Section I: The Classic Descriptions of Crime

Selection and tutelage are the two necessary elements in the process of acquiring cognition as a professional thief. These are the universal factors in an explanation the genesis of the professional thief. A person cannot acquire recognition as a professional thief until he has had tutelage in professional theft, and tutelage is given to a few persons selected from the total population.

Selection and tutelage are continuous processes. The person who is not a professional thief becomes a professional thief as a result of contact with professional thieves, reciprocal confidence and appreciation, a crisis situation, and tutelage. In the use of this process a person who is not a professional thief may become first a phyte and then a recognized professional thief. A very small percentage of those that start on this process ever reach the stage of professional theft, and the process may be interrupted at any point by action of either party. . . .

Notes

Several statistical studies of habitual thieves, defined in terms of repeated arrests, have been published. Some of these are excellent from the point of view of the problems with which they deal, but they throw little light on professional thieves because they do not differentiate professional thieves from other habitual thieves. See Roland Grassberger, Gewerbs- und Berufsvorbrechern in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika (Vienna, 1933); Fritz Beger, Die rückfälligen Bétrüger (Leipzig, 1929); Alfred Kohn, Die Rückfallsbetrüger (Leipzig, 1929).

Stories circulate at intervals regarding schools for pickpockets, confidencemen, and other professional thieves. If formal schools of this nature have ever existed, they have probably been ephemeral.
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The 1900-1906 Juvenile Court Series

Series Studied and Types of Defenses

Third in this sequence is the series of 8,056 male delinquents brought into the juvenile court of Cook county from Chicago during 1900-1906 (the first 7 years of the juvenile court's existence). By comparing this series with that for 1927-33 it will be possible to determine the extent to which variations in the rates correspond and the extent to which changes in rates can be related to changes in the physical or social characteristics of the local areas.

The age distribution of the boys in the 1900-1906 series indicates that, on the whole, they were a little younger than those in the more recent series. At that time the upper age limit in the juvenile Court was 15 instead of 16, and a somewhat larger number of boys were under 10 years of age (6.1 percent). The highest frequencies were in ages 13, 14, and 15. With regard to offenses, it seems probable that some boys were taken to court in these earlier years on charges for which no petitions would be filed by the police probation officers at the present time. This is indicated both by the fact that the number of cases in court was greater in proportion to the population than at present and by the fact that the classification of offenses indicated a somewhat higher proportion of less serious charges.

Distribution of Delinquents

Map 12 [not reproduced here] shows the distribution by home address of the 8,056 boys brought to court in the 7-year period 1900-1906. In this series, as in those previously discussed, it will be noted that a preponderance of the delinquent boys lived either in areas adjacent to the central business and industrial district or along the two forks of the Chicago River, Back of the Yards, or in South Chicago, with relatively few in other outlying areas.

While this series exhibits the same general configuration found in the others, there are two noticeable variations. First, the concentrations are somewhat more restricted and closer to the central business district and to the industrial centers than

Source: Reprinted with permission from Clifford R. Shaw and Henry D. McKay, Juvenile Delinquency in Urban Areas, pp. 60-61, 63-68. Copyright © 1942 The University of Chicago Press.
in the later series. This is to be expected, since many of the areas used for residential purposes in this early period have since been depopulated by expanding industry and commerce. Second, on this map there are relatively few delinquents in the areas east of State Street, south from the Loop. These areas, it will be remembered, contain many delinquents in the 1917–23 map and were also areas of heavy concentration in 1927–33.

Rates of Delinquents

Map 13 shows the rates of delinquents in the 106 square-mile areas used for this 1900-1906 series. The population upon which these rates were calculated was secured by combining into 106 comparable areas the 1,200 enumeration districts of 1900 and the 431 census tracts of 1910 and computing the yearly increase or decrease of population in each. The population for the midyear of this series was then estimated from the aged 10–15 male population in 1910. The areas for which rates are presented are practically the same as those used in the 1917–23 juvenile court series, except that in 7 instances it was necessary to construct combinations of the 113 areas in order to secure a larger population in districts which were sparsely settled at that time.

