CRIME AND PUNISHMENT IN EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA, 1903–18, PART 2

Bobby A. Wintermute
Queens College

ABSTRACT: The first half of this article (*Pennsylvania History*, Summer 2017) studied the nature of crime and criminology in early twentieth-century Pennsylvania. In this follow-up, Eastern State Penitentiary reforms and advocacy for prisoners fighting in World War I are examined, along with the efforts of Progressive Era penologist Warden Robert J. McKenty.
KEYWORDS: Eastern State Penitentiary, Robert J. McKenty, World War I, prison reform, Progressive Era

INTRODUCTION

When Eastern State Penitentiary (ESP) first opened in 1829, it was intended as an alternative model to prevailing incarceration systems employed in the United States and Europe. Influenced by Quaker ideas of self-redemption, and built on the panopticon model, inmates at Eastern State existed in total isolation. Living, working, and taking meals in their own cells, prisoners were encouraged to pursue silent contemplation of their misdeeds. The objective of this treatment was the individual prisoner's personal epiphany of his or her sins, a rehabilitative moment considered to set all but the most depraved on a righteous path.[1] Over the decades, the institution evolved both physically and conceptually. The earlier Quaker-based model for rehabilitation was abandoned as the commonwealth grew in population and influence over the course of the nineteenth century. As ESP approached its eightieth year of operation, a new warden took charge of the facility, initiating a series of new policies and experiments intended to reassert the prison's rehabilitative mission.

PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY: A JOURNAL OF MID-ATLANTIC STUDIES, VOL. 84, NO. 4, 2017.

Over his fifteen-year tenure (1908–1923), Warden Robert J. McKenty introduced several material reforms designed to better prepare inmates for life outside the penitentiary and to introduce some measure of controlled personal responsibility within the institution's confines. A proponent of what this author labels *redemptive rehabilitation*, McKenty applied a moral Progressive's outlook to his task as warden. In a departure from many prevailing theories of criminal behavior and incarceration, McKenty dispensed with Lombrosian notions of born criminality and atavistic impulses that provoke individuals into deviance. Recognizing (within limits) the difference between professional criminality and accidental or circumstantial factors leading

FIGURE 1 Portrait of Warden Robert J. McKenty. Courtesy of Eastern State Penitentiary Historic Site, gift of the McKenty descendants, the Banks, Myers, and Calkins families.

individuals to cross the line of decency, McKenty practiced a combination of moral intervention and practical reeducation designed to steer young inmates and older first offenders away from future criminal behavior. The actual success of his efforts is debatable; McKenty's own penchant for nepotism and possible abuse of prison funds (never proven) as well as the events surrounding his ignoble removal as warden in 1923 undermine his reputation. Mention Robert J. McKenty today and one is likely to receive blank stares. Forgotten to all save a handful of scholars, experts, and local historians, McKenty was nonetheless very well respected over much of his career as warden of Eastern State, and was once considered one of the nation's premier Progressive figures in penal reform and administration.

As familiar as crime and criminality were to American society at the turn of the century—as attested by the lurid coverage of crime in local newspapers—it was viewed in polite society through a moral/behavioral lens. World War I occurred just at the point when new empirical methods of data collation and classification were being applied to human behavior. Ethnologists, sociologists, and anthropologists competed with each other as they sought to categorize what qualities rendered different groups (e.g., defined by ethnicity, class, and intellect) fit or unfit members of society. Joined by biologically attuned eugenicists, social scientists charted criminality, not merely to identify possible behavioral cues that could be used to predict or prevent crime, but also to classify distinctions between the accidental offender and the career criminal. The recidivist was a threat to the moral stability of those who came into contact with him; he was also viewed as evidence of the incipient physical degeneration of the lower classes. As the nation rallied its youth to arms, these were precisely the sort of persons who moralists wished to keep away from their children, lest they lead them down a path of corruption and immoral lusts and base desires.

Lost on the progressive architects of the American wartime military was the irony of how the normal social roles had changed. Before 1917, the army was seen as an opportunity of last resort for immigrants, the poor, and suspect degenerates; now in wartime, these were the very sorts that were seen as unfit for service. Now reformers prepared to use the circumstance of military conscription as a vehicle for social engineering on a nationwide scale. In one of its first wartime actions, the War Department charged Rockefeller Foundation reformer Raymond B. Fosdick with organizing the Commission on Training Camp Activities (CTCA). After visiting the Mexican Border National Guard mobilization in 1916, Fosdick was appalled that soldiers

enjoyed easy access to alcohol and prostitutes. At the head of the CTCA, he quickly forged alliances of progressive social philanthropy with a range of organizations to manage civilian-based recreation and lectures for the soldiers. This was all intended, historian Nancy Bristow observes, to make the wartime army the most moral and upright force it could be, a safe haven for middle-class youth free from the hazards of drink and sex that had become synonymous in public opinion with military service. But this was not the sole object, she notes, as the CTCA also championed the assimilation of foreign immigrants to a cultural ideal firmly set in Anglo-Saxon identity. Ideally these norms, she writes, "would become national standards, replacing the multitude of American cultures with a homogenous one."[2]

This scheme had little use for employing men who lived on the margins of law, order, and morality. In the rush to field an army for service in Europe, one of the most traditional (and overlooked) manpower pools in the American experience—convicted felons—was rejected outright by the War Department.[3] By refusing these men for military service, reformers not only made a clean break with past experience, but they also signaled a divide within progressive moral ideology. Even as criminologists determined "criminal man" a degenerative subtype, they also held out the prospect of redemption for young felons who were compelled by bad decisions and bad company to commit crime. These young men were not beyond the pale; rather they could be made whole through careful management in progressive prisons and penitentiaries. As we shall see, there were professional penologists, including prison wardens, who regarded wartime mobilization as an opportunity not only to Americanize immigrant men and to stamp out vice in society, but to also redeem young souls who would otherwise be lost to crime. The story of Eastern State Penitentiary in wartime, then, is one of competing, yet curiously parallel, courses of social reform, a moral saga of another type than that dominated by the CTCA. To understand this alternative path to moral reform, we begin with Robert J. McKenty, warden of Eastern State Penitentiary.

