NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

From Priest to Prisoner: Examining the Contribution of Pioneers in the Chicago Reentry Landscape from the 1950s to the 1970s

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Sociology

By

Karlia Nicole Brown

EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

September 2023

Abstract

Prisoner reentry has become an increasingly popular topic of research in the past few decades due to the phenomenon of mass return as a result of the era of mass incarceration. While research has been done on the experiences of the returning population before mass incarceration, few contemporary researchers have gone back to examine the decades predating mass incarceration through the lens of the returning citizen and the supports available to them. To address this gap, I conducted a historical analysis of formal reentry efforts in the U.S. dating back to their inception in the mid-1950s. I found that before the 1950s, there were very few formal public or private efforts in place to support individuals returning to society from incarceration. The formalization of reentry efforts began in the 1950s, continuing into the 1970s, and can be attributed to three distinct entities which shaped the landscape of reentry in unique ways. These entities included (1) religious leaders and the larger institutions of which they were a part, (2) antipoverty initiatives created during the War on Poverty and the public-private partnerships which they created, and (3) self-made reentry programs which were founded and run by returning citizens for returning citizens. I argue that these reentry pioneers had a tangible influence on the provision of reentry services from the 1950s–1970s and likely influenced the trajectory of support efforts in the years that followed. Recognizing the role of reentry pioneers allows us to better understand and analyze present-day reentry efforts while providing us with insight into how key historical events impacted one the most vulnerable populations of the 1950s-1970s.

Acknowledgments

I am endlessly grateful to my friends, family, colleagues, and mentors without whom this dissertation would not have been possible. First, I would like to thank my parents, Kenneth and Carlissa, for fostering my love of books and my dedication to learning from an early age. You have never doubted my ability or my perseverance, and it is only because of your faith in me that I had the confidence to pursue such a massive undertaking. To my big sister, Kensli – thank you for having faith in me and my ability to do anything I set my mind to while keeping me grounded with some light bullying. And to my baby brother Kenneth II – thank you for supporting me in my endeavors no matter where you are! I love you all dearly. To my extended family – thank you for showering me with love, gifts, and chai lattes. Thank you for being amazing role models and paving the way for me.

Next, I want to thank my mentor and dissertation chair, Dr. Andy Papachristos. Thank you for believing in my abilities and giving me the chance to learn and grow with the Center for Neighborhood Engaged Research & Science (CORNERS) lab – it has shaped my research, my career, and my relationship with the city of Chicago in ways I cannot even express. Thank you for having confidence in me and for providing me with all that I needed to write a dissertation of which I can be proud. You're honestly the best.

To my committee member and mentor Mary Pattillo – thank you for offering your time, resources, and support throughout my graduate career. You are truly a legend in the field, and I have appreciated every bit of guidance, advice, and feedback you have given me. And to my committee member Tony Chen – every single conversation I had with you was so thought-provoking and so helpful. Thank you for taking the time to share your expertise and for playing a

crucial role during the process of transforming my general topic into an actual historical sociology dissertation! I am so very lucky to have such a brilliant and kind committee.

I cannot stress enough that this dissertation quite literally would have never been written were it not for the help and patience of archivists at the *Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscript Collections*, the *Chicago Public Library Special Collections*, the *Chicago Public Library Vivian G. Harsh Research Collection of Afro-American History & Literature*, and the *DePaul University Special Collections & Archives*. And I want to give an extra special thanks to Newland Smith of the *Richard R. Seidel Archives of the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago* who showed immense kindness when walking through my first ever archives visit and the many visits that followed. Your accessibility and your patience made me feel at home!

This achievement would not have been possible without the support system offered by my friends and peers. Thank you to my twin soul and lifelong friend, Dr. Ashley J. Hartwell, who was a constant source of laughter and support even while getting her own Ph.D.! Your brilliance is inspiring, and I feel lucky to have gone through this wild experience alongside someone I love! To my best friend Bianca, thank you for making me stop and take time for my health and wellbeing. I am so very lucky to have you in my life, today and always. To the first people I reach out to when I'm having a meltdown – Kelly and Lauren – thank you both for talking me off of every ledge. You are my rocks, don't ever change! And to my friends Courtney, Jessica, Zoya, and many more – thank you for talking through ideas with me, listening to me vent, funding my coffee shop visits, and reminding me that I am more than my dissertation.

To my colleagues-turned-friends – I would not have wanted to do this thing with anyone but you! To Wayne – thank you for being persistent and not letting my general demeanor scare

you off from trying to make friends! To Dominique – thank you for all of the support, friendship, and guidance you have offered me over the years. You are what a friend-peer-mentor looks like and you have offered me more help and guidance than you know! To my wonderful friend, Sonia – thank you for the laughs, for our short-lived Wine Thursdays, and for getting me out of the house and onto campus on occasion. I am not sure why such a friendly person would hang out with cranky ol' me, but I can't imagine graduate school without you! And to my beautiful, high-achieving, kindhearted cohort mates – Oscar, Yannick, Devin, Nick, Qi, Emilio, and Mirna – every single one of you has inspired me to work harder and reach higher throughout our time at Northwestern. I would not have wanted to do this thing with anyone but y'all!

Many thanks go to the Department of Sociology for supporting me along this journey and funding my research! And an extra huge thank you to the department staff members – past and present – whose helpfulness is only matched by their patience. Additionally, there are a number of professors, mentors, and beings of pure light who I encountered throughout my undergraduate and graduate careers who had an enormous influence on my confidence in my abilities. Without the support of Dr. Laura Carpenter, Melinda Allen, Dr. Dawna Leggett, and Andreina Phelan, I do not believe I would have become the researcher I am today. Thank you.

It's important to note that at least 50% of this dissertation was written at my local Starbucks so I must thank my baristas profusely for letting me hunker down for hours at a time, playing awesome music, and keeping the matcha & chai lattes coming. This one's for you!

A quick shout out to Chicago Cubs fans for stealing my parking spots, causing tons of traffic, and generally raising my stress levels before big deadlines – every major achievement comes with a hurdle that must be jumped and you, Cubs fans, were mine.

And finally, this dissertation was brought to you by Mavis Beacon Typing and the seventh-grade computer class that taught me keyboard shortcuts. I could not have done it without you.

I am dedicating this dissertation to my two amazing grandmothers: Berniece, who is here to see me achieve this goal, and Jean Rita, who supported me through this journey but is no longer with us. Thank you both for building the beautiful and brilliant families of which I am lucky to be a part. Without you, none of this would be possible.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Mass Incarceration, Reentry & the Construction of the Carceral State

Over 1.2 million individuals are under the legal authority of state or federal correctional officials today.[1] This number does not capture the 7 million people admitted to jail each year[2] or the nearly 20 million people who are no longer under legal authority but nonetheless live with a felony record.[3] These high rates of incarceration and punishment in the U.S. are accompanied by a culture of surveillance which can be seen in the 65 million Americans who have been arrested at some point in their lives and the many more who have been stopped, interrogated, searched, and intimidated without experiencing a formal arrest.[4] Given this massive number of citizens who interact with the criminal system in America, it is no wonder that society has been overwhelmed by the number of individuals returning from these interactions in need of support.[5]

Given this sizeable returning population in the United States and the growing number of public and private reentry support efforts, many researchers have dedicated their work to examining the experiences of the returning population population,[6] the barriers they face to reintegration,[7] and what they need to make their reentry successful.[8] Because the phenomenon of mass return as a result of mass incarceration has come about in the past three to four decades, much of the contemporary literature on reentry is confined within the 1990s-present. While research on

---

[1] E. Ann Carson, "Prisoners in 2021 – Statistical Tables," Bureau of Justice Statistics (2022).
[2] Zhen Zeng, "Jail Inmates in 2021 – Statistical Tables," Bureau of Justice Statistics (2022).
[3] Sarah K. S. Shannon, Christopher Uggen, Jason Schnittker, Melissa Thompson, Sara Wakefield, and Michael Massoglia, "The Growth, Scope, and Spatial Distribution of People with Felony Records in the United States, 1948-2010," *Demography* 54, no. 5 (2017).
[4] Christopher Dunn, "Stop-and-Frisk during the Bloomberg Administration (2002–2013)," *New York Civil Liberties Union* (2014)
[5] Reuben Miller, *Halfway Home: Race, Punishment, and the Afterlife of Mass Incarceration* (New York: Hachette Book Group, 2021).
[6] Bruce Western, *Homeward: Life in the Year After Prison* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2018).
[7] Miller, *Halfway Home.*
[8] Christy A. Visher and Jeremy Travis, "Life on the Outside: Returning Home After Incarceration," *The Prison Journal* 91, no. 3 (2011).

the experiences of the returning population before mass incarceration has been conducted, the vast majority of it was written *during* the 1970s-1980s,[9] suggesting that few contemporary historical sociologists have gone back to examine the long sixties specifically through the lens of the returning citizen and the supports available to them. Some researchers have hypothesized about the catalyst behind certain reentry efforts predating the 1990s,[10] and some have identified key actors in the field of reentry prior to mass incarceration.[11] However, little research is specifically focused on the experiences of those returning from incarceration in the decades preceding the massive expansion of the American carceral state, and even less has been dedicated to uncovering the actors and institutions who pioneered early reentry support efforts, why they did so, and how their influence can still be seen in the reentry efforts of today.

To address this gap, I conducted a historical analysis of formal reentry efforts going back to their inception in the mid-1950s and discovered that there were distinct pioneers of reentry from the mid-1950s to mid-1970s who shaped the landscape of reentry in ways that manifest today. I argue that the long sixties[12] were marked by a new awareness of and engagement with the returning citizen population and that the formalization of the reentry efforts that took place as a result can be attributed to three groups of pioneers: religious institutions, creators of federal antipoverty initiatives, and returning citizens themselves. I believe that understanding the institutions that

---

[9] Mitchell W. Dale, "Barriers to the Rehabilitation of Ex-Offenders," *Crime & Delinquency* (1976); Timothy Larkin, "Removing the Ex-Offenders' Catch-22," *Journal of Employment Counseling* (1975); Edward Latessa and Harry Allen, "Halfway Houses and Parole: A National Assessment," *Journal of Criminal Justice* 10 (1982).
[10] Erica Meiners and Sarah Ross, "'And What Happens to You Concerns Us Here': Imaginings for a (New) Prison Arts Movement," in *Art Against the Law*, ed. Rebecca Zorach (Chicago: School of the Art Institute of Chicago, 2014).
[11] Cyrus J. O'Brien, "'A Prison in Your Community': Halfway Houses and the Melding of Treatment and Control," *The Journal of American History* (2021).
[12] I use the term long sixties to describe my time period of interest which is 1954-1974. I elaborate on this definition and the utility of the term later in this chapter.

pioneered reentry efforts in the long sixties is crucial to understanding why reentry programs look the way they do today. Additionally, understanding the context behind certain characteristics of the reentry landscape allows us to better analyze current efforts and tailor them to the needs of returning citizens today, rather than to the perceived needs of returning citizens of the past. Finally, examining the pioneers of reentry from 1954-1974 provides us with insight into how key historical events impacted one the most vulnerable populations of the time.

In this introduction, after a brief discussion of the language that will be used throughout this work, I will give an overview of the wide-reaching surveillance, enforcement, conviction, and incarceration behaviors of the criminal system today. After highlighting the importance of reentry today and thus the crucial role of research on reentry programs and efforts, I will explain my contribution to this literature before giving historical context that will help ground the chapters to follow. Finally, I will provide a roadmap of the remaining chapters.

The Importance of Language

The vast majority of historical documents refer to previously incarcerated individuals as *ex-offenders,*[13] *ex-prisoners,*[14] *ex-convicts,*[15] or other similar labels. According to Bartley, words like *inmate, prisoner, convict,* and *offender* "are like brands…they reduce human beings to their crimes and cages."[16] I believe that using these terms that were once used as tools of subjugation, even if they are preceded with an *ex-*, ultimately serves to dehumanize returning citizens by reducing them to their incarceration and opening the door for ongoing stereotyping and judgment

[13] "Ex-Prisoner Artists Set Exhibition," *Chicago Daily Defender,* Jun. 13, 1970.
[14] "'Looking Toward Freedom' Opens at Artists Guild," *Chicago Daily Defender,* Sep. 30, 1970.
[15] "Latin Halfway House Stymied by Burocrats," *Chicago Tribune,* Jan. 3, 1974.
[16] Lawrence Bartley, "I Am Not Your 'Inmate,'" *The Marshall Project,* April 12, 2021.

based solely on that aspect of their identity.[17] Given this, I will not utilize any *ex-* language to refer to formerly incarcerated individuals unless quoting from a source directly.

Instead, as I discuss the experiences of formerly incarcerated individuals, I will often refer to them as *returning citizens*. I use this term because it recognizes the precarity of their citizenship while still naming it. In light of historic efforts by actors of the criminal system to withhold the status of citizenship from Black, Latinx, poor, and incarcerated populations in an effort to deprive them of "any sense of human dignity" and "keep them in line," I believe it is crucial to recognize the citizenship and humanity of formerly incarcerated individuals even when discussing the barriers that they face.[18] I believe the term *returning citizen* recognizes this citizenship while acknowledging the fact that many previously incarcerated individuals never feel as though they are able to fully reintegrate into society.[19] Turner, for example, suggests that previously incarcerated folks are often unable to sever their attachment to the carceral facility which acts as kind of "homeland" for them, shaping their identities long after they depart.[20] As such, even those who have been released from incarceration in years past may never feel quite like they have returned.

That said, I acknowledge that many who have been out of prison for months or years may no longer see themselves as in the process of returning to society, and may feel that the term returning citizen actually undermines their citizenship.[21] As Ducksworth said of the formerly

---

[17] Jerry Blassingame, "'Ex-Con,' 'Ex-Offender' and 'Ex-Inmate' Are Words That Reduce Millions to Stereotypes," *The Root,* May 1, 2019. https://www.theroot.com/ex-con-ex-offender-and-ex-inmate-are-words-that-1834428065.
[18] "Southern Christian Leadership Conference, A Proposal for the Development of a Nonviolent Movement for the Greater Chicago Area, 1966," in *The Civil Rights Movement: A Documentary Reader*, ed. John A. Kirk (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2020), 189.
[19] Miller, *Halfway Home.*
[20] Jennifer Turner, "Re-'Homing' the Ex-Offender: Constructing a 'Prisoner Dyspora,'" *Area* 45, no. 4 (2013).
[21] Jerry Blassingame, "Words That Reduce Millions to Stereotypes."

incarcerated individual, "when they have demonstrated their ability to be a contributing member of society and the duration of their supervision has ended, should they not be allowed to move beyond the reentry phase?"[22] However, given that I will be speaking of previously incarcerated individuals whose experiences during incarceration and upon their departure from penal facilities are central catalysts for their experiences, including their emergence as leaders in the reentry landscape, I feel it appropriate to refer to them with language that points to this experience.

Nonetheless, I want to acknowledge that this language may not be preferred by members of this population. Additionally, I believe in the importance of using individuals' preferred identity markers whenever is possible and support the argument that allowing returning citizens to decide what they want to be called is an important step to protecting against the dehumanization of these individuals and promoting their agency as citizens.[23] To that end, at any point when I reference firsthand accounts or documents from a previously incarcerated person, I will adopt the language they use to refer to themselves.

I use the term *reentry* to refer to the formal and informal experiences associated with the process of being released from incarceration and returning to society. I am using this term in the tradition of those sociologists who, in the past few decades, have centered their research on understanding and comprehensively depicting the experiences of those being released from incarceration.[24] Some scholars use the term reentry to describe the programs, services, and institutions that are specifically designed to help reintegrate formerly incarcerated individuals into

---

[22] John Ducksworth, "The Prisoner Reentry Industry," *Dialectical Anthropology* 34 (2010): 558.
[23] Blassingame, "Words That Reduce Millions to Stereotypes."
[24] Jeremy Travis and Christy Visher, *Prisoner Reentry and Crime in America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

their communities.[25] For the purposes of this research, however, I am using the term to encompass not only the formal offerings experienced by returning individuals, but the informal experiences they have upon returning as well. Notably, many authors use *prisoner reentry* to refer to this process and thus use reentry as shorthand. While I do not believe it appropriate to characterize a population that has been released from incarceration as prisoners, regardless of the level of supervision they may still face, I occasionally use this term to place my work directly in conversation with these other works.

Other sociology scholars have chosen to use different language for this experience of returning to society from incarceration, including, for example, Miller's *afterlife of mass incarceration* which centers on the supervised society that those being released from incarceration, and their loved ones, often face.[26] While Miller's depiction of the afterlife is fruitful for understanding the ways in which the aftereffects of incarceration impact those far beyond the scope of the individual incarcerated, the richness of this concept stems in large part from its focus on mass incarceration as a cataclysmic starting point.[27] Because my research is concerned with the experiences of those returning to society *before* the onset of mass incarceration as we understand it, I will use the term reentry which I believe has broad applicability and a level of neutrality, making it uniquely apt for historical research.

Finally, I will use the term *criminal system* to refer to the law enforcement, courts, and penal institutions that returning citizens encounter. Erica Bryant at the Vera Institute for Justice argues that "words shape how people think, and our speech should recognize that our system…is

---

[25] Joan Petersillia, *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); Darrell P. Wheeler and George Patterson, "Prisoner Reentry," *Health & Social Work* 33, no. 2 (2008).
[26] Miller, *Halfway Home.*
[27] Ibid.

not just."[28] Given the racial and economic discrimination that characterizes arrests, convictions, sentencing, and incarceration within this system,[29] not to mention the system's mistreatment of those experiencing addiction, housing instability, mental illness and more,[30] I agree that our criminal system cannot be described as just. As such, I will avoid using the term *criminal justice system* unless I am directly quoting another source. Additionally, while researchers have increasingly adopted the term *criminal legal system* to describe the system of policing, courts, and corrections in the United States,[31] I find that such a term is not beneficial in discussions about returning citizens whose most recent and often longest lasting interaction with the criminal system has been with penal institutions and its agents of punishment and surveillance rather than with courts or legal agents. policing, prosecution, courts, and corrections in the United States.

While one could argue that the term *criminal punishment system* which has been used by abolitionist scholars like Mariame Kaba[32] might, then, be an appropriate label in this context, this dissertation will address intentional reentry support efforts by agents of penal institutions that may subvert depictions of these institutions as solely sites of punishment. Thus, I use the term *criminal system* to be as general as possible, while still recognizing that law enforcement, courts, carceral facilities and surveillance efforts all interact to create the complex and flawed system we have today. Occasionally I will also use the term *carceral state* in the tradition of legal scholars like Heather Schoenfeld to refer to this network of law enforcement, courts, and penal institutions in

---

[28] Erica Bryant, "Why We Say 'Criminal Legal System,' Not 'Criminal Justice System,'" *The Vera Institute*, Dec. 1, 2021, https://www.vera.org/news/why-we-say-criminal-legal-system-not-criminal-justice-system.
[29] Elizabeth Hinton, LeShae Henderson, and Cindy Reed, "An Unjust Burden: The Disparate Treatment of Black Americans in the Criminal Justice System," *Vera Institute of Justice* (2018).
[30] Bryant, "Why We Say 'Criminal Legal System,' Not 'Criminal Justice System.'"
[31] Bryant, "Why We Say 'Criminal Legal System,' Not 'Criminal Justice System.'"
[32] Mariame Kaba, *We Do This 'Til We Free Us: Abolitionist Organizing and Transforming Justice* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2021).

combination with "other technologies such as legal financial obligations (fines, fees, and restitution orders) and other types of community sanctions."[33]

Defining the Long Sixties

Throughout future chapters, I will use the term *the long sixties* to refer to my time period of interest, 1954-1974. The long sixties have been defined as a period of time characterized by a cultural revolution consisting of a series of simultaneous and overlapping revolutions wherein new ideas, new developments, and new practices came to permeate society.[34] In other words, the start and end of the long sixties are not marked by date but rather key moments, important events, and turning points in society. The long sixties are therefore "more of an idea than a decade."[35] The key event at the start of the long sixties on which this research is centered was the creation and proliferation of the halfway house for returning citizens, the first of which opened its doors in November 1954.[36] The turning point that marks the end of the long sixties and the end of my time period of interest is the growth of the carceral state in the 1970s.

Notably, there is no agreed upon start point to the expansion of the criminal system and onset of mass incarceration. According to Miller, the supervised society that accompanies mass incarceration began in 1972, marked by a national violent crime wave.[37] Kaba on the other hand, has suggested that the tough-on-crime policies that led to the growth of the carceral system in America were actually not correlated with rates of crime but rather came about with the emergence

---

[33] Heather Schoenfeld, *Building the Prison State: Race & the Politics of Mass Incarceration* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018), 6.
[34] Arthur Marwick, "Youth Culture and the Cultural Revolution of the Long Sixties," in *Between Marx and Coca-Cola: Youth Cultures in Changing European Societies, 1960-1980,* ed. Axel Schildt and Detlef Seigfried, 39-58 (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005).
[35] Christopher B. Strain, *The Long Sixties: America, 1955-1973* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2017).
[36] Richard Dunlop, "The Strange Family of Father Jones," *Kiwanis Magazine*, Feb. 1958, 16.
[37] Miller, *Halfway Home.*

of a punishment-centered mindset that led to carceral logics being used to approach all aspects of life and government function.[38] Alternatively, Schoenfeld argued that mass incarceration was a result of a growth in carceral capacity that occurred when, in response to the Civil Rights Movement, a series of federal policies were established that stimulated state and federal spending on prisons, court systems, and policing.[39] Rather than attempt to locate a specific end date of the long sixties and start of the mass incarceration era, my analysis extend throughout the early 1970s.

The U.S. Criminal System & Barriers to Reentry

Since the turn of the 21st century, federal, state, local, and private funds have been increasingly invested in reentry initiatives. From 2001 to 2004, the US federal government allocated over $100 million for reentry programs, and in 2008, the Second Chance Act was enacted to expand the existing Department of Justice reentry grant program by creating an array of pilot programs focusing on everything from housing support to employment to job training resources.[40] In December 2021, the Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs announced more than $110 million in awards to jurisdictions, nonprofit organizations, and research institutions to reduce recidivism and support returning citizens through evidence-based treatment, training and support efforts.[41] This change correlates with the growth in public attention being paid to mass incarceration in the United States which has been, in large part, due to concerns about the sustainability of the budget required to maintain the current U.S. criminal system.[42] Additionally,

---

[38] Kaba, *We Do This 'Til We Free Us.*
[39] Schoenfeld, *Building the Prison State.*
[40] Nathan James, "Offender Reentry: Correctional Statistics, Reintegration into the Community, and Recidivism," *Congressional Research Service* (2015).
[41] Department of Justice: Office of Public Affairs, "Justice Department Awards More Than $110 Million to Support Currently and Formerly Incarcerated Individuals," *Justice News,* Dec. 22, 2021.
[42] Elsa Y. Chen and Sophie Meyer, "Beyond Recidivism: Toward Accurate, Meaningful, and Comprehensive Data Collection on the Progress of Individuals Reentering Society," in *Beyond Recidivism: New Approaches to Research*

over the past couple of decades there has been growing acknowledgement in public consciousness of the racialized history of U.S. incarceration and the poor treatment of the incarcerated population as seen by the popularity of certain literature on mass incarceration in non-academic spaces[43] and the engagement of public figures in the conversation on race, incarceration and abolition.[44] This has brought more attention to the needs of returning citizens than ever before.

Despite the rise in reentry support initiatives, the needs of many returning citizens continue to go unmet, and their citizenship continues to be challenged. As a 2014 national project on reentry noted, "for U.S. citizens, a criminal record, especially a felony conviction, often confers a legal, political, and social status that falls far short of full citizenship."[45] On average, more than half of the returning population is unable to find stable employment within their first year after release, and 75% of them end up rearrested within three years of their return.[46] Many are unable to find employment because of the stigma attached to their incarceration, a stigma that is "one of the most important and well-documented barriers to successful reentry and reintegration," and which also negatively impacted their housing and education prospects.[47] As Jerry Blassingame, a previously incarcerated author and mentor to returning citizens, noted about the stigma that follows previously incarcerated individuals, "time after time, men and women who are trying to rebuild their lives after serving time are hit squarely with the realization that there's no clean slate. Ever."[48]

---

on Prisoner Reentry and Reintegration, ed. Andrea Leverentz, Elsa Y. Chen, and Johnna Christian (New York: New York University Press, 2020).

[43] Michelle Alexander, *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness* (New York: The New Press, 2010).

[44] Colin Kaepernick, *Abolition for the People: The Movement for a Future Without Policing and Prisons* (New York: Kaepernick Publishing, 2021).

[45] Jeremy Travis, Bruce Western, and Steve Redburn, *The Growth of Incarceration in the United States: Exploring Causes and Consequences* (Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2014), 304.

[46] Annelies Goger, David J. Harding, and Howard Henderson, "Rethinking Prisoner Reentry," *Contexts* 20, no. 4 (2021).

[47] Ibid., 47.

[48] Blassingame, "Words That Reduce Millions to Stereotype."

According to noted reentry scholar Bruce Western, "the great failure of mass incarceration is that it tends to weaken the social bonds that produce order and predictability in daily life. The removal of community residents by incarceration reverberates through families, and so does their return."[49] This assertion highlights that the reach of the carceral state in the lives of returning citizens often ends up disrupting the lives of their loved ones as well. For example, those loved ones who live with someone on parole are subject to the same random check-ins and possession restrictions as returning citizens.[50] Additionally, many mothers who return from incarceration find their parental authority eroded as being "imprisoned has damaged their maternal identities in their own eyes and those of their intimates."[51]

Incarceration and the transition to society have negative effects for returning citizens beyond the informal stigma they experience. Among postindustrial democracies, the United States is one of few countries to permanently disenfranchise previously incarcerated individuals.[52] According to reentry researchers, "this loss of rights and privileges pushes [previously incarcerated individuals] further to the political, social, and economic margins."[53] Specifically, this disenfranchisement has a clear personal effect on these individuals' sense of citizenship and political participation, leading to those who have had contact with the criminal system being more likely to withdraw from political and civic life.[54] Additionally, given that Black and Latino populations are overrepresented in the criminal system, the "political ramifications of

[49] Bruce Western, *Homeward: Life in the Year After Prison* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2018), 182.
[50] Miller, *Halfway Home.*
[51] Marilyn Brown and Barbara Bloom, "Reentry and Renegotiating Motherhood: Maternal Identity and Success on Parole," *Crime & Delinquency* 55, no. 2 (2009): 332.
[52] Christopher Uggen and Jeff Manza, "Democratic Contraction? Political Consequences of Felon Disenfranchisement in the United States," *American Sociological Review* 67, no. 6 (2002).
[53] Jeremy Travis, Bruce Western, and Steve Redburn, *The Growth of Incarceration in the United States.*
[54] Ibid.

disenfranchisement" most impact Black and Latino communities[55] and increase the likelihood that their needs will be overlooked or disregarded by those in positions of political power.[56]

Unfortunately, many returning citizens remain under the supervision of the criminal system after their release from incarceration, whether via probation, parole, electronic monitoring, or other means. Despite the expectation that they will begin to integrate back into society, these individuals face a host of restrictions that not only limit their autonomy as human beings but also hinder their growth and independence while challenging their citizenship.[57] While these individuals are no longer behind bars, they are still under the legal authority of the criminal system which limits their ability to find gainful employment, find a safe and affordable housing situation, and rebuild lasting relationships with their loved ones.[58] Moreover, those under supervision of the criminal system must follow a whole host of rules that other adults, and even other returning citizens, do not have to face.[59] Behaviors like drinking alcohol, traveling out of the city/state/country, fraternizing with someone who is formerly incarcerated, failing to attend mandated meetings, being unhoused, or even owning a "vicious" dog can all be illegal for returning citizens.[60] These terms of supervision and the constant surveillance that accompanies them often result in returning citizens being reincarcerated for "technical violations" which are minor infractions like breaking curfew or

[55] Kelly Lytle Hernandez, Khalil Gibran Muhammad, and Heather Ann Thompson, "Introduction: Constructing the Carceral State," *The Journal of American History* (2015): 20.
[56] Uggen and Manza, "Democratic Contraction?"
[57] Miller, *Halfway Home.*
[58] Jason M. Williams, Zoe Spencer, and Sean K. Wilson, "I Am Not *Your* Felon: Decoding the Trauma, Resilience and Recovering Mothering of Formerly Incarcerated Black Women," *Crime & Delinquency* (2020).
[59] Miller, *Halfway Home.*
[60] Ibid.

failing to pay unaffordable supervision fees.[61] This means that the current systems of surveillance and control via parole or probation often contribute to recidivism rates rather than reducing them.[62]

Another barrier to successful reentry has been the drain on social service resources and informal support for returning citizens due to the fact that so many of them are returning to the same overburdened and under-resourced communities.[63] Some researchers have suggested that this lack of access to comprehensive community services in the neighborhoods to which most citizens return is one of the primary barriers to successful reentry that previously incarcerated individuals face.[64] Even before their return to society, incarcerated individuals have to navigate the unequal distribution of preparatory efforts, with pre-release services being "unevenly available across facilities and under-resourced."[65]

Sadly, those programs and services that do exist to serve the returning population still face an uphill battle. They can provide network connections, temporary housing, and services to develop certain skills, but they simply cannot remove the structural barriers that previously incarcerated individuals face as they work to reestablish themselves in society.[66] Much reentry programming centers soft skill development in an effort to prepare returning citizens for everyday problems they might encounter, but returning citizens rarely get a chance to utilize these skills because they are stopped by employers or property managers before they even get a foot in the

---

[61] Ibid.
[62] James Austin and Patricia Hardyman, "The Risks and Needs of the Returning Prisoner Population," *Review of Policy Research* 21, no. 1 (2004).
[63] Miller, *Halfway Home.*
[64] Caitlin J. Taylor, "The Supervision to Aid Reentry (STAR) Programme: Enhancing the Social Capital of Ex-Offenders," *Probation Journal* 60, no. 2 (2013); Visher and Travis, "Life on the Outside: Returning Home After Incarceration."
[65] Goger, Harding, and Henderson, "Rethinking Prisoner Reentry," 48.
[66] Miller, *Halfway Home.*

door.[67] "Reentry organizations can't erase [returning citizens'] records or change their social situations," all they can do is provide them with the support to reimagine their lives and work towards achieving normality, even though, given the stigma of the criminal system, "normal life" is not a privilege they will likely be afforded.[68] As Miller said, "the prison lives on through the people who've been convicted long after they complete their sentences…because they are never really allowed to pay their so-called debt to society."[69]

Pioneers of Reentry in the 1950s – 1970s

In conducting a historical analysis of reentry support efforts between 1954-1974, I discovered that there were three sets of actors who had a visible impact on the reentry landscape of the time.

