

# the informer in law enforcement


Second Edition

## MALACHI L. HARNEY

Formerly Superintendent  
Division of Narcotic Control  
State of Illinois  
Formerly, Assistant to the  
Secretary for Law Enforcement  
United States Treasury Department  
Assistant to United States  
Commissioner of Narcotics  
and Treasury Agent

## JOHN C. CROSS

Formerly  
Assistant Superintendent  
and Superintendent  
Division of Narcotic Control  
State of Illinois  
Formerly Treasury Agent  
United States Bureau of Narcotics



"The authors are to be particularly congratulated on their omission of mystery which is often thrown about the operation of informants . . ."

- The Journal of Criminal Law

CHARLES C THOMAS • PUBLISHER

Springfield, Illinois

**the informer in  
law enforcement**



# the informer in law enforcement

*(Second Edition)*

By

**MALACHI L. HARNEY**

*Formerly Superintendent, Division of Narcotic  
Control, State of Illinois; Formerly Assistant to the  
Secretary for Law Enforcement, United States  
Treasury Department; Assistant to United States  
Commissioner of Narcotics, and Treasury Agent*

and

**JOHN C. CROSS**

*Formerly Assistant Superintendent and Superintendent,  
Division of Narcotic Control, State of Illinois;  
Formerly Treasury Agent, United States Bureau of Narcotics*



**CHARLES C THOMAS • PUBLISHER**  
*Springfield • Illinois • U.S.A.*

*Published and Distributed Throughout the World by*  
**CHARLES C THOMAS • PUBLISHER**  
BANNERSTONE HOUSE  
301-327 East Lawrence Avenue, Springfield, Illinois, U.S.A.  
NATCHEZ PLANTATION HOUSE  
735 North Atlantic Boulevard, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, U.S.A.

This book is protected by copyright. No part  
of it may be reproduced in any manner with-  
out written permission from the publisher.

© 1960, 1962 and 1968 by CHARLES C THOMAS • PUBLISHER  
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 68-13758

First Edition, First Printing, 1960  
First Edition, Revised Second Printing, 1962  
Second Edition, 1968

*With THOMAS BOOKS careful attention is given to all details of  
manufacturing and design. It is the Publisher's desire to present books  
that are satisfactory as to their physical qualities and artistic possibilities  
and appropriate for their particular use. THOMAS BOOKS will be  
true to those laws of quality that assure a good name and good will.  
Printed in the United States of America*

*To*

**HARRY J. ANSLINGER**

*United States Commissioner of Narcotics, Retired, whose stature grows, and will continue to grow on fuller public realization as to just how much he has meant personally in the control and eradication of the slavery of drug addiction.*

*His clear thinking, sound policies, unswerving dedication and fighting heart have helped to preserve tens of thousands of people in this country, and multitudes throughout the world from the curse of narcotics.*

*We have had great satisfaction in receiving a little reflected light from his accomplishments.*



## PREFACE

**I**N this generation law enforcement has been a rapidly evolving and developing profession. Today the competent policeman is possessed of a multitude of special skills, backed by the technician and the forensic laboratory. We may expect to continue to see a steady advance against crime in all areas. But in our concentration on, and preoccupation with the new, and the novel, we must always remember that law enforcement has to do with people, human beings whose acts and motives are not always subject to prediction and to mechanical measurement. The successful and efficient investigation of crime always will call for skillful application of the old arts. Virgil Peterson quotes Sir John Knott-Bower, Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police of London (Scotland Yard), in a speech before the American Bar Association in London in 1957. Referring to the modern scientific facilities of Scotland Yard, Sir John said, “. . . but when every allowance is made for this help, the detective officer has still to rely on his own brains, to work doggedly on interrogating perhaps scores or even hundreds of people before getting the lead he is looking for.”

And so it must be with the use of the informer in law enforcement. From the dawn of our history, internal law and order has had to depend in greater or less measure on the informer. While we hope that the new techniques will be helpful, they will, in most cases, only minimize the importance of and not eliminate the necessity for the informer.

