expected. Greater flexibility in acceptance of ex-convicts for financial assistance as compared with other clients was evident. In one instance, articulated more clearly than in others similarly handled, the caseworker records that, following a conference with the Executive Secretary on 3/3/36, it was decided to use the Fund for the case in question "for experimental purposes" only--that the Agency was not justified in using its general fund for assistance to the client, because of his very poor background.

Although, in general, clients were informed of the source of relief, here, too, there was some difference of opinion. The interesting viewpoint was brought out in connection with one case that: "I do not think it is a good thing to tell the man about the fund as it does put a premium on a penitentiary record. In many instances we have not let the man know the source of the fund and the purpose of it." At times bewildering, too, to caseworker and client, must have been the occasional instances of supplementation of W.P.A. wages, since clients who were not ex-convicts were continually being told of the inter-agency policy of non-supplementation of W.P.A. income. Was it a sense of over-protection of the ex-convict on the part of the caseworker, who feared the consequences of sub-marginal income on an individual already in conflict with society? Was it merely

a welcome use of another resource for a few cases among many that the caseworker likewise would have been eager to assist? It is impossible to know just what was felt during this period--perhaps something of both feelings.

In a general review of the cases of this period, several facts are noted: The yearly numbers of ex-convicts assisted shows a range of four to 18 per year. The former low number was attributable to the famous 1937 flood, during which period Agency activities per se were suspended for a while and clients were assisted by the American Red Cross. The eight ex-convicts assisted in 1935 represent a low count as the service was resumed so late in the year. Of the total number of 35 cases carried from 1935 through 1939, the majority, 25, were still men residing with their families and in 16 of these cases contacts were held equally with the ex-convict and other members of the family. In 9 of the total group, the caseworker had primary contact with the ex-convict himself. In the group of 10 unattached individuals, the caseworker, of course, had the major contact with the ex-convict himself. Thus, numerically, more than half the number of cases represent major concern with the ex-convict's prison experiences and feelings about his readjustment to society than in the earlier period. In all but 4 cases, the fact of imprisonment was verified, with sometimes not all the

dates or other data complete, and with sometimes excellent information from the penal institutions. Among the four cases in which imprisonment was not actually verified, there was evidence in three cases that the man was probably an ex-convict, by mention of a prison record by the referral source. One of the cases, for instance, had been referred to the Agency by Mr. Roser, Treasurer of the Lotta Fund. The offense in this situation was an old one--having ended in 1930--and the client stated of himself that he had "bummed around since 1930". In all but six of the cases, the imprisonments were of relatively recent date--all within a year of slightly more from the date of acceptance. One of these six cases, however, had been assisted in 1931 from the Ex-Convict Fund, and was selected again in 1935 when assistance from the Fund was first resumed.

Although, again, information as to the use of both general and Ex-Convict Fund is not always clearly brought out in the case-records, in 19 of the 35 cases the financial plan seemed to be a combination of general and special funds, with the latter supplying "special" needs, such as clothing items, seeds for gardening, false teeth, etc. In as many as 16 cases, relief was drawn entirely from the Ex-Convict Fund, indicating a much more conscious use of the Fund for specific clients.

Wider community knowledge of the existence of the Fund is evident, since 11 of the 35 cases came to the Agency as direct referrals from other individuals or agencies for assistance from the Fund, or came at the suggestion of individuals or agencies who knew of the Fund's purpose.

In recapitulating this period, 1935-1939, one sees perhaps confusion in using the flexible criteria--not yet written in any definite statement--to accept ex-convicts for assistance from the Lotta Fund. At the same time there appears to be a natural growth toward individualizing the ex-convict clients and conscientiously trying to use the funds for rehabilitative purposes.

Service Related To The Individual 1940-1946

An interesting "profile" is drawn from the years 1940-1946, on table 1, page 21. The beginning and the ending year of this period show a relatively high number of ex-convicts assisted, while the intervening years of 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945 represent a marked decrease in the yearly numbers assisted with the Lotta Fund. The average for these five years is only 4.6. The drop in numbers of applicants for assistance coincides with the rise in employment opportunities. War industries drained the labor market, and even many individuals who by reason of physical handicaps,

poor work-records, evidences of general instability, etc. could not find work in other years, were now fitting into some form of employment. With the war's ending, and the attendant problems of readjustment, skill and experience again became criteria for adequate employment. One might safely predict that ex-convict requests for assistance will either remain at the present level, or increase, and that the period for review of the fifteen years of service to ex-convicts is both timely and necessary as preparation for increased demands and usable criteria to meet these.

In Agency history, the period is marked by refinement of casework skills both in direct treatment of clients and in interpretation of the Agency's work to the community. In 1946 the Agency completed a project which stands as the epitome of its struggle for high standards of staff development and case-work service--the comprehensive manual of all job classifications in the Agency, and of personnel practices.

What has been the development and change in the one small corner of the Agency's varied services of this period--the handling of the ex-convict group? (A comparison of totals by year of ex-convict cases with totals by year of all cases, as shown on table 1, page 21, indicates the small part they are of the total case-load). Apparently, the service was affected rather more indirectly than directly

by the general changes of the period. With rapid staff turnover, many caseworkers were no longer close to the struggles of the early developmental period. Consequently, many of the workers had forgotten or had never absorbed the purpose or mechanics of the Lotta Fund. On 8/17/46, after evidence of the staff's general lack of knowledge of the service became apparent in inadequate reports of their ex-convict cases, a memorandum was sent to the staff by the Executive Secretary repeating and enlarging upon facts needed for the reports:

In order to be sure that we have the money in the fund and in order that the workers understand the procedure, any client who is accepted for relief from the Ex-Convict Fund must be cleared with me first by the worker. If we have sufficient money in the fund, the case can be accepted. At that point the worker is to send me a very brief memo, giving me a statement as to the reason the man was committed, the date and length he was committed, when he was paroled or released, and what the present situation is. There should be a brief statement of his needs and what we hope to do for him and some indication as to the length of time and the amount of relief. Following the original statement, a memo should be sent to me at the end of each month (not later than the 6th of the following month). This statement should include briefly a report of what has been done, such as the kind of relief and what the plan has been in relation to the relief and what you anticipate doing. The book-keeper gives me the itemized statement of the relief, so it is not necessary for the worker to give me this, but the worker should give me the relief plan and some estimate of the amount needed for the coming month. It is important that the workers give a brief statement and a clear statement that will be understandable to the Secretary and Treasurer.

How did the service itself grow and change in this period of 1940-1946? Thirty-eight ex-convict cases were assisted in this period, with four of these overlapping from the previous period. One of these had continued from 1939-1940, and three were reopened in 1940. In 30 cases--by far the majority--the major contact was with the ex-convict himself. In six cases the approach was directed to the family as a unit. In two cases, interestingly enough, the major contact was definitely with the wife of the ex-convict. In one situation this was purposefully done, apparently, since the wife had been the client of the Agency's for a period of years during her previous marriage. Ex-Convict funds were used to supplement the family's Aid to Dependent Children's grant. In the other situation, the caseworker apparently had unwittingly fallen in with the ex-convict's plan of evading contact and securing assistance by sending in his pregnant wife. Later, the caseworker apparently became aware of what was happening and requested contact with the ex-convict himself.

Of the total number of 38 cases of this period, 24 were definitely unattached individuals--either single, separated, divorced or widowed. Twelve were "family men", with one of these having an established home with his mother. Two were women ex-convicts with an established home with

their adolescent sons. A larger number of transient individuals appear in the group than at any other period.

As for the relief plan--all but one ex-convict were assisted entirely from the Lotta Fund, although the family of one of these was later assisted out of the general fund after the man deserted. In the one case where a combination of funds was used, an interesting distinction was made: a requested grant for repair of a truck was decided in conference with the Executive Secretary to be so questionable in view of the client's extremely poor background, that the request was met out of general rather than the special fund. This is, in a sense, a reversal of an earlier opinion that a questionable request could not be met from the Agency's general fund, but rather, experimentally, from the Lotta Fund.

There were 17 direct and clear-cut referrals from other agencies or individuals for assistance from the Fund. Two additional cases were referred by the penitentiaries, upon release of the clients, for service in locating employment. Eventually they received some assistance from the Fund. In two or three additional cases one suspects the individuals had heard of the existence of the Fund while they were still in prison or while they were wandering about the country.

All but four of the ex-convicts' penal records were verified--although, again, methods and success in securing definite data vary. The penal records of two of the clients could not be verified at all, although attempts were made, and in two situations the caseworker made no attempt at verification.

Three ex-convicts had only jail or workhouse sentences. Two clients, assisted previously, were assisted again, although their prison terms were now as far back as three years prior to the last contact. One client had a penal record of about six years prior to acceptance for assistance from the Fund, although jail and workhouse sentences had intervened. Not counting the clients whose terms could not be adequately verified, 27 ex-convicts had penal record not much farther back than one year from the date of acceptance.

There are some interesting variants in types of services apparent in this period, many of which are, in a sense, precedent-setting, and serve as material from which policy emerges. One case was accepted to help the client establish a work-record by part-payment of sheltered workshop wages from the Fund. It is brought out more clearly than in the past, and so stated in case-records, that temporary help may act as a preventive against temptation--a sort of immediate brake on recidivism. Also, the question

of residence seems fairly definite now in several statements as result of conference with the Executive Secretary. One record carries the statement: "The Ex-Convict Fund is not restricted to residents." Interesting, too, is the group of cases containing recording to the effect that criteria for treatability be much more flexibly applied to ex-convicts than to other clients. One statement is very nicely put:

-----The Ex-Convict Fund was donated by a woman interested in helping even those who do not show possibilities for rehabilitation. It would be possible, therefore, to use it for the repair of Mr. A's artificial limb and for temporary maintenance. Then we could refer the case to Jefferson County Welfare Department.

Following along this line, there appears a trend to give relief for short periods, and if chronicity of the problem is in evidence, to refer the client to a public agency for long-term assistance.