The first pioneers in the reentry space were religious figures and the institutions of which they were a part, They were the first to identify returning citizens as a population in need of support due to their access to and close relationships with incarcerated, and thus returning individuals, through prison chaplaincy.[70] Their understanding of this population's need for support led to the creation of the first consistent transitional housing program for returning citizens in the nation.[71] Given their unique access to both the incarcerated population and the staff of penal institutions, in combination with the wealth of resources that religious institutions possessed, religious leaders

---

[67] Ibid.
[68] Andrea Leverentz, *The Ex-Prisoner's Dilemma: How Women Negotiate Competing Narratives of Reentry and Desistance* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2014).
[69] Miller, *Halfway Home,* 8.
[70] A Final Report: Four Years of Progress, 1954-1958, Cook County (Ill.) Sheriff report, 1958, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscript Collections.
[71] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "A Chance to Go Straight" biography, undated, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

had a significant influence on prerelease, parole/probation, and private reentry services, thus making them pioneers in the reentry space.

In the mid- to late- 1960s, new programs for returning citizens emerged. These efforts were the result of a shift in federal policies toward combatting poverty through manpower development and training efforts. With the War on Poverty came a wealth of such programs geared toward those most in need, low-income people of color in urban centers,[72] and a significant amount of federal funding went toward training and manpower development programs that were specifically geared toward difficult to employ populations which included returning citizens, as well as individuals with disabilities and those struggling with substance abuse.[73] This may be surprising given that the War on Poverty was quickly followed by the War on Crime which played an enormous role in the growth of the carceral state and the establishment of the massive criminal system that we experience today. However, federal policies reflected a belief that many poor and incarcerated individuals *wanted* to work but lacked the skills necessary to join the labor market. The War on Crime, then, was geared toward those who remained unemployed or were reincarcerated despite the wealth of manpower development programs being provided- a population who many policymakers at the time considered pathologically criminal.[74]

Given that the bulk of federal grants being disseminated to low-income and returning populations during the late 1960s to early 1970s centered on the belief that training and employment were central to combatting poverty and crime, private reentry efforts that sought federal funding needed to shift their focus in this direction. As a result, the State had a massive

[72] Elizabeth Hinton, *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime: The Making of Mass Incarceration in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016).
[73] Gary Thatcher, "Jobs for Ex-Convicts Fill a Double Purpose," *Christian Science Monitor*, Jun. 3, 1975.
[74] Hinton, *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime.*

impact on the trajectory of reentry efforts, both public and private, leading training and employment to become central aspects of many reentry support efforts in the decades that followed. Notably, the emphasis on job *training* programs, motivated by the belief that low-income people of color in urban areas simply lacked the skills necessary to keep up with the needs of employers, was a key feature of the federal manpower development agenda.[75] The many training programs geared toward "unemployable" populations[76] has shaped the focus of reentry efforts in the decades that followed. Finally, research on the relationship between employment and recidivism suggests that, while there may be a correlation between the two, there are many factors that have an influence on this relationship, including gender, age, and types of employment available.[77] Given the somewhat tenuous nature of this correlation[78] and the many other factors that play a role in decreasing recidivism and improving the quality of life of returning citizens than employment, employment efforts are likely overrepresented in the reentry landscape, highlighting the impact of the War on Poverty on reentry in the 1960s-1970s through today.

The final pioneers of the reentry landscape at the end of the 1950s-1970s period was returning citizens themselves. The 1960s were marked by the increased politicization of prisoners which occurred when political leaders of the Civil Rights and Black Power Movements became incarcerated[79] and those in penal facilities adopted the language of these leaders to express their

---

[75] Hinton, *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime*.
[76] "Business Spearhead Jobs Project." *Chicago Daily Defender*, Jul. 20, 1967.
[77] Christopher Uggen, "Work as a Turning Point in the Life Course of Criminals: A Duration Mode of Age, Employment, and Recidivism," *American Sociological Review* 65, no. 4 (2000).; Stephen J. Tripodi, Johnny S. Kim, and Kimberly Bender, "Is Employment Associated with Reduced Recidivism? The Complex Relationship Between Employment and Crime," *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 54, no. 5 (2010).
[78] Christy A. Visher, Laura Winterfield, and Mark B. Coggeshall, "Ex-Offender Employment Programs and Recidivism: A Meta-Analysis," *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 1 (2005).
[79] Heather Ann Thompson, *Blood in the Water: The Attica Prison Uprising of 1971 and Its Legacy* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2016).

own discontent with the system, culminating in the Prisoners' Rights Movement.[80] Ultimately, as these politicized incarcerated individuals were released, they found the existing reentry landscape to be severely lacking, specifically in terms of providing the emotional and psychological support they felt many returning citizens needed.[81] Thus, they were motivated to start their own reentry initiatives to fill this gap, though many focused on support efforts far beyond the psychosocial support that first motivated them. These self-made reentry efforts corresponded with an increase in returning citizens joining established reentry programs as program managers, executive directors and more, suggesting that the phenomenon of returning citizens getting involved in the reentry of others was common across the reentry landscape of the early 1970s. The belief that they were uniquely qualified to support the returning population permeated the reentry space and is a sentiment that is still common in many reentry efforts of today.[82]

Overall, religious leaders, federal War on Poverty initiatives, and returning citizens themselves all introduced unique components to the reentry landscape of the 1950s-1970s that influenced the trajectory of support efforts for returning citizens during this period of time and, likely, beyond. I refer to these entities as pioneers not because they had the most groundbreaking approaches to reentry or because they somehow demonstrated a desire to serve this population more than others, but because they had the most tangible influence on reentry efforts of this time. There are certainly individuals and entities with fewer resources and less visibility that likely played significant roles in supporting returning citizens but whose impact is more difficult to identify. And certainly, it can be said that the federal government, and even religious institutions,

[80] Simon Balto, *Occupied Territory: Policing Black Chicago* (Durham: University of North Carolina Press, 2019).
[81] "'Looking Toward Freedom' Opens at Artists Guild."
[82] Paul Sultan and Gerhard F. Ehmann, "The Employment of Persons with Arrest Records and the Ex-Offender," *National Conference of Christians and Jews* (1970).

should have been the biggest contributors to the reentry landscape because they possessed the resources necessary to support the returning population. Regardless of the reason for their impact, religious institutions, federal manpower development efforts, and returning citizen leaders played central roles in crafting the landscape of reentry that defined the 1950s-1970s and that has influenced the reentry support efforts that we see today.

Notably, I have chosen to examine the history of incarceration and reentry in Chicago as a way of discovering and examining the national reentry landscape as a whole. One reason for this is that St. Leonard's House, which many consider to be the first halfway house in America, was founded in Chicago in 1954.[83] Additionally, between the Bridewell House of Correction, Cook County Jail, Stateville Correctional Center, Joliet Correctional Center, Pontiac Penitentiary and Dwight Women's Reformatory, the Chicagoland area was a hub for penal institutions and thus hosted a significant population of returning citizens. Finally, Chicago works as a strong case study for the examination of reentry because, during the 1950s-1970s, Chicago was characterized by a large and relatively diverse religious presence; a racially and ethnically diverse population; protests, marches, and other demonstrations involving a number of different rights movements; social issues like poverty and poor housing conditions; and a wealth of powerful political figures. All of these things had an influence on the returning population.

Crime & Policing in the 1920s – 1940s

[83] Richard Dunlop, "The Strange Family of Father Jones," *Kiwanis Magazine*, Feb. 1958, 16.

Between 1925 and 1940, the national homicide rate dipped nationally by one-third.[84] Homicide rates in Chicago also plunged during this time by nearly two-thirds.[85] Despite this steep decline in violent crime, the 1920s were marked by a crime panic that motivated the mid-1920s war on crime.[86] At this same time, municipal police departments were becoming increasingly aggressive and police brutality became was growing more systematic.[87] "Reinventing themselves as crime fighters, the hitherto bumbling municipal police became increasingly aggressive with suspects," adopting shoot-to-kill policies and coercive interrogation techniques and "justifying their behavior by involving the war on crime."[88] In a Report on Lawlessness in Law Enforcement released in 1931, it was reported that Chicago detectives "beat suspects with rubber hoses, held guns to the heads of suspects who refused to confess, applied electric currents to the genitals of suspects who would not admit their guilt, and occasionally murdered noncompliant suspects."[89]

By the late 1930s, the crime panic had waned but the "bulked-up criminal justice machinery remained, including draconian laws, federal involvement in law enforcement."[90] It was around this time that the national incarceration rate peaked, with rates never seen again until the surge in mass incarceration in last quarter of the century, and with arrest, incarceration, and execution rates rising disproportionately for Black Americans.[91] The proportion of Black inmates increased nationally over the 1925 to 1940 time period by one-third, and Black incarcerated individuals grew to make up 60% of U.S. executions, replacing whites as making up the majority of executions across the

[84] Jeffrey S. Adler, "Less Crime, More Punishment: Violence, Race, and Criminal Justice in Early Twentieth-Century America," *The Journal of American History* (2015).
[85] Ibid.
[86] Ibid.
[87] Ibid.
[88] Ibid., 41.
[89] Ibid., 41.
[90] Ibid., 45.
[91] Ibid.

country.[92] This growing disparity was due to an increase in police focus on Black suspects and a trend of prosecutors "flex[ing] their discretionary muscles, inflating conviction rates largely by securing guilty pleas from African American suspects."[93]

Thousands of Black Americans were moving en masse to Northern cities at this time, leading Chicago's African American population to quintuple to more than 275,000 between 1915 and 1940.[94] In the wake of this demographic shift, European immigrant groups who had previously been the target of the police force, put aside their differences and worked to advance politically by securing positions in municipal services like law enforcement in order to "deflect the residential, economic, and status competition of the southern newcomers."[95] This increase in German and Irish immigrants joining the police department led to a decrease in police violence and repression[96] against the "undesirable" white immigrant groups which the Chicago Police Department was originally established to control and protect against.[97] As a result, the rates of arrest for white immigrants "plummeted precipitously" and police shifted their focus to the rapidly increasing population of Black Southerners in the city.[98] According to Balto, by the 1940s, "the primary purpose of the police was to control supposedly unruly and dangerous racial minorities and to keep crime out of white neighborhoods. It was in performing this latter function that the police gradually began to solidify their standing in the eyes of the majority population."[99] When Harry S. Truman came to the presidency in the mid-1940s, he began what came to be a decades-long national

---

[92] Ibid.
[93] Ibid.," 45.
[94] Simon Balto, "How to Defund the Police," *Public Books*, Nov. 20, 2020.
[95] Christopher Muller, "Northward Migration and the Rise of Racial Disparity in American Incarceration, 1880-1950," *American Journal of Sociology* 118, no. 2 (2012): 284.
[96] Simon Balto, *Occupied Territory.*
[97] Balto, "How to Defund the Police."
[98] Simon Balto, *Occupied Territory*, 17.
[99] Ibid., 94.

preoccupation with law and order, targeting specifically the police-sanctioned white violence that Black Americans were facing.[100] By the end of World War II, President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights "designated the 'right to safety and security of the person' the first condition of all rights, and in doing so, fired the Democratic Party's opening salvo against white mob violence and racial prejudice" in the criminal system.[101]

Chapter Overview

In the first chapter, I discuss the role that religious leaders and institutions played in the formalization of reentry support and the growth of the reentry landscape in Chicago and beyond. First, I describe public perception of the returning population from the 1940s to the 1950s which can primarily be described as disdain for and mistrust of returning individuals who have been released on parole. I then go on to introduce key religious leaders who were the first to dedicate their efforts to the returning population. As I demonstrate, while religious institutions played a pioneering role in reentry in the 1950s, it was only because of these individual religious leaders that they came to recognize returning citizens as a population worth serving. After introducing the historical context and key players, I illustrate the ways in which religious leaders and institutions capitalized on their access to returning citizens, the resource afforded to them through their diocesan networks, and their status as leaders in the field to become the blueprint for all other reentry efforts that followed. I conclude Chapter 1 with a discussion of the barriers that religious institutions faced despite their domination of the reentry support space.

---

[100] Schoenfeld, *Building the Prison State.*
[101] Naomi Murakawa, *The First Civil Right: How Liberals Built Prison America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 2-3.

In Chapter 2, I begin by discussing the conditions in which the most vulnerable communities are living moving into the early 1960s. Specifically I focus on low-income families in Black urban centers and the previously incarcerated individuals who return to those communities. I then go on to give historical context of the 1960s antipoverty initiatives that came about with President Johnson's War on Poverty and the flood of federal funds geared toward tackling poverty in the low-income areas that were most impacted.[102] In Chapter 2 I demonstrate the results of these national policies on Chicago antipoverty initiatives, highlighting the increase in grants being provided to local manpower development and training programs and discussing the government reliance on partnerships with private community organizations to serve their target populations. I describe both the strengths and the shortcomings of the bulk of these programs, spotlighting the Operation DARE program as a success story among the many manpower development efforts that arose during that time. Finally, I demonstrate the ways in which private organizations made the most of the public-private partnerships of which they became a part.

In Chapter 3, I discuss self-made reentry efforts, which I define as reentry services for returning citizens by returning citizens. I begin my discussing the experiences of mistreatment that many incarcerated individuals face and the way in which this mistreatment in combination with the influence of the civil rights movement ultimately politicized the incarcerated population in the late 1960s and early 1970s. I argue that this politicization led to an increase in community-building and organizing among incarcerated individuals – practices that they brought with them upon their release. I then highlight some of the most visible self-made reentry programs in Chicago, highlighting the benefits of returning citizens receiving services from individuals who understood

[102] Robert Haveman, Rebecca Blank, Robert Moffitt, Timothy Smeeding, and Geoffrey Wallace, "The War on Poverty: Measurement, Trends, and Policy," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 34, no. 3 (2015).

their experiences, while acknowledging the barriers that many of these efforts faced in maintaining longevity and providing the services they wanted to offer.

Finally, in the last chapter I will summarize my key contributions to historical and sociological research on reentry while demonstrating the ways in which characteristics of long sixties reentry efforts manifest in the difficulties faced by returning citizens today. I will conclude with a discussion of potential directions for future research.

Chapter 1: Religious Institutions as Pioneers of Reentry

On September 25, 1954, Bridewell House of Correction chaplain Episcopal Reverend James G. Jones, rolled out of bed with a fever of over 100°F to intervene before a prisoner uprising at Bridewell turned deadly.[103] Father Jones, who had been a prison chaplain in the Cook County carceral system since 1952, used his relationship with Bridewell warden, Frank Sain, to gain access to the disgruntled prisoners with whom he also had established relationships in the couple of years before. Jones entered the South Cell Block, the site of the riot, and held up his hand which was a gesture that Jones used every Sunday during services. It put the prisoners at ease. They accepted Father Jones into the cell block and, according to a 1954 *Advance* article:

> [Father Jones] asked if [the prisoners] could hear him and suggested they pretend this was a church service. This idea appealed to their sense of humor. He then asked if they recognized him with a hat. They laughed again and Father Jones could sense that the guards below him, who were guarding the open door, relaxed ever so slightly. He then assured the men that their rioting, which had been going on for hours, had effectively brought their grievances to the attention of all Chicago through the newspapers, the radio and TV.[104]

Jones proceeded to assure the prisoners that if they were to cease riot activities, they would not face any reprisals from the prison staff for the day's actions. He mediated a discussion between the prisoners and Warden Sain and, when terms were agreed upon, he escorted the men to the dining room for a meal and spoke with them one by one, listening to the concerns that inspired the riot. Jones returned with the men to their Block after dinner and stayed until the final count was

---

[103] St. Leonard's Ministries, "Chaplain is Peacemaker in Prison Riot," *Advance* article, October 1954, Box A664, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[104] Ibid.

made. After ensuring that all agreed upon conditions to surrender were met, Jones' work was complete…almost. His final task before returning home and getting back to bed was calling the wives of the prison guards who were on all-night duty and assuring them of their husbands' safety and well-being.[105]

The above incident took place just two months before Reverend James G. Jones founded St. Leonard's House (SLH), a residential program for previously incarcerated men named after a sixth-century Frankish noble who, after becoming a monk, traveled far and wide to free prisoners, offer them aid, and shelter them in his monastery.[106] While the concept of the "halfway house" had a long history in Europe, originating in England and Ireland in the early 1800s,[107] St. Leonard's House, which was founded to serve as a source of support for those in transition between incarceration and community, is said by many to be the first "halfway house" of its kind in the United States after opening in 1954.[108] As such, SLH acted as a blueprint for other religious institutions to follow and founder/director Father Jones emerged as a notable pioneer in the reentry space. Throughout the late-1950s to early-1960s, Christian groups replicated the St. Leonard's House model in cities across the nation and beyond including St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Los Angeles, Wilmington, Delaware, Toronto, and Windsor, Ontario.[109] Given the historical significance of St. Leonard's House and its far-reaching influence on the field of prisoner reentry in America, I will

---

[105] Ibid.
[106] St. Leonard's Ministries, "Let Every Guest be Received as Christ," *Advance* article, April 1958, Box A664, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[107] Edward Latessa and Harry Allen, "Halfway Houses and Parole: A National Assessment," *Journal of Criminal Justice* 10 (1982): 153.
[108] T. N. Libby, "The Residential Centre for Released Prisoners," *Canadian Journal of Corrections* 10, no. 2 (1968).
[109] Cyrus J. O'Brien, "'A Prison in Your Community': Halfway Houses and the Melding of Treatment and Control," *The Journal of American History* (2021).

use the story of Father Jones and SLH to examine why and how religious actors and institutions emerged as leaders in the long sixties reentry support space, specifically in the Chicagoland area.

Religious institutions have had a presence in and influence on the American criminal system for centuries, first inspiring corporal punishment as a retaliation against the sinfulness of crime, then motivating the post-Revolution shift from corporal to repentance-based carceral punishment.[110] Additionally, throughout history, "both incarcerated and returning inmates from jails and prisons have used religious organizations to adapt and transition back to society."[111] While religion scholars have demonstrated this link[112] and criminologists have highlighted the unique role that prison chaplains[113] have played in the lived experiences of both incarcerated and returning citizens,[114] few have identified the structural reasons that allowed religious institutions to become pioneers in this space before other private or public institutions.[115] Even fewer have identified religious institutions as the first to truly formalize engagement with returning citizens and thus the first to engage in reentry as we know it today.[116]

---

[110] Brett Garland, Eric Wodahl, and Rebecca Gretchen Smith, "Religious Beliefs and Public Support for Prisoner Reentry," *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 28, no. 9 (2017).
[111] Gautam Nayer, Luis Perez-Feliciano, and Michael Adams, "Got Faith? An In-Depth Analysis and Review of Five Faith-Based Prisoner Reentry Programs in Florida," *International Journal of Business and Social Science Research* 2, no. 10 (2021).
[112] Irene Becci and Joshua Dubler, "Religion and Religions in Prison: Observations from the United States and Europe," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 56, no. 2 (2017); Byron R. Johnson, "The Faith Factor and Prisoner Reentry," *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion* 4 (2008).
[113] In keeping with the language of the time, I will use the term "prison chaplain" to refer to chaplains in prisons, jails, and any other carceral facilities.
[114] Jody L. Sundt and Francis T. Cullen, "The Role of the Contemporary Prison Chaplain," *The Prison Journal* 78, no. 3 (1998); Jody L. Sundt and Francis T. Cullen, "The Correctional Ideology of Prison Chaplains: A National Survey," *Journal of Criminal Justice* 30 (2002).
[115] Nayer, Perez-Feliciano, and Adams, "Got Faith?"; Kendrick Oliver, "'Hi Fellas. Come on in.' Normal Carlson, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and the Rise of Prison Fellowship," *Journal of Church and State* 55, no. 4 (2012).
[116] O'Brien, "'A Prison in Your Community."

Some have certainly recognized the unique role that St. Leonard's House specifically has played in serving the returning population and mentoring other reentry support organizations,[117] but my analysis goes beyond St. Leonard's House to make a statement about the structural characteristics that allowed for religious institutions *in general* to become pioneers in the reentry space. After examining the work that St. Leonard's House and other religious entities in Chicagoland did for and with incarcerated individuals upon their return to society, I argue that religious institutions emerged as leaders in the post-war, long sixties reentry space because they had unique access to the incarcerated population, an extensive infrastructure that allowed for large scale interventions, and the opportunity to shape the local, state, and federal carceral landscape as interest in the returning population began to swell. I will expand upon each of these factors in the remainder of this chapter, before discussing the limitations and shortcomings of religious institutions in the reentry space.

Public Perceptions of Returning Citizens Before the 1950s

The 1930s-1940s were a time of disregard for and suspicion of individuals returning to society from incarceration. In 1935, it was reported that half of the crimes committed in Chicago were committed by "ex-convicts, the majority of whom are on parole or probation," and that such rates of crime "showed the existence of a criminal class who couldn't 'make good' despite all the kindly judges, probation officers, probation officials, parole authorities, behavior clinicians, psychiatrists, welfare workers, and sentimentalists…"[118] This sentiment was common throughout

[117] Earl L. Durham, "St. Leonard's House: A Model in the Use of Ex-Offenders in the Administration of Correction," *Crime and Delinquency* (1974); Robert G. Meiners, "A Halfway House for Parolees," *Federal Probation* 47, no. 2 (1965).
[118] "Half of Crimes Done in Chicago by 'Repeaters': Study Bares Danger in Parole System," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, Apr. 7, 1935.

the 1930s-1940s, and led to a variety of parole reforms including an attempt by the Illinois Parole Board to make it more difficult for incarcerated individuals to successfully apply for parole,[119] a notice by the Chicago Crime Commission recommending against the sponsorship of returning individuals by labor organizations,[120] and the passage of the 1943 Maximum-Maximum Sentence Act which was aimed at removing sentencing decisions from the hands of a lenient parole board and putting them in the hands of, what were assumed to be, sterner judges.[121]

In addition to these efforts came the increasing insistence by parole boards that incarcerated individuals have a job and stable housing lined up before being released on parole.[122] This societal disdain for returning citizens in combination with increasingly strict parole requirements made the transition from incarceration to society more difficult than it had been before. By the start of the 1950s, returning citizens, particularly those without families that they could rely on,[123] were in desperate need of housing and employment assistance, in addition to emotional and social reentry support. This is the gap that religious institutions soon identified and sought to fill.

The Influence of Individual Religious Leaders

It should not be surprising that, given a general emphasis on doing service and helping one's neighbor, religious institutions would step up to offer support to a population in need. When discussing the motivation behind clergy adopting incarcerated individuals as parishioners, St. Leonard's House founder Father James G. Jones wrote:

---

[119] "Hope Hall, Home for Ex-Convicts, Closed by State," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, Apr. 4, 1937.
[120] "Crime Bureau Fights Union Aid for Ex-Convicts," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, Sep. 1, 1939.
[121] George Tagge, "1943 Act Cuts Parole Control of Ex-Convicts: Find Judges Disagree on its Application," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* Sep. 6, 1949.
[122] "Half of Crimes Done By 'Repeaters.'"
[123] St. Leonard's Ministries, "St. Leonard's House Provides a Haven for Ex-Prisoners," *Advance* article, Summer 1955, Box A664, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

> The chaplain doctors and medicates the soul of the inmate in the hope that the sentence will not scar the man so badly that he is lost to God, the Church, and Society. A prison chaplain believes in "time" but, in the jargon of the "joint," in "good time." He, with St. Paul, wants man not to be overcome with evil, but rather to overcome evil with good. He would rather that no man would have to serve a sentence, just as he would rather that no man would have to suffer pain. But he would also not wish to do away with pain for, just as pain has its purpose in God's creation, so has a prison sentence. Its purpose is to warn and teach not to mutilate. A chaplain works toward helping "time" achieve its rightful purpose.[124]

This quote showcases Father Jones' motivations for performing prison chaplaincy and gives insight into why a clergy person might choose to serve a difficult to access and theretofore overlooked population, rather than serving a traditional parish. As Father Jones wrote in letter to the friends of St. Leonard's House, "there are times when Father Taylor and I would very much enjoy taking on a quiet parish and having the vestry raise the budget, while getting comfortably back to doing a parish ministry. But society needs St. Leonard's House…needs it terribly!"[125]

Importantly, these quotes also highlight the central role that *individual* religious actors like chaplains played in the lives of both the incarcerated and returning populations. Perhaps the most important figure to the establishment of a formalized program of reentry support, Father Jones was the son of an Episcopal priest who began his work in Illinois and moved his family across the Midwest to serve a variety of people in need, including patients in a mental health facility in "the

[124] St. Leonard's Ministries, "My Parishioners Are in Jail," *Advance* article, March 1954, Box A664, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[125] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, Friends of St. Leonard's House correspondence, February 1961, Box A673, Folder 14, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

slums of Cincinnati."[126] While Jones eventually followed in his father's footsteps, his path there was far from linear. During his sophomore year, Jones dropped out of high school to join the navy where he drank, fought his fellow officers,[127] and stole from his shipmates.[128] In one incident during his naval service, Jones "got drunk and in a fit of anger slugged an officer," an altercation that got Jones twenty-five days "in the brig where the indignities and grossness of prison life made a sharp impression on him."[129] Upon his release, Jones was court martialed transferred to base duty at Palermo where he was assigned to the Shore Patrol vice squad.[130]

According to an unpublished biographical write-up of Jones authored by *Chicago Tribune* journalist Robert Cromie "this sordid but exciting duty undoubtedly sharpened Jones' sympathy for the unfortunate and socially unfit. But he still had no thought of entering the ministry when he returned to the United States."[131] In other words, the downtrodden and having his own carceral experience during naval service did immediately inspire Jones to follow in his father's footsteps. In fact, when Jones returned to the States with only the goal of heading to Chicago and getting drunk.[132] Before completing that task, Jones had to drive his younger sister to a religious camp in Indiana where they were greeted at the gate by a monk, Dom Leo, who asked Jones about his plans and offered for him to stay the night.[133] Cromie's biography continues, "'Dom Leo knew exactly how I felt,' Father Jones says – 'muddled and mixed up- and he was so understanding about it that

[126] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "A Chance to Go Straight" biography (Robert Cromie), undated, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[127] Richard Dunlop, "The Strange Family of Father Jones," *Kiwanis Magazine,* Feb. 1958, 16.
[128] Ray Brennan, "The Frustrations- and Hopes- of St. Leonard's House," *Chicago Sun-Times,* Jul. 25, 1963.
[129] Dunlop, "The Strange Family of Father Jones," 16.
[130] Ibid.
[131] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "A Chance to Go Straight" biography (Robert Cromie), undated, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[132] Ibid.
[133] Ibid.