Continually a subject of controversy and emotional reaction, the role of the informer to insure the safety of the law-abiding is seldom understood or given consideration by the general public. In the literature of law enforcement there is little knowledgeable writing on the use and place of the informer.



The writings of some modern police technicians, particularly in Europe, have tended to disparage the informer. In their preoccupation with the laboratory and in their impatience with police organizations who fail to use modern technology, these police scientists have seen in the informer a rival to the adoption of modern thinking and equipment. Some have been too narrow in their partisanship, too quick to decry the informer as old-fashioned. Law enforcement cannot afford to abandon good, but incomplete, old weapons for good, but incomplete, new weapons when it needs to utilize both to the fullest extent in the war against crime. In truth, the informer, as old as the dawn of history, is also as new as today. No modern policeman who properly uses informers needs to be apologetic about them. The apology should come from the officer who fails to use this device to protect his community. Between us, the authors bring the experience of more than two-thirds of a century of personal dealing with the informer in criminal cases. Over the years we have been lecturing on this subject to innumerable law enforcement officers in many categories. We had been urged to record our material. We found a necessity for a printed document in our own training programs. This book is the result.

It is our hope that we may contribute something to further the understanding of police, prosecutors, the courts and the public on the role of the informer in the suppression of crime.

We have thought it appropriate to amplify our material in a Second Edition.

Since the original publication of this book there has been some accelerated discussion of the role of the informer in law enforcement. We have attempted to reflect some of this.

There have been several court decisions of significance in the field.

We have included, in some detail, accounts of additional criminal cases which we believe are of interest and value in demonstrating the place of the informer in law enforcement.

THE AUTHORS

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to acknowledge with appreciation the following: Harry M. Dengler, "Grand Old Man" of Treasury Law Enforcement Training, and Colonel Garland Williams, for help in putting our original lectures together.

George H. White, District Supervisor, Retired, United States Bureau of Narcotics, for suggestions and criticism.

Patrick P. O'Carroll, Assistant to the Commissioner, United States Bureau of Narcotics, formerly Director, Treasury Law Enforcement Training, who supplied much of the material on noncriminal informers and many excellent suggestions.

"Bridges" (Mrs. Florence Burdick Bridges) who, when we were in the Treasury, assisted in assembling these notes.

Miss Dorothy Bundy, Illinois State Library, for cheerful and effective researching on obscure leads.

### **For the Second Edition**

Henry L. Giordano, Commissioner, United States Bureau of Narcotics, Treasury Department, for generous access to material on informers.

George H. Gaffney, Deputy Commissioner, United States Bureau of Narcotics, for vital assistance and advice on important cases.

Donald E. Miller, Chief Counsel, and the legal staff, United States Bureau of Narcotics, for advice on the knotty problems of the informer and the law.

Jane Zack, Librarian, United States Bureau of Narcotics, for patient and indispensable researching.

Gladys Harney, for steadfast help with preparation of the text.

Junia Shambaugh, formerly writer-editor, United States Bureau of Narcotics, to whose invaluable talents we owe the completion of the manuscript and the index.

J. C. C.

M. L. H.



# CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Preface</i> .....	vii
<i>Acknowledgments</i> .....	ix
 <i>Chapter</i>	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	3
2. USES FOR INFORMERS .....	21
3. FINDING INFORMERS: HOW, WHY, AND WHERE .....	31
The Fear Motive .....	41
Revenge Motives .....	42
Perverse Motives .....	43
Egotistical Motives .....	44
Mercenary Motives .....	45
The Detective Complex .....	47
Selective Law Enforcement .....	47
Repentance or Desire to Reform .....	47
Appreciation or Gratitude Toward Police or Prosecutor ..	48
Demented, Eccentric or Nuisance Type Individuals .....	48
4. HOW TO HANDLE INFORMERS .....	60
Development—Control—Protection .....	60
Precautions .....	76
5. INFORMERS AND THE LAW .....	85
Informer Privilege .....	100
6. DIVERS AND SUNDRY INFORMERS .....	107
Joseph Valachi .....	107
Abel and Hayhanen .....	126
A Textbook Case — On In Cold Blood by Truman Capote	131
<i>Bibliography</i> .....	139
<i>Index</i> .....	141