WARDEN ROBERT J. MCKENTY AND HIS PHILOSOPHY OF REHABILITATIVE INCARCERATION

Despite its best intentions, the original Pennsylvania system was greeted with moral outrage. English novelist Charles Dickens was compelled to write a substantive critique of the isolation regimen after visiting Eastern State,

noting its high-minded, yet soul-sapping, cruelty. Before long, total isolation was abandoned, as much due to the expense as compassion for the inmates. By the turn of the twentieth century, overcrowding at Eastern State, responsible not only for holding prisoners from eastern Pennsylvania, but also a select number of federal inmates, had forced the building of an extension to cell block 1, and four new cell blocks. Even with the new structures, the prison population continued to grow, reaching 1,175 by 1900; the original plan for individual cells was abandoned, and prisoners since the late 1860s had been doubled up two to a cell. In addition, new prison workshops were built, supplementing the cottage industry of hosiery and shoes undertaken in prisoners' cells. The moral optimism that guided the construction of the prison waned as well, transformed, according to historian Jeffrey A. Cohen, into "a warehouse for the state's toughest convicts . . . a place of unpleasant necessity, where the focus was on firm discipline, if occasionally leavened with personal acts of humanity."[4]

At the turn of the century, prisons across the country became the subject of great debate over their perceived failure to reform their guests. Punitive incarceration did little to solve the problems of recidivism. Firm, yet fair governance of the prison yard, with humane conditions and ample opportunity to earn trust and prove personal rehabilitation, became the objective of the new prison reform movement. As progressive governors were elected to office in the first decade of the twentieth century, like-minded reformers were appointed as wardens when appropriate. After 1910 state prisons across the country sought to adopt the reform models of hard, yet meaningful, work as a key to rehabilitation. It is important to note that the stereotype of exploitive chain-gang labor, or graft-ridden prison workshops, was not at all considered a problem in this period. Reformers recognized that the majority of prisoners held in local and state prisons were victims of circumstance. Most of the inmates at ESP, for example, were guilty of property-related crimes such as theft, larceny, and burglary; all generally associated with poverty. Many were unskilled day laborers, who committed crimes out of base necessity. For others, alcohol fueled many a rage leading to assaults, manslaughter, and even murder. Work then was not only presented as a means to maintain order in the prison; it also offered an opportunity for these young men to acquire a trade that would sustain them after their sentence ended.

This is the setting in which ESP's warden, Robert Jackson McKenty, lived and thrived. A careful guardian of his own image, for a time McKenty was considered one of the country's most visionary prison administrators.

His philosophy of paternal rehabilitative incarceration, while in some ways following the general trend of other progressive penal reformers, also fit into the tradition of self-reflective penitence reinforced by meaningful labor that was the hallmark of the Pennsylvania system. A keen proponent of the "new penology," according to historian Paul Kahan, McKenty sought to create a reform-oriented institution at Eastern State in the model championed by progressive penal reformer and Sing Sing warden Thomas Mott Osborne. Accordingly, McKenty sought to "de-institutionalize" ESP and in the process recast the penitentiary as a miniature civic community in which convicts relearned how to function in civilian society through the application of custom therapeutic-oriented sentences.[5]

How much of a paternalist was Warden McKenty? The best sources for that are the voluminous newspaper accounts of his career and his own public writings. All but forgotten now, McKenty was a national figure of no small prominence in penology and progressive reform in the first decades of the twentieth century. Born in poverty in Philadelphia's Seventh Ward on September 3, 1859, McKenty was a Horatio Alger story in the flesh. After leaving school at the age of twelve, McKenty worked in a number of jobs until he landed a position in the Philadelphia Gas Works as a stoker. After joining the Philadelphia Police Department as a sub-policeman in 1886, he quickly rose through the ranks, becoming a detective in 1892, superintendent of the Philadelphia House of Correction in 1904, and director of public safety on September 23, 1906.[6] He retired six months later from that position, and opened a private detective agency in the city before he was appointed ESP warden in 1909.

As warden of Eastern State, "Bob" McKenty was acclaimed by penologists across the country as a "crackerjack," the "professor of reclamation," and "humanitarian."[7] A frequent contributor to local newspapers and magazines like *The North American*, McKenty often expounded his rehabilitation philosophy for interested readers. He claimed credit for eliminating solitary confinement in the prison while also instituting a vocational education system, asserting that this was for many inmates the only schooling they had ever had.[8] He also sought to break up the stifling dullness of incarceration by allowing the formation of prison clubs, baseball teams, newspapers, and other amenities. According to McKenty, his intention was not to soften incarceration out of blind compassion, but rather to give prisoners the chance to improve their own selves through work and leisure. The alternative, McKenty argued, was the creation of a "criminal class." It was better

instead to create a model community of work and self-improvement among the inmates in his charge.

McKenty's formula for personal rehabilitation was built around his role as the *paterfamilias* of the model community he was trying to create. His interviews and articles are rife with patronizing inferences and anecdotes that both elevate his own status and infantilize the inmates of Eastern State. In one wartime interview, he told how his inmates, "400 men . . . as hard as nails," had become molded into a drill team by McKenty's grandson, Robert J. McKenty, III. "He drills every one of the 1000 men that are able to participate in various groups. Yes, I think they love him, and would follow the 'little tyke' any place he led," the elder McKenty added.[9] Consistently, he told reporters stories of how inmates came to him asking permission to perform some act of benevolent service for the community outside the walls, from collecting money for Belgian war relief, to sending Christmas gifts to children on the outside, to knitting socks for AEF soldiers in France. Often the inmates are personalized as well, not individually, but collectively as his "boys," establishing a hierarchical relationship that asserted for McKenty the power to administer discipline and also the right to claim ownership for their actions when they achieved successful rehabilitation. Thus, as the great paternal figure of Eastern State, it is not surprising that he should want to acknowledge not only the wartime service of his "boys," but the sage hand that guided them toward their vindication in khaki.

It is tempting to view ESP as a model institution under a particularly honest and scrupulously fair warden. Such views would be mistaken. Even during the war, McKenty's administration abused its power over inmates with a callous indifference to their welfare. Postwar investigations would reveal harsh treatment—if not depraved indifference and sadistic abuse—of prisoners in his care. Ultimately a combination of charges of nepotism, graft, and systemic abuse would compel McKenty's resignation. But these scandals lay far in the future from the wartime accounts of progressive reform and management he peddled as evidence of his own benign paternalism. The men who served during the war may have largely become McKenty's favorites, his selection of men to represent his vision at large. But no amount of skepticism over his motives could account for the fact that every single prisoner who served in the wartime US military after completing their sentence was ineligible for service under the most basic terms of the Selective Service Act.

COULD INMATES BE MADE FIT FOR SERVICE?