Empirically, therefore, we see in actual practice precedent-setting opinions. As the study proceeds, these will become clear as the picture emerges of who the ex-convict really is, what the total practice in relief-giving has been, and what the practice appears to be in other agencies. It is suggested that the above data be compared with later tables giving a total picture of the ex-convict's social status to bring out differences in the three periods cited.

CHAPTER II

PRACTICE IN OTHER AGENCIES PARTICIPATING IN USE OF FUND

In connection with the present study, the names and locations of the seven agencies--other than Family Service Organization--sharing in the income from the Lotta Fund for Aiding Discharged Convicts--were secured from the trustees in February, 1947. These agencies are: (1) Massachusetts Society for Aiding Discharged Prisoners, Boston, Massachusetts; (2) Prison Association of California, San Jose, California; (3) St. Louis Committee for Aiding Discharged Prisoners, St. Louis, Missouri; (4) Central Howard Association, Chicago, Illinois; (4) Prison Association of New York, New York, New York; (6) Prisoners Relief Society, Washington, D. C.; (7) Volunteer Prisoners' Aid Society, New Orleans, Louisiana. Upon receipt of the names of the agencies a letter was written executives of these agencies, requesting certain kinds of information that might be of interest in comparing with our findings. Some information regarding the agency itself was requested - its function, origin of funds other than the Lotta Fund, its personnel and the allocating of cases either to one certain worker or to all

workers. General information about the cases was felt desirable: the approximate average number of ex-convicts handled yearly, as well as the total number handled; general information regarding the sex, residence, family attachments of the ex-convicts. Some general points regarding the handling of relief for the ex-convicts were requested: whether this was relief for maintenance or for special items; whether it was primarily in cash. Additional data regarding the approximate average duration of ex-convict contacts, method of reporting to the trustees, an estimate of total success in dealing with the ex-convict group, was solicited. It seemed well to know if any study of any of the seven agencies' work with ex-convicts assisted with the Lotta Fund had ever been made.

As with many similar inquiries, the success in getting responses was limited. Only three agencies sent any kind of reply; The Prisoners Relief Society of Washington, D. C.; The Prison Association of New York; The John Howard Association of Chicago, Ill. In general, it is difficult to glean from the material sent, answers to specific questions, but some interesting information was obtained. From enclosures, which were chiefly copies of the charter of incorporation, correspondence with government officials, and news paper clippings, one gathers that Dr. Dudding, a

much venerated man of past 85 years, is president of the Board of Directors of The Prisoners Relief Society of Washington, and that one of the organization's chief aims is in "managing large institutions and is authority on the proper conduct of hospitals and state and government institutions". The organization was "founded in Huntington in 1914" and "has been financed without a single drive for funds or without a solicitor". The charter's stated purpose of the agency is:

"To solicit, accept and receive money, funds, endowments, and contributions of every kind and description, to be used in the social and moral uplift of ex-convicts and to render them financial aid and assistance, to secure homes and employment for ex-convicts, to render financial aid and assistance to the families of men serving terms in prison, and to do all things that will better the condition of ex-convicts, their families and the families of men serving prison terms, and for all other purposes necessary or incidental to the proper conducts of said work and business, and to engage in all kinds of charitable and philanthropic work."

The Corporation office is located in Washington, D. C., and a branch office is retained in Huntington, W. Va.

Apparently, no distinction is made in the source of funds for any special purpose, since the total program of the agency is directed toward prison work: "Whenever we receive funds from any source left by will to aid ex-convicts we use it to aid worthy cases and no part of the fund is used for salaries." No information as to personnel was

secured other than the statement: "The by-laws of the Society provides that no person employed by the Corporation can or shall receive more than \$100.00 a month room and board." Another interesting statement of recent focus (February 12, 1947) in that agency is:

"It was through the efforts of the Prisoners Relief Society that convicts and ex-convicts were permitted to enlist and be drafted into the armed forces during the War. They made good soldiers too and gave no unusual trouble. Our society is not taking on any new cases now as we have all we can do in taking care of the commitments."

No additional information was secured as to total caseload, etc.

The reply from The Prison Association of New York stated that pressures of the period, especially with the New York Legislature in session, precluded their giving the desired information. The Agency's annual report for 1945 was forwarded. The letter commented briefly on the Lotta Fund as follows: "We have received contributions from the Lotta Crabtree fund and our case records are quite clear on that point". The annual report, however, does not give information as to the source of the Association's funds for financial assistance to ex-convicts, but rather summarizes the broad activities of the organization, as indicated by listing of its standing committees: Committee on Law; Committee on Finance; Committee on Detentions; Committee

on Nominations; Committee on Probation and Parole; Committee on Prison Administration. The Association, founded in 1844 and incorporated in 1846, is imposingly active in championing legislation for prison reform, for handling of juvenile delinquents, for probation improvement, etc. The Association was "conspicuously identified with the writing and passage of the first probation law in this State over forty years ago."¹ In short, the total function of the association is "to assist in the fields of crime prevention and in the improvement of those methods of crime treatment relating to court procedures, institutional administration and planning, parole and postrelease activities."² As part of its total function, the Association maintains an Employment and Relief Bureau, "under the able guidance and direction of Mr. Harry Schwartz who is credited with more than thirty-five years experience in the field of crime treatment, prevention, and avoidance"³, and a Family Service Bureau, "under the

¹State on New York, The One Hundred and First Annual Report of the Prison Association of New York, Legislative Document (1946) No. 29 (Albany: Williams Press, Inc., 1946) p. 19.

²Ibid., p. 25.

³Ibid., p. 46.

supervision and guidance of Miss Margaret Murdock. Her experience of many years in dealing with families in circumstances less fortunate than most, well qualifies her for the task of directing the Bureau."¹ The first service gives temporary lodging, meals, and cash relief to released prisoners, the majority of whom come from N. Y. City and state penal institutions and attempts to find employment for them. Total expenditures for 1945 were \$2,281.10 and 808 men were interviewed. The Family Service Bureau enumerates several primary functions:

It meets the urgent need of providing for the family of the prisoner during the period of his incarceration.... removing a primary cause of bitterness and thus indirectly aids in his rehabilitation.....Temporary financial help is given where it is needed. The policy of the Bureau precludes its acting as a substitute for public assistance, but it can be a very present help at the beginning when the shock is greatest and help is most needed. It promptly places the families in touch with public relief authorities and may continue to supply necessary supplementary funds after relief is obtained.²

Also, the intangibles of case-work treatment are indicated by the Bureau's services in preparing the family psychologically for the return of the husband; in providing recreational activities for the family, etc. The total number of cases under care carried in this division during

¹Ibid., p. 51.

²Ibid., p. 50.

1945 was given as 234, with an expenditure of \$6,828.06. Statistics only for the two service bureaus listed above, The Employment and Relief Bureau and the Family Service Bureau, were given in the annual report. No additional information as to number and training of personnel was obtainable.

The John Howard Association of Chicago, Illinois gave a full outline of its function, services, and method of financial assistance, succinctly summed up as follows, in a letter of Feb. 13, 1947:

The John Howard Association (formerly Central Howard Association) was founded in 1901, to provide assistance to men released from prison, through casework service, employment placement, temporary financial aid. The agency also fosters crime prevention activities, and the improvement of prisons. It is the only casework agency in Illinois which works exclusively with men in prison and with men released from correctional institutions, regardless of race, creed, or color, to aid them in their rehabilitation to productive living and good citizenship.

The Agency is a member of the Council of Social Agencies of Chicago, participates in the Community Fund, and is a beneficiary of two foundations. It is principally supported through the contributions of individuals interested in our particular work.

Our staff consists of a professionally trained executive secretary, two professionally trained caseworkers, one research Fellow, whose salary is financed through a non-budgetary fund, and two clerical personnel.

The funds received from the Lotta Crabtree Fund are very important to us in our employment placement program.

We work with approximately 500 men a year, both inmates and men released from prisons. The total budget for the year is approximately \$15,000, exclusive of non-budgetary funds for research, seminars, and scholarship grants.

Financial assistance for the most part is on a loan basis, and we receive about 60% in return. Prior to the war, 85% of the men we assisted were successful, although during the war, the percentage ran considerably higher.

Although the Association had hoped to make a study of the use of the Lotta Fund in their work, this to date had not been done.

Although use of the term "men" may be collective for both sexes, no particular mention is made of women prisoners or ex-convicts in any of the three agencies answering inquiries. The three agencies have a broad scope of activities dealing directly with problems of crime prevention, imprisonment, and release. Assistance to ex-convicts is a logical part of their entire program, and no doubt special skills in some of the agencies, and long acquaintance, by experience, with practical problems of court procedures, prison life, and parole requirements must create a helpful background in dealing with released prisoners and their families. While it is not possible to evaluate the effect of the caseworker's general inexperience with these problems on the handling of ex-convict cases, in a setting like the Family Service Organization, there undoubtedly is some effect, if only within the caseworker's own acceptance of what may seem an

alien problem in the gamut of a private family agency's caseload. Although it is impossible to state definitely that the Family Service Organization, set up to render service to an undifferentiated clientele, was the only agency, organized on this basis, selected to administer the Lotta Fund, the titles of all the other agencies suggest functions similar to those of the three Associations described above.

CHAPTER III

CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS AIDED

It was seen, in Chapter I, that the total Agency experience in handling the ex-convict cases, from 1931-1946, seemed logically to fall into three periods, and that the character of the service, general handling of relief, community awareness of existence of the local resource for ex-convicts in these respective periods closely followed trends in casework thinking, changes in agency function, etc. A glance at Table 1, page 21, helps put the Agency's service to ex-convicts in somewhat clearer perspective for the total period than might appear in the discussion in Chapter I, where necessary focus on the handling itself emphasizes those cases. Actually, the numbers of ex-convicts assisted each year is exceedingly small as compared to the total numbers of cases carried each year--a relationship of 20 ex-convict cases to 4392 undifferentiated cases, in the year of greatest assistance to ex-convicts (1932), and a relationship of 4 ex-convict cases to 801 undifferentiated cases in the year of least assistance to both ex-convict as well as other cases (1937).