I decided to stay for a while.' In fact, he remained at the camp for a week, and it was during this time that he first considered entering the ministry."[134]

In 1952, after finishing high school and pursing his degree in divinity, twenty-five year old Jones approached Bishop Conkling of the Diocese of Chicago to request that he be assigned to Cook County Jail as chaplain.[135] This request surprised Bishop Conkling because most young clergymen requested parishes in the suburbs.[136] Additionally, at the time Jones was still finishing school in Wisconsin, meaning a chaplaincy appointment in Cook County would require a nearly daily interstate commute.[137] Of course, unbeknownst to Bishop Conkling, Father Jones' unconventional path to the clergy uniquely prepared him for the difficult chaplaincy appointment he sought. His experiences during his naval service aided him in understanding the state of mind of many of the incarcerated individuals he served and thus allowed him to build friendships with this population that lasted throughout their incarceration and remained upon their release. These lasting relationships, in addition to his own knowledge and experiences, imbued Father Jones with the "seemingly intuitive understanding of the needs of newly released prisoners,"[138] that led Father Jones to establish St. Leonard's House.

Like Father Jones, Father Cronan Murphy was a prison chaplain who was engaged with returning citizens long before his institution had any formal support efforts in place. Father Murphy, a Roman Catholic clergyman, came to his chaplaincy assignment at Cook County Jail

---

[134] Ibid.
[135] Dunlop, "The Strange Family of Father Jones," 16.
[136] Ibid.
[137] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "A Chance to Go Straight" biography (Robert Cromie), undated, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[138] Ibid.

from a Wisconsin parish in 1955.[139] He went on to spend the next five years counseling twenty prisoners at the Jail each day, establishing lasting relationships with incarcerated and, eventually, returning individuals.[140] Murphy worked with the social service programs available at the Jail upon his arrival and noted that "he would be happy to spend the rest of his ministry in penal institutions" serving what he referred to as "an often-forgotten segment of society."[141]

One of Father Murphy's longest lasting impacts during his five-year stint at Cook County Jail was the creation of the Citizens Committee for Employment (CCE) of which he was the primary catalyst. In the early 1950s, Murphy gave a speech to a PTA meeting in Evanston that married couple John and Dorothy Drish attended.[142] The Drishes were "so impressed with his plea for help to the men" that they began collecting books and clothing for the incarcerated population at Cook County Jail and reached out to Warden Jack Johnson to begin scheduling visits to drop off these materials.[143] According to an article about the Drishes, they ran into Father Murphy during their second visit to the Jail delivering materials at which time Murphy told them, "if you really want to help these men, you'll go out and find them jobs."[144] And so, the Citizens Committee for Employment was born!

In 1956, John and Dorothy Drish founded CCE, an employment program that worked with the Cook County warden to identify strong job candidates among soon-returning citizens, interviewed those candidates to get an idea of their job skills and potential barriers to successful

---

[139] Michael Pakenham, "Jail Chaplain Off to Big Job: Franciscan Priest Endeared Self to Prisoners," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* Sep. 25, 1960.
[140] Ibid.
[141] Ibid.
[142] Aldo Beckman, "Couple Help to Rehabilitate Ex-Convicts: Try from Home to Find Jobs for Them," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* Jul. 1, 1962.
[143] Ibid.
[144] Ibid.

employment, then matched candidates with an employer upon their release.[145] This organization, officially incorporated in 1958,[146] went on to became the Safer Foundation[147] which is one of the largest national nonprofits providing reentry support to returning citizens today. Additionally, by 1969, John Drish had become a board member of the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago[148] and Dorothy Drish had been appointed as a board member of the new Cook County Department of Corrections.[149] Given the impact of the aforementioned institutions, it is clear that Father Cronan Murphy's individual efforts to engage Catholic parishioners, and the Drishes' long-term dedication to the returning population in the name of the Catholic Church, had an enormous impact on the reentry landscape in Chicago during the 1950s when they began, and well into the 21st century.

Access to Incarcerated & Returning Citizens

Undoubtedly, individual religious leaders were able to make unique contributions to the reentry landscape in the 1950s to early-1960s because of their ability to develop lasting one-on-one relationships with the incarcerated population. Oftentimes this was possible through their prison chaplain appointments, which gave them near-daily interaction with the incarcerated population who would eventually become returning citizens. Due to the presence and influence of these chaplains in carceral facilities, religious institutions had direct access to the incarcerated population, and thus the soon-to-be returning population, primarily through the extensive system of carceral chaplaincy in Chicagoland penal facilities. Ultimately, this direct access was key to the pioneer-status of religious institutions in reentry in the 1950s-1960s.

---

[145] "Praise Couple for Help to Ex-Prisoners: Found Committee to Find Jobs," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* Jul. 23, 1959.
[146] Ibid.
[147] Kenan Heise, "Safer Foundation's Dorothy Drish, 70," *Chicago Tribune,* Dec. 3, 1991; "John Drish," *Peach Basket Society* (blog), January 12, 2016, http://peachbasketsociety.blogspot.com/2015/12/john-drish.html.
[148] "Welfare Council Urges: Free 800 to Improve Jail Conditions," *Chicago Tribune,* Dec. 21, 1967.
[149] "3 Named to Jail Board," *Chicago Tribune,* Nov. 18, 1969.

The Role of the Prison Chaplain

By the start of the long sixties, Cook County Jail was one of the largest penal institutions in the United States, ranked third largest in terms of annual population turnover and ranked tenth largest in terms of average population.[150] At this time, the average daily population of Cook County Jail was 1,800, though it fluctuated anywhere between 1,600 and 2,400.[151] With the reorganization of the religious program that occurred as part of large-scale reforms by Sheriff Joseph D. Lohman, by 1955 every individual incarcerated in the County Jail had the opportunity to attend the religious services of their choice.[152] These reforms meant that Cook County Jail chaplains like Father Jones and Father Murphy had streamlined access to this massive population of incarcerated, and soon-to-be returning, individuals. There were also chaplains from a variety of Christian denominations who were represented at penal facilities across the Chicagoland area beyond Cook County Jail. By the early 1960s the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago, under which St. Leonard's House was established, had chaplains present in every one of the largest adult penal institutions in Chicagoland, including Bridewell House of Correction, Cook County Jail, Stateville Correctional Center, Joliet Correctional Center, Pontiac Penitentiary, and the Dwight Women's Reformatory.[153]

Given their access to such a huge portion of the incarcerated population in the Chicagoland area, chaplains were privy to the inner workings of carceral institutions that most folks on the outside were not able to see, and they regularly developed close relationships with both

[150] A Final Report: Four Years of Progress, 1954-1958, Cook County (Ill.) Sheriff report, 1958, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscript Collections.
[151] Ibid.
[152] Ibid.
[153] St. Leonard's Ministries, Annual report, 1964, Box A669, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

incarcerated individuals and the staff[154] who worked in these facilities.[155] As a result, chaplains were often attuned to the needs of the incarcerated and returning populations and could tailor their services accordingly.[156] Moreover, the connections they made with incarcerated individuals lasted beyond the carceral walls, such that returning citizens often utilized prison chaplains as their support systems once they got out.[157]

In a 1958 newsletter to supporters of St. Leonard's House (SLH), Father Robert Taylor, then director of the program, told readers that a "typical day" in the life of a prison chaplain was comprised of,

> A host of routine things like visiting in the hospital, calling the employer of an alcoholic to request another 30-day 'leave of absence,' preparing a man in the tailor shop for his first confession (above the din of 40 sewing machines), attempting to repair a broken marriage between a young couple who for the next six months will see one another six times (then only for a few minutes through a small pane of glass), wandering through the heating plant and discussing the economic situation with a drug addict on the way, agreeing to obtain reading glasses for a girl, arranging to find a coat for an old man about to be discharged – in short dealing with a thousand problems, spiritual and material, deep and shallow, real and imagined.[158]

---

[154] I use the term "staff" throughout this chapter to refer to all individuals who worked within these carceral facilities. This includes prison administration, corrections officers/prison guards, wardens, associate wardens, case managers, counselors, facilities managers, captains, department heads, and more.
[155] St. Leonard's Ministries, Annual report, 1963, Box A669, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[156] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "A Chance to Go Straight" biography (Robert Cromie), undated, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[157] Dunlop, "The Strange Family of Father Jones," 15.
[158] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Open Door* newsletter, 1958, Box A669, Folder 13, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

While this is just one chaplain's account of his duties, the picture painted by Father Taylor has been reflected by extensive research on prison chaplaincy, and other firsthand accounts of the experience. Dating back as early as the turn of the 20th century,[159] chaplains have been expected to juggle a wide range of religious and secular responsibilities including "facilitating adjustment to prison, visiting prisoners in isolation, helping inmates make plans for their release, counseling and helping inmates' families, providing religious and general education,"[160] and ministering to both the incarcerated population and the corrections staff.[161] Oftentimes, despite their affiliation with a specific religious institution, chaplains worked with men of all faiths[162] providing guidance, discussion, and services meant to "fill a religious void apparent in so many of the men who enter the walled city."[163]

Building Relationships with the Incarcerated Population

Chaplains were not the only representatives of religious institutions who were able to access carceral facilities and build relationships with both incarcerated individuals and staff. The staff of the aforementioned Citizens Committee for Employee (CCE) which consisted of Catholic parishioners, for example, went to Cook County Jail every Saturday to interview men who were about to be released in order to assess their readiness for employment.[164] Additionally, CCE had access to Warden Jack Johnson and other Cook County Jail staff since they were invited to assist the group in determining which returning individuals made the best candidates for the CCE

[159] Sundt and Cullen, "The Role of the Contemporary Prison Chaplain."
[160] Sundt and Cullen, "The Correctional Ideology of Prison Chaplains."
[161] Sundt and Cullen, "The Role of the Contemporary Prison Chaplain."
[162] St. Leonard's House, Service report, May 1965, Box A667, Folder 21, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[163] Adolph J. Slaughter, "Former Jazz Player Helps Warden Perform 'Miracle,'" *Chicago Defender,* Mar. 15, 1958.
[164] Beckman, "Couple Help to Rehabilitate Ex-Convicts."

program.[165] Members of the St. Leonard's Men's League, a group created in 1958 with the purpose of campaigning for jobs for SLH men, similarly made regular visits to the Cook County Jail to meet with prospective House residents before their release.[166] Here we see that the reach of religious institutions into penal facilities likely began with the presence of prison chaplains like Father James G. Jones and Father Cronan Murphy, but grew to include other parishioners and agents of the church.

With the access afforded to them, prison chaplains and other religious figures were privy to the poor conditions of Chicagoland penal facilities which led to their desire to provide support for survivors of these conditions upon their release. In 1954, Father Jones spoke to Rector, Dr. Charles F. Schreiner of Christ Church in Winnetka, IL[167] and the Church's parishioners about the conditions he'd witnessed in the past two years during his time at Cook County Jail. According to Schreiner in his 2003 correspondence with the Bishop and Right Reverend William D. Persell about Jones' 1954 visit,

> [Jones] went thoroughly into the conditions in the jail. To [sic] many prisoners committed suicide by hanging, and he had to cut them down; the sewer pipes went over the kitchen where prisoners ate and some leaked; Cook County was so inhuman it had a cell next to the electric chair (this before Warren Court) where one scheduled to die were [sic] required to sleep, if they could. It was here that Jim also heard confession, gave last rights and took each man into the electric chair…He pointed out that when many prisoners came out of jil [sic] they were so pscho [sic] hurt they need rehab, at a place, a home, where they could be

[165] "Hiring Jail Grads No Risk, Couple Believes," *Chicago Daily Defender*, Oct. 25, 1961.
[166] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Open Door* newsletter, March 1958, Box A669, Folder 13, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[167] "Rev. Dr. Charles F. Schreiner," *Kitsap Sun*, Nov. 28, 2006.

> helped to reenter society, get work, etc. This was his first mention of a place like St. Leonard's.[168]

Here we see just how closely Father Jones interacted with the incarcerated population on a regular basis. This quote also demonstrates that, before the establishment of St. Leonard's House, Father Jones was already showing concern about the potential impact of the poor conditions at Cook County Jail on the wellbeing of the incarcerated population upon their release.

Ultimately, prison chaplains and other religious actors established two pathways of communication that were equally important to the creation of Chicagoland reentry programs. The first was their communication with incarcerated individuals about their experiences, needs, and concerns about reintegrating into society which allowed religious institutions to build effective reentry support programs that benefited the population they wanted to serve.[169] In the case of Father Jones, in addition to his aforementioned concern about the mental state of returning citizens who experienced inhumane conditions at the penal facilities from which they were departing, he also "became concerned over the plight of men turned loose from the county jail with nothing but the clothes they wore when committed- a serious problem for those jailed in summer and released some bitter winter's day- and a bus token for a one-way ride to nowhere. 'They almost had to commit crime to eat,' the priest said."[170]

This concern led to Jones taking in men with whom he built relationships before their release, offering them emotional support and a place to stay when they had none. According to a

---

[168] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, Schreiner correspondence, November 26, 2003, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[169] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "A Chance to Go Straight" biography (Robert Cromie), undated, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[170] Ibid.

1955 write-up on St. Leonard's House, before SLH was established, "night after night Father Jones would be called at home by men on their first night out, pleading for assistance to find a place to stay until they could get a job and ear enough for at least a meal."[171] A February 1958 *Kiwanis Magazine* article said of Father Jones' pre-SLH days:

> His wife had grown accustomed to the phone in their small apartment ringing at odd hours in the night…Sometimes his wife had as many as four jailbirds sleeping on her couch or on her kitchen floor. Their toddling children knew a long succession of rough "uncles." The baby had his diapers gently changed by a man whose record of crime filled two sheets in the FBI files.[172]

The fact that returning individuals felt comfortable reaching to Father Jones and had his contact information demonstrates the closeness of the relationship that Jones was able to form with them during their incarceration, while the fact that Jones allowed them into his home upon their release shows how much he valued those individuals and the relationships that access to the Cook County Jail afforded him.

It was shortly after the birth of their third child that Father Jones' home became too full to host his returning guests, but rather than sever those relationships, Jones went to Bishop of Chicago Gerald Francis Burrill to request a new place to home these returnees.[173] It was then, on November 9, 1954 when Jones and two recently released returning citizens entered a dilapidated Victorian mansion owned by the Episcopal Church of Chicago, that St. Leonard's House was born.[174]

---

[171] St. Leonard's Ministries, "St. Leonard's House Provides a Haven for Ex-Prisoners."
[172] Dunlop, "The Strange Family of Father Jones," 16.
[173] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "A Chance to Go Straight" biography (Robert Cromie), undated, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[174] Dunlop, "The Strange Family of Father Jones," 16.

Without access to the incarcerated population, Father Jones would not have had an opportunity to establish such lasting and impactful relationships with incarcerated individuals prior to their return to society. Without this preexisting relationship, Jones would not have been consistently contacted by returning citizens in the hours or days after their release and thus would have likely been less conscious of the needs of this unique population, meaning St. Leonard's House might have simply never come to exist.

Working with Prison Staff & Navigating Occasional Conflict

The second pathway of communication that chaplains and other religious actors were able to establish through their access to the staff of penal facilities proved to be equally crucial to the development of St. Leonard's House and other pioneering reentry efforts. This communication was with the wardens, administration, guards, and other penal facility staff and led to the development of relationships beyond those within the walls of any one carceral facility. Father Jones felt strongly that developing relationships with all who worked in the prison should be a priority for chaplains of the Episcopal Church if they wanted to successfully minister to and support incarcerated individuals. Jones, in co-authorship with his peer Reverend Robert Serfling, wrote, "the chaplain must know and understand and whenever possible, co-operate with those in the fields of sociology, psychology, psychiatry, Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, One, Inc. (a national organization of adjusted homosexuals), etc. who also work in prisons."[175]

One of the most important motivators behind such relationship-building efforts was that SLH relied heavily on referrals from prison wardens, counselors, volunteers, and other staff

[175] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "To those interested in St. Leonard's House…" (James Jones & Robert Serfling), undated, Box A673, Folder 2, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

members to find men who were strong candidates for St. Leonard's House.[176] For example, in an early 1958 St. Leonard's House newsletter, it was noted that SLH had received resident referrals from a new chaplain at the House of Correction, the John Howard Association, and the Illinois parole board.[177] In a 1961 annual report, it was stated that the year's residents came to St. Leonard's House through contact with the Illinois Parole Department, Cook County Probation offices, and Federal Probation offices, as well as the "court," "institutions," and "social agencies."[178] Without referrals from these entities, St. Leonard's House would have had to rely exclusively on the recruitment efforts of prison chaplains and religious volunteers to connect with men who were in need of their services.[179] While this was possible, and the first residents at St. Leonard's House came from these very means, referrals from prison staff, volunteers, and other agencies allowed SLH to reach folks who they otherwise would have never encountered.[180] Fortunately for St. Leonard's House, prison administrators often "saw utility in some forms of Christianity that promised to reform, redeem, or, at minimum, help manage their charges."[181] Given this belief, it was not often difficult for members of the clergy to build positive working relationships with prison staff.

Despite the benefits of direct access to prison staff and the incarcerated population, there were occasional downsides of such access. First, churches were often concerned about prison chaplains being influenced by the institutional agenda of the penal institutions at which they

[176] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Open Door* newsletter, 1957 Progress report, Box A669, Folder 13, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[177] Ibid.
[178] St. Leonard's Ministries, Annual report, 1961, Box A669, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[179] O'Brien, "A Prison in Your Community."
[180] St. Leonard's Ministries, "Progress at Last at County Jail" *Chicago Tribune* article, 1960, Box A664, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[181] O'Brien, "A Prison in Your Community," 99.

worked, at the detriment of their chaplaincy appointment.[182] Specifically there was a belief that chaplains would "experience role conflict when attempting to balance their responsibilities to inmates with those to COs [correction officers] and administrators."[183] This was a concern because the conflicting expectations of the church and the prison staff could put chaplains in a place where they are unable to perform their role as expected. This sentiment was reflected in St. Leonard's House 1963 Annual Report:

> We feel that it is important that none of our chaplains are on an institutional payroll. This fact, together with the warm and cooperative relationship which we have with the wardens and administrations of all the institutions we serve, gives us the freedom necessary to provide an effective institutional ministry to Episcopalians incarcerated in their institutions, as well as an effective program of counseling and assistance to all prisoners.[184]

When Father Cronan Murphy left Cook County Jail in 1960, he alluded to such conflict, noting that the "prisoner population and administrative problems are increasing."[185] While he did not specify that such conflict was an effect of his job or affected his ability to perform his role as the chaplain, he would not be the only pioneer in the Chicagoland reentry landscape to acknowledge concern over competing demands. Ultimately, balancing the needs of the incarcerated with the demands of the institution was a skill that chaplains had to develop to make a long-term impact on the incarcerated and returning populations. As Fathers Jones and Serfling noted, "the chaplain

[182] Sundt and Cullen, "The Role of the Contemporary Prison Chaplain."
[183] Ibid., 279.
[184] St. Leonard's Ministries, Annual report, 1963, Box A669, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[185] Pakenham, "Jail Chaplain Off to Big Job."

must walk the difficult tightrope of the intermediary between the security administration and the inmate population."[186]

There were other instances of conflict that occasionally arose between clergy members and the staff of penal institutions given their occasionally divergent goals. One such incident took place with Father Jones as he was conducting a Sunday afternoon service in Cook County Jail. The interaction, according to Robert Cromie, went as follows:

> [Father Jones] found it impossible to keep his mind on the sermon. One of the guards not only failed to remove his uniform cap but also disrupted proceedings several times by ordering members of the congregation back to their cells for some breach of his own version of the rules. The chaplain…became increasingly angry as the disturbances continued, and when the services ended and the prisoners were filing out, Father Jones stopped the guard and asked if he would avoid such needless actions in the future. "Who do you think you are," the guard snapped back, "telling me what to do?" The broad-shouldered chaplain, a 190 pounder with a quick-fused temper, wasted no time arguing. He simply picked up the guard and sent him sprawling out the door. The incident, understandably, strained relations between the prison staff and the chaplain for a few days.[187]

Admittedly, the vast majority of chaplains at this time likely did not have the life experience or temperament of Father Jones, so most instances of conflict between prison staff and religious institutions were not quite so physical or volatile. Still, conflict was inevitable given that prison

---

[186] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "To those interested in St. Leonard's House…" (James Jones & Robert Serfling), undated, Box A673, Folder 2, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[187] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "A Chance to Go Straight" biography (Robert Cromie), undated, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

chaplains and prison staff had fundamentally different motivations behind their interactions with the incarcerated population.[188] However, as Fathers Jones and Serfling wrote, "a half-way ex-prisoner house will not and cannot work outside the walls of a purely punitive prison; it must be in connection with the prison system that wants to turn out a man better than it found it."[189] In other words, religious institutions were only allowed the opportunity to build upon this access because, ultimately, agents of the facilities in which they worked generally supported their rehabilitative efforts. This means that the relationship-building afforded by access was just as crucial as the access itself.

Many religious institutions and the actors that represented them made the most of this access to oft restricted carceral spaces and utilized these relationships with incarcerated individuals, returning citizens, facility guards, wardens, administrators, and various political and government boards to pioneer Chicagoland reentry efforts in the 1950s and 1960s. As I will explain below, these religious actors combined this access with the power, network, and resources of their institutions to expand their reach and establish their reentry programs as long-time fixtures in the community.

Institutional Networks, Resources & Infrastructure

The second key factor in the ability of religious actors to make great strides in the provision of reentry services and support was that religious institutions had the infrastructure to support such undertakings on a large scale, including extensive networks of parishioners, access to capital, and established relationships with various institutions throughout the Chicagoland community. As

[188] Ibid.
[189] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "To those interested in St. Leonard's House…" (James Jones & Robert Serfling), undated, Box A673, Folder 2, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

evaluators of faith and non-faith reentry programs noted, "faith-based ministries have large social networks…[which] can provide for housing, social support, and employment…as well as other charitable donations such as clothing when an inmate returns to society."[190] Essentially, individual chaplains, parishioners, and other pioneers in the reentry space were able to tap into the economic and social capital of their respective religious institutions and, in combination with their own cultural capital, develop wide-reaching and sustainable reentry programming.

The Funding of St. Leonard's House & Calls to Parishioners

At its inception, the St. Leonard's House program was housed in an old Episcopal building that, as I noted above, was given to Father Jones by Bishop Gerald Francis Burrill. Although the building was "run-down," Jones' access to it, and the support he received in early days from Reverend James I. Davidson, Rector of St. Andrew's Episcopal Church around the corner, are the first examples of SLH benefitting from the material and social resources of the Episcopal Church.[191] Additionally, only four years after its opening, St. Leonard's House had been moved to a 22-room building and featured "an Episcopal Salvage Outlet…two Episcopal clergymen, an administrative staff of four, and a group of physicians, dentists and psychiatrists, who stand ready to help men with physical or mental problems."[192] Such exponential growth under such a short period of time was only possible because of the resources and infrastructure unique to established religious institutions.

---

[190] Nayer, Perez-Feliciano, and Michael Adams, "Got Faith?"
[191] Louise Hutchinson, "Pastor Helps Ex-Convicts Get Fresh Start at Center," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, Dec. 25, 1955.
[192] St. Leonard's Ministries, "Let Every Guest be Received as Christ."

When it was first founded, the St. Leonard's House building and the program were then solely sustained by Episcopal funds and gifts from supporters,[193] which required Reverend G. Jones to travel to various parishes and give speeches on the work of St. Leonard's House.[194] On one occasion, Father Jones traveled to St. David's Church in Glenview to give a sermon on SLH that so touched parishioners that Jones returned just a couple of weeks later to load up a truck with a washing machine and a variety of furniture donations from those who attended.[195] Just a few days later, Father Jones received a letter from a parishioner of Christ Church who had heard a sermon the preceding Sunday and offered Jones an automatic electric hot water heater for the new SLH building.[196]

It was because of these sermon-delivering and fundraising efforts on the part of Father Jones that SLH got the attention of the Women's Guild of the Winnetka Congregational Church and the Women's Auxiliary of Christ Church.[197] And it was due to the dedication of these groups to St. Leonard's House that, only two years after its founding, SLH was relocated from its original six-person,[198] "seedy Victorian mansion on Chicago's Washington Boulevard"[199] to "a newly purchased and paid for 22-room building" at 2100 W. Warren Blvd.[200] As Robert Cromie noted in his undated biography of Father Jones,

---

[193] Hutchinson, "Pastor Helps Ex-Convicts Get Fresh Start at Center."
[194] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, Schreiner correspondence, November 26, 2003, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[195] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, A. Fuller Dean correspondence, March 15, 1956, Box A673, Folder 15, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[196] Ibid.
[197] St. Leonard's Ministries, "St. Leonard's House Provides a Haven for Ex-Prisoners."
[198] Ibid.
[199] Dunlop, "The Strange Family of Father Jones," 15.
[200] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, *Family of St. Leonard's* newsletter, August 29, 1957, Box A673, Folder 14, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

> In 1955 he contracted to buy the present St. Leonard's House, a block from the original one, for $23,000. Another $30,000 was needed to put it in shape. At that point financial help came from both the diocesan budget for dity [sic] missions and from donations…Mrs. Charles Howells Coffin, a member of fashionable Christ Church in suburban Winnetka, heard Father Jones speak and went on a one-woman fund-raising spree. She collected $35,000 during 1956. As a result of these voluntary efforts, the fourteen-year mortgage was paid off in nine months.[201]

Without the ability to call upon all congregations within the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago, including those outside of the city limits who would likely otherwise not encounter St. Leonard's House or even hear of the troubles faced by returning citizens, Father Jones would not have had success growing St. Leonard's as a program and as a residence as quickly as he did. Even after St. Leonard's House was incorporated in 1958 as an agency of the Episcopal Church and began receiving state funding[202] as well as funds from private efforts like McCormick Foundation[203] and the Wieboldt Foundation,[204] SLH nonetheless depended on the consistency of donations of time, money, and material goods from members of their network to keep the program running.

Other religious institutions similarly relied upon the goodwill of parishioners to keep their reentry programs afloat. The United Methodist Men of the Illinois Conference of the United Methodist Church were another such example. In the handout about their Prison Release Ministry,

---

[201] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "A Chance to Go Straight" biography (Robert Cromie), undated, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[202] St. Leonard's Ministries, Annual report, 1959, Box A669, Folder 2, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[203] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, Friends of St. Leonard's House correspondence, February 1961, Box A673, Folder 14, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[204] St. Leonard's House, *Wieboldt Foundation* report, March 1, 1965, Box A667, Folder 21, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

they explicitly ask the reader, "Will you help this man?"[205] They soon go on to list a wealth of ways by which one could offer their assistance including through correspondence, visitation, counseling, or family support; training men for work that will help them rebuild their lives; ministering through the local church and conference; and aiding the state as it serves incarcerated and returning citizens.[206] The handout closes with the following:

> WHEN? NOW!
>
> Your Help is Needed NOW!
>
> By: Your gifts of money!
>
> Your commitment of time!
>
> Your concern for your brother![207]

I don't believe they could make their requests any clearer. They wanted assistance as they supported returning citizens and they wanted it immediately!