Perhaps the most critical question related to the Eastern State Plaque, described in part 1, and the former inmates listed on it is how 121 felons gained entrance into what was intended to be the most morally fit and upstanding army fielded by the United States up to that time? According to the terms of the Selective Service Act of 1917, convicted felons were ineligible for the draft, as a felon was considered "morally unfit to be a soldier of the United States."[10] During the course of the debate over the classification of exemptions that followed passage of the Selective Service Act on May 18, 1917, many of the classifications were revisited, including those regarding essential labor, farmworkers, married draftees, and resident aliens.[11] Whereas much of the debate over the eligibility or exemption of these groups was deliberate and at times quite heated, at no time was there any such debate over the status of criminals. So, if criminals were clearly exempted from military service, then how is it a plaque even exists commemorating the contributions and sacrifice of 121 former inmates of Eastern State Penitentiary? Even though they were excluded from military service, felons were required to register for the draft. According to regulations governing the administration of the Selective Service Act, "Inmates of penitentiaries will be registered by the warden thereof on the day set for registration." Once collected, this data was to have been kept out of the general pool of registrants. All registered names were to be reported to the adjutant general, but not included in the state report sent to the War Department. Further, "registration cards will be kept by the warden and not consolidated with county records. The copies thereof will be forwarded to the adjutant general and will not be consolidated with the cards of the State, but will be kept in a separate file."[12]

Registration therefore appears to have served cross purposes. Not only did it collect and collate a manpower base for induction, but it also provided a tool for social categorization and classification. The Selective Service Act was an opportunity for progressives to exercise those same nation-building impulses that were put to use in the Caribbean and the Philippines in the previous two decades. In this case, the outcome was the classification of American men on the basis of their productivity, ethnicity, and base worth to society. Writing after the war, Major General Crowder affirmed this: "What had theretofore been a conglomerate mass of man-power now stood arrayed in five great classes. Class I represented the men available for the Army, Class V, the legally exempt, and the intervening classes contained in the inverse

order of their industrial and domestic importance the remaining groups of men."[13]

Obstacles to service for former felons were numerous and clearly identified. First, they were considered exempt on moral grounds. Second, they were thought to be medically unfit, as their moral failings were viewed as indicative of some constitutional psychopathic state. Third, the system itself was structured so that those inmates in prison at the time registration for the draft began (again, twenty-three of the total sampling were in prison when registration began in June 1917) were kept out of the general pool of potential draftees. Despite all of these obstacles, how did these 121 paroled felons enter into military service?

Rehabilitation, civic and personal, through wartime military service was a favored cause of many prison administrators and reformers. At the American Prison Association's 1917 annual meeting in New Orleans, several wardens reported "a general restlessness was noticed among some prisoners" with regard to the war.[14] In most cases, the appropriate response was to expand opportunities for inmate action in support of the war effort, such as knitting socks and making bandages for the Army's medical services, growing vegetable gardens to make up for wartime shortages, hosting speakers, and raising money for bond drives. But there remained a growing wish to do more on the part of some inmates, a desire apparently accommodated by some states as they offered conditional parole to prisoners who immediately enlisted in the Army or Navy. When enlistments were closed in September 1917, the wardens unanimously passed a resolution calling on the Navy and War departments to revise regulations and the conditions of the Selective Service Act of 1917

> to permit the enlistment in the military and naval forces of the United States of men, who, in the judgment of the proper military and naval authorities, are physically, mentally and morally qualified, despite the fact that such persons may have been convicted of the offenses set forth in the regulations and articles above referred to and imprisoned therefor, upon their being duly and honorably paroled or discharged from such imprisonment.[15]

Driving the wardens' campaign for conditional release of select prisoners for military service were reports of successes in similar programs in Canada and the United Kingdom. Prisons all across Canada were apparently depopulated as

prisoners were released for wartime military service, transforming institutions like the Ontario Reformatory, in Guelph, Ontario, into rehabilitation hospitals for repatriated wounded soldiers. Prison superintendent J. T. Gilmour reported he learned that regardless of their alleged immorality, the prisoners in his charge were no less patriotic than the average Canadian. Indeed, he noted, frequently "men have exchanged prisoner uniforms for army uniforms in three hours after their discharge from prison."[16]

The Canadian program was more engaged and active than Gilmour revealed. Since the outbreak of hostilities, Canada granted over 600 paroled felons the opportunity to serve in the nation's armed forces, provided they were "industriously employed in their various avocations" and were otherwise of sound moral character. While there were some cases of backsliding recidivism among the group, by and large the paroled felons served with honor and distinction. Anecdotal accounts of one-time offenders receiving field commissions and high decorations for valor were presented as evidence of the overall high moral character of former inmates in service. The act of service, accordingly, was presented as a personal decision on the part of the former inmate, for whom redemption was an act of individual sacrifice, as W. F. Archibald, an Ottawa-based parole officer, reported at the 1919 American Prison Association's (APA) annual meeting:

> I would make honorable mention and pay tribute to these paroled men who served at the front and have given their services so freely. In many cases they have made the supreme sacrifice for their country. Notwithstanding the fact that these men have had a discovered fault in their lives and were punished for their offense, who, with a human heart, would even mention their past under these circumstances? Their blood today mingles with other heroes of other nations who have fallen with their faces to the foe and they now lie buried together in the Mother Earth of dear old France. What more could mortals do to win back their honor and the esteem of their fellow men.[17]

Canadian prisoners were thus given an opportunity to demonstrate a material atonement for their actions through wartime military service. The act of taking their place in the firing line proved that, despite their misdeeds, the parolee and the convict in uniform were no less citizens than their law-abiding comrades.[18]

Not surprisingly, Robert J. McKenty quickly demonstrated his own support for enrolling parolees for conscription along the same lines expressed by the APA. Given his strongly paternalistic outlook and tendencies expressed prior to the war, it was almost a natural course for him. Even before the 1917 APA meeting, he promoted a series of schemes for organized conscription of paroled felons from ESP and other institutions. While there are some references to his proposed program in the civilian press, the most immediate source for deciphering McKenty's ideas is the prison's inmate-edited biweekly newsletter, *The Umpire*.[19] While the newsletter was produced by inmates, it could hardly be considered a truly independent voice. McKenty frequently employed the paper to vocalize his own philosophy of paternal administration and rehabilitation to a captive audience. Moreover, as an ostensibly independent product of the inmate population, it provided proof to the Board of Inspectors of how successful his administration of the prison was, especially as the paper published no news that could prove even remotely embarrassing to the warden. It is uncertain if McKenty wrote editorials or articles himself; it is also unlikely the editor would have taken the serious risk of misquoting or misrepresenting the administration in any way. In this light, then, *The Umpire* must be considered a valuable source offering critical insight into McKenty's vision for how the prison and its inhabitants *should* conduct themselves, as well as providing a blameless and scandal-free mirror of how he believed his own administration functioned.