**the informer in  
law enforcement**



## Chapter 1

### INTRODUCTION

WHEN on October 7, 1953, the headlines of the nation's newspapers screamed "*Kidnapped Boy Murdered — Body Found,*" little six-year-old Bobby Greenlease of Kansas City had already been missing for more than a week; a week characterized by the most intensely concentrated kind of police work by local and federal officers to solve a kidnapping so cunningly planned that the ransom of \$600,000 had been demanded and paid by the frantic father without disclosing any tangible evidence or clues to the kidnapers. But, despite their clever advance planning, the guilty kidnapers had only a week to revel in their loot, their dreams perhaps haunted by the spectre of the little boy they lured from his schoolroom, cold-bloodedly killed and buried under some shrubbery. Indiscretion with alcohol and dope, maybe to obscure in their minds the picture of the dead boy, caused careless actions observed by watchful eyes. To the St. Louis Police Department went an informer's tip. Two suspects were arrested and were promptly determined to be the kidnapers. Justice was swift and certain, and the perpetrators, Carl Austin Hall and Bonnie Brown Heady were executed. Here an informer pointed to the prompt solution of one of the most atrocious crimes of this generation, a crime which conceivably would be unsolved to this day, had not an informer come forward. But the action of this informer was not to have uniformly happy results to all law enforcement people concerned.

The police officer most responsible for obtaining the services of the tipster, and who made the main contribution to solving a crime which shocked and outraged the nation, did not long continue to receive what one might think was his deserved acclaim. Instead, he was soon to be discredited, disgraced, and imprisoned because of actions growing out of his relations with the same in-



former. We will have more to say on this case. In a nutshell, it illustrates some of the great advantages—and the sometimes great dangers—of the use of the police informer.

“Informer” is a dirty word. In the underworld, he is scum or something that crawls out from under stones. He is the most hated creature because he is the underworld’s most dangerous threat. He is the Achilles heel of the single thief, the ticking time bomb which might explode to blow apart the small mob or big organized crime. One might suppose that this fact would make the public pause in accepting the underworld’s derogatory appraisal of the informer. But it does not. This is part of a curious phenomenon which arises in part, we suppose, from the fact that few of us possess an entirely clear conscience. Too often we identify ourselves with the underworld rather than the law. Special antagonism to informers may be attributed also to our American revolutionary heritage and to the fact that the forebears of many of our citizens came to this country one jump ahead of the process of the law. Many Americans of today have a sort of atavistic hatred of the informer derived from a grandfather who evaded the “Black and Tans” in Ireland or the Kaiser’s conscriptors in Germany. Today, of course, there is another generation of newly arrived Americans who have a more recent and poignant recollection of the distress occasioned by an informer against them.

In our society, there is one curious departure from the public’s reluctance to be associated in any way with informers. In an election year, in our politics we regard “informing” as a stock operation. This, we are told, is part of the strength of the two-party system!

In the informer the public see a Judas Iscariot discarding his thirty pieces of silver to go hang himself with a halter. The patron of literature or the movies may think of him as the Informer of Liam O’Flaherty, the bull-bodied, ox-witted Gypo Nolan who, broke, hungry and rejected, betrayed his comrade, Frankie, for the twenty pounds reward offered by the Dublin police.

The ancients put a light touch on a heavy subject in the Roman myth about Larunda or Lara. This goddess was beautiful and talented but she talked too much. Jupiter became so incensed

with her spreading tales about his boudoir adventures with the other females that he ordered her tongue cut out and directed she be sent to Hades. On the way, her escort fell in love with her and spirited her away, since the only fault of this wonderful goddess had been corrected. The children of this happy ending are the Lares, household spirits or gods of the Romans.