It is understandable that the service to ex-convicts might have lost itself somewhat in the greater pressures and responsibilities of an undifferentiated caseload. Some objective review of who the ex-convict really is--what makes him stand out, if really he does, from the rest of the caseload--is needed better to visualize the service as it exists and to clarify certain criteria for acceptance and treatment of these individuals.

Data From 92 Case-Records

As the name implies, "Family Service Organization" has, as its mainspring, the motive of preserving family life and preventing its breakdown. The majority of its clients are part of a bona fide family group. The unattached individual represents the exception to this majority and are accepted for casework treatment (that may or may not involve financial help) only after considerable scrutiny of the individual's capacity for taking help, for sharing in the casework process, etc. has been attempted during the initial application. It was evident, in analyzing the period 1940-1946, during which time the ex-convict was increasingly seen as an individual without family ties, that definite statements in records appeared, indicating that treatability was not a criterion for acceptance. As brought out in the

discussion in Chapter I one of such statements bears repeating: "...The ex-convict fund was donated by a woman interested in helping even those who do not show possibilities for rehabilitation", and therefore assistance was granted the client in question, although his penal record indicated repetitive asocial behavior, his work record was negligible, and he had no family ties. Comments on records read for this study bring out often, as result of conference with caseworker and Agency Executive, that the ex-convict need not express a desire for service in order to receive assistance. Another statement lends weight to this conviction: "He (the client) probably will have to be helped without using the same criteria as we did for giving relief to most clients. He probably is fearful of intrusion into his personal affairs and I doubt that he is near enough normal to take any help in discussing his feelings about this." This client, whose social situation was scarcely known, was requesting assistance pending receipt of wages on a job.

Also, it was observed in Chapter I that residence requirements are waived in the case of ex-convicts, and that the only stipulation for receiving the Ex-Convict Fund is that the client must be residing, at the time of application, in Louisville. While exceptions are made with regard to residence of all clients, again these exceptions

are in the minority and predicate real considerations of treatability within the client, especially where a relief request is involved. Exceptions might be the meeting of an emergency for one instance, the granting of assistance where non-residence is a technical matter--i.e., the situation of a Louisville woman's losing residence by virtue of marriage to a non-resident man, as occurred during World War II--and with similar unusual circumstances. Generally, assistance is given only when the client has proven residence of at least one year in the State and six months in Jefferson County.

Requirements as to race or religious beliefs do not exist; however, the Jewish Welfare Federation in the community does meet the needs of clients of Jewish faith. Insofar as relations of White to Negro population is concerned, official statistics will not be available again until 1950; however, recent estimates, according to the Kentucky Room of the Louisville Free Public Library, show the general population of Louisville, according to the State Board of Health, to be 363,100, as of July, 1947, while the Urban League estimated the Negro population to have been between 50,000 and 51,000 in July, 1946. The percentage of Negro to White population is therefore 14 plus % (almost 15%). Within the Agency, the ratio of White to Negro clients

given financial assistance is four to one. At the end of 1947, service and relief was given to 1377 families, of which 338 were Negroes.

Since Family Service statistics are not computed on the basis of who the client is--i.e., whether major contact has been with husband or wife--it is impossible to use general figures that would have any meaning in relation to sex of the ex-convicts treated; however, for the purpose of getting a picture of who the "ex-convict" really is, the visualization of relative number of men ex-convicts to women in the same category seems important.

Table 2, page 58, gives a picture of data secured from the 92 case records of the fifteen year period during which the Lotta Fund has been used, in relation to sex, race, religion, residence, family status--i.e., whether the individual has family ties or not. In the latter category, a married individual, living with his spouse at the time of contact, an individual living in a common-law relationship of long standing, an individual living in a family group--i.e., in an established home with Mother or children--all were regarded as "attached". In the opposite group fell those individuals who most obviously have no family ties, have either been widowed, separated or divorced from their spouses, or have never married nor

established a home with any person or persons. In addition to the above data, it was interesting to investigate the place of birth of these individuals. As shown in table 2, certain facts stand out and give a picture of the origin of the clients in question.

It is immediately outstanding that in the ex-convict group the overwhelming majority of individuals who have been offenders are men. This does not mean that the caseworker necessarily considered the ex-convict as the client to be treated, within the framework of his own family setting. Later it will be seen where the caseworker actually put the major emphasis (see table 10, page 81). It has already been seen how the trend to treat the ex-convict directly has consistently grown in the historical development of the service. The above figures do indicate that the person for whose rehabilitation the Lotta Fund was primarily intended has been in almost all cases a man. For a private family agency this fact may pose at least temporary problems, in that, until recently, most such agencies have been unable to obtain men caseworkers--primarily due to the War and also to salaries incommensurate with obligations and responsibilities of men caseworkers who are heads of households. It may be argued that only the skill of the caseworker has meaning in treatment, and not his or her sex; however,

TABLE 2

DATA FROM 92 EX-CONVICT CASE-RECORDS, AS TO SEX, RACE, RELIGION,
RESIDENCE, FAMILY STATUS, AND BIRTHPLACE

Total No. Ex-Convicts	Sex		Race		Religion					Legal Res.			Attached		Birthplace		
	M	F	W	N	Prot.	Cath.	Other ^a	None	Unk.	Yes	No	Unk.	Yes	No	Ky.	Other	Unk.
92	89	3	68	24	33	8	1	14	36	67	13	12	55	37	52 ^b	23	17

^aChristian Scientist

^b14 of these were born in Louisville, Ky.

certain practical aspects of treatment, such as need for home-visits in undesirable locations (i.e., flop-houses, houses of prostitution, etc.) could be performed more easily by men than by women caseworkers. Undeniably, also, certain personality problems of unattached men respond better to handling by men than by women caseworkers. Although figures are not obtainable, comments on records read and observations of the obvious selection of a man caseworker whenever possible for ex-convicts accepted by the Family Service Organization point to the desirability of giving considerable thought to the sex of the caseworker in assigning these cases. It has also been seen that there is considerable evidence that the other agencies sharing the Lotta Fund have geared their services more to men than to women.

With regard to race, it appears that, proportionately, there is a higher ratio of Negro to White clients than the ratio in undifferentiated cases. It is difficult to assign any particular meaning to this, as the proportion is not greatly different. Throughout the remainder of the text, no further differentiation between White and Negro clients is made, as Agency monthly reports no longer separate the two races, insofar as problems seen and services rendered, and the division seems artificial with respect to the

handling of the Lotta Fund. In most of the following material, also, differentiation between sexes is seldom made, as the division did not lend significance to the study.

The significant fact seen with relation to religion is the large number of "Unknowns". Invalid, too, in most cases, is the data on the different religious faiths, since it was not always brought out how the information was secured. Often the religious faith appeared on face-sheets, or was somewhat incidentally secured. Of most significance to the reader of the cases is the slight emphasis put by caseworkers on the use and meaning of religion to the individual client, and the disregard for even securing this data in so many cases. Outstanding was the mention of the one client's use of Christian Science faith in healing, etc. in the one case singled out in the above table.

It is interesting to note that 67 of the 92 ex-convicts were legal residents of Louisville--a higher proportion than one might expect. Even among the "Unknown" group, in some instances there was indication that the individual had some ties in Louisville and might even have legal residence in the city, or at least in the State. Further breaking down of the residence figures

brings out that only 19 of the 92 ex-convicts could be definitely said to be "drifters" or transients moving from one community to another. (There were only 2 of these in the period 1931-1932; six in the period 1939-1940; eleven in the period 1940-1946). Again, the residence figures are subject to some inaccuracy, as residence was not always verified per se, but social-service exchange clearings, records from other agencies, work-records, etc. in most cases seemed clearly to establish residence. Greater care was exerted by the caseworker in checking residence than in obtaining data on religion.

Bearing out the evidence that the majority of ex-convicts were of local origin, is the fact that 52 of them were born in Kentucky, 14 of these in Louisville, the remainder preponderantly in rural sections of the State (except for possibly three of these men). Twenty-three ex-convicts were born in other states--the majority originating in the sister states of Indiana and Tennessee. Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi and Illinois were given as other birthplaces.

From the figures, one would deduce the conclusion that, while the transient, unattached group of ex-convict clients are in the minority, there is a trend toward increase of this group and contingent need to clarify the

kind of service most suitable to these individuals.

Of interest to the caseworker are clues to the background of the ex-convicts. Because of variations in history-taking, facts regarding parental ties are not present with enough uniformity to make an objective statistical record; however, time after time the comment was made on schedules of the case-records that the ex-convict had come from a broken home situation. This fact, though, is largely true of many other clients of the Agency who are not ex-convicts, but who have had serious personality difficulties and problems in adjusting to accepted norms of society. Within easier reach of statistical study and of value to the caseworker, intent on assessing potentialities of the ex-convict client and finding practical means of rehabilitation with regard to employment and training, are the school and work records of these ex-convicts. Tables 3 and 4, page 63, give some picture of the ex-convict clients' background with respect to education, training, and work-records. In determining whether the individual is "skilled" or "unskilled", one encounters the obvious drawbacks of unreliability of the clients' statements and lack of complete verifications; however, wherever there is considerable question expressed by the caseworker with regard to the client's reliability, the information was

TABLE 3

EDUCATIONAL RATINGS AND TRAINING OF 92 EX-CONVICTS ASSISTED
WITH LOTTA FUND BY THE FAMILY SERVICE ORGANIZATION

Total No. Ex-Convicts	Educational Ratings					Performance Ratings		
	None	Less than 8th Grade	8th Grade & Less than 12th	12th Grade & over	Unk.	Skilled	Unskilled	Unk.
92	1	29	21	4	37	31	50	11

69

TABLE 4

EMPLOYMENT RECORDS OF 92 EX-CONVICTS ASSISTED WITH LOTTA FUND
BY FAMILY SERVICE ORGANIZATION

Total No. Ex-Convicts	Continuous Work Record	Casual, Irregular Work Records	Unk. or Inf. Invalid
92	13	44	35

checked "unknown". This form of checking applies also to educational ratings, many of which originate from clients' own statements. Work-records, however, were checked when verified and are classified according to amount of verification done, continuity of jobs held, and length of work-records. If the latter preponderantly fell in sequence of jobs lasting less than one month, the employment record was classified as "casual employment".