For the first ten months after the United States entered the war, *The Umpire*'s treatment of the war was split into two distinct but related courses. The first was the reprinting of informational pieces from outside sources, no doubt preselected by McKenty or his staff, outlining how other institutions, domestic and foreign, were proposing to make use of or actually did employ convicts in the war effort. Short news stories calling for inmate conscription were reprinted, all creating the appearance of a unified appeal across all groups in society. George Washington Kirchway, the acting warden of Sing Sing Penitentiary in 1915, was quoted in the *New York Evening Post* (and reprinted in *The Umpire*), as recommending individual recruitment of prisoners as a rehabilitative exercise. It was important they be treated as average citizens, however:

> The Army is the greatest socializing influence we have. The inmates need it as the country needs their rehabilitation. In the Army they would be among all classes and conditions of men. . . . As long as men

> are kept together as ex-prisoners, or criminals, their service to their country becomes less of a redeeming feature. The men ought not to feel that they are to have a chance to make good merely as a body of criminals. A prisoner in the Army takes upon himself the duties and opportunities for service of a normal man. The *Crois de Guerre* of a reclaimed man ought to show no reservation. There would be no better opportunity of humanizing or socializing the criminal class than by getting them into the Army.[20]

Others argued for the formation of special units of prison inmates, all under the command of former prison guards, and kept segregated from other soldiers. "Strict discipline could be enforced by officers who are familiar with that kind of man," an editorial from the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle* argued. "Give the regiment a fancy name (as the Russian women have done in the 'Command of Death') like the 'Legion of Redemption'—prisoners are sentimental creatures."[21]

Another type of story sought to make the case for prisoner conscription by citing British successes. According to *The Umpire*, some 7,000 convicts were enlisted in the British army by mid-1917, and many of these served with distinction. Nearly 600 of them died in service, and another 1,520 were seriously wounded; more tellingly, twenty men were alleged to have been mentioned in dispatches, eight others receiving battlefield commissions, and three receiving the Victoria Cross.[22] The paper's editor—ostensibly prisoner B7413—applauded this example, and made an evocative appeal for similar treatment for the inmates at Eastern State:

> It seems to the writer good sense, in the light of these astounding figures, for the authorities to give us the chance now, and not wait until tens of thousands of our young men have laid down their lives. Let us in first. We have sinned, say we, let us expiate our transgressions so far as we may, by serving as defenders of our country.
>
> There are many men of the shifty-eyed type in prison. There are many more in prison who have the look of eagles in their eyes. The old idea that prisoners are a class apart from humanity has been discarded along with a host of other myths. . . .
>
> A dozen regiments could be raised from men in prisons in this country today. If the others who are serving the flag did not wish to associate with them, they could be kept apart. More than likely that

> would be more desired by the men coming from the prisons than any one else. They would be more contented to work out their salvation among themselves than by being thrust among those who do not care for their company.[23]

This last point echoed Warden McKenty's own thoughts almost to the letter. Within weeks of America entering the war, he authorized the creation of individual cell-block drill companies. The Honor and Friendship Club organized companies, each under the direction of the respective inmate block wardens. Marching and drill exhibitions soon opened each Sunday's baseball game, with inmates marching to and fro across the common yard beneath homemade and donated flags of all the Allied nations. Overseeing the prison pageantry from the reviewing stand, Warden McKenty pronounced judgment on each week's competition, offering his own call to arms. Given the chance, the warden on occasion remarked to the assembled prisoners, "he could raise a regiment of men who would follow him into battle and make a name for themselves," before dismissing them for their entertainment.[24]

More important than convincing outside observers that the men of ESP were ready and willing to go to war was making the case that military service would further the personal rehabilitation of the inmate. This was comfortable ground for McKenty. He had made moral and social rehabilitation (carried out with a paternal hand but also built upon the premise of trusting inmates to self-regulate and modify their behavior), the public face of his administration. The progressive reform-oriented line was that not all prisoners were social deviants; the majority of inmates in American prisons were first-time offenders, victims of circumstance whose mistakes had led them to this cruel intervention. McKenty touted his approach as a more humane and sensible alternative to punitive incarceration: allow inmates the chance to develop their own moral compass while they improved their vocational skills and learned how to behave in a civil society. He summarized at one point, "The best prison system is the one that combines steady work offering a livelihood outside with religious training that arouses a man's sense of moral obligation."[25] Vocational education opportunities were limited, thanks to legislated restrictions on prison labor. In response, McKenty introduced a wide-ranging academic curriculum, ranging from elementary education courses in reading and arithmetic to electricity and steam engineering.[26]

Military service, then, could only be a positive adjunct for the McKenty system of rehabilitative improvement. It went better than any successful

program of incarceration could; after all, paroled inmates still returned to a community that knew who they were, and frequently still harbored resentment and distrust of their returning prodigals. After all: "The police view him suspiciously and arrest him on suspicion for everything that happens. He can not secure employment easily when his felony is known. . . . With such treatment it is little wonder the discharged felon soon gets back into jail."[27] Military service therefore offered an escape from this cycle of distrust and recidivism. Instead of returning to their old neighborhoods, paroled felons could be guaranteed a fresh start in an environment that not only benefited from honest masculine activity and labor, but also provided the needed discipline and oversight to resist the temptation to drift back into their old ways. "The United States should hold these men to military duty," *The Umpire* opined, echoing McKenty's own thoughts, "both to secure their services and to make men of them. It would be a fine piece of social service, an approach to a glimmer of common sense in the handling of our young men who have taken a wrong step and who are almost sure to become confirmed criminals if left to themselves."[28]

The solution was clear: let the inmate fight. After all, not only were they allegedly eager to do their part, according to *The Umpire*'s columnists and reader-submitted pieces, some inmates had particular "skill sets" that would make them especially valuable in the trenches. In October 1917, *The Umpire*'s editor was prompted to make this argument in a piece describing one of the Honor and Friendship Club's drill competitions. "Give Pershing a few regiments like that and the flag would be in Berlin within a month. We will gladly head a fund to send the 1st Block and the bugle corps 'Over There,' and we feel sure they'd bring back the 'bacon.' If they didn't, they'd bring back nearly everything else that was unattached."[29]

The different stories calling for the enlistment or open conscription of felons were not idle exercises or musings by prison-yard patriots or well-meaning outside reformers. They were all part of a larger plan to promote a formal policy redressing the manpower policies of the War Department. As recounted in *The Umpire*, individuals directly associated with the operation of the prison lobbied Harrisburg and Washington, DC, directly for change. Eastern State's chaplain, Joseph Welch, repeatedly petitioned President Woodrow Wilson and Pennsylvania governor Martin Brumbaugh to facilitate military service for paroled felony inmates. He had mixed results. The inquiries to Wilson were ultimately answered by an officer attached to the Army's Adjutant General branch; the answer was no,

citing the War Department's existing ban on conscripting or enlisting felons. Governor Brumbaugh was somewhat more amenable to the idea. While the federal statute made it unlikely that any paroled felon could receive the needed waivers for military service, he did hold out the prospect of pardons for any parolee seeing to enter the Army or Navy.[30] Maud Ballington Booth, the spouse of the leader of the Volunteers of America, an offshoot of the Salvation Army and a regular advocate for humane prison reform, met with President Wilson and Secretary of War Newton D. Baker in June 1918 to promote the idea of prisoner conscription. According to Mrs. Booth, the president was impressed with her accounts of prisoner activities in support of the war effort from behind bars and gave his tentative support to the idea of conscripting inmates for support services in uniform.[31]