The ultimate contribution to be expected from law enforcement is sometimes referred to in the eloquence of the prophet Micah, "They shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make him afraid." John Citizen, U.S.A., today sits under a ranch-house version of vine and fig tree and not often does anyone make him afraid, except perhaps Mrs. John. For this domestic tranquility Mr. John seldom stops to give thanks or even a second thought. The idea that he owes anything to American law enforcement is usually far back in the recesses of a mind sometimes too strongly conditioned by long peering into a rear-vision mirror. And if Mr. John were told that a potent factor in preserving his life and person and the peaceful possession of his property was the police informer, he might be surprised, shocked, incredulous and indignant!

We are conditioned from earliest childhood against the tattletale. We tell our children not to come bearing tales on one another. But if little Willie, fed up with the special attention being squandered on his new sister should decide to resolve things by poking her in the eye with the scissors, we would think it disastrous, indeed, if one of the saner siblings did not overcome our Mafia-like indoctrination and "yell bloody murder."

Sober reflection will indicate that the citizen has a right and duty to inform his government of violations of its laws. The fact that he recognizes this most readily only when his own person or property or his loved ones are involved does not invalidate the principle.

Seldom has anyone in authority spoken with approval of or in defense of the informer. When at the outbreak of World War II the military solicited our experience in preparing training material, there was little to be found in the literature, and most of that critical and useless. One excellent reason for silence is that over-publicizing the informer might minimize his value.

However, this concept has resulted in a one-way flood of derogatory observation of the use of the informer in law enforcement. In the modern police era, one who has spoken forcefully against the public's suicidal rejection of the informer is the Honorable Frank S. Hogan, long time District Attorney for New York County, New York and one of the most respected prosecutors in the country. In an address before the New York County Grand Jury Association in February, 1947, he said in part:

The concept of "informer" is an ancient one by which our ancestors heaped scorn upon those attempting to betray them to tyrannical rulers seeking to suppress their liberties; a healthy concept by which we still put to shame the blue noses among us who set themselves up as arbiters of morals and manners, and seek to make trouble for those whose standards differ from their own.

A wholesome concept! But is it not misused when applied to one who would report a murder or to one who would try to preserve the integrity of his profession or calling?

This misapplication, however, seems to be the rule rather than the exception. We appear to have developed a public morality which condemns—rather than praises—any private citizen who seeks to enforce the laws that we—as members of a free society—have called into being.

We want the laws enforced and, to this end, we hire men at good salaries to secure obedience to the law, to preserve order and to protect our persons and property. Then—by declining to cooperate and, indeed, by bringing social pressure against those who would cooperate—we make it difficult, if not impossible, for those men to serve us effectively. They would fight our enemies, but we refuse to point them out. We make a sort of a game of it, between law enforcement officials and criminals, and sit complacently by, quite ready to applaud a brilliant stroke on either side.

There is an historical precedent also for enlisting your interest. There was a time, some hundreds of years back, when the Grand Jury was charged with the duty of supplying all information with respect to wrongdoers. The early jury, which replaced trial by battle or ordeal, was forced to rely on its own independent knowledge of the cases before it. For many centuries no witnesses could be produced. Twice a year the sheriff would visit each district and the twelve principal freeholders, having acquainted themselves with all of the crimes that had been committed, would present the defendants. They were held to strict accountability and, if they failed to present all offenders, were fined and imprisoned.

A curious echo of this practice is found in the laws of Connecticut where it is provided that a sworn grand juror shall forfeit eight dollars if he shall neglect to make seasonable complaint of any crime or misdemeanor committed within the town where he lives, which shall come to his knowledge.

In early days in England, also, the individual was required by law to come forward with information about crime and criminals. If he knew that B had committed a felony and neglected to report it, he would be indicted, and, upon his conviction, fined and imprisoned. This offense was called "misprison of felony" (concealment of a felony).