Tables 3 and 4 give some indication of the educational level of the ex-convict group, with the greater number of clients falling in the "less than 8th" and "8th and less than 12th" grade ratings, and with again a large proportion of unknowns. More than half the number definitely fell in the unskilled group. This group represents, largely, those who had either no work-record or had been employed on unskilled laboring jobs. The skilled workers included, as examples, individuals in the more skilled branches of labor--construction workers, mechanics, "white-collar" workers, and a few professionally skilled individuals. (Two were writers of acknowledged skill.) Four individuals claimed training in extension classes or in other professional schools--listed are courses in commercial art, woodwork, poetry, blacksmithing, craftsmanship, business.

Employment records were difficult to rate, as information in case records was often extremely difficult to draw together, verifications were incomplete, and interpretation is apt to be somewhat subjectively colored; however, in general, as shown in table 4, 35 individuals gave such meager information, or so little information was solicited by the caseworker, that the information was rated unknown or invalid. In this group fell the obvious "drifters"; those whose given records could never be checked; those who were sent on jobs but immediately reported some accident or casualty to prevent their working; and those who were supported by their spouses. Of the 57 who had verified records, 44 had very irregular work-records, usually of very short duration. In this group, the majority displayed restlessness in quitting one job after another and generally had unsatisfactory ratings by employers, due to drinking or absenteeism. In this group, too, fell the seasonal workers--carpenters, tobacco workers, domestics, etc.--and those who embarked on their own businesses which were sporadic or unsuccessful. The most stable group of individuals, insofar as employment is concerned, again show only relatively good work records, as compared to the other groupings. Although each of the 92 case-records were closely perused, with notations made

as to the sequence of jobs, rate of pay, duration of jobs, reason for discharge, etc. (see schedule, Appendix), information as to these facts is not consistent in each case record. Often the caseworker took the referral of the case from another agency, and incorporated its work-record as authentic. There is unevenness in the persistence and quality of checking or verifying work records. The above figure of 13 individuals with stable work-records is therefore somewhat tentative. It indicates a group of individuals who have had at least one or two records of employment of more than two years' duration. Often the imprisonment broke a period of such employment. Often, too, the depression period of the early thirties manifestly interrupted what otherwise appeared to be a stable employment record, and individuals falling in this group were assisted in getting onto made-work programs, where they usually acquired very good ratings, indicating potential stability. From the information secured, \$6.00 was the lowest weekly pay-rate given, for a 17 year-old grocery clerk, and \$60.50 for a construction employee at a bridge company the highest weekly salary.

How old are these ex-convicts? The age of the individual has meaning for the caseworker in terms of treatability of the client. Table 5 shows the age ranges of the 92 ex-convict clients assisted by the Agency:

TABLE 5

AGE RANGES OF 92 EX-CONVICT CLIENTS ASSISTED WITH LOTTA FUND BY THE FAMILY SERVICE ORGANIZATION

Age	Total	M	F
Total	92	89	3
Under 25	2	2	0
25 Under 35	33	32	1
35 Under 45	34	32	2
45 Under 55	15	15	0
55 and over	2	2	0
Unknown	6	6	0

It is evident, from the above table, that the Agency has assisted more ex-convict clients in the age range 25 to 45 than any other age group. It appears, too, that the tendency is toward older, rather than younger, clients' reaching the Agency, so that expectation of success of casework treatment might not be as high as with a younger group of individuals.

From a caseworker's point of view, there are strong evidences of emotional instability of varying degrees evident in the personalities of the ex-convict clients; however, again, instability and immaturity are often seen

in other clients who come to the Agency for service with regard to marital problems, problems of relationship to others, work adjustments, etc. An increasing tendency, over the years, in the handling of ex-convict clients, is the greater effort to secure psychiatric consultation or to locate records from other agencies, pertaining to the clients' mental or emotional disturbances. Table 6 below shows the extent of the diagnosed mental illness among the ex-convict group, as well as diagnosed physical illness or handicap.

TABLE 6

EXTENT OF DIAGNOSED MENTAL ILLNESS AND PHYSICAL ILLNESS OR HANDICAP AMONG EX-CONVICT CLIENTS

Total No. Ex-Convicts	Diagnosed Mental Illness	Diagnosed Physical Illness or Handicap
92	9	26

A relatively small proportion of the ex-convict group have had diagnosed mental illness; however, this group represents actual psychiatric study with diagnosis of serious mental handicap, while another group were rated "unstable" or as having "simple adult maladjustment",

and another large group showed, in their contact with the Agency, erratic and immature behavior, but these borderline groupings are difficult to classify into objective data. Twenty-six individuals had physical illness or handicaps of serious effect on their adjustment--i.e., loss of limb, partial loss of sight, chronic heart ailments, etc. No acute illnesses were included, such as acute venereal disease, influenza, etc.

Penal Records

Although the penal records of each ex-convict client are subject to some inaccuracy in getting full details as to the type of offense, dates of incarceration and verifications, on the whole the caseworkers appeared conscientious in securing data that would identify the client as an ex-convict, and eligible to receive the Lotta Fund. Gaps in information, however, do stand out when certain basic questions are asked regarding verifications of the penal records and follow-ups in securing information directly from the prison regarding the client's adjustment and potentialities for being helped. Table 7, 70, gives an overall picture of the extent of verifications made of the client's stated penal record and of inclusion of material from the prisons or reformatories. Verifications

show variations in extent of getting detailed information, in timing, etc., but the schedules of cases read were checked affirmatively if even partial information was secured. Also, with regard to inclusion of material from penal institutions about the client, the schedules were checked affirmatively whether the information was solicited by the caseworker, initially sent by the penal institution, or secured via other reliable agency records.

TABLE 7

EXTENT OF VERIFICATION OF PENAL RECORDS AND OF INCLUSION
OF MATERIAL ABOUT EX-CONVICT FROM
PENAL INSTITUTIONS

Total No. Ex-Convicts	Verifications			Inclusion of Material from Institution		
	Yes	No	Unable to verify	Yes	No or Material Inadequate	Unable to Secure
92	83	6	3	40	49	3

The table indicates that only six ex-convict records were definitely not verified in any way, and that 83 of them were checked, by a variety of means to be sure, but with enough information to establish the client as an ex-convict. The means used ranged from direct correspondence to penal institutions to perusal of parole papers and

accepting the statements of reliable referral sources-- i.e., federal and state probation officers or other agencies, newspaper articles, etc. Less in evidence in the case records is the inclusion of correspondence, whether a short letter or complete summary, from the institution of the client's incarceration. More than half have no material at all, or material with such meager, inadequate data, as to be of no help at all. The State prisons generally responded very briefly or not at all to the caseworker's inquiries. The Federal prisons generally sent excellent evaluative material, including full physical, psychiatric, psychological and social data.

Are these clients recidivists? Only an incomplete and tentative answer can be given, since only the record prior and during the Agency contact can be used. Then, too, one faces the fact that although an individual may have only one sentence listed for commission of a felony, at the same time he may appear to be a repeater in minor offenses or misdemeanors, such as drunkenness, disorderly conduct, etc. Artificial, too, is the taking for granted that all persons committing only one offense are equally treatable and equally guilty before the law. Too many factors enter into the classification of the crime

itself and of the person committing it. One offender may have been induced to support his family by a temporary venture into bootlegging; another may have committed murder as a culmination of many other small, but vicious, attacks of violence. "A good motive does not prevent an act from being a crime nor does the law punish a bad motive if the behavior is not prohibited. But if the function of the criminal law is to protect society by reforming the offender his motive should not only be considered but should play an important role."¹ For purposes of the present study, however, and for use in a limited sense, table 8, page 73, shows the number of prison sentences per ex-convict client, with accompanying record of juvenile delinquency, work-house or jail sentences falling within each category. In checking numbers of sentences, only imprisonment in state or federal prisons or reformatories were considered, while the accompanying juvenile delinquency, misdemeanor record indicates not the number of such offenses, but the existence of any record other than for felonies.

¹Nathaniel F. Cantor, Crime and Society (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1939), p. 277, quoting Act, Intention and Motive in the Criminal Law, (1917), 26, Yale L. J., 645.

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF PRISON SENTENCES PER EX-CONVICT CLIENT WITH ACCOMPANYING
JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, JAIL OR WORKHOUSE RECORDS

No. of Prison Sentences per Ex-Convict	No. of Ex-Convicts		Total No. Ex-Convicts	Total No. Offenses Committed	No. Ex-Convicts having other offenses or court records			No. Ex-Convicts having no other listed offenses		
	M	W			M	W	Total	M	W	Total
1	51	3	54	54	23	2	25	28	1	29
2	14	0	14	28	6	0	6	8	0	8
3	11	0	11	33	5	0	5	6	0	6
4	3	0	3	12	2	0	2	1	0	1
5	3	0	3	15	1	0	1	2	0	2
6	1	0	1	6	1	0	1	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	1	0	1	9	1	0	1	0	0	0
None	3*	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	0	0
Unknown	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0
Totals	89	3	92	157	44	2	46	45	1	46

*Workhouse or jail sentences only

Table 8 may give some indication why care must be taken in interpreting a one-time offender necessarily as a reformable individual. Although by far the greater number of ex-convict clients, 54, have a record of only one felony, 25, or almost half of this group have either had juvenile delinquency records or other conflicts with the law--including drunkenness, disorderly conduct, non-support, assault and battery, larceny, etc. It is also very interesting to note that exactly half the number of 92 ex-convicts have listed juvenile delinquency or jail and workhouse sentences. Chances are exceedingly great, however, that a larger proportion than this had other records, for police records were not uniformly checked, and in some cases, not enough was known about the client to make the results too valid except in a general sense. The table may indicate, however, that the Agency is seeing the majority of these clients before they become recidivistic in committing major offenses, punishable by death, life imprisonment, or by terms longer than one year's duration.