In July 1918 McKenty's scheme for enlisting inmates finally appeared in *The Umpire*. He introduced a five-step plan for enrolling Pennsylvania felons in the wartime military. First, full amnesty for all prisoners who were examined by a federally appointed Board of Enquiry and who were found qualified for uniformed service. Second, all selected persons would be immediately conscripted into the services, "without any badge or method of identification as to their having been in prison." Third, all men conscripted would serve in the very same capacity as any other soldier or sailor and would be fully subject to the rules of military justice. Fourth, each prison that contributed men for service would be given a service flag showing the number of men selected. A monthly meeting commemorating their service would be required of each prison, which also would have the opportunity to provide fiscal or material support to any relatives or dependents affected by their service. Finally, McKenty insisted that participation in the program be voluntary.[32]

Warden McKenty was clearly obsessed with the fulfillment of his scheme. The McKenty family preserved a draft manuscript written by the warden, in which he describes in rather melodramatic tones a meeting in Newton D. Baker's office. The exhausted Secretary, worn down by the decisions he made daily to win the war, is lectured by McKenty on the subject:

> Mr Secretary . . . you know my reason for this visit and enclosed within that packet you will find a letter from the Gov. of Pennsylvania who urges you to use the power of your office in obtaining the conditional release of hundreds of thousands of healthy young men between the ages of twenty and thirty-five years that are being permitted to waste

> away behind barred enclosures, while this country needs able bodied men to carry on the noble work that we have entered into. Why not obtain the release of these men . . . with the provision that they be enlisted under the colors at once and if the other soldiers dislike to congregate or have such men in their regiments, why put them all together and I will wager you that the sector in France or any other theater of the war that they will be called upon to defend will be defended with such force that their opponents will never forget.[33]

The manuscript continues in this vein, with Baker agreeing to take the subject up with the president and, if all went well, appoint McKenty a major general in command of "The Army of the Black Sheep." From this fanciful turn, the manuscript continues to describe the bustle "Ten days later" after a call for volunteers among prison inmates was made. Uniforms were made in the prison shops, 700 men were outfitted and made ready to be sworn into military service, when McKenty suddenly—and almost sheepishly—ends the reverie, merely stating, "I woke up."[34]

This fantastical manuscript provides valuable insights into how Robert J. McKenty viewed his own role in helping create the conditions for rehabilitative military service for felons. Laying aside his imagined commission as a major general, the real focus of the scenario is the highly emotional case he makes to Secretary Baker for according felons access to military service. From the moment he enters the War Secretary's office, McKenty presents himself as a rational visionary, the only man qualified through personal experience and insight to champion the case of the misunderstood victim of circumstance. The post-meeting mobilization is quickly described and presented really as a denouement to the lecture McKenty gives Baker, and, it can be presumed, the audience to whom McKenty would address these remarks. Rehabilitation through the crucible of military service was McKenty's objective. The sacrifices of former prisoners on a global stage would validate his own philosophy of paternal oversight and personal responsibility.

SUCCESSES AND FAILURES

Superficially, McKenty's efforts met qualified success. A review of surviving letters exchanged between the warden and some of his former charges reveals his immediate interest in helping them enter the military in the face

of War Department resistance. Here McKenty appears to have been able to work with some of the local draft boards. Indeed, considering the extent of resistance from some communities, some of these boards—especially in the commonwealth's agricultural and mining districts—started conscripting known parolees as a matter of course. Considering that exemptions and deferments excluded many otherwise eligible husbands, farmers, factory workers, miners, and resident aliens from the draft, achieving the high quotas set by Washington was a nearly insurmountable task. Efforts to do so were further confounded by the War Department's reluctance to allow local boards the relief of crediting voluntary enlistments against their quota. Thus, local boards turned to the pool of *ineligible* manpower to meet their needs. Some of these efforts were undertaken with support from the War Department: revised deferments for married men, resident aliens, and others considered sacrosanct (farmers and factory workers) or beyond the pale. Either way, the local boards enjoyed great discretion in making their selections, thanks largely to the decentralization of authority from Washington to the local level.

Did agents of the state take a very loose interpretation of their mandate to gather up eligible manpower for the nation in crisis? Did they violate the letter, and more important, the spirit of the law that charged them with raising the forces for the great moral crusade? As might be expected, there is no easy answer. Registration cards that were supposed to be carefully segregated from the general population either found their way into the system by accident or design. According to section 67 of the *Registration Regulations*, "Persons awaiting trial and misdemenant are not to be treated as felons. The inmates of jails and reformatories who are not felons will be treated as absentees and will be registered and their cards forwarded to their domiciliary precinct."[35] It is plausible that the cards of felons either accidentally or intentionally were misfiled; once in the possession of the local boards, these cards would have been included in the pool of eligible inductees according to other exemption classifications, as determined by the members of the board.

This explains how registration cards could have found their way into the general population, but what of intent? Was there an organized attempt to use felons as ad hoc substitutes to fill local draft quotas? Judging from extant records at the Pennsylvania State Archives dealing with ESP in wartime and of Governor Martin G. Brumbaugh's papers associated with the draft, it is unlikely that incriminating evidence will be found. One letter from Deputy Warden Courtland Butler, however, points the way toward a sense of design

and purpose on the part of the state. Acting in the stead of Warden McKenty, Butler penned a response to an October 3, 1918, letter from one John F. Scragg, an attorney from Scranton. Scragg wrote to McKenty on behalf of his client, former inmate Elmer Glossinger, who had just received his notice to appear before his local board.

Butler's reply offers several revealing insights. First, he notes how prison officials viewed the draft as a positive influence, since "we felt that if they were in the service it would keep them out of trouble, and at the same time society would be protected." More interesting, however, is what Butler says about the position of the state's local boards on the matter. "The rules laid down by the War Department are to the effect that any prisoner convicted of a felony is not morally fit for Service, but a great number of Draft Boards, knowing that the man committed a felon, and was on parole from this Institution, placed them in Class One, and if physically fit sent them to Camp."[36] So much for intent.

There is also the matter of McKenty's personal interest in the activities of his former charges. As condition of their discharge, former inmates were required to maintain a monthly correspondence with the prison's parole officer. The idea, of course, was to show that the former convict was making an effort to return to "normal" society, through gainful and steady employment, association with people of good character, avoiding old practices and associates, and so on. Beginning in June 1917, the response letters to the first of the 121 men from the parole officer—Robert McKenty Jr., the warden's son—begin to go to the various training depots where the new soldiers were sent following conscription or enlistment. Again, there is no real change from this author's initial perception regarding their service. It appeared that for these men, the war would be a quiet one, spent loading trains or ships with goods bound for France, or guarding facilities against the ever-feared yet rarely realized threat of sabotage.