The individual also had police duties. If, for example, he actually witnessed B committing a felony, it was his duty to sound a general alarm, called the "hue and cry." Then he gave chase and did his best to apprehend the criminal. The proper cry was "Out! Out!" All persons hearing the hue and cry were expected to turn out with bows, arrows, and knives and join in the hunt. Neglect of these communal obligations was punishable by fine and imprisonment.

We have an interesting survival of hue and cry in our Penal Law, which makes it a misdemeanor for any person to fail to assist in overtaking a criminal when directed to do so by a police officer.

Legal writers have expressed doubt whether this old obligation to come forward with information about crime survives at all in either England or the United States. On the other hand, it has been stated on many occasions that a citizen owes a moral duty, if not a legal obligation, to inform the authorities when a crime comes to his knowledge. This duty of coming forward with information, however, is recognized less and less as we depend more and more on organized police power.

It is reasonable to conclude that the modern police organization is a great advance over the primitive criminal law system. But that happy evolution should not be interpreted to mean that the community may now abdicate its responsibility for coming forward with criminal information.

An excellent study by Robert S. Earhart\* makes much perceptive comment on the role of the informer, much of it derived from his long experience in law enforcement. He gives us an apt description of the contradictory public attitudes toward the informer. Earhart points out that the public will tolerate, if not necessarily accept, the fact of the employment of informers to

---

\* *A Critical Analysis of Investigator-Criminal Informant Relationships in Law Enforcement*. A thesis submitted to Michigan State University toward a Master of Science degree in 1964, available through The Center, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D. C.

solve something like a heinous child murder or to effect an important narcotic seizure, but may react in a most negative way to the employment of informers in some other types of crime. He cites an instance where the services of a young woman were enlisted to break up a strongly entrenched syndicated gambling operation in Michigan. Through her efforts a criminal operation that had successfully resisted law enforcement efforts for six years was broken. The young woman, when she agreed to cooperate, had in mind only the performance of a civic duty. Yet the police organization utilizing her services was criticized and the young woman was subjected to public ridicule, jibes from fellow employees and threats on her life, as a result of which she had to endure round-the-clock police protection. (At this distance we suspect that some of this may be a demonstration of just how far and how deeply the tentacles of organized gambling may reach.)

The poison of prejudice against the informer sometimes appears in unexpected places. Our long experience in law enforcement fields has meant of course that we have had long and extensive working relationships with parole and probation officers. In Illinois, particularly before *Robinson v. California*, our contacts especially in the addict rehabilitation field, were extensive and close and mutually rewarding. We are led to think that most parole and probation officers would have information sources which might be described as informants. As a matter of fact we could hardly envisage a field parole or probation officer in the active discharge of his duties who would not welcome the availability of an informer on occasion.

But in 1964 the National Parole Institutes, under a grant from the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, published a paper, *Control and Treatment of Narcotic Use*, which was in many respects a valuable study but with some drawbacks. Not the least of these drawbacks, in our opinion, were some references to the use of informers in developing narcotics cases. The author referred to the difficulty of making criminal cases on narcotics peddlers because of the subterranean nature of the traffic. He then goes on to make some remarkable statements as follows:

It is because of this that the police need *extreme methods* (italics supplied) if they are to achieve arrests which will result in convictions; they generally must *entrap* (italics supplied) the offender by using paid informers, who act as sellers or customers.

One must suspect that the word "extreme" is being used in its commonest contemporary sense, in which it is now a dirty word. And we must entrap the offender! "Entrap" is perhaps employed in a more general sense, but in law enforcement entrap has a special meaning which denotes that the police bring about a "crime" which the proposed defendant had no intent to commit. A successful plea of entrapment is a complete defense and therefore entrapment at its best is but a futile exercise of despicable tactics by law enforcement officers.

The statement goes on:

Known addicts are converted to informers through payment by the police, through threat of arrest and of a report of noncooperation to the court, and *sometimes, through their being allowed to keep some of the drugs they purchase illegally*, (italics supplied) or through promise of immunity or of favorable recommendation to the court.

Furnishing drugs to an addict as described would constitute a felony!