Of what offenses were these ex-convicts guilty? It may be of interest to examine the offenses, and to be alert to possible needs within the client for certain kinds of service, or to attitudes in taking help, as these

skills in treatment might be related to the client's background. Although crime classifications are generally arbitrary devices, suitable for the needs of the person or agency using them, some classification is necessary for tabulation. According to Nathaniel Cantor, sociologist at the University of Buffalo, and an authority on criminal behavior, most classifications "are all too simple in that they emphasize the act and fail to take into account the individual and social contexts in which the crime arises"¹, but he concedes that for statistical purposes, classification according to the type of crime is usable. Edwin Sutherland, Sociologist, agrees that some classification is needed, and states that "Crimes are frequently classified for statistical purposes as crimes against the person, crimes against property, and crimes against public decency, public order, and public justice."² "Crimes against the State" is added as a category by Nathaniel Cantor, to include all possible classifications. Table 9, page 76, is based on these 4 large classifications. Assistance in classifying the crimes of the 92 ex-convicts being studied was secured from Mr. Briscoe, Federal Probation Officer of Louisville, in addition to comparison with

¹Ibid., p. 275.

²Edwin H. Sutherland, Principles of Criminology (Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1939), p. 21.

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF OFFENSES COMMITTED WITHIN LISTED
CRIME CLASSIFICATIONS

Crime Classification	Total No. Offenses
Crimes Against Person	10
Crimes Against Property	112
Crimes Against Morals, Public Justice and Public Order	25
Crimes Against State	-
Parole Violation, reason not stated*	5
Offenses listed but unknown	4
Military violation	1
Total No. Offenses	157

*In each of these instances, there was a separate imprisonment, but caserecord did not state cause of parole violation.

examples given in the two text books mentioned above. Certain crimes may fall within one of several classifications, depending on local interpretation, so that the typing of the offenses above cannot be considered as static. The results, however, point to a general trend of types of offenses seen in the 92 ex-convicts.

It is readily seen from table 9 that the number of offenses falls preponderantly in the classification of "Crimes Against Property". Since the classification includes a broad range of all types of stealing, this would be natural to expect. One can assume just as great a variety of motives and just as great a difference in the degree of severity of the violation. Among the types of stealing seen were: Larceny, Housebreaking, Burglary, Armed Robbery, Conversion, Fraud, Embezzlement, Charge Attempt Under False Pretense, etc. Under "Crimes Against Person" one finds: Murder, Manslaughter, Shooting Without Wounding, Rape, etc. Among the "Crimes Against Morals, Public Justice, and Public Order are: Bigamy, Violations of the Volstead or Harrison Narcotic Acts, other violations of interstate commerce, Violation of White Slavery Act, Impersonating a Federal Officer, False Swearing, etc. No "Crimes against the State"--i.e., Treason--were found among the records studied. In the above table are listed "Parole Violations." Usually the offenses necessitating return to prison were given in the clients' penal record, and are tabulated according to the type of offense, but in 5 cases a new imprisonment, after a lapse of time, was listed as having been caused by "parole violation". Continuations of a

last sentence beyond the parole period are not included under "Parole Violation", as the listed offense itself was the cause of the extension of the prison term, and "parole violation" accompanied the charge.

Four offenses were marked "unknown", and one ex-convict's claim to the Lotta Fund was based on a military charge of Desertion. Although data was not consistently secured in all releases, as to the release category, in checking over the schedules it was evident that by far the majority of ex-convicts were paroled or conditionally released, with a minority having completed a full sentence. The length of periods of incarceration ranged from several months to 12 years.

What lapse of time is there between the termination of the prison sentence and the beginning contact with the Agency? The statement in Clause 9 of Lotta Crabtree's will implies that the purpose of the Fund is to aid those persons who are newly discharged. By comparison of dates of ending prison term and beginning contact with the Agency, some picture is secured of how soon the Agency is meeting the discharged convict's service and relief needs. There is great validity to the thinking advanced during the past War, that service and help to battle-shocked soldiers must not be too long delayed. Perhaps

the situation of the ex-convict offers a parallel. It is difficult to suggest a recommended period of time between date of discharge and date of acceptance by an agency. For purposes of this study a period of 12 months was set as the outer limit, although this may actually be too long a lapse of time. It was found that 62 ex-convicts out of 92 came to the Agency 12 months or less after release from prison. Of this 62, 50 were accepted by the Agency within a 2-3 month lapse between date of discharge and date of acceptance by the Agency. Thus, slightly more than 50% of the total number of ex-convicts were seen by the Agency at the time when the shock of incarceration and impact of adjustment to an outside world was at its most critical stage, while 62, or 60.8% of the total number of ex-convicts were seen within a period of one year from date of discharge. A few cases had penal records ending in 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1925. Others were within periods of 2-3 years from date of beginning contact with the Agency.

Who is the Client?

For a family agency the question of the identity of the client under treatment is important, and considerable attention is given the selection of the person or persons for major service. Selection of the client for

major contact in a family assisted by the agency depends on criteria of treatability and desire for service. Where two people equally wish and are amenable to help, two caseworkers are generally assigned the treatment of each of the two partners in a situation of marital difficulty. The question arises as to whether the same criteria apply to ex-convict cases. In many cases read for this study it was obvious that the ex-convict himself did not want the service that accompanied the giving of financial assistance, but that some other member of the family showed greater anxiety over the social situation confronting the ex-convict than he did himself, and more actively sought the services of the Agency. Does that mean that the caseworker should thereupon select the latter person as the client, and carry on a subsidiary contact with the ex-convict himself, or does the use of a special fund like the Lotta Fund carry an obligation to use limitations in directing casework help to the ex-convict--putting upon him the obligation, likewise, to maintain frequent and direct contact with the caseworker? Can indirect treatment of the ex-convict through, say, the wife or mother, be considered as carrying out the obligation for rehabilitative help inherent in the purpose of the Fund? Perhaps, as the total picture emerges, some guides can

be established for settling these questions.

Table 10, below, gives an objective picture of where the major contact lay in the 92 cases studied. Results were based on notations of actual numbers of interviews, and on careful evaluation of content of interviews with regard to quality and depth of treatment. Often the caseworker directed her activity equally to both husband and wife (or ex-convict and other members of the family). This approach was especially true during the early period of 1931-1932, as has already been discussed in Chapter I.

TABLE 10

SELECTION OF CLIENT BY AGENCY AS SHOWN BY NUMBER,
FREQUENCY, AND CONTENT OF INTERVIEWS

Total No. Ex-Convict Cases	Selection of Client by Caseworker		
	Ex-Convict (1)	Spouse (2)	Family as unit (3)
92	58	4	30

It is thus seen that out of 92 cases, the caseworker maintained major contact with the ex-convict himself in 58 cases; in four cases, the contact was directed toward the spouse (in each case, the wife of the ex-convict); in 30 cases, the caseworker directed the services

of the Agency to all members of the family with even emphasis. Often this meant alternating interviews with husband and wife, home visits or office interviews in which both partners were present, etc. In the review of the actual relief handling, to be discussed in Chapter IV, the selection of the individual to receive the actual financial assistance from the Lotta Fund will be seen, and comparison of Table 10 with Table 14, page 95 is suggested.

How did the client get to the Agency? An overall picture of referral sources is seen in Table 11, page 83. The Family Service Organization counts as "personal", the application to the Agency by the family itself, without formal referral by any outside source. An "individual" referral is a formal referral of a client, by letter or telephone, by any person or persons not connected with an agency or institution respected as an agency--i.e., police department, school, social-service department of a church, etc. A referral by any of the latter sources is rated as an "other agency" referral.

TABLE 11

NATURE OF REFERRAL SOURCES OF 92 EX-CONVICT
CASES STUDIED

Total No. Ex-Convict Cases	Nature of referral		
	Personal	Individual	Other Agency
92	40	10	42

The above figures indicate that initial approach by the family itself and referrals by other agencies were about evenly divided, while 10 cases were referred by interested community people, relatives, etc. It must be kept in mind, however, that many of the "personal" applications were made at the suggestion of other agencies or individuals, although no formal referral was made. "Other Agencies" included the Municipal Bureau of Social Service, Community Chest, Probation Department, Federal Prisons, Aid to Dependent Children Division of the State Welfare Department, etc. In latter years one sees the majority of such referrals consciously made because of the existence of the Ex-Convict Fund. In all cases referred directly as ex-convicts, the request was for financial assistance and service.

A variety of agencies in the community were used as resources for treatment of the ex-convict. Chief among these were health agencies, Legal Aid Society, Municipal Bureau of Social Service (during period of made-work programs), Kentucky State Employment Service, Salvation Army, Saint Vincent de Paul Society. Family Agencies, members of the Family Service Association of America, in other communities were consulted for collateral information, and employers, physicians, lawyers, clergymen, schools, and relatives were seen as adjuncts in helping the ex-convict make a better environmental adjustment or in assisting the caseworker to a better understanding of the client. In 19 of the 92 cases, the caseworker made some sort of contact with the parole officer. These contacts, however, were usually not of a continuing nature, nor was there much contact maintained on the parole officer's initiative. It seemed that once the case was in the Agency's hands, the details of parole requirements were largely put in the background. In only a few cases did the caseworker actually discuss parole limitations with the client. In one situation the Agency assumed parole sponsorship for the client and sent in his reports to the parole officer.