But the letters from the prison began to change in address, tone, and even authorship. More and more were sent to men attached to specific units: machine gun battalions, infantry companies, cavalry troops, and field artillery batteries. They also began to be addressed not to American training depots, but to soldiers serving or resting in England and France. Where the letters were once restricted to simple acknowledgment of one's military status, and the agreement to cease monthly status reports for the duration of service, they now began to inquire of news from France. At this point, Warden McKenty takes over from his son, starting a regular correspondence with

some men, offering paternal advice, congratulations, and admonishments to those who for some reason or another were particular favorites.

One example is his exchange with Private James A. Edmiston, formerly ESP prisoner B6945, convicted of burglary. Between October 1918 and February 1919, Edmiston appears to have shared a number of his experiences as an ambulance driver in the Oise-Aisne and Meuse-Argonne campaigns with the warden, prompting several enlightening letters from McKenty. In the first, dated October 22, 1918, McKenty shared with Edmiston his satisfaction upon hearing of his service in the "big show," writing how "it gives me pleasure to write to the boys who are doing their bit for good old 'UNCLE SAM', and to tell you that we have put another dent in the Boches head by over subsc[r]ibing the Fourth Liberty Loan, when the old stiff gets a lo[o]k at this he will surely take forty different kinds of fits."[37] The second letter from McKenty to Edmiston, dated February 10, 1919, continues in the same vein. By this time Edmiston reported he was stationed at Spa, the former headquarters of the German Supreme Command. McKenty wrote that he was pleased to hear that Edmiston was "living like a king . . . occupying the Headquarters of the Kaiser." The warden also gave his former charge his personal sanction to administer justice against any German prisoners he came into contact with, telling Edmiston to "give them a wallop for me." More telling, though is his paternal pride in Edmiston's apparent transformation into a solid citizen: "I am also glad to learn that you have the spirit of giving and I am sure you will be one hundred times repaid for the sacrifices you make for these unfortunate people, especially the kids."[38]

Another example is in letters written by the warden to Private Harry L. Northeimer, prisoner B6950. In January 1919 McKenty wrote to Northeimer, who was recovering from wounds at Base Hospital Ward #6, Camp Merritt, New Jersey, saying, "I am glad to learn that you conducted yourself while in the U.S. Army as to have a clean record and you have reasons to be proud of it."[39] McKenty continued to correspond with Northeimer throughout his recovery, on each occasion inviting him to come and visit him at the prison when he was able to do so. Another letter to a third correspondent, Daniel Spangler, formerly ESP prisoner B8581, convicted of forgery, congratulated him on his entering the army while also alluding to news from others: "I receive word most every day from some one of the boys who are either on the other side or in one of the Camps on this side, and they are all making names for them selves."[40]

The majority of the men on the plaque either did not maintain a correspondence with the warden or, if so, it was lost over the years. Tracking down the individual men's experiences requires long hours of piecing together their experiences from literally dozens of sources, ranging from newspaper clippings to veterans' military service card files, and from bonus request cards to death certificates. Official unit histories, countless folders of individual unit orders and citations, and personal memoirs by other surviving veterans help fill in the narrative, giving us a better picture of what those specific men experienced even without their own stories. It is an incomplete account, but it can nevertheless be remarkably detailed and poignant.

Consider the experiences of Felix McCrossin, prisoner B1393, the murderer of John Aranyodi who enlisted in the Marine Corps to escape justice (introduced in part 1 of this article). After his parole, McCrossin disappeared from public view until his induction into the army on June 23, 1917. One can only presume he was well aware of the obstacles his murder conviction presented to any anticipated reenlistment: rather than attempt to reenter the Marine Corps, he traveled to Gettysburg, Pennsylvania to enlist, far from the prying eyes of anyone who would have known his story. During training, he was assigned to the Fourth Infantry Regiment's M Company, part of what would become the famous Third Division, "The Rock of the Marne," a sobriquet McCrossin helped the division earn. As might be expected given his prior experiences and background, McCrossin excelled in uniform, being promoted first to corporal within three months of his enlistment, and again to sergeant on April 25, 1918. Perhaps acting true to form, he was soon demoted; busted to private in July 1918.[41]

After arriving in France on April 15, 1918, Corporal (soon to be Sergeant) McCrossin and his company spent the next few months in constant training for the different conditions they could expect in trench warfare. The training was worth the time; within six weeks the Third Division was in battle, helping defend Paris from the latest German Spring offensive. McCrossin's company was engaged in some of the hard fighting along the German line of advance east of Chateau-Thierry and took up positions along the Marne River. After staving off the July 15 offensive, American and French forces in the sector launched their own counteroffensive, reclaiming much of the land lost in the last two German attacks. McCrossin survived these actions relatively unscathed; he went on to take part in the subsequent St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne campaigns, including the harsh fighting at the Bois Clair Chenes, a densely wooded escarpment in the northern end of the German

Kriemhilde Stellung, the heavily fortified position north of Montfaucon. After the armistice, McCrossin joined his company in the march across Northern France and Lorraine into Germany, where the Third Division joined the American occupation forces at Coblenz. He remained there until he was ordered to Brest in August 1919, where he embarked for New York, arriving there on August 22. McCrossin returned to civilian life on August 26, after receiving his honorable discharge.[42]

Like so many of his peers, Felix McCrossin returned to a nation that had already moved past the moment of tickertape parades and celebrations. Coming home over nine months after the armistice, he would have collected his back pay, purchased his train ticket back home to Philadelphia, and tried to settle into civilian life. A single man, he rented a room from his sister and brother-in-law in Northwest Philadelphia, and took on work as a roofer. Sadly, McCrossin never enjoyed a family or a home of his own. Soon after coming home he was diagnosed with stomach cancer and died of post-operative trauma on January 29, 1920. It is not clear whether his condition was triggered by circumstances related to his wartime service. He was thirty-five years old.[43]

The Eastern State plaque commemorates not only those former inmates—all of the members listed on it were supposed to be parolees, though there are several notable discrepancies—but also Warden McKenty's unfulfilled vision of redemptive rehabilitation through wartime military service for existing felons, following the Canadian model. As with so many aspects of the American effort, the war's unexpected and sudden termination came before convict conscription could be tested or implemented. Had the war lasted into 1919, as General John J. Pershing and other military planners anticipated, McKenty's scheme may well have been implemented. In his classic study of the draft in American society, *To Raise an Army: The Draft Comes to Modern America*, John Whiteclay Chambers II notes the likelihood of a five-million-man American army in France by the end of 1919. As more groups sought exceptions such as bankers, farmers, factory workers, railroad workers, even professional baseball players, pressure mounted on draft boards to meet quotas. The prevailing opposition to conscripting paroled felons, or even convicts still serving their sentence, was certainly wavering as more able-bodied Class I and II individuals committed and deliberately bungled petty burglaries in order to escape the draft.[44] By entering into Eastern State Penitentiary, the Philadelphia draft board reveals that the existing restrictions on Class V individuals were being relaxed in advance of a

likely total revision of the policy. Wartime necessity dictated the terms of military service; a prolonged struggle for the American Expeditionary Force through France and into Germany lasting over a year was anticipated by the War Department. It was better to employ every potentially eligible man of conscription age, including morally suspect felons, than to risk the prospect of defeat or stalemate in 1919.