And the article continues:

These *morally compromising devices* (italics supplied) to motivate an informer, of course, *increase the possibility that innocent persons will be arrested and even convicted, although this probably happens rarely* (italics supplied).

It is a little chilling to note that any body of police would be thought to be engaged in arresting and convicting people in a program where there was a greater than average possibility that innocent persons might be convicted. Our own firm opinion is that there is less chance of a person being wrongfully convicted in the usual narcotics case of the supervised informer than in supposedly "open and shut eye witness" cases. (Eye witnesses have been mistaken.) We might mildly suggest that this categorical labelling of investigative processes used in some narcotic (and many other) cases as morally objectionable is somewhat presumptuous. On morals, see our Old Testament authority cited later herein.

The trouble here may be the naiveté of an author who has nothing but book experience in the narcotics enforcement and informer field. Nevertheless it may also be a good example of a widespread underlying prejudice which adversely affects the fullest professional use of one of the most valuable weapons against criminal enterprise, the informer.

The September 1966 issue of the *Military Police Journal* has an excellent short article by Captain Clifford E. Simonsen (p. 12-13) on the necessity for a positive approach to break the dam of inhibition against giving information on crime to the authorities, citing among others the atrocious 1964 New York case in which a young woman was murdered as "hardened non-tattle-tales" watched from their windows.

The unwholesome implications of the code against informing are dreadfully apparent in an Arizona case.

On May 20, 1967, at Tucson, Arizona, Charles Howard Schmid, Jr., "Pied Piper of Tucson," entered a plea of guilty to a charge of second degree murder in the 1964 slaying of a fifteen-year-old girl, Alleen Rowe. This was a premeditated murder of an acquaintance of Schmid in the Arizona desert for thrills. The victim had been chosen by a girl friend of the murderer from a list of three. The acceptance of a second-degree murder plea under the circumstances was perhaps due to anticipated technical difficulties over some of the evidence. Also Schmid was already facing death in the gas chamber for the 1965 murders of two other girls, Wendy and Gretchen Fritz. These cases are on appeal.

Schmid, a well-heeled twenty-year-old playboy, specialized in associating with younger teen-agers who seemed to be fascinated by him. One of the many horrible facets of these cases was commented on by the magazine, *Life* as follows:

The death of the girls was shocking enough to Tucson, but the city had to face something more. There were indications that Smitty had boasted about the killings to his teen-age followers long before authorities even began to suspect that murder might have been done. Nobody spoke up. As the trial began for the murder of two of the victims—there will be another trial later for the murder of the third—Tucson's parents looked closely at their own children, and at the different young man so many of their children admired.\*

\* *Life*, March 4, 1966, p. 19. Reprinted by permission.

According to prosecuting attorney William J. Schafer III, one of the teen-agers who knew but did not speak up was seventeen-year-old Gretchen Fritz. She died because Schmid thought she might talk about the Alleen Rowe murder.

In the preface and introduction to our first edition we commented on the generally unfavorable picture of the informer as it appears in current news media. This has not improved. The treatment usually varies from the derogatory to the flippant, with some heartening exceptions. Also as we stated in that edition, there has been little knowledgeable serious writing on the informer subject, although such seems to be somewhat on the increase.

The informer has not come off too well in some of the law review discussions of the subject. Admittedly, it is difficult for those who have had no practical experience with them to write accurately about informers. An earlier and lengthy article, "Judicial Control of Informers, Spies, Stool Pigeons and Agents Provocateurs," by Richard C. Donnelly in the *Yale Law Journal* (November 1951) sets out much interesting historical matter on informers. But the author, wittingly or not, seems to reflect to these readers at least such a strong animus against informers as to detract from the effectiveness of his presentation. However, Donnelly's comments in the National Debate Proposition for American Colleges and Universities, 1965-1966,\* (p. 17, 20) are an admirably objective short summary of the place and problem of the informer in American law enforcement.