Psychiatric study was completed on 8 of the 92 cases and begun in three. In a few other cases, psychiatric reports were secured from other agencies or institutions. In the cases of incomplete workup the client either left town or was unwilling to continue going to the hospital or Mental Hygiene Clinic. Direct vocational service was noted in only seven cases, where use was made of special interviewers at Kentucky State Employment Service, of teachers in trade schools, and the State Vocational Rehabilitation Department. Direct recreational service was offered in three or four cases, with the giving of "Y" memberships and encouragement to the ex-convict to take part in settlement house activities. In no case, however, was there continuous follow-up and real service in consulting with recreational workers in the client's behalf.

It was found that 18 of the 92 ex-convicts received the Ex-Convict Fund for two separate periods of contact, and one received the Fund three separate times. In the last instance the client had had no intervening prison terms. In most of the former group of 18 cases, the case became recurrent a few months after the ending of the first contact and could almost be interpreted as a continuation of it. A large proportion of the ex-con-

vict cases were known to the Agency at different periods during which they were not classified as "ex-convict" cases, and were given relief only from the general fund. Table 12, below, shows the number of these Agency contacts had by the ex-convict. For purposes of differentiation, they are labeled "other contacts".

TABLE 12

NUMBER OF OTHER FAMILY SERVICE ORGANIZATION
CONTACTS BY EX-CONVICTS STUDIED

No. of other F.S.O. Contacts	Number of Ex-Convicts
0	28
1	10
2	13
3	10
4	10
5	2
6	10
7	3
8	
9	1
10	4
11	1
Total	92

Thus we see that 28 ex-convicts had no other contact with the Agency beside period or periods of assistance with the Lotta Fund; 10 had one other contact; 13 had 2 other contacts, etc. "Other contacts" were often inquiries from other agencies about the case, other short-term services ending at the application desk, or sustained contacts over a period of months. Short-term contacts were by far the more numerous.

Some total picture of the ex-convict--his origin, background, physical and mental condition, penal record, etc.--has emerged from statistical and social data in the case-record. How he comes to the Agency, and what community resources were used in his behalf, have been noted. Now the focus will be turned on the actual administration of the Lotta Fund, the use to which the money was put, the amounts given, and for what periods of time.

CHAPTER IV

USE OF FUND FOR RELIEF AND SERVICE

The chapter title conveys the interlinking aspects of "relief" and "service" in all financial assistance, from the caseworker's point of view. Even in situations where the client has not articulated a desire for "service" per se, it is believed that the appropriateness of the relief given, the timing of its giving, the approach used by the caseworker, and the form in which it is given are all aspects of the giving process, full of treatment possibilities for the client and caseworker. Within the limits of the present study it is impossible to evaluate the less tangible areas of casework treatment in these 92 ex-convict cases--i.e., the establishment of relationship between client and caseworker, the degree of direct treatment of his basic difficulty through casework interviews, etc. Perhaps, however, as the picture of the use of the Ex-Convict Fund emerges, certain treatment skills may stand out, or may be found lacking, as these skills are related to the giving process. Also, it may become more evident how relief giving to a specialized

group of individuals either is similar to, or different from, financial assistance to undifferentiated clients.

In the beginning period of 1931-1932, it was seen, as discussed in Chapter I, how the Ex-Convict Fund was usually used as a supplement or extension of the general fund. This handling arose out of necessity, produced by pressure of relief demands, and limitations of the Agency's budget. As the general relief situation in the community improved, it was seen that gradually the Ex-Convict Fund was the only source of financial assistance to ex-convicts, with exceptions made on a planned, casework basis. This background must be kept in mind in interpreting the tables which appear below.

It is seen from table 1, page 21, that a total of \$6970.05 has been spent from the Lotta Fund from 1931-1946. How has the Fund been utilized? For what items of relief has it chiefly been employed? Do the total expenditures per ex-convict client indicate short-term relief plans or a continued plan of assistance? The extent of the relief plan actually is a more accurate index of the type of contact--continued or brief-- than the dates of beginning and ending Agency contact. These latter dates may mean that the family was known to the Agency for some time before the focus was put on

the ex-convict, or activity may have extended after the ex-convict left the family, and casework was continued with the rest of the family.

From Agency bookkeeping records, the total expenditure from the Lotta Fund for each of the 92 ex-convicts was given. From this list of relief totals, the following table was drawn up to give a picture of the amounts of financial assistance given.

TABLE 13

TOTAL AMOUNTS OF LOTTA FUND
USED FROM 1932-1946

Range of Relief Totals	Number of Ex-Convicts
\$1 - \$9	9
\$10 - \$24	20
\$25 - \$49	23
\$50 - \$99	17
\$100 - \$199	14
\$200 - \$399	8
\$400 - \$595	1
Total	92

It is evident from the above relief figures that the majority of the ex-convict clients received less than \$200 total relief per family, with only 8 receiving between \$200 - \$300, and one client receiving a total of

\$523.71. This client was assisted from 12/15/30 to 11/10/32, although the Agency's general fund was used after June, 1932, when the Lotta Fund was overdrawn. Over half the 92 families received less than \$50 total relief from the Fund.

From the 92 cases read, information was checked as to the relief category in which the assistance from the Lotta Fund to the client fell. The Agency is considering eliminating the category "supplementary", as it is a relative term and often misleading. One client may receive more "supplementary" assistance than another who receives "maintenance". In the years of worst economic deprivation, a "maintenance" plan may have meant a \$2.50 weekly food order and \$10 monthly rent check, with no coverage of other necessities. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, only the category "maintenance items" is being considered, regardless of whether at the time of contact the caseworker considered the relief as supplementary or as meeting most of the maintenance needs. Considered as maintenance items are: food, rent, clothing, utilities, fuel, etc. Whenever these items were given on a planned basis, over a period of at least two or three weeks, the category "maintenance items" was checked. If one or more of these items or any other item

was given as an emergency measure for one occasion and recognized as such by client and caseworker, the category "emergency relief" was checked. "Special items" would be items given outside the general maintenance plan, and having a purposive intention--i.e., tools for a specific job, a "Y" membership, a suit of clothes when not given in connection with a maintenance plan, etc. The information on the above relief categories was checked and reviewed, and from the checkings it was seen that 81 ex-convicts out of 92 were assisted with maintenance items from the Lotta Fund. The individual plans varied from that of supplementing other income with one or two maintenance items--especially during the early period when income consisted of relief from the general fund, or inadequate wages of some member of the family--to a coverage of all of the maintenance items with the Lotta Fund. In the latter cases, the relief plan was generally one of short duration--lasting only a few weeks or, at most, a few months. In 24 of the 92 cases, the ex-convict was assisted with special items, apart from the general relief plan, or during a recurrent contact. Such items included: funds for transportation to place of legal residence; special Christmas gifts; funds for plowing cost and for seeds; replacements in dishes, utensils, bedding, etc;

moving expenses in order to locate in a more desirable neighborhood; money for a driver's license, part of a cab uniform, etc; union dues; Y.M.C.A. membership; money for glasses or dental work; funds for carpenter's tools, drawing supplies, for part of cost of repair of artificial leg, and similar needs. In one instance, the Lotta Fund was used to purchase clothing to send to the ex-convict after he had already arrived at his place of legal residence. In six cases the relief plan was entirely one of assistance with special items for specific use, and was a matter of one or two occasions of relief-giving. Three ex-convicts were given emergency assistance at application desk in situations that were apparent from the beginning as being of short duration-- for example, the situation of the man who had a definite job to which to report, and needed emergency assistance one time for food until he could draw a pay. In seven of the 92 cases, the Lotta Fund was used to make wage-relief payments on the Agency's made-work program, which lasted only a short while in the early thirties. In one of these instances, the payments were actually to the ex-convict's son, but the caseworker reasoned that his employment would benefit the whole family situation and make a more agreeable home life for the ex-convict. In two cases, part of the money

given was on a loan basis, and in one case there was partial repayment.

Did the caseworkers generally seem to trust the ex-convicts with cash relief? Table 14, page 95, shows at a glance how the relief was handled - whether by cash, requisition, or combination of methods, and whether it was given, for the most part, directly to the ex-convict, to his wife, or handled as was the casework, with the family as a unit. Often the check was mailed to the family, or requisition given to whomever came to the office. Sometimes the caseworker made a special point of giving the cash to the ex-convict himself, as in the case where the caseworker decided to give the money to the ex-convict "so he might carry it himself". (This same client later absconded with a large sum of money from an individual, outside the Agency.) Giving cash to other members of the family beside the ex-convict, however, did not preclude casualties to the grant, as in the case of the caseworker's giving the husband and wife together a sum of \$20 for furniture. The wife reported a short time later that her husband, a prior deserter, had left again with the money and without having purchased any furniture.

TABLE 14

CHIEF FORMS OF RELIEF FROM LOTTA FUND AND CHIEF
RECIPIENTS OF FUND IN 92
EX-CONVICT CASES

Total No. Ex-Convicts	Chief form of Relief			Chief Relief Recipient		
	Cash	Requisi- tion*	Combi- nation	Ex-Con- vict	Family as unit	Spouse
92	49	28	15	65	22	5

*Category includes relief check mailed to landlord, or relief not given as cash or check directly to family.

It is suggested that the above table be compared to table 10, page 81, as certain differences are apparent between the chief focus of treatment and selection of person or persons to handle relief funds. Although table 10 shows that the caseworker directed her contact, in 30 of the 92 cases, to the ex-convict himself, when it came to relief handling, she gave the money directly to the ex-convict in seven more cases than cited in table 10, column 1, and in 8 less than in column 3 of the same table. This may indicate a tendency to feel that the Lotta Fund, designated for the ex-convict, should, whenever possible, be given directly to him. It must be remembered that in giving relief to the "family",

often it was given to the ex-convict himself, although not as a regular plan. Relief, however, was given in 5 cases to the wife of the ex-convict, while treatment was directed to the wife in 4 cases. The five cases in which the wife was the recipient present some variation of motives in such selection. For example, one case represented a long prior contact with the wife, and the entire treatment and relief plan was continued with her rather than with the ex-convict, whom he had just married. In another case, the ex-convict seemingly purposely evaded contact and made it difficult for the caseworker to reach him. In two cases, the ex-convict was a deserter, and relief was continued with his wife - although later thinking discarded use of the Lotta Fund whenever the ex-convict himself was out of the family setting. In another case, the Lotta Fund was used as a supplement to the wife's earnings as a domestic, and since she handled family finances, the relief plan was made with her.