What of the men who served? How did war affect their lives? Are they "double victims" of the state's coercive power, submitted first to the weight of the penal system, only then to be drummed into military service in place of other, more eligible and desirable members of society? Yes and no. First, we should not be quick to label them as "victims" of the state. It is likely that many or all of the 121 Eastern State men *wanted* to serve. Caught up in the spirit of patriotism, eager to prove their own rehabilitation, or simply bored with the mundanity of the outside world, they could have answered the call willingly.

It is also likely that former inmates of ESP made an easier transition to military life since they already had experienced a coercive power-oriented relationship with the state. As soldiers, not only would they enjoy greater privilege and freedom than they had as prisoners, but they had crossed the line of power differentiation that was so starkly drawn in prison. No longer simple objects of the full weight of the state's power to control and punish, they now became participants in the act of coercion by violence. Never mind that the state had broken its own rule for classifying its citizens by moral worth and practical utility. Forget that the "criminal" was publicly deemed to be socially unfit for the "great crusade" to save civilization from German militarism. By donning the khaki uniform of the doughboy, the former inmate rejoined the "normal" society that had rejected him. By reclaiming their legitimacy through violence, the 121 parolees from Eastern State had become like the "screws" that had once wielded state-sanctioned power over them.

Military service was not the reformative epiphany McKenty hoped it would be for everyone. Consider the example of Private Angelo Rando, formerly prisoner B5514, convicted of forgery. Rando was inducted into the army on September 17, 1917. Three months later he was discharged from military service at Camp Gordon, near Augusta, Georgia, after having acquired syphilis. Another prisoner, Private Walter Rudisell, formerly prisoner B6158, convicted of pandering, deserted during training at Camp Lee, near Petersburg, Virginia, on October 19, 1918.[45] Similarly, several recidivists have been identified among the group. Prisoner B7755, Cornelius Trautman, alias "Trolur,"

a twenty-three year-old German immigrant residing at 2608 S. 15th Street, was sentenced to two to four years at ESP on April 28, 1915, for robbery, taking $19 from one Jeblon Britten.[46] This was his third offense, having twice before appeared before the Philadelphia County Court on charges of larceny and malicious mischief. After his release from Eastern State and his military service, Trautman was again arrested for robbery in Philadelphia, for which he received a five-year probation, and again in Montgomery County, where he was sentenced to three to four years in September 1922.[47] For Trautman and a few others like him, recidivism marked them as career criminals, as they consistently resisted efforts at rehabilitation and reform.

These lapses should not be taken as evidence of utter failure. For many of the men listed on the plaque, their military service was a validating experience. The overwhelming majority of paroled felons did not fall back into their old habits or make the same mistake twice. After the war, they returned to their old homes and professions or made new lives entirely. Some of them were wrecked by the war: bodies maimed, lungs corroded, minds shattered by their experience. Others prospered, finding within themselves the capacity to overcome any challenge they faced. Many went on to marry and raise families, keeping the story of their one-time lapse a jealously guarded secret. As far as these veteran parolees were concerned, ownership of their own past was theirs if they sought to reclaim it.

On November 11, 1918, far from the battlefields of northern France, millions of young Americans experienced peace in their own unique ways. All across the United States, inducted men were sent home from local processing centers as news of the armistice arrived. Recent recruits found their daily schedules disrupted, their instructors uncertain of how to proceed with training the men for a war that was now on hold. Before long, the great mobilization machine that was built from scratch a year before, and which had incorporated a complete regime in social engineering and reform through its association with the CTCA, disappeared. The end of the war signaled an end to the great crusade and its attendant mission to preserve the honor and purity of the young men sent abroad on the nation's behalf. As attention shifted from foreign wars to the threat of insurrection at home, social conservative forces long dormant in Progressive America were roused to action, overwhelming the call to rational reform in American life. Indeed, as Nancy Bristow concedes in *Making Men Moral*, even as the CTCA was being dismantled at the war's end, many of its members could make the shift from positive social reformer to angry coercive social reactionary because of

the conservatism concealed within the organization and its agenda: "The progressives of the CTCA moved easily between their positive recreation and education programs, on one hand, and repression on the other hand in their efforts to transform Americans into crusaders."[48]

At Eastern State Penitentiary during the Great War, a different approach toward civic morality and reform took place. Had the war gone on, it is more likely that Warden McKenty's scheme for convict conscription in the name of redemptive rehabilitation would have been accepted by the War Department. The prospect of felony convicts serving out their sentence in military uniform certainly ran counter to the traditional ideas of military service as a privilege and obligation reserved only for citizens in good standing. But the idea found ready acceptance by many social progressives who championed personal agency and individual rehabilitation. The stories of the personal experiences of those paroled felons who gained access to military service serve as microhistories of what might have been; how men excluded from service and full manhood on the basis of their prior criminal acts reclaimed their identities through wartime action. Even if he exerted little direct role in opening their paths to service, Warden McKenty took full credit for providing the moral example through his administrative regime at the penitentiary for their service. The plaque within the central rotunda is more than a simple recounting of individuals who went to war. It stands as a testimony to the flawed vision of a man who, in his own way, sought to make moral the men of Eastern State Penitentiary, if not all federal and state prisons.

BOBBY A. WINTERMUTE is associate professor of history at Queens College, City University of New York, and co-host, New Books in Military History: http://newbooksnetwork.com/category/politics-society/military-history/.

NOTES

1. Norman Johnston, *Eastern State Penitentiary: Crucible of Good Intentions* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1994, 2000), 47, 49.
2. Nancy K. Bristow, *Making Men Moral: Social Engineering during the Great War* (New York: New York University Press, 1996), xviii.
3. See Charles Neimeyer, *America Goes to War: A Social History of the Continental Army* (New York: New York University Press, 1997), and James M. McCaffrey, *Army of Manifest Destiny: The American Soldier in the Mexican War, 1846–1848*

(New York: New York University Press, 1994), for examples and discussion of the use of vagrants, debtors, drunks, and felons as soldiers in American conflicts of the first half of the nineteenth century.