Relationship Building, Public-Private Partnerships & Institutional Networks

Affiliation with a religious institution also provided Father Jones and other religious actors with a sense of credibility that they could leverage in developing connections with non-religious institutions. In the first few years of the SLH program, for example, Father Jones "convinced the electric power and gas companies their bills would be paid eventually and "wheedled the telephone people into overlooking their traditional deposit."[208] Additionally, in contrast to state-run correctional centers in urban areas, St. Leonard's House and other religious programs generally

---

[205] Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records, United Methodist Men Prison Release Ministry, Undated, Box 2, Prison Committee, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscripts Collection.
[206] Ibid.
[207] Ibid.
[208] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "A Chance to Go Straight" biography (Robert Cromie), undated, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

did not face "not-in-my-backyard" protests and "drew little public opposition and virtually no critical media coverage until the late 1980s."[209]

The St. Leonard's House partnership with the Illinois Parole Board (IPB) is another example of the crucial role that direct access and network-building abilities played in the expansion of SLH. In addition to the referrals that they received through its relationship with prison staff and volunteers, St. Leonard's House also built a positive relationship with the IPB which allowed them access to parolees who previously could not reside at St. Leonard's House due to parole restrictions forbidding them from living together.[210] Given this, the IL Parole Board partnership was essential to the growth of SLH. The first instance in which this relationship came to bear was when, for St. Leonard's House specifically, the IL Parole Board waived the rule that forbade individuals on parole from living and socializing together, allowing St. Leonard's to house individuals released on parole, and thus opening up the IPB as a viable referral source for SLH by 1957.[211] By 1963, 91.5% of St. Leonard's House residents were under parole supervision.[212] The second development in the relationship between IPB and SLH was when, in 1961, the IPB approved a program that allowed men with confirmed housing but no employment prospects to be released on parole into the care of St. Leonard's House through a nonresidential program.[213] In other words, the IL Parole Board allowed SLH to provide sponsorship for over two hundred men in a three-year period whose lack of employment options would have otherwise left them incarcerated indefinitely.[214] This

[209] O'Brien, "A Prison in Your Community."
[210] St. Leonard's Ministries, "St. Leonard's House Provides a Haven for Ex-Prisoners."
[211] Ibid.
[212] St. Leonard's Ministries, Annual report, 1963, Box A669, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[213] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Keys of St. Leonard's* newsletter, July 1961, Box A669, Folder 11, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[214] St. Leonard's House, *Wieboldt Foundation* report, March 1, 1965, Box A667, Folder 21, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

relationship with the IPB thus provided SLH with the opportunity to greatly expand the pool of individuals they served and the types of program offerings they provided.[215]

It is worth noting that the IL Parole Board offices were not housed in the penal facilities to which chaplains had direct access. However, the relationships that these chaplains were able to build with the staff and administration within these facilities ultimately allowed them access to state administrators who had the power to authorize such important policy changes. Additionally, I want to underscore that the IPB made exceptions to their fraternization rule *specifically for St. Leonard's* – these were not sweeping changes in policy but were special considerations made for SLH. In fact, it was not until winter 1968 that the Illinois Department of Corrections and the Illinois Parole Board "unanimously relaxed the rigid rule of non-association of ex-offenders"[216] – a move that benefited the self-made reentry programs[217] discussed in Chapter 3. In other words, SLH benefited from its close relationship with correctional authorities and state agencies before any formal state parole reform or reentry efforts began.[218]

Interestingly, the relationship that St. Leonard's House formed with the Illinois Parole Board was a precursor to the public-private partnerships that would come to dominate the reentry landscape, as I will discuss in Chapter 2. And, like the relationships that state agencies would come to form with private organizations during the War on Poverty and under the Nixon administration, the relationship between SLH and IPB was mutually beneficial. First, this partnership allowed

---

[215] Ibid.
[216] Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary House of Representatives, Ninety-Second Congress, First Session on Corrections, "Part IV: Prisons, Prison Reform, and Prisoners' Rights: Wisconsin, November 23, 1971," Serial No. 15 (Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972).
[217] Reentry efforts that were created for returning citizens by returning citizens.
[218] St. Leonard's Ministries, *Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago* membership application, January 20, 1960, Box A664, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

overcrowded Illinois penal facilities to free up space[219] by releasing individuals who were eligible for parole but would have remained incarcerated for up to three years due to job search barriers.[220] Additionally, IPB may have benefited from this partnership by essentially using SLH's goodwill in the community to legitimate surveillance efforts that may have otherwise been opposed. Historian Cyrus J. O'Brien has argued that "private facilities – especially those operated by religious groups – drew little public opposition and virtually no critical media coverage,"[221] thus allowing for the Illinois Parole Board to expand their reach into these facilities and communities without experiencing pushback from the public who, at the time, had begun questioning the American prison system.[222] It is not clear then what specifically motivated the Illinois Parole Board to engage in this partnership with St. Leonard's House, but it is apparent that SLH benefited from having IPB in their network.

The St. Leonard's Farm in Three Rivers, Michigan was another interesting example of how church infrastructure allowed for the growth of the St. Leonard's program. The idea for the Farm, which was active for only three years until being closed in 1963,[223] came about when SLH staff began to realize that some returning citizens were facing extreme cases of what they called "institutionalization."[224] This specific population of men was "highly institutionalized" during incarceration, and thus, upon their release, lacked the confidence or sense of autonomy to make

[219] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "'Hoodlum Priest' Guides Their Steps" (Tony Weitzel), undated, Box A673, Folder 2, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[220] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Keys of St. Leonard's* newsletter, March 1961, Box A669, Folder 11, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[221] O'Brien, "'A Prison in Your Community," 111.
[222] Heather Ann Thompson, Blood in the Water: The Attica Prison Uprising of 1971 and Its Legacy (New York: Pantheon Books, 2016).
[223] St. Leonard's Ministries, Annual report, 1963, Box A669, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[224] St. Leonard's Ministries, St. Leonard's Farm report, 1961, Box A664, Folder 7, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

decisions, set goals, or relate to others.[225] In other words, they became so accustomed to the rules and structure of the penal facility that strip them of their autonomy, individuality, drive, and humanness, that they have a difficult time transitioning back to life in the city. According to the SLH staff, "too often a man whose personality has been damaged this degree will commit some senseless crime just in order that he may return to the protective environment of the penal institution which, ironically, has itself been the instrument of the damage done."[226] SLH staff felt that this unique population would benefit from a place where they would receive "quiet and firm counseling" while also having time to relax, pray, and reflect on past mistakes in order to ease their transition back to society.[227]

St. Leonard's Farm came to fruition because of the many relationships that the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago was able to establish. First, SLH discovered land that they wanted to use that was owned "by a Churchman."[228] According to a December 1957 newsletter, the landowner's "concern for the work of the Church induced him to permit us to buy the farm by bits."[229] Just four months after this purchase was announced, the Women's Auxiliary of Christ Church, who fundraised for the new SLH Chicago building as I mentioned above, gifted $700 to the St. Leonard's Farm through the fundraising efforts of another church- St. David's in Glenview, IL.[230] Additionally, St. Leonard's Farm involved inter-state collaboration which was made possible by the Episcopal Diocese. Through the diocese, an arrangement was made such that the Bishop of

[225] Ibid.
[226] Ibid.
[227] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Open Door* newsletter, December 1957, Box A669, Folder 13, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[228] Ibid.
[229] Ibid.
[230] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Open Door* newsletter, March 1958, Box A669, Folder 13, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

Western Michigan was able to create an Advisory Board that acted as the primary liaison between its Michigan parishioners and St. Leonard's Farm.[231] Finally, St. Leonard's Farm developed a partnership with the Michigan Parole Board to become the first and only agency in Michigan to provide parole and release plans. The fact that no such agency existed in the state, despite the Michigan Parole Board forbidding out-of-state travel,[232] in combination with the speed at which this partnership was developed[233] suggests St. Leonard's Farm's association with the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago and, as a result, the Diocese of Western Michigan, led the Michigan Parole Board to make exceptions for the Farm as the Illinois Parole Board had done for SLH.

The Difficulty of Fundraising

Despite their frequent success, not all religious figures wanted to play a role in the strategic relationship-building and fundraising that was required to access material donations, monetary donations, volunteers, and other resources. In an interview for a 1963 *Chicago Sun Times* article, Jones stated,

> My major problem, I'm convinced, is that I'm being put to work in an area of fundraising which is not my best shot. I would be working with criminals, not begging or making speeches for money. I have to scramble around…making a speech before a garden club for a $20 fee. We need that $20 fee. We can't get along with it. Suppose I consulted with 10

[231] St. Leonard's Ministries, St. Leonard's Farm report, 1961, Box A664, Folder 7, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[232] Ibid.
[233] While I did not find any official paperwork stating the dates of this partnership, it was reported on in the 1961 St. Leonard's Farm introductory report which suggests to me that the relationship had been established within a year of the 1960 opening of the Farm.

> people during those four or five hours. Suppose I could stop two of them – and I could stop more – from stealing. Think of the money I would save the public.[234]

While there are several reasons why St. Leonard's House might not have been getting the financial support from the diocese that Father Jones thought it deserved, it is clear here that Jones was disillusioned with the process that required him to fundraise to keep SLH afloat. He believed he would be more valuable working directly with returning citizens as he did when he began the St. Leonard's House program.

In a 1963 letter to Northbrook residents and longtime friends Louise and Jack Tallman, Father James G. Jones wrote:

> I, now, for eleven years have been shaking the tambourine like a damn gypsy from one end of the diocese to the other and I am getting tired of it. I know that there are people who could pledge $100 or $25 or $10 or $1.00 a month to St. Leonard's House and underwrite this budget and save me and my religion. Therefore, I am after you Jack and Louise. Your last donation was in April of 1960 of $3.00. We appreciate this very much but now suggest that you get on a stick, make a monthly pledge and do something that will make you feel real good.[235]

Here Jones again expresses his frustration with having to fundraise for St. Leonard's House when there are people who could easily afford to donate regularly and support the SLH cause. That said, the brash and straightforward tone that characterize this correspondence does not necessarily suggest the level of frustration that it might indicate for someone without Jones' unconventional

---

[234] Brennan, "The Frustrations- and Hopes- of St. Leonard's House."
[235] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, Louise and Jack Tallman correspondence, May 20, 1963, Box A673, Folder 15, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

background and demeanor as mentioned above. We see a similarly brazen tone in his February 1961 correspondence to Friends of St. Leonard's House, in which he wrote: "If 500 wonderful people like you would pledge $10 a month (representing just the price of 1 carton of cigarettes a week), or if 1,000 of you would pledge $5 a month (the price of 2 dry martinis a week), we'd have the entire 1961 budget assured."[236] So, while some of Father Jones' tone may have been more reflective of his unique personality than his frustrations, his statements to the Tallman family and to the *Chicago Sun Times* nonetheless highlighted his disdain for the fundraising process necessitated by his institution.

Despite Father Jones' sense of disillusionment regarding the inconsistency of funding and the need to fundraise in order to maintain the SLH residence and program, it is undeniable that St. Leonard's House directly and indirectly benefited from the resources of the Episcopal Diocese. In 1961, for example, SLH did not receive the National Council of the Episcopal Church three-year grant that they applied for with the goal of making St. Leonard's Farm self-sustaining by the end of that time period.[237] However, this was because SLH's request "arrived too late for consideration in the 1962 budget."[238] Even still, the Farm received $1,500 from the Council. Moreover, this same year SLH received $6,000 from Bishop Burrill for the planned purchase of a new rectory.[239] So, while Father Jones did have to speak at different parishes and write letters to parishioners requesting donations for the House, even without the support of individual Episcopalians, SLH

[236] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, Friends of St. Leonard's House correspondence, February 1961, Box A673, Folder 14, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[237] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Keys of St. Leonard's* newsletter, July 1961, Box A669, Folder 11, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[238] Ibid.
[239] Ibid.

benefited from the resources of the Episcopal Church and were able to grow their efforts due to this institutional funding.

Opportunities to Influence the Reentry Landscape

The final factor that allowed for religious actors to dominate the reentry space in Chicago was that the neglect of state and social services provided religious institutions with a unique opportunity to influence services for an underserved population. In essence, St. Leonard's House and other religious institutions came to directly influence and dominate all reentry discourse taking place in Chicago during the 1950s-1960s because the space was available for them to do so. In one report, St. Leonard's House wrote: "In other countries, the half-way house idea has been developed by the state. We feel that the Church has an important contribution to make to development of this idea."[240] In fact, Father Dismas Clark urged that the "movement be kept in private hands rather than have state participation" at all.[241] For the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago, the Roman Catholic Church, and other religious institutions, their direct access to the incarcerated and returning populations in combination with their institutional resources and networks ultimately placed them in a better position than state institutions to shape the landscape of reentry in Chicagoland and beyond. As one Gary, IN reverend noted when he began his own halfway house efforts, "the church is the only institution that has an answer…other institutions have failed."[242]

Similar sentiments were shared by the Chicago Conference on Religion and Race (CCRR) which was formed in January 1963 and "officially" spoke on matters of "racial harmony" for the

[240] St. Leonard's Ministries, St. Leonard's Farm report, 1961, Box A664, Folder 7, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[241] Meiners, "A Halfway House for Parolees."
[242] Luci Horton, "Gary Minister, Ex-Convicts Join to Prevent Crime," *Chicago Tribune,* Jun. 13, 1971.

Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish communities.[243] After conducting visits to Pontiac and Stateville penitentiaries, the CCRR Special Committee on Prison Reform wrote the following about the staff and administration of those facilities: "The people at the institution seem to have accepted the community's negative attitude regarding the reception of minority members in the community. They have not come to grips with the fact that they can challenge that position and possibly do much from their power positions to change the conditions."[244] Essentially, these religious figures felt that agents of the penal facilities had simply accepted that returning citizens would face discrimination and disdain upon their reintegration back into their communities. Rather than doing anything to address this as individuals or using the resources of the state, they simply accepted this plight of previously incarcerated individuals as inevitable.

Interestingly, these very agents of the state similarly identified flaws in the system in which they worked and spoke to the unique work of religious institutions in addressing the needs of returning citizens that carceral institutions did or could not address. One such institutional actor, Joseph Lohman who served as Cook County Sheriff from 1954 to 1958, stated said at the dedication ceremony for St. Leonard's House new facility: "This is the single most important contribution to the philosophy of correction in a generation."[245] According to an article about the ceremony, Lohman went on to state, "it is a terrific indictment of our prisons that they make transgressors worse. These are men rejected and repelled by the community and find people and friendship only among those they have known in jail. St. Leonard's will bridge the gap back to

[243] Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records, Proposal to Sheriff Ogilvie and Greater Chicago Area Chiefs of Police, September 1964, Box 3, Sheriff of Cook County [1964], Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscripts Collection.
[244] Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records, Special Committee on Prison Reform CCRR, undated, Box 2, Prison Committee, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscripts Collection.
[245] Dunlop, "The Strange Family of Father Jones," 19.

society when they are released."[246] During his time as Cook County Sheriff, Lohman made significant changes to the Cook County Jail system in order to address some of these flaws in the carceral system- changes that were recounted in a final report:

> In the past four years the Cook County Jail has been shaken to its foundation. Shaken with reforms…improvements…understanding…and realistic attempts at rehabilitation of its inmates. So impressive were the changes that the Grand Jury report of April, 1956 read: 'We believe Sheriff Lohman and his associated have done more in the past 15 months than has been done in the last 10 years.'…Sheriff Lohman and his staff set about their task of progressive reforms. Many are visible, but the most important of them would remain 'invisible' and be taken for normal unless they were described.[247]

The extensive nature of Lohman's own reform efforts in combination with his extensive knowledge of the carceral system as both a trained criminologist and the Cook County Sheriff make his belief in the unique ability of a religious institution to overcome barriers that penal institutions cannot especially poignant.

In addition to the state, nonprofit social services were also absent from many of the early conversations about reentry in Chicago in the 1950s. This may be because what carceral geographer Ruth Wilson Gilmore described as the nonprofit industrial complex had not yet been established to act as a safety net for this neglected population.[248] While U.S. nonprofits have been around since the mid-17th century, the responsibility of providing direct services to those who

---

[246] Ibid.
[247] A Final Report: Four Years of Progress, 1954-1958, Cook County (Ill.) Sheriff report, 1958, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscript Collections.
[248] Ruth Wilson Gilmore, "In the Shadow of the State," in *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Nonprofit Industrial Complex*, ed. INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2007).

were "in the throes of the abandonment" wasn't placed upon the nonprofit sector until the expansion of government agencies and services through the early 1970s led to a subsequent effort by anti-state intervention actors to undo those programs at the state, federal, county, and local levels.[249] Since there was no nonprofit industrial complex to fill the state's gap in support for the incarcerated and returning populations, religious institutions moved to become their safety net.

One sphere of influence that St. Leonard's House had was over peer programs across the country. In the 1957 SLH progress report, Reverend James G. Jones wrote:

> One of our major sub-projects has been communication with two other groups that have started. The Quakers have opened their rehabilitation house in Los Angeles, California, and the State of Delaware has opened their house. We have been their host on two different occasions to discuss the various methods and we spent some time helping the Quakers set up their budget.[250]

The fact that SLH consulted for both a religious reentry program and a state reentry effort just goes on to highlight the centrality of the SLH model to all reentry efforts of the late 1950s. The influence of SLH continued into the 1960s as Father Jones traveled across the country to speak in Episcopal churches and "stimulate interest" in proposed reentry projects being developed in the area.[251]

In a 1963 annual report, the staff of St. Leonard's House wrote, "it is or philosophy to influence the institutional and parole authorities as best we can."[252] SLH viewed its partnerships with institutions of the state as opportunities to influence policy on whatever scale they possibly

---

[249] Ibid., 45.
[250] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Open Door* newsletter, 1957 Progress report, Box A669, Folder 13, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[251] "Minister Here to Aid Home for Ex-Convicts," *New York Herald Tribune,* May 19, 1962.
[252] St. Leonard's Ministries, Annual report, 1963, Box A669, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

could. As I will discuss in-depth in the following chapter, SLH viewed the non-residential reentry support program that came from their partnership with the Illinois Parole Board as "a model for an experimental case load that could be utilized by any parole jurisdiction."[253] St. Leonard's House took a similar approach to all of the programs they developed for returning citizens. Essentially, SLH leadership believed that if they were doing their job right and capitalizing on their access in order to inspire the establishment of state-run and state-funded efforts for returning citizens, they would eventually render their own programs obsolete.[254] When discussing the closure of the Women's Residence Program in 1970, SLH wrote in their March newsletter, the program "was discontinued after the state of Illinois initiated its women's residence program, which is in keeping with our philosophy of maintaining programs only until we can convince the proper public agency that it is its obligation to provide these programs for a particular segment of the population."[255] Other religious leaders who were involved in Chicagoland reentry efforts similarly saw their role as being to influence public policy on a grand scale like Dorothy Drish of the Citizens Committee for Employment (CCE) who joined the Cook County Department of Corrections Board upon its inception in 1969.[256]

Interestingly, one specific portion of the returning population that did garner interest prior to the formation of the 1950s-1960s Chicago reentry landscape was juvenile returning citizens. As early as the turn of the 20th century, Black Clubwomen called attention to the exploitation of Black children in the southern criminal system.[257] By the 1960s, concerns about youth in the criminal

---

[253] Ibid.
[254] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Keys of St. Leonard's* newsletter, March 1970, Box A669, Folder 12, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[255] Ibid.
[256] "3 Named to Jail Board."
[257] Tera Eva Agyepong, *The Criminalization of Black Children: Race, Gender, and Delinquency in Chicago's Juvenile Justice System, 1899-1945* (Durham: University of North Carolina Press, 2018).

system and, more specifically, fears around "juvenile delinquency" had moved north, leading to Chicago becoming home to the very first juvenile court.[258] Such concerns eventually reached the federal level as seen by President John F. Kennedy's passing of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 which established the Office of Juvenile Delinquency which sponsored programs like Neighborhood Youth Corps and Head Start.[259] By 1964, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons James V. Bennett had piloted "prerelease guidance centers" in Los Angeles, Detroit, New York City, and Chicago to combat youth parole violation by "reintroduce[ing] the youths to their communities and families in a more gradual way and help[ing] to resolve the inevitable problems the youth encounter in earning acceptance and a place for themselves…"[260] According to Kennedy, the problems of unemployment, discrimination, lack of emotional or familial support, and negative old associations that all returning citizens faced were "worse for youngsters,"[261] which explained their decision to "start with the juveniles and youths."[262]

That said, efforts made regarding juvenile delinquency were often couched in the language of preserving a community's sense of safety, were frequently punitive and occasionally violent, and were done with a goal of cracking down on youth in the community rather than offering support to youth who were in the criminal system.[263] The Chicago Police Department Juvenile Unit is one such example, which was expanded upon in the city's "growing effort to control young Chicagoans" and "had the effect of further embedding police control and surveillance" into the

---

[258] Ibid.
[259] Naomi Murakawa, *The First Civil Right: How Liberals Built Prison America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 75.
[260] Robert F. Kennedy, "Halfway Houses Pay Off," *National Council on Crime and Delinquency* 10, no. 1 (1964): 1.
[261] Ibid., 2.
[262] Ibid., 3.
[263] Simon Balto, *Occupied Territory: Policing Black Chicago* (Durham: University of North Carolina Press, 2019).

lives of kids in the city's most disadvantaged neighborhoods.[264] Regardless, as I will discuss in the chapter that follows, local and federal support emerged for the juvenile population before adult returning citizens emerged as a population of interest among these institutions. This meant that St. Leonard's House and other religious institutions had the opportunity to influence adult reentry efforts significantly before the state got involved.

Limitations of Religion in Reentry

Despite the sizeable impact that religious institutions had on the reentry landscape in Chicago due to the access, infrastructure, and opportunity they were afforded, there were some characteristics of these institutions that limited their success. One such limitation was the contentious relationship that many returning citizens had with the church. As noted in one St. Leonard's program report, "for many, the community of the church is too self-righteous for their present frame of mind. This community gives them a guilt-complex with which they are unable to cope…"[265] For many returning citizens, this did not keep them from utilizing the services of St. Leonard's House or other reentry programs run by religious entities, particularly when those programs were intentional about not forcing any one religion or faith onto their residents—as Father Jones said, "if anyone has thoughts of starting similar work, he should quit if he has in mind a house in which he can force conversion. He must be content to sow his seed and let apollos water."[266] However, such an aversion to church communities may have kept any number of returning citizens away from the support systems they needed- there's simply no way to know.

---

[264] Ibid., 146.
[265] St. Leonard's House, Progress report, November 1, 1962, Box A667, Folder 21, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[266] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, Schreiner correspondence, November 26, 2003, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

Additionally, some religious institutions were said to be vehemently opposed to their clergymen participating in political action which became an issue of contention during the Civil Rights Movement and Chicago Freedom Movement in the 1960s.[267] One reason behind this opposition to political involvement was because many churchgoers were politically conservative. As noted in a history of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago, the civil rights and anti-war movements were "strongly supported by ecumenical leadership throughout the country," but "local churches, particularly the laity, were more conservative."[268]

Oftentimes this conservative nature manifested as opposition to integration. Catholic, Episcopal, and Protestant churches all had a history of barring nonwhite parishioners from their space and oftentimes establishing new segregated parishes specifically for people of color. Many Catholic priests and parishioners, for example, "did not express enthusiasm" for new Puerto Rican or Mexican residents and "did not welcome or accommodate" them in their parishes.[269] Another story tells of a white Protestant man in 1960s Evanston whose attempts to integrate his neighborhood and Protestant church led to his fellow parishioners demanding his excommunication.[270] Additionally, a write-up St. Edmund's Parish, a Black parish dating back to 1928, author Reverend B.B. Fisher argues, "the opportunity for the Episcopal Church work among Negroes is limited only by the ability of the rector and the enthusiasm of his lay workers."[271]

---

[267] Irv Kupcinet, "Kup's Column," *Chicago Sun-Times*, Jun. 28, 1965.
[268] Eighty Years of Ministry: The History of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago, Report, 1987, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscript Collections.
[269] Lilia Fernandez, Brown in the Windy City: Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in Postwar Chicago (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012)
[270] Terkel, *Division Street*.
[271] St. Edmund's Episcopal Church Archives [Box 12, Folder 2], "Negro Work: Much Has Been Done, Yet Much Remains" (Rev. B. B. Fisher), 1948, Vivian G. Harsh Research Collection of Afro-American History and Literature, Chicago Public Library.

In Studs Terkel's book on 1960 Chicagoland residents, he spoke with a white Presbyterian parishioner whose comments highlighted this disdain for black residents and Civil Rights efforts. According to Terkel, this Chicagoan said, "The average white person, you ask him about integration, is the Negro equal? He wants to scream NO. But he thinks back and he's a Christian. Now he knows in his heart that he doesn't believe he's equal, but all this Christian training almost forces him to say yes."[272] These examples suggest a strong hidden culture of anti-Blackness in multiple church spaces which, in combination with other conservative ideals, led to the opposition of many parishioners to their clergy engaging in any political movements that centered on the rights of minority groups. Given this culture of anti-Blackness and general opposition to engagement with politicized populations, and the fact that Black Americans were overrepresented among the incarcerated and returning population,[273] many parishioners were likely vehemently opposed to church engagement with returning citizens. And, as I noted above, if reentry efforts like St. Leonard's House did not have the support of parishioners behind them, they simply would not have the resources necessary to successfully serve the returning population.

In addition to their disdain for nonwhite populations, many churchgoers at this time were also opposed to political action.[274] As the authors of a July 1965 *Chicago Tribune* editorial wrote, "we find it difficult to understand why clergymen who support such wild talk and wild demands think they are helping their churches or contributing to the cause of religion. Among the elements

---

[272] Terkel, *Division Street,* 126.
[273] Jeffrey S. Adler, "Less Crime, More Punishment: Violence, Race, and Criminal Justice in Early Twentieth-Century America," *The Journal of American History* (2015).
[274] It is worth noting here that many white Catholic parishioners did participate in the large-scale housing riots that took place in the 1940s-1950s and consisted of predominantly Catholic European immigrants using violence and intimidation to keep Black residents from moving into their communities. However, these actions were not characterized as political demonstrations [Arnold Hirsch, Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago, 1940-1960 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983)].

of religion are order, authority, charity, and peace, and we find none of these in campaigns of civil insurrection."[275] Here the authors express a clear disdain for both the causes behind which clergymen were organizing and the manner in which they organized. This disdain for political action in general and, more specifically, engagement in the social rights movements of the time often had very real effects, an example being the eventual reassignment of Reverend James G. Jones from St. Leonard's House and the Chicago Episcopal Diocese in general. It was rumored that Jones' outspoken support of integration and the Civil Rights Movement ultimately led to his transfer from St. Leonard's House in 1964.[276] As reporter Irv Kupcinet wrote in the midst of the Civil Rights movement,

> Clergymen who participate in civil rights demonstrations are beginning to get the "squeeze" play. A Roman Catholic priest was transferred in Alabama because of his efforts on behalf of Negroes. And the Reverend James G. Jones of the Episcopal Charities here may lose his post for the same reason. Father Jones, who has the courage to match his convictions would rather be transferred than halt his activities. His social views are not for sale.[277]

Notably, this statement was written in 1965, after Jones had already been transferred from the helm of St. Leonard's House, and thus likely referred to demonstrations he joined while in his role as Director of Development for Episcopal Charities.[278] According to the July 1965 *Chicago Tribune* editorial, at some point that year Father Jones had "invited his arrest by engaging in a sit-

[275] J. Howard Wood and W. D. Maxwell, "Editorial: Example of the Cloth," *Chicago Tribune,* Jul. 1, 1965.
[276] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, Schreiner correspondence, November 26, 2003, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[277] Kupcinet, "Kup's Column."
[278] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "St. Leonard's House Cleric Willowbrook Graduation Speaker" press publication [Villa Park, IL], May 28, 1965, Box A673, Folder 2, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

down designed to disrupt rush hour traffic at the city's busiest intersection,"[279] which may be the event to which Kupcinet refers above. However, while still at St. Leonard's House, Jones participated in the 1961 Prayer Pilgrimage to protest segregation practices in southern states which ultimately resulted in his arrest and multi-week detention.[280] This combined with his outspoken criticism of the Episcopal church's "modest civil rights platform"[281] may have been the catalyst for Jones' initial transfer from St. Leonard's House. If true, this means that the conservative nature of the church and its opposition to political engagement led them to sacrifice the success of SLH in order to take a stand against a politically active but undeniably successful clergyman.