It is seen, also, that cash-relief was generally used in over half the 92 cases, that a combination of cash relief, relief by requisition, and relief in kind (i.e., coal or milk) was given in 15 of the 92 cases. In 28 cases, the ex-convict or his family experienced very few occasions of handling cash relief. In these 28 cases,

relief was given in the form of a voucher, exchangeable at specified groceries for food, clothing, etc. or checks were mailed to landlords, utility companies, rather than the payment given in cash to the family.

The relief plan with regard to the ex-convict cases seemed to have more relation to general practice in the Agency at the time, rather than to specific needs of the ex-convict. In other words, the giving of relief by requisition was almost entirely present during the early thirties, when cash relief to all clients was still the exception to the rule. As the Agency more and more adopted cash relief, assistance to the ex-convicts almost uniformly fit into this plan also. There are some indications, though, that the caseworker gave serious thought to the form of relief best adapted to the needs of the ex-convict. In 1936 the comment was made on a case that the Executive Secretary suggested that "no lump sum be given" the client unless "under close supervision". Later, if the client proved he could "stand on his own", more money could be given him. In another case, the supervisor suggested to the worker that a meal ticket be given to the client instead of cash relief, as the client was addicted to alcohol. When the meal ticket was offered the client, he became angry and refused assistance.

In surveying the entire period of the use of the Lotta Fund, one sees flexible adaptations in relief giving from year to year. Partly, these variations are accountable to changing philosophy of casework and relief-giving and are a healthy growth process. Partly, they seem due to lack of cohesion in bringing together the total thinking about meeting the needs of the specialized group of clients, known as "ex-convicts". It has already been mentioned that in one instance, the decision was made that relief for the requested item could be met only by the Lotta Fund, because of the questionable nature of the request; in a similar situation, it was decided that the relief should instead come from the general fund.

In the early period of 1931-1932, the Lotta Fund was a welcome substitute for dwindling relief funds, and interpretation of its function and origin was seldom given the client. A period of experimentation and "trial and error" use of the Fund followed, as the acuteness of the general relief need subsided. In one case the caseworker considered giving money from the Lotta Fund as an allowance to the daughter of the ex-convict, in order to ease family tension. The Fund, again, was used in limited amounts of \$25 to meet specialized needs in several more families of ex-convicts already being assisted

by the Agency. One sees the term "exploratory period" used more frequently, and cases otherwise refused assistance, were taken "on trial" by using the Lotta Fund. Casualties occurred more frequently--in a few instances, the client disappeared with cash given in an early contact, or gave misleading information to the caseworker as to his income, job arrangements, etc. The caseworker grew in alertness to "psychopathic" tendencies in individual clients. Interpretation of the source and function of the Lotta Fund was generally given the recipients.

As the development of the use of the Fund advanced to recent years, a certain self-confidence in the handling of the Fund emerged, as well as a great deal more articulated questioning about the pros and cons of its use. If the client was not "hopeful", the caseworker was, on the other hand, better able to predict possible disappointing results. More definite time limits, of "not longer than a month to evaluate" potentialities for rehabilitation, are evident in the case records. Also, there is recognition that, with extremely unstable individuals or individuals having lived through very trying experiences, the Family Agency may have a right, within its function, to meet emergency needs without expectation of recognized rehabilitation--at least with a limited

number of clients. Hence, relief from the Lotta Fund is occasionally given, accompanied by the caseworker's thinking in granting relief in this way.

The total relief amounts per ex-convict family are, as has been seen, relatively low in comparison to other relief cases, where often the same amount is given monthly and on a much more prolonged basis. As has been discussed in Chapter III, a little more than half the total number of ex-convicts assisted from 1932-1946 were given relief within a period of a few months from dates of release, with still 30 of the total number's being accepted for assistance after more than a year's freedom. Comments in a few records indicate that caseworkers and supervisors are doing much more thinking as to whether more definite criteria should be established regarding recency of the prisoner's release in relation to acceptance for assistance from the Lotta Fund. Also, questions have been raised as to the client's eligibility for assistance from the Fund when a recurrent application for help has been made, with no intervening prison record.

A few additional comments should be made about some of the caseworkers' sincere efforts to make the environmental situation easier for the ex-convicts, even though objective end results cannot be measured within

the limits of this study. Noted were several illustrations of providing better living quarters for the ex-convict and his family; of trying to help the client restore his citizenship rights; of securing "adopted parents" for an unattached young man; of helping the client establish a work record by cooperation with a sheltered workshop, where the client could build up a work recommendation; of getting helpful information from other agencies regarding the client's mental, physical and social background, of giving marital counseling to ease readjustment strains, etc. Some of the results have been discouraging; many can probably never be measured. A follow-up study on selected cases may be an outgrowth of this study, and point up the depth of the work done with the ex-convict group.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In recapitulating some of the findings of the present study of 92 ex-convicts assisted by the Lotta Fund at the Family Service Organization from 1932-1946 several facts stand out. First, until the present study was made, there has been no drawing together of the total Agency's experience in dealing with the ex-convict group and in setting up guides to establish eligibility of clients for the Lotta Fund. In relation to the total Agency's service and relief program, the ex-convict group represents but a small minority of the total Agency caseload, and it is not unusual to expect attitudes of confusion, lack of practical knowledge about conviction, imprisonment and release procedures, and a lack of sharpness in defining eligibility requirements. At the same time, the lack of focus on this group has a healthy aspect in that, rightfully, the ex-convict is not put into too rigid a category. After all, actual treatment should be directed to the client as a person, and not as a different species of human being, categorized as "ex-convict". Involuntarily, the tag may persist and become a stigma even in the minds of trained caseworkers, if too much

emphasis is put on the social status of these clients. On the other hand, the Agency has the administration of a limited income for the benefit of those persons recently discharged from prisons, and limitations in eligibility requirements and in some aspects of treatment need defining in order to narrow the number of recipients.

The clause 9 of Lotta Crabtree's will does not give too many guides in interpreting the function of the Fund, in specific terms. It would appear that assistance is recommended for recently discharged men and women convicts, as the statement implies in the will: Those "who find themselves after their release in any almost helpless condition in which to begin the world anew." Although it is extremely difficult to set up arbitrary time limits between date of release and date of seeking help, it would seem that a gap of not longer than one year would indicate something of the client's capacity to adjust, would give clues as to the difficulties he faces in readjustment to society, and still would be a period within reasonable distance from date of release. Since the will does specify the service to be rendered in helping the client find employment, the ripest period for doing this, for finding sympathetic assistance from employer groups, etc. would appear to be during the period

closely following the client's release. A year's period of time also would give seasonal workers four seasons in which to find work opportunities suitable to their respective skills. Of course, flexibility in evaluating periods beyond a year from date of release as making a client eligible for help from the Lotta Fund would be needed. Old prison records of the client certainly influence the caseworker's approach and treatment in all cases, but would not make him thus eligible for assistance from the Lotta Fund. The function of the Lotta Fund, because of its limited amount, would more likely be assistance for those clients still "in shock" from recent imprisonment. In evaluating a client's acceptance for help from the Lotta Fund it would seem logical, therefore, to consider the client's problem of adjusting to his family and the community, after incarceration, as the precipitating factor in his coming to the Agency, rather than incidental to other problems.

Available material from other agencies indicates that the Lotta Fund is chiefly used for short periods of time, to ease the first shock of leaving prison life, and that when prolonged needs are presented, referrals are made to appropriate agencies in the community equipped to handle long-time dependency. The Family Service Organi-

zation has also demonstrated this belief in its practice, and definite recommendations either to continue the relief plan from the general fund or to refer the case to a public agency in the community have appeared in cases where the need extends beyond a few months. The majority of relief totals per ex-convict family fall in a range from \$1.00 to \$50.00. It would seem wise, therefore, to consider reasonable time limits to use of the Lotta Fund, within a range of 2-3 months, with definite case evaluation and recommendations at the end of that period, either to make a new relief plan with funds drawn from the Agency's general fund, or to transfer the case to another community Agency.

What is an ex-convict? As an individual he or she is no different from any person who is a victim of poor environment, lack of childhood security, or other unfavorable developmental influences. His lack of adjustment happens to be manifested by aggressive acts against society. Further, the acts he has committed not only fall into categories of punishable crime, but he also happens to have been apprehended, whether by accident or unconscious wish on his part. Another individual may carry on destructive dealings under the cover of "good business" and escape legal punishment. In a

narrow sense, however, some defining of an "ex-convict" is necessary further to establish his eligibility for a special fund. Should not the question of whether he is an ex-convict after he has been released from prison, reformatory, or penitentiary or whether he can be so considered after only jail or workhouse sentences be settled? Early in the history of the use of the Lotta Fund at Family Service Organization, the statement was made that only individuals having had prison, penitentiary or reformatory sentences were eligible for the Ex-Convict Fund; later, this requirement was apparently changed or overlooked, as three of the 92 ex-convicts assisted had had only jail and workhouse sentences. By dictionary definition, a convict is "one found guilty of crime", and "crime" is defined as "any grave offense". Again, the caseworker may seem to be thrown into having to use subjective interpretation of the relative seriousness of the offense committed. Because practice in other agencies using the Lotta Fund has been, by virtue of the very function of these agencies, to assist those discharged from prisons, and since the limited amount of the Fund requires selectivity in choice of eligible clients, it would appear that the Agency's original limitation of aid

to those discharged only from prisons should be reinforced. The existence of jail or workhouse sentences appears all too common an experience of many clients of a social agency, and the problem of selectivity would be greatly complicated if all were considered potentially eligible for such a small source of assistance as the Lotta Fund. Finally, there are the actual words in Lotta Crabtree's will, that assistance should go to "both men and women, who suffered punishment therefor in our state prisons and reformatories". One wonders if the limitation "state prisons" needs further refinement; however, practice in other agencies who sent material indicates that both state and federal prisons were settings for imprisonment of men and women assisted.