The rates in this series range from 0.6 to 29.8. The median is 4.9 and the rate for the city as a whole is 8.4. Four areas have rates of 20.0 or over; 7 have rates of 15.0 or over; and 12 have rates of 12.0 or over. At the other extreme, 3 areas have rates of less than 1.0, and 12 of less than 2.0.

Map 13 indicates that the variation in rates of delinquents is quite similar to the variations presented previously. The four areas with highest rates are all immediately adjacent to the Loop, and other high-rate areas are in the Stock Yards district and in South Chicago. The areas with low rates, on the other hand, are located for the most part, near the city's periphery. As compared to rate maps for subsequent series, it can be seen that the areas with very high rates are somewhat more closely concentrated around the central business district. This is especially noticeable south from the Loop and east of State Street, where, after the first two miles, the rates of delinquents are below the average for the city as a whole.

Comparisons Among Juvenile Court Series
(1927–33, 1917–23, and 1900–1906)

Three methods will be employed to determine the extent to which the variations in rates of delinquents in the several time series correspond: (1) comparisons by zones, (2) area comparisons and correlations, and (3) extent of concentration.

Rates by Zones

Rates of delinquents were calculated for each of 5 zones drawn at 2-mile intervals, with a focal point in the heart of the central business district. These rates were computed on the basis of the number of delinquents and the total aged 10–16 male population in each zone.1

It should be borne in mind that zone rates of delinquents are presented chiefly because of their theoretical value. They show the variations in rates more conceptually.
and idealistically than do the rates for smaller units. The number of zones used for this purpose is not important, as it is not assumed that there are actual zones in the city or sharp dividing lines between those presented. It is assumed, rather, that a more or less continuous variation exists between the rates of delinquents in the areas close to the center of the city and those outlying and that any arbitrary number of zones will exhibit this difference satisfactorily.

Inspection of the rate maps indicates that there are wide differentials among the rates for the same square miles within each zone, just as there are among rates for census tracts within each square-mile area. These fluctuations do not greatly affect the general trend, however; in fact, it is because the zone rates eliminate the fluctuations evident for smaller areas and present the general tendencies that they are interesting and important.

Maps A, B, and C, Figure 1, show rates of delinquents by 5 complete zones, and also by the north and south halves of the city separately, for the three juvenile court series that have been presented. On the same figure are given the critical ratios between the rates in outer and inner zones, which are so great that clearly they could not be due to chance alone. The critical ratios for adjacent zones (not shown) are also statistically significant in every instance.

**Area Comparisons and Correlations**

Of the 24 areas with the highest rates of delinquents in the 1927–33 series, 20 are among the 24 highest also in 1917–23. On the other hand, a few areas where significant changes took place in community characteristics show also marked changes in rates of delinquents. When the 1917–23 and 1927–33 rates are correlated by the 113 areas used for the earlier series the coefficient is found to be .70 ± .02. This coefficient is greatly reduced by the fact that the rates in 6 areas have changed so much that the points representing them fell entirely outside the line of scatter on the correlation sheet.

Most of the areas of high rates in the 1900–1906 series also correspond with those ranking highest in the two later series. Of the 12 highest in 1900–1906, 9 were among the 12 highest in 1927–33. Three of the 5 highest-rate areas in the latter series, but not in the former, are the same 3 found among the high-rate areas as of 1917–23. Although some new areas appear among those with high rates in the more recent series, it is significant to note that all 12 of the areas of highest rates in the 1900–1906 series are among the areas of high rates in 1927–33. Because of these areas, the correspondence between the series is even more clearly seen when comparisons involving a larger number of areas are made. Of the 25 areas with the highest rates of delinquents in the 1900–1906 series, 19 are included among the 25 highest in the 1917–23 series, and 18 among the 25 highest in 1927–33, even though these series are separated by approximately 2 and 3 decades, respectively. This is especially significant in view of the fact that the nationality composition of the population has changed completely in some of these neighborhoods.