Regardless of the reasons for his departure, Reverend James G. Jones left in January 1964 after about ten years at St. Leonard's House, at which time he was transferred to his new position of Director of Development of Episcopal Charities.[282] In his final correspondence with Friends of St. Leonard's Jones did not note a specific reason for his departure, rather he wrote:

> Although they have been much used in the tragic death of President Kennedy, the words of the Book of Proverbs do really apply. "All things and people have a time," and the time has come for the father-founder of St. Leonard's House to permit the work to grow and mature under new leadership. This will be a good-bye letter from me, but one with great hope that it will not be a good-bye from you.[283]

Under his direction, SLH expanded to include "all prison chaplaincy work in the Episcopal diocese; St. Leonard's House, St. Leonard's Farm in Michigan; the Episcopal Service organization

---

[279] Wood and Maxwell, "Editorial: Example of the Cloth."
[280] St. Leonard's Ministries, "We Could Not 'Stay at Home and Mind Our Own Business,'" *Advance* article, January 1962, Box A664, Folder 4, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[281] O'Brien, "A Prison in Your Community," 101.
[282] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "St. Leonard's House Cleric Willowbrook Graduation Speaker."
[283] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, Friends correspondence, January 23, 1964, Box A673, Folder 14, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

for employment of ex-prisoners, and the out-client program for counseling ex-prisoners and their families."[284] Individual religious actors like Jones utilized their institutional resources and demonstrated the initiative, resilience, and relationship-building skills that made early reentry programs possible. As one write-up on Reverend James G. Jones noted, "Father Jones and St. Leonard's…are virtually synonymous. Without him, the place would not exist."[285]

As much as these individuals needed the access, infrastructure, and opportunity that membership in or alliance with a religious institution afforded them, these institutions relied on individuals to come up with ideas, make one-on-one connections, do the groundwork dedicate all their time and energy to the cause, and do the groundwork. And while the influence of individual religious leaders cannot be overstated when discussing the role of religious institutions in reentry in Chicago, it is important to note that many of the programs they created were able to continue without them, leaving religious institutions like St. Leonard's House to be key players in the landscape of reentry in Chicago today.[286]

Ultimately, I argue that these religious leaders and the institutions behind them were the first to truly formalize reentry efforts as we know them today. In the next chapter, I will demonstrate how the reentry landscape grew from being dominated by these institutions in the 1950s into the early 1960s, before government antipoverty efforts flooded the reentry space with manpower development and training funds, thus shifting the type of reentry efforts that dominated the landscape from the mid-1960s through the early 1970s.

---

[284] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "St. Leonard's House Cleric Willowbrook Graduation Speaker."
[285] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "A Chance to Go Straight" biography (Robert Cromie), undated, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[286] "Re-entry Resources for Prisoners and Former Prisoners, *Illinois Legal Aid Online*, February 4, 2023. https://www.illinoislegalaid.org/legal-information/re-entry-resources-prisoners-and-former-prisoners

Chapter 2: Public-Private Partnerships During the War on Poverty

In 1974, Operation DARE (Direct Action for Rehabilitation and Employment), a program dedicated to providing employment support to returning citizens, reported a 7% recidivism rate among its program participants,[287] compared to the 51.4% national recidivism rate reported by federal prisons just a few years before.[288] When discussing their low recidivism rate and the success it represented, DARE employment coordinator Dick Turzinski noted, "the reason for our success is that DARE shows the ex-cons that somebody cares."[289] Without the effort of DARE and its volunteers, Turzinski went on to say, when the returning citizen got out "he [would] feel as if he's all alone and nobody cares what happens to him."[290]

While providing its returning citizens with both employment assistance and social support had become central to the program's mission, this multi-pronged approach to rehabilitation and employment was not the initial framework for Operation DARE. Like many programmatic efforts focused on the employment of previously incarcerated individuals in the 1960s to early-1970s, DARE was the result of national and state manpower development programs created to train the "hard-core unemployed."[291] While many of these programs differed in their language and execution and had varying levels of success, they were all largely motivated by the belief that residents of low-income minority communities in urban centers needed job training so that they could get long-term, stable employment.[292] DARE's original program efforts reflected this single-

[287] John Gorman, "They DARED, and Ex-Convicts Are the Winners," *Chicago Tribune,* Sep. 19, 1974.
[288] U.S. Department of Justice: Federal Bureau of Prisons, "Recidivism Among Federal Offenders," *National Institute of Justice,* 1986.
[289] Gorman, "They DARED, and Ex-Convicts Are the Winners."
[290] Ibid.
[291] William C. Selover, "Work-Program Clouds Hide Bright Spots," *Christian Science Monitor,* Jan. 26, 1966.
[292] Elizabeth Hinton, *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime: The Making of Mass Incarceration in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016).

minded focus on job training and skill development. When the program, funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), was first piloted in 1970 by the Illinois Department of Corrections in partnership with the Portland Cement Association, the goal was to utilize the Portland Cement manpower development and training department to train individuals on parole in construction trades and eventually get them accepted into the Operating Plasterers and Cement Masons International Union, AFL-CIO.[293] They argued that "financial stability is a necessity to attain a solid foundation in the community," which meant focusing on post-release employment was crucial.[294]

This iteration of the program proved to be somewhat successful, with "some parolees" getting accepted into the aforementioned union,[295] and only about 20% of enrollees dropping out of the training in the first year.[296] However, after only a year of the program, DARE leadership said in a Subcommittee Hearing on Prisons, Prison Reform, and Prisoners' Rights that getting community volunteers to provide social support to returning citizens before and after their release from incarceration was "equally important" to the job training efforts that DARE had been performing.[297] By 1971, there had already been years of expansive manpower development efforts across the country that looked more like DARE's original training-centered programming than the holistic approach they came to adopt. Beginning with the Manpower Development and Training

[293] "Plan to Put Ex-Convicts in Building Jobs," *Chicago Tribune,* Aug. 1, 1970.
[294] Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records, Operation DARE correspondence, July 18, 1972, Box 2, Prison Committee, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscripts Collection.
[295] "Plan to Put Ex-Convicts in Building Jobs."
[296] Stanley Ziemba, "Operation Dare Trains Ex-Convicts in Trades," *Chicago Tribune,* Jan. 17, 1971.
[297] Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary House of Representatives, Ninety-Second Congress, First Session on Corrections, "Part IV: Prisons, Prison Reform, and Prisoners' Rights: Wisconsin, November 23, 1971," Serial No. 15 (Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972).

Act of 1962 and antidelinquency efforts of President Kennedy,[298] continuing with a number of training and jobs programs passed during President Johnson's War on Poverty, and concluding with President Nixon's 1973 Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA),[299] this chapter focuses on the ways by which federal policy and national manpower development efforts led to a wealth of nationally funded programs that centered heavily on job training and skill development for previously incarcerated individuals rather than their social and emotional needs or their acquisition of jobs upon completion of training.

Communities Experiencing Poverty in the Long Sixties

The long sixties was a time of uncertainty for many Black Americans. National unemployment rates hit a record low in 1953, though the employment prospects for Black Americans in urban centers were minimal.[300] By 1958, national unemployment rates hit a historic high meaning that there were even fewer employment prospects for this Black urban population and many such communities were thrust into conditions of extreme poverty.[301] As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said of the Black community in 1966, "our greatest need is economic security."[302]

There were a number of social, political, and economic factors that explained this instability. Many Black Americans in large urban centers migrated from the South to seek out employment opportunities that they were told would be plentiful. Upon their arrival they found that increased automation, a decreased need for unskilled labor, and factories moving their jobs

---

[298] Gladys Roth Kremen, "MDTA: The Origins of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962," *U.S. Department of Labor*, 1974, https://www.dol.gov/general/aboutdol/history/mono-mdtatext.
[299] Richard Nixon, "Statement About the Emergency Employment Act of 1971," (San Clemente, CA), July 12, 1971.
[300] "Unemployment Rate (Seasonally Adjusted)," *Bureau of Labor Statistics*, retrieved April 25, 2023.
[301] Ibid.
[302] Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., (address, Chicago Freedom Festival, The Amphitheater, Chicago, IL, March 12, 1966).

South had ultimately led to declining job prospects for Black Americans in urban centers.[303] This economic instability exacerbated housing segregation which led to segregated and underfunded schools in Black urban communities. These schools lacked sufficient resources to "prepare students for careers in thriving industries like aerospace and engineering" and were thus unable to keep pace with the growing need for skilled labor.[304] Ultimately, the experiences of continued unemployment that Black Americans living in urban communities faced led to widespread experiences of extreme poverty.

Unemployment Among Returning Citizens

One subset of this Black American urban population that was especially hard hit by the high unemployment rates in their communities was previously incarcerated individuals. Incarcerated individuals were more likely than the general population to be undereducated and unemployed.[305] A survey that took place after the August 1965 Watts Rebellion in South Central Los Angeles found that half of the unemployed residents in the Watts area had an arrest record.[306] According to one missive distributed by Operation DARE in 1972, a whopping 75% of the thousands of men and women released on parole in the Chicagoland area were unable to find employment in the first 90 days of their release.[307] Because of the stigma associated with their convictions and the assumptions made about their inherent criminality, previously incarcerated

[303] Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., "The Chicago Plan," *Southern Christian Leadership Conference News* (Atlanta, GA), January 7, 1966.
[304] Hinton, *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime,* 67.
[305] Hinton, *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime*.
[306] Paul Sultan and Gerhard F. Ehmann, "The Employment of Persons with Arrest Records and the Ex-Offender," *National Conference of Christians and Jews* (1970).
[307] Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records, Operation DARE correspondence, July 18, 1972, Box 2, Prison Committee, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscripts Collection.

individuals were often denied employment opportunities, despite their desire to get a stable job and another chance at escaping poverty.[308]

This population also faced discrimination in licensing and bonding restrictions that limited their ability to find work even if they found an employer who was amenable to hiring them. By 1970, it was estimated that 25% of all commercial official jobs had bonding requirements, meaning they had a contract with a bonding company under which any loss they sustained because of a dishonest employee would be reimbursed to them.[309] The prevalence of bonding contracts among commercial employers posed a huge barrier to employment for many returning citizens as bonding companies often required that these employers "avoid knowingly hiring persons with criminal records."[310] This meant that employers who were open to hiring returning citizens had a legal contract prohibiting them from doing so, and those employers who were against hiring this population had a ready-made excuse for discriminating against this population.

Another form of discrimination against returning citizens during this time was the prevalence of licensing restrictions. According to a survey of state legislative codes, by 1975 there were 1,948 statutory provisions affecting over 300 occupations.[311] The reason behind many of these restrictions was unclear. By 1975, for example, there existed state laws requiring "good moral character" of septic tank cleaners and limburger cheesemakers.[312] Such seemingly random licensing restrictions ultimately had a negative impact on the morale and motivation of returning citizens, making them even more pessimistic about their employment prospects. As a volunteer of

---

[308] Gopal C. Pati, Raymond D. Curran and Gus Wilhelmy, "Operation DARE – Help for the Ex-Offender," *Business Horizons* (1973).
[309] Sultan and Ehmann, "The Employment of Persons with Arrest Records and the Ex-Offender."
[310] Ibid., 31.
[311] Timothy Larkin, "Removing the Ex-Offenders' Catch-22," *Journal of Employment Counseling* (1975): 128.
[312] Ibid., 28

Looking Toward Freedom, a Chicagoland self-made reentry organization,[313] stated, "It is impossible to motivate somebody when they can't even drive a taxicab, you know? Like taxi drivers have never been notoriously polite or anything, right? But [ex-convicts] still can't become taxicab drivers."[314]

It is important to note that many returning citizens had "erratic connections to the world of work,"[315] lacked verifiable references from previous employers,[316] and often had no more than an eight-grade education level.[317] In other words, returning citizens often faced barriers to employment that had to do with characteristics beyond their incarceration history. That said, other populations of jobseekers who had the same characteristics that marked previously incarcerated individuals as undesirable employees did not experience the same rates of unemployment[318] because they were not as stigmatized as the returning citizen. The refusal of prospective employers to hire returning citizens was a massive barrier to reintegration that resulted in high recidivism rates among previously incarcerated individuals, also known by DARE staff as "perpetual imprisonment syndrome."[319]For example, a 1975 study showed that an individual on parole who did not find gainful employment was four times less likely to successfully complete parole than their employed counterpart.[320] Additionally, a *Chicago Tribu*ne article reported that returning citizens who did not get a job in their first four weeks after being released increased their chance

[313] A self-made reentry organization is a reentry effort created for returning citizens by returning citizens. The specific organization mentioned here is Looking Toward Freedom which will be discussed in-depth in chapter 3.
[314] Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3, "Part IV: Prisons, Prison Reform, and Prisoners' Rights."
[315] James B. Jacobs, Richard McGahey, Robert Minion, "Ex-Offender Employment, Recidivism, and Manpower Policy: CETA, TJTC, and Future Initiatives," *Crime & Delinquency* 30, no. 4 (1984): 487.
[316] Frederick Lowe, "Staying Out of Prison: Overcoming Job Barriers Biggest Fight for Ex-Convicts," *Chicago Tribune*, Aug. 2, 1973.
[317] Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3, "Part IV: Prisons, Prison Reform, and Prisoners' Rights."
[318] Hinton, *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime*.
[319] Pati, Curran and Wilhelmy, "Operation DARE – Help for the Ex-Offender," 52.
[320] Larkin, "Removing the Ex-Offenders' Catch-22."

of returning to prison by 75-80%.[321] Based on these statistics, legal experts argued that "gainful employment [was] perhaps the most important ingredient needed to help ex-offenders pursue law-abiding, productive lives."[322]

The Emergence of Antipoverty Initiatives

A central influence on the reentry landscape in Chicago during this time of high unemployment rates among Black citizens was the War on Poverty and the manpower development programs that it created. President Lyndon B. Johnson's 1964 declaration of "unconditional war on poverty in America"[323] was not the first presidential acknowledgement of widespread unemployment in America. His predecessor, President John F. Kennedy, passed the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (MDTA) which focused on providing the unemployed population with vocational counseling, relevant soft skills, and, most importantly, the job skills necessary navigate the era of automation and technological change.[324] The Act "inaugurated substantial job training efforts targeted on both poor and middle class unemployed workers"[325] with programs geared specifically toward "African Americans and other groups who had been largely excluded" from the provisions and benefits experienced by many white families under the New Deal and the terms of the GI Bill.[326] That said, Kennedy's urban intervention efforts remained fairly small scale given that they "funded programs in only sixteen cities with a relatively modest allocation from Congress."[327] When Johnson declared his War on Poverty, then, it was a

[321] Lowe, "Staying Out of Prison."
[322] Mitchell W. Dale, "Barriers to the Rehabilitation of Ex-Offenders," *Crime & Delinquency* (1976): 322.
[323] Lyndon B. Johnson, "State of the Union Address," (Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union, January 8, 1964).
[324] Kremen, "The Origins of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962."
[325] Robert Haveman, Rebecca Blank, Robert Moffitt, Timothy Smeeding, and Geoffrey Wallace, "The War on Poverty: Measurement, Trends, and Policy," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 34, no. 3 (2015): 597.
[326] Hinton, *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime,* 30.
[327] Ibid., 49.

much expanded version of the antidelinquency, antipoverty initiatives originally introduced by the Kennedy administration.[328]

> In his 1964 State of the Union Address, President Lyndon B. Johnson stated the following: Poverty is a national problem, requiring improved national organization and support. But this attack, to be effective, must also be organized at the State and the local level and must be supported and directed by State and local efforts. For the war against poverty will not be won here in Washington. It must be won in the field, in every private home, in every public office, from the courthouse to the White House.

This address, along with the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, marked the start of the nation's War on Poverty[329] and highlighted the manner in which the federal government intended to rely on state and local efforts to attack the poverty problem. The antipoverty initiatives passed by Johnson targeted the populations most impacted by high poverty rates[330] and, in many ways, these programs were successful. Nonwhite men had one of the biggest drops in poverty levels among all populations from 1965 to 1972 with other vulnerable populations like nonwhite women, Black female heads of households with children, and Black male heads of households with low education also demonstrating higher than average drops in poverty rates over the same period of time. As Haveman et al. note, "to the extent that the programs and expansions launched in the mid-1960s were designed to lower poverty among the highest poverty rate groups…this objective was met in the immediate years that followed."[331]

---

[328] Ibid.
[329] Ibid.
[330] Haveman, Blank, Moffitt, Smeeding, and Wallace, "The War on Poverty: Measurement, Trends, and Policy."
[331] Ibid., 600.

Manpower Development Programs for Vulnerable Populations

In his State of the Union address, Johnson specifically highlighted the ways in which Black Americans were uniquely in need of the employment, education and housing opportunities he had put forward. He stated, "all of these increased opportunities – in employment, in education, in housing, and in every field – must be open to Americans of every color. As far as the writ of Federal law will run, we must abolish not some, but all racial discrimination."[332] Notably, some historians have interpreted Johnson's focus on specifically Black men as representing an underlying believe in an urban crisis that is rooted in black pathology and "a manifestation of fear about urban disorder."[333] Support for this argument comes in the form of the War on Crime declared 1965 and the passing of Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 which was geared toward strengthening state and local law enforcement.[334] These efforts similarly targeted low-income urban communities of color, but with a punitive focus rather than an antipoverty one.[335] We see an example of this in Chicago with the establishment of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission (ILEC) in 1969 which, according to Governor Richard B. Ogilvie, represented "a new determination to cope with the scourge of crime."[336] Still, despite federal investment in punitive law enforcement and the resulting heightened surveillance of vulnerable populations, the War on Poverty initiatives that were centered on communities in need ultimately

[332] Lyndon B. Johnson, "State of the Union Address," (Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union, January 8, 1964).
[333] Hinton, *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime,* 32.
[334] The Administration of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Grants in Illinois, 1969-1971, Chicago Law Enforcement Study Group report (Scott Lassar), undated, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscripts Collection.
[335] Simon Balto, *Occupied Territory: Policing Black Chicago* (Durham: University of North Carolina Press, 2019).
[336] Richard B. Ogilvie, Arthur J. Bilek, John F. X. Irving, "Illinois Law Enforcement Commission: Annual Report, 1969," *Illinois Law Enforcement Commission* (1970).

led to a number of workforce development programs that were specifically directed toward this population.

An example of such an effort geared specifically toward a previously overlooked population was a 1974 U.S. Department of Labor manpower development program specifically "tailored to meet the specific needs and potential" of previously incarcerated individuals with substance abuse issues.[337] According to a 1974 *Chicago Defender* article on the Baltimore-piloted program, returning citizens who were in drug treatment programs would receive referrals to training programs and job search assistance through the pilot program.[338] Interestingly, while being geared primarily to those with substance abuse issues, the program was also opened to other groups of returning citizens who were deemed to need extra assistance including "juvenile delinquents, Hispanos, the older ex-offender (30 years and older) and those incarcerated for three or more years, females, and heads of households whose families are or have been on welfare."[339]

Another effort focused specifically on assisting the returning population was a bonding program established nationally in 1971 under the Department of Labor with the purpose of bonding returning citizens when employers' commercial bonding contracts would not allow them to do so.[340] Similar efforts emerged in individual states like the Illinois State Employment Service bonding program which reimbursed employers "up to $10,000 for what an ex-con might steal or do wrong on the job."[341] The federal government program was successful in that only six claims were drawn on the individuals they bonded in the first two years of the program, and a number of

[337] "Map Project to Aid Addicted Ex-Convicts," *Chicago Defender*, Mar. 5, 1974.
[338] Ibid.
[339] Ibid.
[340] "An Analysis of the Federal Bonding Program – Volume 1: Program History, Final Report," *Contract Research Corporation*, September 1975.
[341] Lowe, "Staying Out of Prison."

commercial bonding companies relaxed their restrictions against returning citizens in order to keep pace with the competition.[342] Unfortunately, such government bonding efforts were not successful if employers were unwilling to utilize them which, in the case of the Illinois State Employment Serving bonding program, was often the case.[343] Nonetheless, the existence of such programs on a federal and state level highlight the significant manpower services geared specifically toward returning citizens during the War on Poverty and throughout the long sixties.

These efforts geared specifically toward overlooked populations like "ex-offenders, drug addicts, delinquent youths, former mental patients, and welfare recipients,"[344] were often successful in their goal of placing such individuals in stable employment. The Chicago Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC) founded in 1968 and funded by an Illinois Law Enforcement Commission (ILEC)[345] grant, for example, had a 79% percent success rate "placing more than 800 hard core unemployed" in Chicagoland jobs during its first three years of service.[346]

Examples of such efforts specific to Chicagoland also exist throughout the long sixties including, for example, a 1967 agreement between the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry (CACI) and the Chicago Committee on Urban Opportunity to provide an On-the-Job training program for "unemployed Chicagoans who need a second chance."[347] A large-scale example was the creation of the creation of a new OIC program, still funded by the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, that specifically served 18-30 year old returning citizens living in the

[342] Sultan and Ehmann, "The Employment of Persons with Arrest Records and the Ex-Offender."
[343] Lowe, "Staying Out of Prison."
[344] Gary Thatcher, "Jobs for Ex-Convicts Fill a Double Purpose," *Christian Science Monitor*, Jun. 3, 1975.
[345] The Illinois Law Enforcement Commission was a statewide planning and coordinating agency financed by state and federal funds.
[346] Judy Roberts, "Training Center to Help Ex-Convicts Help Selves," *Chicago Tribune,* Jan. 20, 1972.
[347] "Business Spearhead Jobs Project," *Chicago Daily Defender,* Jul. 20, 1967.

Cabrini Green housing projects.[348] The program lasted a whopping 25 weeks and involved motivational, academic, and vocational training including "welding, machine shop, drafting, plastics, blueprint reading, electrical repair and electrical maintenance to start out with."[349]

Operation DARE

One of the most successful programs funded by federal antipoverty initiatives is Operation DARE. Piloted in 1970 in multiple Midwestern states and funded by a $200,000 grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the purpose of the program was to place returning citizens, 125-250 of them from Illinois, into construction jobs.[350] According to a 1971 article on the pilot effort, the plan for the program was to expand beyond construction jobs to include trades in other industries.[351] However, unlike many of the federally-funded training efforts mentioned above, Operation DARE quickly expanded its services to reflects its "more personal and humanitarian approach to alleviate crime."[352] According to a form letter about the organization that was sent out to potential volunteers and community partners, Operation DARE adhered to the following philosophy: "A job may give an ex-offender financial security, but only the volunteer associate gives him emotion and psychological security. The volunteer associate helps to break down the barriers of depression, rejection, and apathy."[353] In other words, the volunteers at Operation DARE felt that developing personal relationships with returning citizens was just as important to their long-term successful reentry.

---

[348] Roberts, "Training Center to Help Ex-Convicts Help Selves."
[349] Ibid.
[350] "Plan to Put Ex-Convicts in Building Jobs."
[351] Ziemba, "Operation Dare Trains Ex-Convicts in Trades."
[352] Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records, Operation DARE correspondence, July 18, 1972, Box 2, Prison Committee, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscripts Collection.
[353] Ibid.

The success of this approach can be seen in a July 1976 *Christian Science Monitor* article which stated, "Operation DARE soon will place its 5,000th client in a job. DARE, which stands for Direct Action for the Rehabilitation and Employment of ex-offenders, now is the nation's largest private community-based correction program, and its 35 staffers here are proud of their record placement."[354] In the first six years of Operation DARE, it grew exponentially in staff size, programmatic offerings, and clients served. New services included a six-week GED program for returning citizens that included carfare, a stipend, and clothing if they needed; a teacher they can call at night if they're having trouble with homework; a Career Motivation Institute that recruited employers to assist in lesson planning for prerelease job training; and one-on-one conversations with one of the 300 businessmen volunteers to help returning citizens adjust to a daily job routine.[355] While it cannot be assumed that the success of Operation DARE is due to the program's dedication to providing holistic reentry support despite its original employment focus, it can be stated that their approach was successful in both job placement and relationship-building between returning citizens and members of their community as can be seen in the volume and accessibility of their staff and volunteers. As Assistant Regional Director Wilhelmy said in his address to the Subcommittee Hearing on Prisons, Prison Reform, and Prisoners' Rights,

> The…objective is to recruit, train, and place volunteers to work with ex-offenders. This is as important to the man as the job because in this area we are involving, intimately, the community in his problem, which is also the community's problem. We, you and I, have

[354] Nancy Iran Phillips, "The Help Ex-Convicts Build New Lives," *Christian Science Monitor,* Jul. 7, 1976.
[355] Ibid.

helped create the problems of poverty, bad education, broken homes; all of these things are causes of crime. Now, we have to once again take responsibility back.[356]

The Downside of Federally-Funded Programs

It is important to note that these manpower development and training programs were not without flaws. One 1974 Chicagoland manpower training effort, or example, was charged with underserving the growing Latinx population in Chicago by using only two Latinx organizations for recruitment and failing to build training facilities in areas with a high Spanish-speaking population.[357] Another concern expressed by researchers and program staff alike was that the quality of the training programs varied greatly, with many failing to provide well-paying, realistic training that would have actual real-world marketability.[358] As Operation DARE's Assistant Regional Director, Gus Wilhelmy, stated in the aforementioned 1971 Subcommittee Hearing on Prisons, Prison Reform, and Prisoners' Rights, "DARE's…problem is difficulty of finding and keeping men in training. First of all, the stipends are too small. You can't expect a man coming out of prison to live on $50 a week in a training program."[359]

Another big problem with many of these training and manpower development programs that arose in the 1960s-1970s was that they did not guarantee full-time job placements after the training was completed. To some extent, this was simply an issue of where jobs were located in comparison to the populations being served. Jacobs et. al. said "job training alone cannot remedy the joblessness produced by the structural labor market conditions that face many ex-offenders

[356] Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3, "Part IV: Prisons, Prison Reform, and Prisoners' Rights."
[357] Abe Gomez, "¿Què pasa? City Manpower Training Program Neglects Latinos," *Chicago Tribune*, Nov. 8, 1974.
[358] Jacobs, McGahey, and Minion, "Ex-Offender Employment, Recidivism, and Manpower Policy: CETA, TJTC, and Future Initiatives."
[359] Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3, "Part IV: Prisons, Prison Reform, and Prisoners' Rights."

upon release. Jobs are increasingly available in office and service sectors located in downtown cores or suburbs, not in the poor urban neighborhoods to which many ex-offenders return."[360] That said, many of these training programs simply did not offer post-training support. Programs like the Chicago Committee on Urban Opportunity, for example, equipped a wealth of unemployed Chicagoans with training and "the know-how to stay on jobs and keep working."[361] Unfortunately, that know-how is useless until the person being trained gets a long-term, stable job placement, which this program was not offering.

In terms of the job training that happened before individuals were released from incarceration, undated notes from a Special Committee of clergymen with the Chicago Conference on Religion and Race (CCRR) stated of a visit to Pontiac State Prison, "we saw many young men at work on jobs which were basically meaningless and without real renumeration."[362] Charles Howard, President of self-made reentry program Looking Toward Freedom, had a similar perception of the training efforts that took place behind bars, saying:

> The ironic element of preparing a man for release is that he should have good work habits and be productive in the prison labor system – a system which has traditionally maintained convict labor solely for the benefit of the state, with no regard to the inmate's prior skill, incentive, or programmatic preference. The same is true of the federal prison industry, wherein inmates primarily serve the commodity needs of the U.S. Defense Department…the so-called training provided by institutions lacks a clear objective…In

[360] Jacobs, McGahey, and Minion, "Ex-Offender Employment, Recidivism, and Manpower Policy: CETA, TJTC, and Future Initiatives," 501.
[361] "New 'Manpower Policy' Here Aids Unemployed," *Chicago Daily Defender*, Apr. 25, 1968.
[362] Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records, Special Committee on Prison Reform report, undated, Box 2, Prison Committee, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscripts Collection.