What special skills should the caseworker have who deals with an ex-convict? Can the service fit into the function of a private family agency? It seems that a private family agency is in an excellent position to give service to such a group of individuals. Its emphasis on understanding motivations of behavior, its non-judgmental attitude, its tendency not to categorize individuals, and its employment of psychiatric consultation, all seem to provide the ideal setting for casework with those individuals who have had damaging experiences. There is

evidence that more emphasis needs to be put on acquiring a better acquaintance, on the part of the caseworker, with practical knowledge about the client's conviction, his prison life and attitudes toward it, the method of his release, the requirements of his release, the category of his crime. Since the majority of the 92 ex-convicts were convicted of "Crimes Against Property", does not the caseworker need to evaluate carefully these clients' attitudes toward money, toward taking assistance, and to consider the best method and form of assistance? It seems that deeper exploration into the clients' attitudes toward money and possessions might lead to more definite evaluation and recommendations regarding the method and form of relief to be given. Should he be given only small sums of money at a time? Should only requisitions be given to certain clients? These questions can be answered individually after the total picture of his offense, its motivation, and its punishment can be studied more deeply.

As the caliber of casework skills increases in the Agency, whenever possible, consultation service should be used on a group of ex-convict cases, as teaching material for the entire staff. In this way a proper perspective on the problems of the ex-convict can be gained,

much as study of the unmarried mother points up many common problems seen in this group of clients. Also, whenever possible, the advisability of selecting a man caseworker for certain ex-convict clients should be considered, for reasons previously mentioned in Chapter I.

Should there be residence requirements for assistance with the Lotta Fund? At a time when considerable thinking is being done about the inadvisability of adhering too closely to settlement requirements, it seems that the Agency's practice in limiting the Lotta Fund to those living in Louisville, not necessarily legal residents, is wise for such a limited group of clients. So far, the majority of the ex-convicts already assisted have definite residence, or ties, to Louisville or Kentucky. If the trend goes more rapidly into increased application by transients or "drifters", more limiting requirements may be needed. Verification of imprisonment and prison evaluation of the ex-convict's record would seem much more useful criteria for acceptance than the fact of legal residence. Such verifications would appear to be necessary parts of the application process. If an agency exists in the location of the ex-convict's legal residence, and there seems no particular reason for his remaining in this community, it would seem that

the Ex-Convict Fund could be used for transportation to his legal community, after assistance there has been arranged for.

It seems obvious that for clearer focus on mutually defined goals and for better client-worker participation, definite interpretation of the Lotta Fund, and its object, should be given the ex-convict client.

What about the matter of the client's "hopefulness" in accepting casework help as a criterion for assistance from the Lotta Fund? Much weight is thrown to evaluation of a client's ability to take help in considering applications of undifferentiated clients. Yet there seems to be validity in thinking that a small group of cases may always be taken on by a private family agency, even where much change within the individual is questioned. There are individuals in every community who recurrently need small "lifts", who may never progress to much greater stability, and who fall "between agencies" in being eligible for assistance. The Family Service Organization has at times filled community gaps in resources for such individuals. Could not the small number of ex-convicts coming to the Agency be considered a justifiable clientele for legitimate exercise of this function--a function resting on the premise that brief,

non-judgemental, warm contacts even without too much hope of rehabilitation gives to the individual one experience that differs from the reception he usually meets from the outside world? Caseworkers have been surprised at the evident treatment values of such contacts, as brought out in recurrent applications and by articulate expressions of the workers' helpfulness. Wise limitations in evaluating employment records, in verifications of jobs and income, as well as alertness to the client's need to make himself appealing to the worker, of course need to be utilized. Perhaps a follow-up study might be profitably made of the eventual adjustment of these individuals who are briefly seen and aided.

In conclusion it would be helpful for the Agency to set down again in a definite written statement, the criteria for assisting ex-convicts from the Lotta Fund. Such a statement would include a requirement to verify the imprisonment and to secure from the prison or from a reliable agency as much information as possible about the offense, the length of imprisonment, the terms of release, the prisoner's adjustment and about the prisoner's social situation. Pending receipt of this information, emergency assistance may need to be given. The statement would include recommendations as to the lapse of time be-

tween release and application to the Agency to consider in acceptance of the case as well as the requirement that the term be one served in prison or reformatory. The decision that there should be no residence requirements except that the ex-convict be residing in Louisville at the time of contact should be set down. Time limits for assistance would be suggested, with evaluation of the client and treatment at the end of the period. The Agency already requires monthly reports on each case, as has been discussed, and this practice is extremely helpful.

A follow-up study of a smaller range of cases of ex-convicts assisted by the Lotta Fund would be very valuable from the point of view of casework evaluation of methods of establishing relationship with the client, of developing treatment through individual interviews, and of results of treatment as observed in the client's ability to take hold of his problem and move toward some adjustment. Specialized treatment skills might thus be stimulated and predictability of results expected from assistance to this group might be sharpened. Such information would be of great value at a time when there is much shifting in thinking as to the best ways to eval-

uate criminal behavior and to treat it. The service to a specialized group of clients, known as "ex-convicts", once regarded as a kind of appendage to the total function of the Agency, may thus be on its way to become less frustrating, and richer in opportunities for casework, once it is viewed with more realism and acceptance. In this way it will also fulfill the spirit as well as the legal requirements of the benefactor, Lotta Crabtree.

APPENDIX

SCHEDULE USED IN ANALYSIS OF
CASE RECORDS

I Identifying Information

Name _____ Case No. _____ Race _____ Sex _____

Age _____ Religion _____ Birthplace _____

No. of Children _____ Residence _____

II Family Status of Ex-Convict

III Social Service Ex-
change Clearings

- A. Married Couple _____
- B. Common-law Couple _____
- C. Unmarried Couple _____
- D. Single _____
- E. Divorced _____
- F. Separated _____
- G. Widowed _____
- H. Unknown _____

IV Education and Training of Ex-Convict

- A. Elementary _____
- B. High School _____
- C. College _____
- D. Other formal training _____
- E. Education unknown _____
- F. Trade or special skill acquired through experience _____
- G. Unskilled worker _____

V Habitual Living Arrangements

- A. Residence chiefly in hotels _____
- B. Residence chiefly in rooming houses _____
- C. Residence chiefly in house or apartment _____
- D. Set-up: Alone _____ With family _____
With friends _____ Unknown _____

VI Mental and Physical Status of Ex-Convict

- A. Diagnosed Mental Illness _____

B. Diagnosed Physical Illness or Handicap _____

VII Penal Record

A.	Prison Offenses	Length & dates of prison stay	Name of Institution	Terms of Release
----	-----------------	----------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.

B. Other Offenses

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.

C. Has incarceration been officially verified? _____
 How? _____

D. Does case-record contain adequate information from
 penal institution? _____ Diagnosis or prison
 evaluation of convict adjustment _____
 Prison estimate of potentiality for rehabilitation _____

VIII Employment Record

A. Regular Employment

Place of Employment	Types	Dates	Wages	Reason for Discharge
------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------------------------

B. Casual Employment

C. Employment record unknown or too incomplete to be valid_____

IX Mechanics of FSO "Ex-Convict" Contact

- A. Sources of intake:
1. Personal application_____
 2. Individual application_____
 3. Client referred by Other Agency_____
- Name_____
- B. Nature of Request by client or referral source_____
- C. Dates of contacts as "Ex-Convict Fund" case_____
- D. Number of all other FSO contacts_____
- E. Contact chiefly with Ex-Convict_____
- With spouse_____ With relative_____
- As a family unit_____

X Administration by FSO of "Ex-Convict Fund"

- A. Principal use of funds:
1. To cover maintenance items_____
 2. To cover special need or needs_____
 - Items_____
 3. To cover wage-relief payments_____
 4. To cover emergency needs for short contact_____
 - Items_____
 5. As a loan_____
- B. Relief negotiations chiefly with Ex-Convict directly_____ With Spouse_____
- Relative_____
- C. Form of relief: Chiefly cash_____
- Requisition_____ In kind_____
- D. Amount of Ex-Convict Fund used_____

XI Use of Community Resources for Ex-Convict during FSO Contacts

- A. Psychiatric consultation_____
- Agency_____
- B. Vocational consultation_____
- Agency_____
- C. Recreational facilities_____
- Agency_____
- D. Consultation with parole or probation officer_____
- E. Other Agencies or individuals_____

XII Comments:

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Rourke, Constance. Troupers of the Gold Coast or the Rise of Lotta Crabtree. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1928.
- Cantor, Nathaniel F. Crime and Society. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1939.
- Sutherland, Edwin H. Principles of Criminology. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1939.
- Attorney General's Survey of Release Procedures. Prisons. Vol. V. Leavenworth, Kansas: Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Press, 1940.
- State of New York, Legislative Document (1946) No. 29. The One Hundred and First Annual Report of the Prison Association of New York. Albany: Williams Press, Inc., 1946.
- Schmideberg, Melitta. "Can Criminals Be Analyzed?" Journal of Social Casework, V. XXVIII, No. 3. March, 1947.
- Prinz, Marian. "A Study of the Family Service Organization, Louisville, Ky. in Reference to Intake 1884-1940." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Louisville, 1941.
- Ellis, Bernice. "The History of the Family Service Organization, 1884-1939." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Louisville, 1941.