

1966

Editors' Page

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nlr>

Recommended Citation

, *Editors' Page*, 45 Neb. L. Rev. 495 (1966)

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nlr/vol45/iss3/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Law, College of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Nebraska Law Review by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

EDITORS' PAGE

Part I of the symposium, "The Tasks of Penology", was intended to provide the reader with a general background in the theories and aims of our modern correctional system. These concepts have been constantly changing throughout the history of penology. Revenge as a "task of penology" is now in ill repute. As Sanford Bates, former director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons wrote: "Our communities are entitled to protection. They are not entitled to vengeance." The effect of punishment as a deterrent is now vigorously disputed in some quarters. If there is one "task" upon which there is mutual agreement, it would be rehabilitation. As Professor Mueller states in his article in Part I: "I know of no American criminologist or lawyer who does not subscribe to resocialization or rehabilitation as a foremost aim of our correctional approach."

Although the tendency is toward the rehabilitation of the confined, there is no universal solvent for the aid of the criminally handicapped. The question still remains: How do you rehabilitate? There has been a growing realization that modifications have to be made in the traditional penitentiary system to accomplish this goal. It has also been recognized that aspects of the administration of criminal justice other than the period of confinement relate to the problem. The background of the offender, the experience of his trial, his sentence, his treatment and activity in prison, and his reception by the community upon release, all have an impact on his ultimate rehabilitation.

The remaining two parts of the symposium will deal, for the most part, with specific proposals and procedures to accomplish the "tasks" ahead. With the space remaining we can only hope to barely scratch the surface.

In this issue Judges Theodore Levin and Luther Youngdahl analyze recent innovations in sentencing techniques. Mitchell Wendell, an active participant and counsel for the Council of State Governments explores the potentials of interstate cooperation in correctional activities. Delyte Morris, President of Southern Illinois University relates the experience of that institution in its attempt to bring higher education into the prison system.

We are pleased with the response to Part I and hope that these next two issues will provide some further discussion and, perhaps, incentive for future action.

THE EDITORS



Thank you for the opportunity of working with you over the last 100 years. We are looking forward to a similar gratifying association for many more years.

THE **Omaha** 
National *BANK*

(Please mention NEE. LAW REV. when dealing with our advertisers.)