> effect, the penal system fails to prepare a man to meet industrial needs or social employment trends.[363]

This quote suggests that the prerelease training and employment of soon returning citizens was not only ineffective in preparing them for the job market upon their release, but it was also exploitative of the incarcerated population. A 1976 criminology study confirmed these observations, reporting that only one-third of those who received training in prison used it in the job the acquired after their release.[364] The article continues, "much of the training offered is misguided and ineffectual. Many of the 'vocational training' programs are a sham, oriented more to institutional maintenance than to the inmate's needs. In the name of 'training,' inmates are given prison industry menial-labor assignments that teach no skills."[365]

The Emergence of Public-Private Partnerships

The emergence of these government funded manpower development efforts led to an important structural shift in the reentry landscape of the 1960s and beyond, marking the beginning of public-private partnerships geared toward supporting returning citizens. As mentioned in Chapter 1, religious institutions dominated the reentry landscape beginning in the 1950s, and their presence remained steady during the 1960s-1970s. Because of their established work with the returning population, government taskforces chose to fund the efforts of these religious reentry programs rather than creating new programs of their own. Such funding was not exclusive to religious reentry efforts, or to reentry efforts in general, but instead was spread across a variety of community programs and private efforts that were geared toward any population with low rates of

[363] Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3, "Part IV: Prisons, Prison Reform, and Prisoners' Rights."
[364] Dale, "Barriers to the Rehabilitation of Ex-Offenders."
[365] Ibid., 323.

employment. As a 1971 report noted about this pattern in reference to the dissemination of funds by an Illinois Commission, "grants tend to favor proven agencies that already have a proven record of success…grants often use these well-established agencies to expand and innovate programs already in existence."[366] This approach to programming resulted in an updated reentry landscape where the majority of programs during the 1960s to early-1970s were run by established private programs/institutions but received funding through the federal government via the state and city.[367]

As public-private partnerships became more prevalent, they received increasing amounts of outspoken support. As assistant regional director of DARE noted, one of the underlying principles of date was that "an ongoing creative partnership must exist between public, governmental agencies, and the private sector in order to aid and rehabilitate a man. This is the most crucial idea of DARE — public and private working together hand in hand."[368]Notably, a lot of folks hoped the partnership of government agencies and community programming was a prelude to a public-private partnership between the Department of Corrections and private businesses, with an eye towards employment.[369] As Samuel C. Bernstein, the director of the Chicago Mayor's Manpower Office, reportedly told a gathering of the National Alliance of Businessmen (NAB) in a 1974 address, "For Chicago's manpower revenue sharing program to succeed, the city's business and industry must provide jobs and on-the-job training…we will expect you to show your commitment by involving your company in a planned program of hiring and upgrading the disadvantaged."[370]

---

[366] The Administration of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Grants in Illinois, 1969-1971, Chicago Law Enforcement Study Group report (Scott Lassar), undated, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscripts Collection.
[367] "Chicago Firms Must Provide Jobs, Training Manpower Chief Says," *Chicago Tribune,* May 5, 1974.
[368] Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3, "Part IV: Prisons, Prison Reform, and Prisoners' Rights."
[369] Eric Berg, "Execs Tell of Success in Hiring Ex-Convicts," *Chicago Tribune*, Jun. 14, 1979.
[370] "Chicago Firms Must Provide Jobs."

Notably, the dissemination of federal funding to private programs *through* the state was not a process exclusive to the Office of Economic Opportunity or manpower development efforts. For example, when it came to halfway houses, "public-private collaboration arose organically as a practical response to the challenges state agencies faced in establishing smaller facilities in urban areas," meaning public funding was funneled into the private facilities that were already established in the urban communities to which previously incarcerated individuals returned.[371] A 1971 report on the administration of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grants (LEAA) in Illinois stated, "recognizing that crime is essentially a local problem that must be dealt with by state and local governments, the Federal Government instituted its major crime control efforts through Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968."[372] In other words, the dissemination of federal funds via state apparatuses was an established process for crime control efforts that focused on granting awards to police, corrections, and the courts.[373]

Given the aforementioned flaws of some state-funded manpower development programs, it may be unclear why private programs who had already established a rapport with the populations they were serving would be a part of the public-private partnerships that came to dominate the reentry landscape. One of the primary reasons for their engagement in this partnership was that it gave them access to grant funds that they otherwise may not have received. For example, a 1971 report noted that $1.9 million of state distributed Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grants was given to drug abuse treatment, transitional housing, juvenile prevention, and public

---

[371] Cyrus J. O'Brien, "'A Prison in Your Community': Halfway Houses and the Melding of Treatment and Control," *The Journal of American History* (2021): 6.
[372] The Administration of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Grants in Illinois, 1969-1971, Chicago Law Enforcement Study Group report (Scott Lassar), undated, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscripts Collection.
[373] Ibid.

education programs.[374] While that amount pales in comparison to the $28 million that the state of Illinois disseminated to the courts, police, and corrections during the same time frame, it nonetheless suggests that there was significant funding being granted to private efforts that were on the state's radar.[375] Even private religious institutions who were traditionally averse to interactions between the church and state "recognized the value of such funding for their own institution-build efforts."[376]

Additionally, despite the efforts of some religious actors and other private reentry programs, the state had direct access to far more returning citizens than private efforts could hope to reach. By 1960, for example, St. Leonard's House (SLH), the Citizens Committee for Employment (CCE), the John Howard Association (JHA), the Salvation Army, and all other private agencies reached "only a few of the 16,000 prisoners" who moved in and out of Cook County Jail annually.[377] Given this, the investment of community organizations and nonprofits in the manpower development programs of the state was a necessity if these groups wanted the opportunity to impact larger swaths of the returning population than they had previously been able to. Ultimately, access to individuals in state or federal penal facilities likely expanded the reach of these organizations drastically.

Finally, the state's emphasis on manpower development often made it so that many private reentry efforts *had* to prioritize job training and employment over other reentry needs. As mentioned in the previous chapter, one condition of the Illinois Parole Department was that

---

[374] Ibid.
[375] Ibid.
[376] Kendrick Oliver. "'Hi Fellas. Come on in.' Normal Carlson, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and the Rise of Prison Fellowship," *Journal of Church and State* 55, no. 4 (2012): 743-744.
[377] St. Leonard's Ministries, "Progress at Last at County Jail," *Chicago Tribune* article, 1960, Box A664, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

returning citizens secure employment before release.[378] This meant that parole-eligible individuals who were "restored to good standing in society"[379] nonetheless remained incarcerated for as long three years after having been granted parole, simply because they could not ensure employment upon their release.[380] As stated in the July 1967 *Keys of St. Leonard's* newsletter, "even though the man has paid his debt in full, often with compound interest and always with good behavior, he could remain in prison for months or years, although technically eligible to walk out through the gate at any time."[381] In order to access this population of returning citizens, St. Leonard's House developed an agreement with the Illinois Parole Board in 1971 under which they could provide sponsorship to individuals who had residences that were approved by the parole department, thus allowing for their release even if they did not have employment plans.[382]

In developing this program, St. Leonard's House was forced to cooperate with a state department that prioritized employment acquisition above familial support when considering the success of those on parole. Additionally, when the outcome of this program was discussed after the first two years of its implementation, success was measured in the employment rate of participants, rather than focusing on mental wellness, housing, or other potential measures of reintegration.[383] However, even in partnership with employment-centered reentry efforts, St. Leonard's House maintained a holistic approach to reentry. While sponsorship for individuals on parole involved providing job-search assistance to these returning citizens, at SLH it also consisted

[378] James G. Jones, Jr. Papers, "A Chance to Go Straight" biography, undated, Box A673, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[379] Ibid.
[380] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Keys of St. Leonard's* newsletter, March 1961, Box A669, Folder 11, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[381] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Keys of St. Leonard's* newsletter, July 1961, Box A669, Folder 11, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[382] Ibid.
[383] St. Leonard's Ministries, Annual report, 1963, Box A669, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

of "providing counseling to them and to their families necessary to their making a satisfactory transition from institutional life to life in the free community."[384] In this way, they were able to expand upon the state requirements that were centered on employment and provide holistic support to those individuals on parole to whom they otherwise would not have access.

As mentioned above, this partnership allowed St. Leonard's House to reach a population who would have otherwise remained incarcerated otherwise. From Feb. 1962 through Jan. 1965, this SLH effort, which came to be known as the "Non-Residential Program," effected the release of 223 men on parole, all of whom would have remained in Illinois state prisons as "submerged cases" indefinitely.[385] Additionally, according to the 1963 Annual Report, St. Leonard's House staff had been concerned for several years about the number of applications they received from men who had familial support they could turn to. Their primary concern was that "there were (and always will be) many more men needing our help than beds…"[386] Through their partnership with the Illinois Parole Board, St. Leonard's House was able to address this concern by doubling the number of participants it served without having to add a single bed.[387] Notably, the staff at St. Leonard's House attempted to use the success of the men in their Non-Residential Program as proof that having employment upon release is not a requirement for individuals on parole to succeed. As noted in their 1965 report on the program, "we have demonstrated that men can be

[384] St. Leonard's House, *Wieboldt Foundation* report, March 1, 1965, Box A667, Folder 21, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[385] Ibid.
[386] St. Leonard's Ministries, Annual report, 1963, Box A669, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[387] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Keys of St. Leonard's* newsletter, July 1961, Box A669, Folder 11, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

released under parole supervision without the promise of a job[388] if assistance is provided on the outside." Whether or not the Illinois Parole Board took heed to this suggestion is unclear.

St. Leonard's House: An Exception to the Rule

Importantly, many training and jobs programs at private organizations like St. Leonard's House predated the War on Poverty and the manpower development program blueprint that arose during the late 1960s. The programmatic offerings of St. Leonard's House are an example of both phenomena. Since its inception in 1954, the goal of St. Leonard's House was to "provide for the man being released from jail or prison who has no family and no place to live and eat until he finds work and gets his first or second paycheck."[389] They shared the common belief that employment in the legitimate labor market could prevent returning citizens from turning to crime to meet their needs. According to a St. Leonard's House newsletter, because the pasts of many returning citizens "indicate that they would turn to crime if unemployed," the need for a program dedicated to finding opportunities for unskilled residents was "immediate and pressing."[390] One example of early SLH training efforts was the 1958 addition of a clinic training program for men going into ministry and the social sciences as well.[391] Many SLH alum went on to work in social services roles, at St. Leonard's House[392] and likely beyond, that allowed them to utilize this training, demonstrating its utility. The SLH Salvage Center was similarly geared toward the employment of residents. While

---

[388] St. Leonard's House, *Wieboldt Foundation* report, March 1, 1965, Box A667, Folder 21, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[389] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Open Door* newsletter, December 1957, Box A669, Folder 13, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[390] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Keys of St. Leonard's* newsletter, July 1961, Box A669, Folder 11, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[391] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Open Door* newsletter, 1957 Progress report, Box A669, Folder 13, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[392] "Black Ex-Con Takes Over as Leonard House Director," *Chicago Daily Defender,* Nov. 1, 1969.

it was originally established to raise funds for St. Leonard's House in 1957, it was expanded in 1961 allowing it to provide full-time employment to a handful of SLH residents.[393]

Importantly, SLH employment efforts were centered on the belief that returning citizens *wanted* the opportunity to contribute to society through stable employment. As a 1957 St. Leonard's House newsletter asserted, "men who have good intentions to re-enter society rarely have any desire for charity; most need only the chance to work and prove what they want to do."[394] This belief led to a variety of St. Leonard's early formal and informal programmatic employment-centered efforts. For example, shortly after a returning citizen's arrival at SLH he is expected to begin job searching in the morning and spending afternoons contributing to chores and odd jobs around the house.[395] Residents were required to contribute because, according to SLH staff, engaging in such behaviors provided residents with the "feeling of being of service, of being wanted, of being useful."[396]

The centrality of this belief that returning citizens want to work can also be seen in its establishment of the Episcopal Service Organization (ESO), a not-for-profit established in 1961 as an agency of the Bishop of Chicago with the purpose of providing temporary employment to unskilled and semi-skilled SLH residents through offering "parishes, missions, church agencies, communicants of the Diocese of Chicago, and industrial firms, supervised employables for

[393] St. Leonard's Ministries, "St. Leonard's Salvage Expands," *Advance* article, December 1960, Box A664, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[394] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Open Door* newsletter, December 1957, Box A669, Folder 13, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[395] St. Leonard's Ministries, House rules, January 28, 1961, Box A664, Folder 7, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[396] St. Leonard's Ministries, *The Keys of St. Leonard's* newsletter, July 1961, Box A669, Folder 11, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.

temporary work at minimal cost."[397] In the goals of ESO we again see proof of SLH's philosophy that returning citizens *want* the opportunity to prove their worth to society and believe that employment is one way to do this. According to the SLH staff, the immediate need for returning citizens was "the restoration of identity and self-respect. A paid job [was] one of the best tools to accomplish this."[398] In the case of the Episcopal Service Organization specifically, according to a 1963 program report the central benefit of the ESO was that "through it, a man is able to pay his own way from the beginning and does not have to depend on handouts," while also being able to "prove his worth as a permanent employee by working a day labor job."[399] That said, St. Leonard's House recognized that employment was just one step toward successful reintegration into society for the returning citizen. A 1963 St. Leonard's House annual report stated that "employment is not a solution to the problems a man faces when he is released from prison. But it is the necessary precondition to the solution of his problems."[400]

Ultimately, the antipoverty initiatives of the long sixties combatted poverty rates among populations in need, but the success of manpower development and training programs is less clear.[401] Nonetheless, the windfall of federal funding geared specifically towards training and job program efforts had a lasting impact on both public and private social services. Given the national emphasis on employment, community programs adjusted their efforts in a way to align themselves with the national shift and get the funding that accompanied it. By the end of the long sixties, employment assistance was a feature of the vast majority of reentry efforts that existed. This was

---

[397] St. Leonard's Ministries, Presentation for review of new agency by the *Welfare Council Committee to Review New Agency Programs*, undated, Box A667, Folder 11, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[398] Ibid.
[399] St. Leonard's Ministries, Annual report, 1963, Box A669, Folder 3, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.
[400] Ibid.
[401] Jacobs, McGahey, and Minion, "Ex-Offender Employment, Recidivism, and Manpower Policy: CETA, TJTC, and Future Initiatives," 488.

even the case for the self-made reentry efforts that I will discuss in the next chapter, though their motivations for providing such reentry support was often based more in personal experience than in keeping up with the national tide.

Chapter 3: The Advent of the Self-Made Reentry Program

The end of the 1960s marked the emergence of a new type of reentry effort that differed from what had been available since the opening of St. Leonard's House in 1954. In the mid- to late-1960s, a growing political consciousness among incarcerated populations emerged. This manifested in the creation of numerous coalitions with the purpose of organizing against poor conditions, low pay, overcrowding, and mistreatment faced by the incarcerated population. This political consciousness and the organizing skills that incarcerated individuals developed as a result followed many upon their release, and only increased when they experienced firsthand the shortcomings of existing supports for returning citizens. This ultimately led to the creation of what I will call self-made reentry programs: reentry efforts that were created *for* returning citizens *by* returning citizens. While these endeavors differed in how they came about, the specific issues that they targeted, their methods of fundraising, and how they capitalized on public attention, they all shared the goal of providing necessary support to returning citizens. In this chapter I will first elaborate on the mistreatment that incarcerated individuals experienced before explaining the factors that led to the politicization of this population. I will then present examples of self-made reentry programs, highlighting the ways in which previously incarcerated individuals believed themselves to be uniquely suited to serve other returning citizens. Finally, I will discuss some of the barriers to longevity and success that self-made reentry efforts faced.

Experiences of Mistreatment in Penal Facilities

Cook County Jail has faced the issue of overcrowding since the early 1900s as recounted in a Cook County Jail Survey conducted in 1922 by The Chicago Community Trust. The report states,

> Into its cells ten feet long, five feet wide and seven and a half feet high, providing air-space a third less than is considered sufficient for one human being, entirely closed on three sides and top and bottom, with one end opening into a dimly-lighted, poorly ventilated corridor – into these are crowded two, three, four and sometimes five persons who must spend twenty hours a day there…[402]

This overcrowding was one factor that led to the creation of a new jail and criminal court building in 1929, which cost Cook County $7 million at the time.[403] The new facility was, according to warden E.J. Fogarty, built in order to give each incarcerated individual their own cell,[404] a fact that led it to be praised by criminologists across the nation.[405] However, by the 1960s, the Cook County Jail system was again facing severe overcrowding and was "putting two men in cells that were only designed for one."[406] By 1970, the facility's overcrowding was so well known and expected that, in Operation Breadbasket Meeting Minutes from March of that year, Rev. Jessie 'Ma' Houston's jail report simply stated, "jail's overcrowded as usual."[407] And by 1978, the new Executive Director of the Cook County Department of Corrections, Phillip Hardiman, confessed that the "biggest problem" he faced in his new role was the overcrowded facilities- a problem he hoped would be remedied by opening two new facilities within the year.[408]

---

[402] Frank D. Loomis, "The Cook County Jail Survey," *The Chicago Community Trust* (1922): 11.
[403] Special from Monitor Bureau, "Chicago Prisoners' Conditions Better in New Quarters," *Christian Science Monitor*, May 15, 1929.
[404] Ibid.
[405] "New Cook County Jail Wins Praise of Criminologists," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* Mar. 9, 1929.
[406] Studs Terkel Radio Archive, "Hans W. Mattick and Father Robert Taylor discuss the scandal at Cook County Jail" WAV format, 1968, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscripts Collection.
[407] Rev. Martin L. Deppe Papers [Box 4, Folder 18], Ministers meeting notes, March 6, 1970, Special Collections, Chicago Public Library.
[408] Jay Branegan and Charles Mount, "County Jail's Boss Gets High Marks – So Far," *Chicago Tribune,* Jun. 22, 1978.

The mistreatment and poor state of facilities faced by incarcerated individuals in the 1960s was a source of anger and resentment for many of these individuals. However, as can be seen in the 1922 Cook County Jail Survey above, these conditions had been long part of the United States penal system. Thus, while the path from political consciousness to the reentry activism of returning citizens begins with experiences of mistreatment during incarceration, it was the presence of political leaders, the adoption of political language, and a burgeoning sense of community among the incarcerated that characterized the politicization of returning citizens who took action upon their release.

It was because of widespread mistreatment and the poor conditions experienced in penal institutions that the incarcerated were particularly susceptible to the political teachings and influence that accompanied the rights movements of the time. One such form of harm was the segregation and discrimination of Black and Latinx prisoners. For example, in many facilities, much of the Black incarcerated population was locked out of educational access programs "because prison staff did not see them as candidates for rehabilitation."[409] Additionally, in 1968, previously incarcerated individuals who spent time in Illinois penal facilities told the *Chicago Daily Defender* of the "wholesale discrimination against Black prisoners and guards plus other sordid conditions" that were hidden from visitors but had lasting effects on the health and wellbeing of the incarcerated.[410]

"When I was at Stateville," one Black previously incarcerated individual told a Chicago newspaper, "discrimination against black prisoners in job assignments was practiced in a very

[409] Erica Meiners and Sarah Ross, "'And What Happens to You Concerns Us Here': Imaginings for a (New) Prison Arts Movement," in *Art Against the Law*, ed. Rebecca Zorach (Chicago: School of the Art Institute of Chicago, 2014), 21.
[410] Bob Hunter, "Charges of Bias in State Prisons Still Being Made," *Chicago Daily Defender*, Oct. 9, 1968.

clever way. In the prison hospital all of the so-called male nurses were white. However, when visitors came through on tour, they would not know this because the nurses wear white uniforms just like the porters."[411] According to this source, even though many members of the incarcerated population at Stateville penitentiary were, in theory, eligible for these prison nursing roles, only white prisoners received these assignments. This source explained the consequences of such discrimination, stating, "they have one white doctor come in once a day and he merely looks at the charts. He is only there for about an hour or so and then he is gone. Thus, the sick inmate is left up to the mercy of the white nurses who primarily come from downstate and naturally hate black people. This is the reason for many prisoners winding up dead overnight."[412] It is important to note that these discriminatory job assignment practices and the general disregard for Black prisoner wellbeing were not a product of passivity or ignorance on the part of the facility. After witnessing the mistreatment Black prisoners faced at the hands of white nurses, the source quoted above had attempted to combat it by applying for a nurse position himself. The result of this bold action was him being thrown into solitary confinement where he had to sleep on the floor and was fed only one meal a day.[413]

Another major issue that plagued penal facilities for decades leading up to the 1960s was overcrowding. In the case of the Attica Prison Uprising of 1971, severe overcrowding was one of the major catalysts that led to the prisoners organizing for better treatment and improved conditions. In the 1960s, when prisoners in New York City facilities began to complain about and organize against overcrowding, New York officials responded by simply sending "as many men

[411] Ibid.
[412] Ibid.
[413] Ibid.

as possible to upstate facilities" which only served to "push the problem up the line rather than to solve it."[414] As a result, upstate facilities like Attica were those most impacted by the overcrowding in the New York penal system. Moreover, as a result of this shuttling of large numbers of incarcerated individuals upstate, these facilities were home to a wealth of politically active prisoners, like Black Panther L.D. Barkley and Black Muslim leader Richard X Clark.[415] As I will explain below, the presence of these individuals played a large role in growing prisoner political consciousness and providing incarcerated populations with the tools needed to name and push back against their mistreatment.

The Politicization of the Incarcerated Population

While there was already an awareness and disdain for experiences of mistreatment among the national incarcerated population, one of the central ways by which political leaders from various rights movements inspired the political action of incarcerated individuals was by providing them with the language they needed to name and thus address their mistreatment. Incarcerated political leaders did not have to teach prisoners about the negative aspects of the penal system, just as organizers of rights movements did not have to introduce community members to the concepts of police brutality and judicial mistreatment. Nor did they have to tell them to distrust these systems of power, as "those sentiments were embedded in the experiences and ethos of wide swaths of those communities."[416] Instead, the role of these leaders was to provide incarcerated individuals with the rhetoric to discuss both their mistreatment and the ideas they had for

[414] Heather Ann Thompson, *Blood in the Water: The Attica Prison Uprising of 1971 and Its Legacy* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2016), 17.
[415] Ibid.
[416] Simon Balto, *Occupied Territory: Policing Black Chicago* (Durham: University of North Carolina Press, 2019), 228.

combatting it. They simply lifted established "grievances high into the public arena" and encouraged prisoners to "formulate specific strategies" to alleviate them.[417]

The importance of providing prisoners with the language to address, discuss, and challenge their mistreatment can be seen in the concerns of Commissioner of Correctional Services Russell G. Oswald, not long before the Attica Prison Uprising in 1971. Oswald reported to New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller that he was concerned that the prisoners were becoming much more politically aware. As historian Heather Ann Thompson recounts of the months leading up to the Attica Uprising, "not only had these men been developing a powerful critique of poor prison conditions, but they also had begun to discuss how they might reform their institution – what they might do, concretely, to get the state to treat them as human beings who were serving their time, not as monsters deserving of abuse and neglect."[418]

Political Language, Prisoner Organizing & Political Consciousness on the Outside

In the case of incarcerated members of the community, the language of these movements proved to be helpful in communicating their mistreatment behind walls with those in power, which increased the potential for change. Notably, incarcerated movement leaders and political figures who became incarcerated and brought this language into carceral spaces maintained their ties to outside groups and thus their impact reached beyond the individual facilities in which they were housed.[419] During the Attica Prison Uprising in 1971, for example, Commissioner Oswald found that the demands of the Attica prisoners were "almost entirely copied form demands issued at

[417] Ibid., 228.
[418] Thompson, *Blood in the Water*, 28.
[419] James B. Jacobs, "The Prisoners' Rights Movement and Its Impact, 1960-80," *Crime and Justice* 2 (1980): 437.

Folsom Prison in California as developed by Black Panther leadership there some time ago."[420] The presence of these individuals in the penal system offered "otherwise apolitical men…a new understanding of their discontents and a new language for articulating them."[421] In other words, it gave them both the language and the courage to "demand that they be treated as human beings," as well as the organizing skills needed to communicate these demands clearly.[422] Many prison officials like Attica warden Vincent R. Mancusi recognized the potential influence of these political leaders and warned that they "needed to be watched with particular care and shut up the instant they spoke out."[423] Such efforts on the part of prison officials, however, failed to dampen the impact of these political leaders.

In addition to providing incarcerated populations with the language of mistreatment, these movements and their leadership also increased the political consciousness of the incarcerated by encouraging their knowledge of organizing, protesting, and revolution. Of course, there was a long history of incarcerated individuals utilizing their time during incarceration to read and learn, as well as teach one another. Still, the presence of these political figures encouraged the consumption of Black and Latinx history, as well as political literature leading to an increase in requests for these items from the incarcerated population.[424] Moreover, political leaders with organizing experience like jail activist Herbert Blyden, knew the dangers that could come with prisoner

[420] Thompson, *Blood in the Water,* 32.
[421] Thompson, *Blood in the Water,* 29.
[422] Patrick D. McAnany and Edward Tromanhauser, "Organizing the Convicted: Self-Help for Prisoners and Ex-Prisoners," *Crime & Delinquency* (1977): 69.
[423] Thompson, *Blood in the Water,* 17.
[424] Rev. Martin L. Deppe Papers [Box 4, Folder 5], Joliet inmates open letter to the community, undated, Special Collections, Chicago Public Library.

activism and thus encouraged the incarcerated to gather "as much information as they could get about how the law might eventually be used against them."[425]

It is important to acknowledge that many incarcerated individuals did not particularly demonstrate an interest in political power or organizing- instead, they were drawn to the sense of community that came from organizing around shared interests.[426] According to criminologists McAnany and Tromhauser,

> By the mid 1960's, the organizing principle of many prisons was challenged. The advent of black militancy as an expression of legitimate civil rights aspirations subsumed the "con values" of former times for many black inmates, who made up a majority in the correctional population. Black Muslims, Panthers, and others began to reject the often limited and selfish rewards which the "con" subculture offered, even if blacks were allowed to gain entry in this latent conspiracy of control.[427]

This shift in culture was marked by a burgeoning sense of community among the incarcerated, something that was previously unseen in penal facilities where racial and other forms of segregation was not simply a common occurrence but was often enforced by prison officials.[428] "The desire for change had prompted usually antagonistic prisoner factions to talk with one another" and ultimately led to the formation of "shaky but nevertheless potentially powerful alliances" among incarcerated individuals across racial and ethnic lines.[429]

---

[425] Thompson, *Blood in the Water*, 29.
[426] McAnany and Tromhauser, "Organizing the Convicted."
[427] Ibid., 69.
[428] "Negro County Jail Warden to Continue Segregation," *Chicago Daily Defender*, Mar. 13, 1968.
[429] Thompson, *Blood in the Water*, 35.

Importantly, the incarcerated population was not solely radicalized by the presence of political leaders, nor did all forms of growth in political consciousness require the consumption of radical language or organizing literature. In the case of many Black, Latinx, and poor individuals, their radicalization was a consequence of the mistreatment they faced at the hands of the police and judicial systems and the increased surveillance and enforcement that accompanied the social rights movements of the 1960s and 1970s. We can see this in the experiences of those incarcerated in Chicago in the mid-1960s, at the height of political demonstrations in Chicago.[430] On August 18, 1967, the Executive Director of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Illinois sent a letter to Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley regarding the "the situation in the police department and in the Municipal court."[431] From Executive Director Jay A. Miller,

> Widespread fear of civil disturbances in Chicago, following serious incidents elsewhere in the nation, has resulted, ironically, in unlawful violations of due process by police, prosecutors, and courts. These violations [were] the indiscriminate arrest and imprisonment prior to trial of individuals presumed to be innocent under our judicial system, for long periods, up to a month, due to the setting of excessive bail.[432]

According to the ACLU of Illinois, the Chicago courts often set excessive bail for these individuals, despite the fact that they were nonviolent and, in many cases, had no prior interaction

---

[430] James Ralph, *Northern Protest: Martin Luther King, Jr., Chicago, and the Civil Rights Movement* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993).
[431] Chicago SNCC (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee) History Project Archives [Box 6, Folder 4], ACLU correspondence, August 18, 1967, Vivian G. Harsh Research Collection of Afro-American History and Literature, Chicago Public Library.
[432] Ibid.

with the law.[433] These excessive bail practices "resulted in the imprisonment of some 250 poor people, all black, for a minimum of three weeks without any determination of guilt."[434]

This unlawful arrest and imprisonment of peaceful protesters, or even those who were simply nearby during any sort of civil action, often sparked a political consciousness in these individuals during their imprisonment, which could last for up to a month.[435] The ACLU of Illinois emphasized this fact in their letter to Mayor Daley, encouraging him to consider how the unlawful behavior of Chicago police and courts could actually serve to worsen civil unrest, which was the very thing they were trying to avoid. Miller wrote of this unlawfully imprisoned population, "those who might not have participated in a riot before…were now 'over the line.' The attitude was 'Man, they better not let me out of here now—after what they did,' and 'I don't care now if they offer me a job for $10,000—if they did this cause they're worried about a riot, we'll give them one.'"[436] Reverend Robert Taylor, a Cook County Jail chaplain and Father James G. Jones' successor as executive director of St. Leonard's House, noted a similar pattern of thinking among those who were treated unfairly by a judicial system set on avoiding violent uprisings, and behaving unlawfully in doing so. Father Taylor noted,

> It's very clear that a number of judges sort of see themselves as standing alone between anarchy and order in the streets when it comes to mob action or riot situation charges arising out of violent outbreaks from the ghetto. And we've packed the jail with a number of angry young men who really oughtn't to be there. And the curious double effect of this has been I think on the one hand to give the jail population a political consciousness that it's never

[433] Ibid.
[434] Ibid.
[435] Ibid.
[436] Ibid.