A more general statement of the relationship is found when the rates in the 1900–1906 series are correlated with those for each of the other juvenile court series.
To accomplish this, it was necessary to calculate rates in the two later juvenile court series for the same 106 areas used in the early series. The coefficient secured for 1900–1906 and 1917–23 was .85 ± .04, and that for 1900–1906 and 1927–33 was .61 ± .04. In the latter case the coefficient was reduced by the few values which fell far out of the line of scatter, indicating areas where considerable change had occurred.

These coefficients are remarkably high when it is recalled that the series are separated by about 20 and 30 years, respectively. They reveal that, in general, the areas of high rates of delinquents around 1900 were the high-rate areas also several decades later. This consistency reflects once more the operation of general processes of distribution and segregation in the life of the city.

**Extent of Concentration**

The distribution of delinquents in relation to male population 10–16 years of age for each of the three juvenile court series has been further analyzed by dividing the population into four equal parts on the basis of the magnitude of rates of delinquents, then calculating the percentage of the total number of delinquents and total city area for each population quartile, as shown in Table 6. [Tables 1–5 in sections of book not reprinted here.]

It is apparent that the quarter of the population living in the areas of highest rates occupied only 19.2 percent of the geographic area of the city in the 1927–33 series 17.8 percent in 1917–23, and 13.1 percent in 1900–1906. Yet, in each instance this quarter of the population produced about one-half of the delinquents.

When the delinquents in each series, in turn, are divided into four equal parts according to magnitude of rate of delinquents and the corresponding distribution of population and city area is analyzed, the concentration of delinquents is again clearly evident (see Table 7).

Table 7 shows that the upper quarter of the delinquents, living in high-rate areas, represented only 7.7 percent of the population in the 1927–33 series, 10.9 percent as of 1917–23, and 10.6 percent in 1900–1906; and occupied respectively only 5.5,

| Table 7 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| PERCENTAGE OF MALE POPULATION AGED 10-16 AND OF CITY AREA FOR QUARTILES OF DELINQUENTS WHEN AREAS ARE RANKED BY RATE OF DELINQUENTS: THREE JUVENILE COURT SERIES |
| Quartiles of Delinquents | Percentage of Population | Percentage of City Area |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Upper one-fourth, from high-rate areas | 7.7 | 10.9 | 10.6 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 3.7 |
| Second one-fourth | 13.8 | 12.1 | 16.6 | 8.6 | 11.1 | 10.1 |
| Third one-fourth | 24.3 | 29.0 | 24.1 | 22.0 | 27.4 | 17.8 |
| Lower one-fourth, from low-rate areas | 54.2 | 48.0 | 48.7 | 63.9 | 55.5 | 68.4 |

6.0, and 3.7 percent of the total city area. At the opposite extreme, the one-fourth of the delinquents in the areas of lowest rates came from 54.2 percent of the population and 63.9 percent of the area in 1927–33, 48 percent of the population and 55.5 percent of the area a decade earlier, and 48.7 percent of the population and 68.4 percent of the area in 1900–1906. . . .

**Notes**

1. When a square-mile area was divided by one of the concentric circles, the aged 10-16 population and the number of delinquents allocated to each zone corresponded to the proportion of the area which fell in each.

**Table 6**

PERCENTAGE OF DELINQUENTS AND OF CITY AREA FOR QUARTILES OF MALE POPULATION AGED 10-16, WHEN AREAS ARE RANKED BY RATE OF DELINQUENTS: THREE JUVENILE COURT SERIES

| Quartiles of Population | Percentage of Delinquents | Percentage of City Area |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Quartiles of Population | 1927-33 1917-23 1900-1906 1927-33 1917-23 1900-1906 |-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Upper one-fourth, in high-rate areas | 54.3 | 46.1 | 47.3 | 19.2 | 17.8 | 13.1 |
| Second one-fourth | 23.9 | 27.3 | 26.6 | 19.4 | 24.8 | 12.1 |
| Third one-fourth | 14.6 | 17.7 | 17.4 | 32.3 | 27.1 | 21.7 |
| Lower one-fourth, in low-rate areas | 7.2 | 8.9 | 8.7 | 29.1 | 30.3 | 53.1 |