4. Johnston, *Eastern State Penitentiary*, 81–84; diagram on 85.
5. Paul Kahan, *Seminary of Virtue: The Ideology and Practice of Inmate Reform at Eastern State Penitentiary, 1829–1971* (New York: Peter Lang, 2012), 86, 87–89.
6. "Saturday a Good Day for M'Kenty," *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, September 24, 1906, filed in the George D. McDowell *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin News Clippings* Collection, SCRC 169, Box 62, Folder 2: "McKenty, Robert J.—Warden and Mrs., Dead, Miscel. Activities," Temple University Urban Archives (hereafter TUUA).
7. "McKenty a 'Crackerjack,' Says Colorado Jail Expert," *Public Ledger*, January 21, 1916, filed in the George D. McDowell *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin News Clippings* Collection, SCRC 169, Box 62, Folder 3: "McKenty, Robert J.—Warden and Mrs., Dead, As Warden of Eastern State, Comments on," TUUA. "Worth-While Philadelphians," *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, October 11, 1918, and "M'Kenty Controls Convicts Under the Golden Rule," *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, January 24, 1915, filed in SCRC 169, Box 62, Folder 6, "McKenty, Robert J. & Mrs.—Warden—Dead, As Warden of Eastern Penitentiary, Parole System," TUUA.
8. "M'Kenty Controls Convicts Under the Golden Rule."
9. "M'Kenty Indorses Convict War Labor," *Public Ledger*, October 17, 1918, filed in George D. McDowell *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin News Clippings* Collection, SCRC 169, Box 62: "Eastern Penitentiary—Convict War Labor," TUUA.
10. US Senate, 1918, *Calling into Military Service of Certain Classes of Persons Liable Thereto*, 65th Congress, 2nd Sess., Senate Report 263; *Registration for Military Service*, 65th Congress, 2nd Sess., 1918, Senate Report 269. US House, 1918, *Regulations Governing Liability to Military Service of Certain Classes of Registered Persons*, 65th Congress, 2nd Sess., House Report 367; *Registration for Military Service*, 65th Congress, 2nd Sess., House Report 497.
11. In his study of the draft, John Whiteclay Chambers III notes that deferments actually rose across the board in 1918 as local boards granted more and more exemptions to people on the grounds of agricultural and industrial necessity. John Whiteclay Chambers III. *To Raise an Army: The Draft Comes to Modern America* (New York: Free Press; London: Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1987), 190.
12. *Registration Regulations Prescribed by the President Under Authority of the Act of Congress Approved May 18, 1917* (Washington: GPO, 1917), 25.
13. Enoch H. Crowder, *The Spirit of Selective Service* (New York: Century Company, 1920), 147.
14. "Prisoners and the War," *Journal of Prison Discipline and Philanthropy* (March 1918): 96–97.
15. Ibid.; *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the American Prison Association* (Indianapolis: Wm. B. Burford, Printer, 1917), 197–98.

16. "Prisoners and the War," 97.
17. W. F. Archibald, "The Canadian Parole System—Paroled Men at the Front," *Proceedings of the Annual Congress of the American Prison Association* (Indianapolis: Wm. B. Burford, Printer, 1919), 117.
18. Ibid., 109–31.
19. *The Umpire* was the inmate-operated newspaper of Eastern State Penitentiary, printed from 1913 through 1918. Volume numbering is erratic (for example, both the 1916 and 1918 print runs are listed as "Volume V," while the 1917 run is "Volume VI." The sole (incomplete) run of the newspaper is maintained in the archives of the Eastern State Penitentiary Historic Site.
20. "Why Not Enlist Prisoners," *The Umpire* 5, no. 30 (July 31, 1918): 3.
21. "A Good Plan," *The Umpire* 5, no. 37 (September 18, 1918): 1.
22. "Prisoners Make Good at the Front," *The Umpire* 6, no. 31 (August 8, 1917): 1, 4.
23. Ibid., 4.
24. *The Umpire* 6, no. 15 (April 11, 1917): 1; 6, no. 16 (April 18, 1917): 4; 6, no. 18 (May 2, 1917): 1; 6, no. 24 (June 20, 1917): 4.
25. Robert J. McKenty, "Religion and the Criminal: How a Prison Can Make Good Citizens," *The Umpire* 5, no. 33 (August 23, 1916): 1.
26. Kahan, *Seminary of Virtue*, 98–100.
27. "The Felon Soldier," *The Umpire* 6, no. 30 (July 25, 1917): 3.
28. Ibid., 3.
29. *The Umpire* 6, no. 39 (October 3, 1917): 4.
30. "They Give Their Money and Offer Their Lives," *The Umpire* 5, no. 23 (June 5, 1918): 4.
31. "Prisoners and the War," *The Umpire* 5, no. 24 (June 19, 1918): 1.
32. "The Scheme in a Nutshell," *The Umpire* 5, no. 28 (July 17, 1918): 3.
33. Draft manuscript, undated. McKenty Family Papers, in possession of the McKenty family. The papers, primarily photographs and some letters, have been digitized and shared with the author.
34. Ibid.
35. *Registration Regulations Prescribed by the President*, 25.
36. Courtland Butler to John F. Scragg, undated, Letter Press Book, September 25, 1918–November 19, 1918, Box 2, ESP Prison Administration Records, Letter Press Books, 1918–19, 146, (RG15) Pennsylvania State Archives (hereafter PSA).
37. Ibid., 252, (RG15) PSA.
38. Letter Press Book, January 8, 1919–February 27, 1919, Box 2, ESP Prison Administration Records, Letter Press Books, 1918–19, 342, PSA.
39. Ibid., 59.
40. Letter Press Book, September 25, 1918–November 19, 1918, 258, ESP Prison Administration Records, Letter Press Books, 1918–1919 (RG15) PSA.
41. World War I Veterans Service and Compensation File, 1917–19, 1934–48, Carton 283, (RG19) PSA.

42. Ibid.; *History of the Third Division, United States Army, in The World War for the Period December 1, 1917 to January 1, 1919* (N.P: Andernach-on-the-Rhine, 1919), 3–10, 51–78.
43. Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920, Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Ward 24, District 0683, Sheet 2B; Death Certificates, 1906–1964, McCrossin, Felix, 1920, 001501-004500 (available electronically at Ancestry.com, Pennsylvania Death Certificates; accessed February 11, 2017). Original at PSA.
44. Chambers, *To Raise an Army*, 194–200, 215.
45. World War I Veterans Service and Compensation File, 1917–19, 1934–48, Carton 351, Carton 373 (RG19), PSA.
46. ESP Prison Population Records, Scrapbooks, 1884–93, 1908–17, 1925–26, vol. 2 (Part), vol. 3, Second Roll, 212 (RG15) PSA.
47. Prison Population Records: Prisoner Fingerprint Identification Cards, 1907–65, A12000 to A12999, Acc.# 1960, Box 11 (RG15) PSA.
48. Bristow, *Making Men Moral*, 209.