> had before on some of the tiers. Especially the youthful tiers. They're better politically organized than they've ever been in the past.[437]

As a chaplain interacting with incarcerated individuals and as SLH executive director engaging with returning citizens, Father Taylor was witness to this process of politicization.

Reentry for Returning Citizens by Returning Citizens

The aforementioned politicization of the incarcerated population is well documented, specifically in the context of the Prisoners' Rights Movement beginning in the 1960s.[438] Additionally, researchers such as Lilia Fernandez have drawn clear connections between the growing political consciousness of the incarcerated and the development of political organizations among youth in Black and Latinx communities. In her account of the creation of the Young Lords Organization, for example, she tells how the political consciousness of the incarcerated Cha Cha Jimenez, leader of the Young Lords, acted as one catalyst for the creation of the formal Young Lords Organization. The Young Lords initially emerged in the 1950s as a street gang with the goal of defending Puerto Rican boys from violent white youth in the neighborhood.[439] By the late 1960s, however, "the group adopted a politically conscious agenda and transformed itself into a militant, leftist, revolutionary organization."[440] Cha Cha Jimenez, the leader of the primarily Puerto Rican Young Lords group, was (re)incarcerated in the mid-1960s, shortly after his ascent to leadership. During his incarceration, Jimenez "encounter[ed] the influence of black Muslims and started

---

[437] Studs Terkel Radio Archive, "Hans W. Mattick and Father Robert Taylor discuss the scandal at Cook County Jail."
[438] Jacobs, "The Prisoners' Rights Movement and Its Impact."; Thompson, *Blood in the Water*.; William Bennett Turner, "Establishing the Rule of Law in Prisons: A Manual for Prisoners' Rights Litigation," *Stanford Law Review* 23, no. 3 (1971).
[439] Lilia Fernandez, *Brown in the Windy City: Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in Postwar Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).
[440] Ibid., 174.

reading about Martin Luther King, Jr., Malcolm X, the Puerto Rican nationalist hero Pedro Albizu Campos, and the massacre of Ponce, Puerto Rico."[441] As he consumed this literature, "he began developing some awareness of the inequalities that Puerto Ricans had suffered and the colonial status of the island," motivating him to encourage the political action of the renewed Young Lords Organization upon his release.[442] As Fernandez notes,

> When [Jimenez] was released from jail in January 1968, he had a newfound emerging consciousness. He and another Lord…reorganized the gang, incorporated the women's group, and renamed the larger body the Young Lords Organization. They also expanded to include black, white, other Latino members. They hoped to transform themselves from a simple street gang to a legitimate community organization.[443]

While this is a powerful example of the manner in which a previously incarcerated individual's political consciousness manifested in a formal support effort, this story only hints at the relationship between politicization behind bars and support systems for returning citizens. Few researchers[444] have made the explicit connection between the growing political consciousness of prisoners and the emergence of the self-made reentry program, created by returning citizens for returning citizens, in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Given their own personal experiences with penal institutions and their knowledge of the shortcomings of state reentry efforts, many returning citizens felt they were uniquely suited to support recently released individuals in their transition back into society. This personal experience combined with the political consciousness they

[441] Ibid., 182.
[442] Ibid., 182.
[443] Ibid., 183.
[444] Criminologists McAnany and Tromhauser addressed this relationship in "Organizing the Convicted: Self-Help for Prisoners and Ex-Prisoners" (1977).

developed while incarcerated led many returning citizens in the late 1960s to establish their own reentry programs and organizations, ultimately starting a new wave of reentry support efforts and marking themselves as reentry pioneers. While they varied in focus, with some centering on providing immediate resources for returning citizens, and others dedicating their time to organizing efforts dedicated to addressing the root causes of crime and violence in local communities, all of these organizations were the result of a returning citizen's fraught experience during incarceration, increased political awareness, experience of inadequate state reentry efforts, and desire to support their fellow formerly incarcerated individuals upon their release.

Returning Citizens as Experts on Reentry

At a 1971 hearing before a congressional subcommittee discussing prisons, prison reform, and prisoners' rights, Herbert Smith, a volunteer with Operation DARE,[445] addressed the committee with the following statement,

> There are no experts, and I would like to put this point before everyone. We want to become involved as ex-offenders because we have about as much knowledge on this subject as anybody else; in fact, in some instances, we have a little more. So…I don't want people to keep pushing an [ex-offender] out because he hasn't got a degree in psychology. I have read a few psychology books and they don't teach you about the ex-convict.[446]

Smith, like many previously incarcerated individuals working in reentry spaces, had come to believe that returning citizens were uniquely suited to serve the returning population due to their

[445] Operation DARE was a program first piloted in 1970 that was dedicated to providing employment support to returning citizens. It is discussed in-depth in Chapter 2.
[446] Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary House of Representatives, Ninety-Second Congress, First Session on Corrections, "Part IV: Prisons, Prison Reform, and Prisoners' Rights: Wisconsin, November 23, 1971," Serial No. 15 (Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972).

personal experiences with incarceration. As discussed in the previous chapters, the 1950s-1960s marked the emergence of reentry support programs and housing for adult individuals returning from incarceration. As Herbert Smith noted in his statement, "until maybe a year or two ago, no positive moves were made in the direction of trying to understand just what was involved with an ex-offender or a convict."[447] As such, none of the professionals running public or private reentry programs or passing reentry legislation were experts on the matter.

And yet, according to Smith, there were not enough "ex-offenders in decision-making positions."[448] According to a Central YMCA Community College handout for a new course created in conjunction with the a local reentry program and being taught by returning citizens, previously incarcerated individuals were "often overlooked as a credible and valid resource for information about prisons," despite them having "acute and intimate insight" into the topic.[449] Given the relative newness of formalized support efforts centered on the needs of formerly incarcerated individuals, many returning citizens agreed with this assessment and felt that their personal experiences with the penal system and reentry led them to be best situated to offer expertise on the needs of the returning population and thus best suited to lead newly established reentry efforts.

Many previously incarcerated individuals felt that the experience of incarceration was so distant from that of the outside world that it left a chasm between the social bureaucracies created to support these populations and the populations themselves.[450] Returning citizens and others in

---

[447] Ibid.
[448] Ibid.
[449] Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records, "From Prison to PROUD and the Central YMCA Community College" handout, August 11, 1972, Box 2, Prison Committee, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscripts Collection.
[450] McAnany and Tromhauser, "Organizing the Convicted."

the reentry support space often shared this feeling that there was an "invisible barrier between the 'con' and the outside world [which could] be penetrated, not by professional social workers, prison officials, ministers or psychiatrists but only the ex-con himself."[451] We see this emphasis on the unique experiences shared by returning citizens in a 1970 *Chicago Daily Defender* write up of Looking Toward Freedom, a Chicago reentry nonprofit organization founded in 1969. In the article, Looking Toward Freedom leadership was quoted as saying, "We organized Looking Toward Freedom because of the insights we gained upon our release from prison." There is no line between prison and post-prison life, only an instant and then series of difficult, frustrating, and seemingly endless experiences for which we were never prepared, and which often resulted in reincarceration."[452] Here the arts-based Chicago reentry group led by formerly incarcerated individuals underscored that they were motivated by the lack of preparation they experienced during their own return. Similarly, Joe McAfee, a returning citizen and pioneer in the self-made reentry space, noted that he and his peers formed their reentry organization "because we felt that ex-offenders would be most sensitive in understanding and attacking the problems faced by those in the prisons."[453]

While they felt they were uniquely positioned to offer support to the incarcerated and returning populations, these returning citizen leaders did not believe that they needed to create a

[451] Paul Sultan and Gerhard F. Ehmann, "The Employment of Persons with Arrest Records and the Ex-Offender," *National Conference of Christians and Jews* (1970): 20.
[452] "'Looking Toward Freedom' Opens at Artists Guild," *Chicago Daily Defender,* Sep. 30, 1970.
[453] "Ex-Con Organizes Reform," *Chicago Daily Defender,* Jun. 3, 1972.

network of reentry support systems on their own. As Ben Bey,[454] Founder of Looking Toward Freedom,[455] stated,

> The present programs of "rehabilitation" are run by professionals for ex-prisoners. We do not reject these programs. We energetically support them and the groups like John Howard Association, who have done much in both the field of penal reform and post-prison rehabilitation. But more is needed, and we see ourselves as a complement of existing organizations.[456]

This suggests that returning citizens did not want to replace or usurp existing reentry efforts, rather they wanted to fill in gaps that these efforts were unable to fill. However, while these programs were often led by professionals who were sympathetic to the needs of returning citizens, previously incarcerated leaders nonetheless felt that there was a difference between what these "professionals [would] do for offenders and what offenders might decide to do for themselves."[457]

Notably, this belief in the unique position of returning citizens to provide services was also shared by some actors within the penal systems from which these returning citizens emerged. For example, a 1967 survey by the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training found that both adult and juvenile facilities were "using offenders, ex-offenders, and persons on parole or probation in teaching academic and vocational courses, helping with research projects,

---

[454] During his time at Looking Toward Freedom, founder Ben Bey held numerous positions including Director, Vice President, Board Member, and more. As such, all mentions of him henceforth will refer to him as the founder to maintain continuity throughout this paper.
[455] This organization has also been referred to as Freedom Thru Art by organization members and various news outlets. It's not clear where this name came from, as the group was formally established as a nonprofit entity in the State of Illinois as Looking Toward Freedom.
[456] "'Looking Toward Freedom' Opens at Artists Guild."
[457] McAnany and Tromanhauser, "Organizing the Convicted," 74.

conducting recreational and rehabilitation programs… and leading prerelease programs."[458] Moreover, by the 1980s many parole officers felt that there was a "definite social distance" and "communication gap" between the largely lower-class people of color who were on parole and the "predominantly middle-class professional correctional workers."[459] This distance was, according to parole officers, a growing problem in their ability to proffer services to the populations with which they worked. As such, they were strong proponents of hiring previously incarcerated individuals to assist in the reintegration being facilitated by parole offices, as these individuals had "a unique capacity to help others with similar problems" as the ones they'd experienced and overcome.[460]

PROUD: The Prisoners Rehabilitation Organization for United Defense

The Prisoners Rehabilitation Organization for United Defense (PROUD)'s returning citizen founders shared this sentiment, highlighting that experiencing the unique horrors of incarceration and struggles of reentry predisposed returning citizens to be more empathetic to the needs of the recently released.[461] When discussing their motivation for founding the reentry program founder Plato Valentine acknowledged the shared horrors of incarceration saying, "we realized, as no one on the outside can, how a prison works to break your morale and will to function as man."[462] This sentiment, along with the rest of their journey in becoming reentry leaders, mark Valentine and his cofounder, Luther Miller, as the perfect examples of the prison activist's

[458] Earl L. Durham, "St. Leonard's House: A Model in the Use of Ex-Offenders in the Administration of Correction," *Crime & Delinquency,* (1974): 270.
[459] Edward J. Latessa, Lawrence F. Travis, and Harry E. Allen, "Volunteers and Paraprofessionals in Parole: Current Practices," *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services & Rehabilitation* 8, no. 1-2 (1983): 92.
[460] Ibid.
[461] Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records, "From Prison to PROUD."
[462] Ibid.

transition into a reentry pioneer. Valentine and Miller dedicated their time inside to creating "a brotherhood among prisoners, sharing food and offering mutual encouragement," much to the chagrin of the prison officials.[463] They were politicized by their own experiences of incarceration, during which it became clear to them that "only in unity could they find the strength to survive."[464] Their successful efforts toward community building, a key principle of prison activism, ultimately led to increased mistreatment, as prison officials began regarding Valentine as "a dangerous organizer" and subsequently placed both him and Valentine in the segregation unit for the bulk of their time at Stateville Correctional Center.[465]

Ultimately, Valentine and Miller developed the idea for PROUD, an organization geared toward assisting those who were struggling with the transition from incarceration into society,[466] as a result of the conditions they witnessed, mistreatment they experienced, and community building they did during their time at Stateville. A1972 write-up on the creation of PROUD stated that Valentine came up with "the idea of the organization evolved…during a period in 1969 when he and Miller were confined in the segregation unit."[467] "It came out of the utter frustration and powerlessness we felt." He noted.[468] Unlike some other reentry efforts that focused all of their efforts on providing resources to returning citizens, PROUD had a grander mission, one that reflected a more radical approach to incarceration- an approach that aligned with many of the Black political leaders who were incarcerated in the 1960s. They argued that most incarcerated individuals were "political prisoners, victims of an oppressive racial system, that local

[463] Ibid.
[464] Ibid.
[465] Ibid.
[466] Ibid.
[467] Ibid.
[468] Ibid.

communities should be directly involved in any efforts of prison rehabilitation, reform, and reentry, and that incarcerated individuals should have a means to "retain constructive contact with their old neighborhoods, even when they're incarcerated."[469]

As a result of this belief in the importance of communities in changing the system, PROUD ultimately developed programming that was targeted at all members of the community, with a stated mission of "giving offenders, ex-offenders, and citizens in our communities positive programs to eradicate the negative aspects of our communities."[470] Such programs included free food and clothing distribution for poor families, job training for returning citizens, local cleanup committees, 24-hour emergency support, drug abuse rehabilitation,[471] juvenile counseling, and a halfway house for recently released individuals.[472]

FREE: Fondo de Rehabilitacion, Empleo y Economato

Similar to PROUD, the Fondo de Rehabilitación, Empleo y Economato (Fund for Rehabilitation, Employment, and Guidance or FREE) was first thought up by its leadership when they were still behind bars. Cecilio Berrios, the founder of FREE, said that the idea for a program to "help Latino inmates make the change from prison to civilian life"[473] originated at Stateville Correctional Center in 1972 as a result of conversations between members of ALAS, the "bilingual-bicultural educational project" for Spanish-speaking incarcerated individuals.[474] Like many of the other self-made reentry program founders, Berrios saw the shortcomings of state

---

[469] Ibid.
[470] Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records, "Programs of PROUD" handout, undated, Box 2, Prison Committee, Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscripts Collection.
[471] Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records, "From Prison to PROUD."
[472] Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records, "Programs of PROUD."
[473] John O'Brien, "Latin Ex-Convicts Win Fund Battle," *Chicago Tribune,* Aug. 19, 1974.
[474] "Latin Halfway House Stymied by Burocrats," *Chicago Tribune,* Jan. 3, 1974.

efforts to support returning citizens, specifically Spanish-speaking individuals, and developed the idea of FREE to fill this gap. As a result, FREE's primary purpose was to establish a halfway house, staffed with "trained personnel and paraprofessionals who are themselves ex-convicts."[475] Berrios specifically wanted to open the house in West Town, the neighborhood from which most of the Spanish-speaking incarcerated population originated, in an effort to place returning citizens back in the communities with which they were familiar.[476]

When discussing the flaws of the state reentry efforts at the time, Berrios stated, "you can't re-introduce an ex-convict back into society by shipping him out to the country," where most Illinois penal institutions are located, "and isolating him form his own kind."[477] Instead, Berrios argued, the logical thing to do is to offer support to the returning citizen in the environment he is most accustomed to. Another flaw in the existing state reentry process that Berrios noted was the inability for many Spanish-speaking incarcerated individuals to gain parole eligibility. He noted,

> The granting of parole requires that the prisoner have a job and place of residence. Many Puerto Rican inmates are here without families and therefore have no place to go. They had hard time finding a job before they become criminals and find it harder, if not impossible to find jobs when seeking parole.[478]

Unfortunately, the FREE halfway house as Berrios envisioned was never established after being "stalled by red tape and resident resistance."[479] Despite receiving the backing of the Chicago-Cook County Commission on Criminal Justice and the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission,[480]

---

[475] Ibid.
[476] Ibid.
[477] Ibid.
[478] Ibid.
[479] Ibid.
[480] O'Brien, "Latin Ex-Convicts Win Fund Battle."

a location for the house was never found. However, Berrios was, like many returning citizen leaders, willing to adapt his reentry vision based on the reality of the circumstances facing returning citizens. He began acting as the coordinator of a neighborhood court program for the Governor's Chicago office where he continued his advocacy for reentry support and built connections that gave him access to potential funding sources for future FREE efforts.[481] Despite the difficulties that FREE faced in the execution of their dream of a self-made reentry house, the efforts of Berrios nonetheless serve as another clear example of how an individual took ideas that developed from prison organizing and coalition-building, and attempted to enact them with the goal of serving the returning Spanish-speaking population in ways that had previously not been done.

Barriers to Self-Made Reentry Success

Not all institutional actors saw the benefit of connecting previously incarcerated individuals with the currently incarcerated or soon-to-be released. Many institutions "not only failed to encourage the use of offenders as a resource but in many instances [were] formally opposed to collaboration."[482] As a result, when reentry programs led by returning citizens sought access to these populations behind carceral walls, for example, they were often "shut out of the institutions by wardens who held firm to policies against readmission of alumni – except as inmates."[483] Of course, many of these wardens had been opposed to the political organizing and growing social consciousness of their incarcerated populations in the years prior. As such, reentry

[481] Ibid.
[482] Durham, "St. Leonard's House," 277.
[483] McAnany and Tromanhauser, "Organizing the Convicted," 69.

groups led by returning citizens were uniformly excluded into the 1970s, and even then only individual exceptions were made "after a careful examination of the man involved."[484]

Also, not all returning citizens developed a political consciousness during their incarceration and participation in prisoner activism did not necessarily result in any post-carceral political involvement, and participation in reentry support programs was not guaranteed. Although many returning citizens thought they were unique positioned to provide support for those returning from incarceration, many of these individuals got involved in reentry programming out of necessity, rather than because of a calling. That is to say, upon their own return to society, many of these individuals saw how inept state reentry support was, and thus felt they needed to fill the gap, or perhaps no one else would. As Ben Bey noted, one of the primary goals of Looking Toward Freedom was to combat both a lack of free institutional programming designed to "encourage continual interest in the arts" and the obvious "apathy among state agencies such as the Illinois Arts Council" toward incarcerated and returning artists.[485] Another member of Looking Toward Freedom, Bud Hayes, said, "ex-offenders in the United States of America have taken it upon themselves to rehabilitate because of the shortcomings of correctional systems both on a formal level and a state level."[486]

Others noted that the vocational training that occurred in prisons with the supposed goal of preparing incarcerated individuals for release was ultimately just a tool of penal institutions to maintain their facilities and keep prisoners busy.[487] In other words, penal institutions placed incarcerated individuals in roles that did not train them for viable careers upon their release or

[484] McAnany and Tromanhauser, "Organizing the Convicted," 73.
[485] Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3, "Part IV: Prisons, Prison Reform, and Prisoners' Rights."
[486] Ibid.
[487] Mitchell W. Dale, "Barriers to the Rehabilitation of Ex-Offenders," *Crime & Delinquency* (1976).

align with the actual interests or skills of the prisoners. Instead, these men were "given prison industry menial-labor assignments that teach no skills" and instead created an atmosphere for the development of poor work habits.[488] Charles J. Howard, Looking Toward Freedom President, highlighted this exploitation when he spoke at the 1971 congressional subcommittee hearing, saying:

> The ironic element of preparing a man for release is that he should have good work habits and be productive in the prison labor system – a system which has traditionally maintained convict labor operations solely for the benefit of the State, with no regard to the in mate's [sic] prior skill, incentive, or programmatic preference. The same is true of the Federal prison industry, wherein inmates primarily serve the commodity needs of the U.S. Defense Department.[489]

Howard argued, "such methods of utilizing an offender's time, and enforcing his occupational work habits, are hardly in keeping with the correctional responsibility of preparing an offender for return to a free society."[490]

Howard's argument above serves as one example of the belief that much of what self-made reentry programs were doing– providing job training, developing positive work habits, preparing incarcerated individuals for employment– was actually the responsibility of the state. As such, reentry leaders like Howard were often centered as much on system reform as they were on directly serving the returning population. Of course, these individuals were still important reentry pioneers whose experiences as returning citizens were still the ultimate catalyst in their involvement in

[488] Ibid., 323.
[489] Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3, "Part IV: Prisons, Prison Reform, and Prisoners' Rights."
[490] Ibid.

reentry efforts. However, rather than being motivated by a desire to personally serve this unique population, they got involved with the goal of ultimately reforming institutional reentry efforts such that private programs and nonprofits would not be necessary to fill the gap. PROUD's founder Plato Valentine, for example, had an ultimate goal of sitting down with "the powers of the Illinois government" and insisting on a "massive overhaul of the penal system."[491] Individuals like Valentine still ultimately believed that returning citizens were uniquely suited to inform such penal reforms and thus argued that it was only if penal institutions trusted the insights of the previously incarcerated that they could actually "begin to do an adequate job" in serving the incarcerated and returning populations.[492]

Although a number of returning citizen leaders found some collaboration with penal institutions and actors to be potentially beneficial, these partnerships were often simply a means to an end. Some returning citizens spoke at public events, congressional hearings, and conferences that were planned by or targeted to prison officials and other penal institution actors. In 1968, for example, ten returning citizens spoke at the Illinois Parole & Probation Offices Annual Conference to discuss how a state-sponsored group therapy seminar assisted with their transition from incarceration. In the case of Cecilio Berrios, for example, he applied for $75,000 in anticrime funds from the Chicago-Cook County Commission on Criminal Justice, which was made up of "police, court, and penal officials in the county," in order to start FREE counseling, job training, and temporary housing programs for returning citizens.[493] In this case, the benefit of cooperating with

[491] Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records, "From Prison to PROUD."
[492] Ibid.
[493] O'Brien, "Latin Ex-Convicts win Fund Battle."

these institutional actors was the receipt of funding that would directly serve the returning population.

Nonetheless, self-made reentry leaders knew from their own lived experiences that penal institutions were highly flawed and generally did not believe them to be the solution to crime in the community. As the group Looking Toward Freedom noted about the downfalls of penal institutions, "prisons do not help one deal with the causes which brought him there. Rather they regiment and institutionalize the individuals whom they control. They take away all but the simplest kind of responsibility and restrict one's ability to choose."[494] Moreover, many of these returning citizen leaders did not feel that arrest and incarceration actually addressed the true causes of crime, and thus they were not viable solutions. PROUD's Plato Valentine argued, for example, that the true cause of crime was poverty. According to Valentine, "about 90 percent of black crime is related to stealing or seizing property. By getting poor people the things they desperately need, we eliminate the need to steal."[495]

While the returning citizen pioneers discussed in this chapter had the political consciousness, motivation, and unique personal experiences to become pioneers in the reentry support space upon their release, they faced numerous barriers to successfully establishing the programs they envisioned. One key barrier faced by many formerly incarcerated individuals was a lack of community investment or buy-in. In the case of FREE, the Spanish-speaking reentry effort mentioned above, the group's goal to open a Spanish-speaking halfway house in West Town was not fulfilled, because the neighborhood's residents were not supportive.[496] By 1974, the group

[494] "'Looking Toward Freedom' Opens at Artists Guild."
[495] Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records, "From Prison to PROUD."
[496] "Latin Halfway House Stymied by Burocrats."

had found what they thought was the ideal location for their intended halfway house but, upon hearing of FREE"s plan, West Town neighborhood residents protested to the owners of the property, which ultimately led to the suspension of purchasing negotiations.[497] Berrios said of the protesters, "many of the residents are elderly and have lived on the block most of their lives and apparently were upset at the idea of having ex-convicts, many of them ex-drug addicts, as neighbors."[498]

Despite experiencing difficulty in garnering community support, FREE did not have trouble acquiring funding support for their efforts.[499] This was not the case for many of the self-made reentry support efforts that experienced setbacks in the execution of their vision. Many of these reentry organizations were "unable to develop and sustain any significant fundraising apparatus"[500] and thus had to rely on returning citizen members to donate the little time and money they had to support the recently released population they aimed to serve. PROUD was one such example of this, wherein the bulk of their actions were financed by the members themselves, along with some private donations.[501] These private donations had, for many reentry organizations, begun to decline in tandem with the public's diminishing interest in prison reform, after peaking around 1971 with the Attica Prison Uprising.[502] Ultimately, the lack of consistent funding made many of these reentry efforts unsustainable, as it "hindered what was central to most groups – getting men back on the street and keeping them there."[503]

---

[497] Ibid.
[498] Ibid.
[499] Ibid.
[500] McAnany and Tromhauser, "Organizing the Convicted," 69.
[501] Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records, "From Prison to PROUD."
[502] McAnany and Tromhauser, "Organizing the Convicted," 68.
[503] Ibid., 72.

Ultimately, the mistreatment that incarcerated individuals experienced, in combination with the politically-charged atmosphere of the long sixties, led to a rise in political awareness and leadership both behind bars and upon release. Individuals who returned from incarceration during the late 1960s to early 1970s demonstrated both an awareness of the specific needs of the returning population and a desire to address these needs. These self-made reentry efforts were diverse in terms of the services offered, but they were all motivated by the belief that returning citizens were the experts of their own experience. Unfortunately, they were numerous barriers to their success which ultimately made these efforts impactful but short-lived.

Conclusion: Examining the Legacy of Reentry Pioneers in Today's Landscape

Given the variety of ways in which returning citizens are disenfranchised, overlooked, and under-supported, they are often uniquely impacted by shifts in public perception, policy changes, economic crashes, developments of the surveillance state and more. As such, my research is in conversation with scholars across topic, method, and discipline. It engages with the many historians, criminologists, and sociologists who have dedicated their scholarship to understanding the long sixties, the War on Poverty, the growth of the carceral state, and the role of public-private partnerships in the proctoring of funds and services. In this section I explain the contributions of my work and put my findings into the context of contemporary reentry research. I then discuss a few of the many avenues of research that are available moving forward.

Religious Institutions as Pioneers of the Rehabilitative Project

As I demonstrated, the first pioneers of the reentry landscape in Chicago and nationally were religious institutions. St. Leonard's House, the first transitional housing program for returning citizens as we know them today, was founded at the start of the long sixties and set the tone for the decades that followed. Religious leaders had access to returning citizens and to the administration of the penal facilities from which such individuals were returning. This access, in combination with personal experience, allowed religious leaders to connect with and understand the needs of returning citizens, leading to the formalization of their reentry support. Because of the financial resources and extensive diocesan networks to which religious institutions had access, these programs grew and so did their influence. As the largest and most established programs in the reentry space, religious institutions were able to influence the development of both the private and

public reentry efforts that followed. In other words, these institutions provided the blueprint for reentry support efforts as we know them today.

Despite this lasting impact, mass incarceration has caused the role of religion in penal institutions, and thus in the lives of returning citizens, to shift. The project of rehabilitation guided by the religious collectivism[504] of the long sixties has transformed into a project of surveillance, punishment, and control. Significant research has been done on the changing role of prison chaplains in penal facilities[505] and the ways by which religious principles of punishment and forgiveness can differently impact perceptions of the incarcerated and returning citizens at various moments in time.[506] My research contributes to our understanding of the role of religious actors and institutions in penal facilities by showcasing the unique features of religious institutions that allowed for the formalization of reentry and thus brought prison ministry from behind bars. It also furthers understandings of the motivations behind/nature of the relationship between religious institutions and the state.

Public-Private Partnerships During the War on Poverty

The War on Poverty is extremely well-researched and its impacts many vulnerable populations has been considered and discussed. My argument is, therefore, not about the impact of the War on Poverty on returning citizens, or even about the impact of the manpower development and training programs birthed by the War on Poverty on the returning population. Instead my greatest contribution to this dialogue stems from my discussion of the public-private

---

[504] Irene Becci and Joshua Dubler. "Religion and Religions in Prison: Observations from the United States and Europe." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 56, no. 2 (2017).
[505] Jody L. Sundt and Francis T. Cullen. "The Correctional Ideology of Prison Chaplains: A National Survey." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 30 (2002).
[506] Brett Garland, Eric Wodahl, and Rebecca Gretchen Smith. "Religious Beliefs and Public Support for Prisoner Reentry." *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 28, no. 9 (2017).

partnerships that came to dominate the reentry support space, usurping the role of religious institutions as having the biggest impact on the way reentry was done. Antipoverty initiatives led to federal funding for manpower development and training programs, which the federal government outsourced to local community organizations via state governments. In doing so, the federal government tied private funding to participation in the national "War," thus causing a shift among private efforts that needed or desired government grants. Employment became foregrounded in all reentry efforts at the time, and there was a massive shift in power from religious institutions to the national government. What was before the domain of private organizations became the site of private-public collaboration.

Recognizing the Self-Made Reentry Program

Self-made reentry programs are the most understudied component of my research. Few authors have examined the pipeline from incarcerated individual to reentry program founder, but none have taken the time to name this phenomenon in an effort to identify it as something unique to the experience of the returning citizen. I argued that the politicization of the incarcerated population during the 1960s led to a population of returning political leaders who identified a need in their community, recognized the benefit of their unique expertise in addressing that need, and went on to take action to provide the services they knew from experience would be most valuable. Of course, returning citizens are not the first or the only group of individuals who have used their own lived experience to empathize with and support the needs of those around them. However, the formalization of these efforts, the motivation behind them, and their discontinuation should be studied so that future iterations of self-made efforts can have the longevity that the majority of efforts from the long sixties did not experience.

Avenues of Research Inspired by Long Sixties Reentry Pioneers

Moving forward, there are three unique avenues of research that I believe would contribute significantly to this conversation on the long sixties, the onset of reentry support programs, and the impact of national policy on local community efforts. The first potential direction one could take this research is by systematically comparing characteristics of reentry programs in the long sixties to those during the War on Drugs and rise of mass incarceration in an effort to identify specific ways in which the direction of reentry shifted during this time of transition. Another avenue of research for which this project makes space is an in-depth examination of self-made reentry programs. While I identified the role that these efforts played in the reentry landscape at the end of the long sixties, I believe much work can be done to determine what happened to the self-made programs that lasted beyond my period of focus. Additionally, a deep dive into these efforts could provide insight into the characteristics that make certain self-made programs successful while others fall short. Additionally, in this paper I analyzed national phenomena through a local (Chicago) lens. How would my understanding of reentry pioneers change if I analyzed these phenomena through the lens of a city with a different history, population, and context? Would my understanding of the catalysts for various reentry programs shift if I began my analysis by identifying key moments in the long sixties that could have an impact on returning citizens rather than taking an inductive approach beginning with Chicago reentry efforts? This is the third avenue of thought inspired by my research.

References

"3 Named to Jail Board." *Chicago Tribune*, Nov. 18, 1969.

Adler, Jeffrey S. "Less Crime, More Punishment: Violence, Race, and Criminal Justice in Early Twentieth-Century America." *The Journal of American History* (2015): 34-46.

Agyepong, Tera Eva. *The Criminalization of Black Children: Race, Gender, and Delinquency in Chicago's Juvenile Justice System, 1899-1945*. Durham: University of North Carolina Press, 2018.

Alexander, Michelle. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: The New Press, 2010.

Austin, James, and Patricia Hardyman. "The Risks and Needs of the Returning Prisoner Population." *Review of Policy Research* 21, no. 1 (2004): 13-29.

Balto, Simon. *Occupied Territory: Policing Black Chicago*. Durham: University of North Carolina Press, 2019.

Balto, Simon. "How to Defund the Police." *Public Books,* November 20, 2020. https://www.publicbooks.org/how-to-defund-the-police/.

Bartley, Lawrence. "I Am Not Your 'Inmate.'" *The Marshall Project,* April 12, 2021. https://www.themarshallproject.org/2021/04/12/i-am-not-your-inmate.

Becci, Irene and Joshua Dubler. "Religion and Religions in Prison: Observations from the United States and Europe." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 56, no. 2 (2017): 241-247.

Beckman, Aldo. "Couple Help to Rehabilitate Ex-Convicts: Try from Home to Find Jobs for Them." *Chicago Daily Tribune,* Jul. 1, 1962.

Blassingame, Jerry. "'Ex-Con,' 'Ex-Offender' and 'Ex-Inmate' Are Words That Reduce Millions to Stereotype." *The Root,* May 1, 2019. https://www.theroot.com/ex-con-ex-offender-and-ex-inmate-are-words-that-1834428065

Branegan, Jay. "Ex-Convicts Get 'Inside' Assistance in Landing on Feet." *Chicago Tribune,* Nov. 3, 1997.

Branegan, Jay, and Charles Mount. "County Jail's Boss Gets High Marks – So Far." *Chicago Tribune*, Jun. 22, 1978.

Brennan, Ray. "The Frustrations- and Hopes- of St. Leonard's House." *Chicago Sun-Times*, Jul. 25, 1963

Bronson, Jennifer and E. Ann Carson. "Prisoners in 2017." *Bureau of Justice Statistics*, 2019.

Brown, Marilyn, and Barbara Bloom. "Reentry and Renegotiating Motherhood: Maternal Identity and Success on Parole." *Crime & Delinquency* 55, no. 2 (2009): 313-336.

Bryant, Erica. "Why We Say 'Criminal Legal System,' Not 'Criminal Justice System.'" *The Vera Institute,* December 1, 2021. https://www.vera.org/news/why-we-say-criminal-legal-system-not-criminal-justice-system.

"Business Spearhead Jobs Project." *Chicago Daily Defender,* Jul. 20, 1967.

Carson, E. Ann. "Prisoners in 2021 – Statistical Tables." *Bureau of Justice Statistics,* 2022.

Chen, Elsa Y., and Sophie E. Meyer. "Beyond Recidivism: Toward Accurate, Meaningful, and Comprehensive Data Collection on the Progress of Individuals Reentering Society." In *Beyond Recidivism: New Approaches to Research on Prisoner Reentry and Reintegration,* edited by Andrea Leverentz, Elsa Y. Chen, and Johnna Christian, 13-28. New York: New York University Press, 2020.

"Chicago Bar Backs Houses to Help Felons." *Chicago Daily Tribune,* Jun. 22, 1962.

"Crime Bureau Fights Union Aid for Ex-Convicts." *Chicago Daily Tribune,* Sep. 1, 1939.

Dale, Mitchell W. "Barriers to the Rehabilitation of Ex-Offenders." *Crime & Delinquency* (1976): 322-337.

Department of Justice: Office of Public Affairs. "Justice Department Awards More Than $110 Million to Support Currently and Formerly Incarcerated Individuals." *Justice News,* December 22, 2021. https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-awards-more-110-million-support-currently-and-formerly-incarcerated.

Ducksworth, John. "The Prisoner Reentry Industry." *Dialectical Anthropology* 34 (2010): 557-561.

Dunlop, Richard. "The Strange Family of Father Jones." *Kiwanis Magazine,* Feb. 1958.

Dunn, Christopher. "Stop-and-Frisk during the Bloomberg Administration (2002–2013)." *New York Civil Liberties Union,* 2014.

Durham, Earl L. "St. Leonard's House: A Model in the Use of Ex-Offenders in the Administration of Correction." *Crime & Delinquency* (1974): 269-280.

"Economist Discredits U.S. Manpower Programs." *Chicago Defender,* Jan. 1, 1966.

"Ex-Con Organizes Reform." *Chicago Daily Defender,* Jun. 3, 1972.

"Ex-Cons, Addicts Vote Drive Starts." *Chicago Tribune,* Sep. 10, 1972.

"Ex-Prisoner Artists Set Exhibition." *Chicago Daily Defender,* Jun. 13, 1970.

Fernandez, Lilia. *Brown in the Windy City: Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in Postwar Chicago.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Garland, Brett, Eric Wodahl, and Rebecca Gretchen Smith. "Religious Beliefs and Public Support for Prisoner Reentry." *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 28, no. 9 (2017): 879-895.

Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. "In the Shadow of the State." In *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Nonprofit Industrial Complex,* edited by INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence, 41-52. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2007.

Goger, Annelies, David J. Harding, and Howard Henderson. "Rethinking Prisoner Reentry." *Contexts* 20, no. 4 (2021): 46-51.

Gorman, John. "They DARED, and Ex-Convicts Are the Winners." *Chicago Tribune*, Sep. 19, 1974.

"Half of Crimes Done in Chicago by 'Repeaters': Study Bares Danger in Parole System," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, Apr. 7, 1935.

Haveman, Robert, Rebecca Blank, Robert Moffitt, Timothy Smeeding, and Geoffrey Wallace. "The War on Poverty: Measurement, Trends, and Policy." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 34, no. 3 (2015): 593-638.

Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary House of Representatives, Ninety-Second Congress, First Session on Corrections. "Part IV: Prisons, Prison Reform, and Prisoners' Rights: Wisconsin, November 23, 1971." Serial No. 15. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Heise, Kenan. "Safer Foundation's Dorothy Drish, 70." *Chicago Tribune*, Dec. 3, 1991.

Hernandez, Kelly Lytle, Khalil Gibran Muhammad, and Heather Ann Thompson. "Introduction: Constructing the Carceral State." *The Journal of American History* (2015): 18-24.

Hinton, Elizabeth. *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime: The Making of Mass Incarceration in America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016.

Hinton, Elizabeth, LeShae Henderson, and Cindy Reed. "An Unjust Burden: The Disparate Treatment of Black Americans in the Criminal Justice System." *Vera Institute of Justice* (2018): 1-20.

Hirsch, Arnold. *Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago, 1940-1960.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Horton, Luci. "Gary Minister, Ex-Convicts Join to Prevent Crime." *Chicago Tribune*, Jun. 13, 1971.

Hunter, Bob. "Charges of Bias in State Prisons Still Being Made." *Chicago Daily Defender*, Oct. 9, 1968.

Hutchinson, Louise. "Pastor Helps Ex-Convicts Get Fresh Start at Center." *Chicago Daily Tribune*, Dec. 25, 1955.

Jacobs, James B. "The Prisoners' Rights Movement and Its Impact, 1960-80." *Crime and Justice* 2 (1980): 429-470.

Jacobs, James B., Richard McGahey, Robert Minion. "Ex-Offender Employment, Recidivism, and Manpower Policy: CETA, TJTC, and Future Initiatives." *Crime & Delinquency* 30, no. 4 (1984): 486-506.

James, Nathan. "Offender Reentry: Correctional Statistics, Reintegration into the Community, and Recidivism." *Congressional Research Service,* 2015.

"John Drish," *Peach Basket Society* (blog), January 12, 2016. http://peachbasketsociety.blogspot.com/2015/12/john-drish.html.

Johnson, Lyndon B. "State of the Union Address." Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union, January 8, 1964.

Johnson, Byron R. "The Faith Factor and Prisoner Reentry." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion* 4 (2008): 1-21.

Johnson, Byron R. "How Religion Contributes to the Common Good, Positive Criminology, and Justice Reform." *Religions* 12, no. 402 (2021): 1-11.

Kaba, Mariame. *We Do This 'Til We Free Us: Abolitionist Organizing and Transforming Justice.* Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2021.

Kaepernick, Colin. *Abolition for the People: The Movement for a Future Without Policing and Prisons*. New York: Kaepernick Publishing, 2021.

Kennedy, Robert F. "Halfway Houses Pay Off." *National Council on Crime and Delinquency* 10, no. 1 (1964): 1-7.

King, Dr. Martin Luther. Address at the Chicago Freedom Festival, the Amphitheater, Chicago, IL, March 12, 1966.

King, Dr. Martin Luther. "The Chicago Plan." *Southern Christian Leadership Conference News* (Atlanta, GA), January 7, 1966.

Kremen, Gladys Roth. "MDTA: The Origins of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962." *U.S. Department of Labor*, 1974. https://www.dol.gov/general/aboutdol/history/mono-mdtatext.

Kupcinet, Irv. "Kup's Column." *Chicago Sun-Times*, Jun. 28, 1965.

Larkin, Timothy. "Removing the Ex-Offenders' Catch-22." *Journal of Employment Counseling* (1975): 126-131.

Latessa, Edward and Harry Allen. “Halfway Houses and Parole: A National Assessment.” *Journal of Criminal Justice* 10 (1982): 153-163.

Latessa, Edward J., Lawrence F. Travis, and Harry E. Allen. “Volunteers and Paraprofessionals in Parole: Current Practices.” *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services & Rehabilitation* 8, no. 1-2 (1983): 91-105.

“Latin Halfway House Stymied by Burocrats.” *Chicago Tribune,* Jan. 3, 1974.

Leverentz, Andrea, M. *The Ex-Prisoner’s Dilemma: How Women Negotiate Competing Narratives of Reentry and Desistance*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2014.

Libby, T. N. “The Residential Centre for Released Prisoners.” *Canadian Journal of Corrections* 10, no. 2 (1968): 406-408.

Loomis, Frank D. “The Cook County Jail Survey.” *The Chicago Community Trust* (1922): 5-28.

Lowe, Frederick. “Staying Out of Prison: Overcoming Job Barriers Biggest Fight for Ex-Convicts,” *Chicago Tribune,* Aug. 2, 1973.

Marwick, Arthur. “Youth Culture and the Cultural Revolution of the Long Sixties.” In *Between Marx and Coca-Cola: Youth Cultures in Changing European Societies, 1960-1980,* edited by Axel Schildt and Detlef Seigfried, 39-58. New York: Berghahn Books, 2005.

McAnany, Patrick D., and Edward Tromanhauser. “Organizing the Convicted: Self-Help for Prisoners and Ex-Prisoners.” *Crime & Delinquency* (1977): 68-74.

Meiners, Erica and Sarah Ross. “‘And What Happens to You Concerns Us Here’: Imaginings for a (New) Prison Arts Movement.” In *Art Against the Law,* edited by Rebecca Zorach, 17-30. Chicago: School of the Art Institute of Chicago, 2014.

Meiners, Robert G. "A Halfway House for Parolees." *Federal Probation* 29, no. 2 (1965): 47-52.

Miller, Reuben. *Halfway Home: Race, Punishment, and the Afterlife of Mass Incarceration.* New York: Hachette Book Group, 2021.

Muller, Christopher. “Northward Migration and the Rise of Racial Disparity in American Incarceration, 1880-1950.” *American Journal of Sociology* 118, no. 2 (2012): 281-326.

Murakawa, Naomi. *The First Civil Right: How Liberals Built Prison America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Nayer, Gautam, Luis Perez-Feliciano, and Michael Adams. “Got Faith? An In-Depth Analysis and Review of Five Faith-Based Prisoner Reentry Programs in Florida.” *International Journal of Business and Social Science Research* 2, no. 10 (2021): 1-11.

“Negro County Jail Warden to Continue Segregation.” *Chicago Daily Defender,* Mar. 13, 1968.

“New Cook County Jail Wins Praise of Criminologists.” *Chicago Daily Tribune,* Mar. 9, 1929.

Nixon, Richard. "Statement About the Emergency Employment Act of 1971." (San Clemente, CA), July 12, 1971.

O'Brien, Cyrus J. "'A Prison in Your Community': Halfway Houses and the Melding of Treatment and Control." *The Journal of American History* (2021): 93-117.

O'Brien, John. "Latin Ex-Convicts Win Fund Battle." *Chicago Tribune,* Aug. 19, 1974.

Oliver, Kendrick. "'Hi Fellas. Come on in.' Normal Carlson, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and the Rise of Prison Fellowship," *Journal of Church and State* 55, no. 4 (2012): 740-757

Pakenham, Michael. "Jail Chaplain Off to Big Job: Franciscan Priest Endeared Self to Prisoners." *Chicago Daily Tribune,* Sep. 25, 1960.

Pati, Gopal C., Raymond D. Curran, and Gus Wilhelmy. "Operation DARE – Help for the Ex-Offender." *Business Horizons* (1973): 51-57.

Petersilia, Joan. *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

"Plan to Put Ex-Convicts in Building Jobs." *Chicago Tribune*, Aug. 1, 1970.

"Praise Couple for Help to Ex-Prisoners: Found Committee to Find Jobs." *Chicago Daily Tribune*, Jul. 23, 1959.

"Quick Facts: United States." *United States Census Bureau*, July 1, 2022. https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/US.

Ralph, James. *Northern Protest: Martin Luther King, Jr., Chicago, and the Civil Rights Movement.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

"Re-entry Resources for Prisoners and Former Prisoners." *Illinois Legal Aid Online*, February 4, 2023. https://www.illinoislegalaid.org/legal-information/re-entry-resources-prisoners-and-former-prisoners.

"Rev. Dr. Charles F. Schreiner." *Kitsap Sun*, Nov. 28, 2006.

Schoenfeld, Heather. *Building the Prison State: Race & the Politics of Mass Incarceration*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018.

Selover, William C. "Work-Program Clouds Hide Bright Spots." *Christian Science Monitor*, Jan. 26, 1966.

Shannon, Sarah K.S., Christopher Uggen, Jason Schnittker, Melissa Thompson, Sara Wakefield, and Michael Massoglia, "The Growth, Scope, and Spatial Distribution of People with Felony Records in the United States, 1948-2010," *Demography* 54, no. 5 (2017): 1795-1818.

Slaughter, Adolph J. "Former Jazz Player Helps Warden Perform 'Miracle.'" *Chicago Defender*, Mar. 15, 1958.

Sodomka, Dennis. "Ex-convict Patrols Battle Drug Problem in Chicago." *The Minneapolis Star*, Sept. 14, 1971.

"Southern Christian Leadership Conference, A Proposal for the Development of a Nonviolent Movement for the Greater Chicago Area, 1966." In *The Civil Rights Movement: A Documentary Reader*, edited by John A. Kirk, 187-189. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2020.

Special from Monitor Bureau. "Chicago Prisoners' Conditions Better in New Quarters." *Christian Science Monitor*, May 15, 1929.

Strain, Christopher B. *The Long Sixties: America, 1955-1973.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2017.

Sultan, Paul, and Gerhard F. Ehmann. "The Employment of Persons with Arrest Records and the Ex-Offender." *National Conference of Christians and Jews* (1970): 1-44.

Sundt, Jody L. and Francis T. Cullen. "The Role of the Contemporary Prison Chaplain." *The Prison Journal* 78, no. 3 (1998): 271-298.

Sundt, Jody L. and Francis T. Cullen. "The Correctional Ideology of Prison Chaplains: A National Survey." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 30 (2002): 369-385.

Taggart, Robert. "Manpower Programs for Criminal Offenders." *Monthly Labor Review* (1972): 17-24.

Tagge, George. "1943 Act Cuts Parole Control of Ex-Convicts: Find Judges Disagree on its Application." Chicago Daily Tribune, Sep. 6, 1949.

Taylor, Caitlin J. "The Supervision to Aid Reentry (STAR) Programme: Enhancing the Social Capital of Ex-Offenders." *Probation Journal* 60, no. 2 (2013): 119-135.

Terkel, Studs. *Division Street: America.* Chicago: Pantheon Books, 1967.

Thatcher, Gary. "Jobs for Ex-Convicts Fill a Double Purpose." *Christian Science Monitor*, Jun. 3, 1975.

Thompson, Heather Ann. *Blood in the Water: The Attica Prison Uprising of 1971 and Its Legacy.* New York: Pantheon Books, 2016.

Travis, Jeremy, and Christy Visher. *Prisoner Reentry and Crime in America.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Travis, Jeremy, Bruce Western, and Steve Redburn. *The Growth of Incarceration in the United States: Exploring Causes and Consequences*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2014.

Tripodi, Stephen J., Johnny S. Kim, and Kimberly Bender. “Is Employment Associated with Reduced Recidivism? The Complex Relationship Between Employment and Crime.” *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 54, no. 5 (2010): 706-720.

Turner, Jennifer. “Re-‘Homing’ the Ex-Offender: Constructing a ‘Prisoner Dyspora.’” *Area* 45, no. 4 (2013): 485-492.

Turner, William Bennett. “Establishing the Rule of Law in Prisons: A Manual for Prisoners’ Rights Litigation.” *Stanford Law Review* 23, no. 3 (1971): 473-518.

Uggen, Christopher. “Work as a Turning Point in the Life Course of Criminals: A Duration Mode of Age, Employment, and Recidivism.” *American Sociological Review* 65, no. 4 (2000): 529-546.

Uggen, Christopher, and Jeff Manza. “Democratic Contraction? Political Consequences of Felon Disenfranchisement in the United States.” *American Sociological Review* 67, no. 6 (2002): 777-803.

U.S. Department of Justice: Federal Bureau of Prisons. “Recidivism Among Federal Offenders.” *National Institute of Justice,* 1986.

Visher, Christy A., and Jeremy Travis. “Life on the Outside: Returning Home After Incarceration.” *The Prison Journal* 91, no. 3 (2011): 102-119.

Visher, Christy A., Laura Winterfield, and Mark B. Coggeshall. “Ex-Offender Employment Programs and Recidivism: A Meta-Analysis,” *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 1 (2005): 295-315.

Western, Bruce. *Homeward: Life in the Year After Prison*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2018.

Wheeler, Darrell P., and George Patterson. “Prisoner Reentry.” *Health & Social Work* 33, no. 2 (2008):145-147.

Williams, Jason M., Zoe Spencer, and Sean K. Wilson. “I Am Not Your Felon: Decoding the Trauma, Resilience and Recovering Mothering of Formerly Incarcerated Black Women,” *Crime & Delinquency* (2020).

Zhen Zeng. “Jail Inmates in 2021 – Statistical Tables.” *Bureau of Justice Statistics,* 2022.

Ziemba, Stanley. “Operation Dare Trains Ex-Convicts in Trades.” *Chicago Tribune*, Jan. 17, 1971.

Appendix A: Archival Materials

Archival Collections

Richard R. Seidel Archives of the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago

- James G. Jones, Jr. Papers
- St. Leonard's House
- St. Leonard's Ministries

Chicago History Museum Archives & Manuscript Collections

- A Final Report: 4 Years of Progress, 1954-1958
- Chicago Conference on Religion and Race records [manuscript], 1963-1983
- Eighty Years of Ministry: The History of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago
- Questions and Answers about PACE Institute
- The Administration of LEAA Grants in Illinois; 1969-1971

Special Collections, Chicago Public Library

- Norman B. Barr Papers
- Reverend Martin L. Deppe Papers
- Reverend Clay Evans Archive

Special Collections and Archives, DePaul University

- Lincoln Park Community Conservation Council Records

Studs Terkel Radio Archives

Vivian G. Harsh Research Collection of Afro-American History and Literature, Chicago Public Library

- Chicago SNCC (Student Nonviolent-Coordinating Committee) History Project Archives
- CORE (Congress of Racial Equality), Chicago Chapter Archives, 1947 – 1990
- Ebenezer Missionary Baptist Church Archives
- Edward Holmgren Papers
- Reverend Addie and Reverend Claude Wyatt Papers
- St. Edmund's Episcopal Church Archives

Newspapers

- *The Chicago Daily Defender*
- *The Chicago Daily Tribune*
- *The Chicago Defender*
- *The Chicago Sun-Times*
- *The Chicago Tribune*
- *The Christian Science Monitor*
- *The Detroit Free Press*
- *The Kitsap Sun*
- *The Living Church*
- *The Los Angeles Times*
- *The Minneapolis Star*
- *The New York Herald Tribune*

- *The Philadelphia Tribune*
- *The Pittsburgh Courier*
- *The Washington Post*

Appendix B: Methodology

The first step of data collection was searching through digital periodical archives using the ProQuest Historical Newspapers website for mention of the experiences of returning citizens during my time period of interest. I began the search by using general terms ("prisoners," "convicts," "inmates," "halfway house") in addition to any other words that, based on the articles I began encountering, seemed to be commonly used in discussions of returning citizens at that time. I limited the results to my time period of interest (1940-1980) and included "Chicago" in combination with every search term in order to limit my geographic area of focus. I found this approach to be more effective than searching specific local publications because it allowed me to discover articles that covered Chicagoland news in other city periodicals, like the *Detroit Free Press*, and in lesser-known publications, like the *Christian Science Monitor*. I uploaded all relevant digital newspaper articles to Atlas.ti for storage and analysis. I ended this phase of data collection with around 190 newspaper articles from 15 publications, as well as a list of key individuals, organizations, and services in the Chicagoland area that worked with, advocated for, housed, or otherwise served formerly incarcerated individuals. I also utilized these periodicals to develop a rough timeline of notable national and local events that might have impacted the landscape of reentry during my time of interest.

After identifying key individuals, organizations, and programs that were involved with reentry efforts during the 1940s-1960s, I searched for any archival collections held by or specific to these entities. Many of the reentry efforts from my list were related to, part of, or housed under larger organizations that served multiple populations, with returning citizens just being one of many areas of focus. As a result, many reentry efforts did not have their own unique archival

collections, rather their archives were found within large collections with diverse offerings. Additionally, due to the concurrence of numerous rights movements during my time period of interest as well as the importance of these movements to the Black and Latinx populations that dominated penal facilities and thus made up the majority of returning citizens, I anticipated that local and national activist movements would have programmatic efforts that served large numbers of previously incarcerated individuals indirectly or otherwise. As such, I also explored archival collections that housed documents from key figures and organizations related to rights movements of the time.

According to Miller,[507] reentry is hyper-local and our ability to understand the experiences of returning citizens is grounded in our understanding of the neighborhoods to which incarcerated citizens return. Given this, I also searched Chicago Public Library Archival Collections for neighborhood collections that had archives from the 1940s-1980s. This included Community & Newspaper Collections from neighborhoods like Austin, Back of the Yards, Humboldt Park, Hyde Park, Ravenswood, South Shore, Woodlawn, and more. I anticipated that these archival collections would allow me to add to my list of key reentry leaders and organizations by highlighting neighborhood-level initiatives taking place during my time period of interest. However, while there were undoubtedly reentry efforts taking place in these communities, I found that early reentry efforts were more diffuse than the hyper-local nature of reentry today. This is likely because such efforts coincided with housing shortages, redefinitions of racial borders, urban renewal efforts, housing discrimination, horrendous conditions, and the continued displacement of Black, Latinx,

[507] Reuben Miller, *Halfway Home: Race, Punishment, and the Afterlife of Mass Incarceration* (New York: Hachette Book Group, 2021).

and poor individuals which ultimately led to a multi-decade period of residential instability among the communities to which incarcerated individuals would return.[508]

This is of course not to say that certain reentry efforts were not geared toward specific neighborhoods. In the case of St. Leonard's House, for example, its West Side location on Washington Blvd. & Hoyne Ave. was specifically chosen with the belief that the "rundown" and "transient" nature of the predominantly Black neighborhood in which they were located would provide them with access to the population most in need of their services.[509] However, St. Leonard's location proved to be less important to the program's longevity and success than its ties to the Episcopal Church which allowed them access to potential House residents across the country. Ultimately, while neighborhood archives gave some context of what was taking place in the city during my time period of interest, they were not ultimately fruitful sources of information on specific efforts.

After collecting and digitizing photos of relevant archival items in the collections I explored, I uploaded these photos to Atlas.ti as I did with the periodicals mentioned above. At the end of this process, I had collected a total of 220 unique documents from six archival collections.

---

[508] Arnold Hirsch, *Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago, 1940-1960* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983); Lilia Fernandez, *Brown in the Windy City: Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in Postwar Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

[509] St. Leonard's Ministries, *Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago* membership application, January 20, 1960, Box A664, Folder 1, Archives of the Diocese of Chicago.