In the *Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems* (Dec. 15, 1965, p. 6-12) there is an extensive article, "Use of Informers in Federal Narcotics Cases" (author not specified). This seems to be based entirely on interviews with prosecutors, former prosecutors, narcotics officers and members of the defense bar specializing in narcotics case defense, the locus in New York City. In general, the law enforcement officials described are very much

---

\* Donnelly, Richard C.: Police authority and practices. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (January) 1962, p. 90-110. Reprinted in: *Should Law Enforcement Agencies in the United States be Given Greater Freedom in the Investigation and Prosecution of Crime?* U.S. House Document No. 304, 89th Congress, 1st Session (September) 1965, p. 10-25.



convinced of the value and necessity for using informers in narcotics cases. This particular quota of the defense bar is solidly against them, which is perhaps a significant endorsement of the great value of informers in these prosecutions.

The short summary of the stated value of the informer from the prosecution point of view is that he is almost indispensable in narcotics cases. With this we agree and elaborate on to some extent in this book.

The complaints of the defense counsel include a statement that informers do not often catch big criminals; this must be done by undercover agents (officers). Of course, the easily demonstrated fact is that the big cases usually are made by informers *and* undercover officers, and that the big case where an informer does *not* figure is unique, almost unheard of. This is true at the local, state or Federal level in this country, in whatever agency concerned; as also it is true for Canada, Mexico or any other foreign country in which narcotic law enforcement exists.

The defense bar complained that informers often make small cases. Of course they do. The narcotics traffic is a business, a sales distribution scheme in which there are, as might be expected, many more retailers than wholesalers. It would be utter folly to consider it a control program where retail outlets were permitted to operate with impunity. Also easy to demonstrate is the fact that the little outlet often leads the police to bigger dealers; this is the philosophy of most narcotics officers whose watchword is, "Seek the source of supply."

A contribution of interest is a chapter on the "Informer System" in *Justice Without Trial*, by Jerome H. Skolnick.\* Professor Skolnick, a lawyer and sociologist, describes the uses of informers by local police in a West Coast city of about 400,000 (alias Westville). In gathering his material Skolnick spent several months riding squad cars and otherwise working with the local police, and this naturally adds realism and point to his narrative and conclusions. We do not agree with some of these conclusions. In our opinion he puts the police on the defensive to an unwarranted

---

\* Skolnick, Jerome H.: *Justice Without Trial*. New York, Wiley, 1966. Reprinted by permission.

degree. But this is well worth reading. It may be a mirror which, if looked into, would serve in avoiding some weaknesses which Skolnick seemed to find in the handling of informers in Westville.

Perhaps because of an extra sensitivity to the usually unfounded charge that police maintain a class of informers through permitting people to commit crime, we were brought up short by Skolnick's statement that

. . . above all, there is an implied understanding between the policeman and the informer that the policeman will protect the informer's criminal status.\*

However, on reading further, this seems to be limited only to the highly laudable "must" of concealing so far as is possible the informer's identity as such.

Professor Skolnick concludes his chapter on "The Informer System in 'Westville'" with an observation to which we must take exception. He states:

. . . the "professional" narcotics policeman is a man who has learned to reduce his accountability to the courts, to outwit, often successfully, the spirit and the letter of the rule of law.\*

We have made no study of the informer system in Westville. We can comment only subjectively. Candor compels the statement that the writers, between them, have had a length and breadth of experience in handling informers possessed by few. We have never felt it necessary to outwit what, within our limitations, we considered to be the spirit and the letter of the rule of law. Neither would we knowingly permit it by officers under our direction.

Incidentally, we were happy to note the emphasis that Professor Skolnick gave to the use of informers in burglary cases. Because much of our writing has been in the narcotics field we have emphasized the use of the informer in narcotics law enforcement. Perhaps we have overemphasized that. Partly because there has been so little written in this field by police (for good reason)

---

\* Skolnick, Jerome H.: *Justice Without Trial*. New York, Wiley, 1966, p. 132. Reprinted by permission.

\* *Op cit.*, p. 138.

we may have contributed to an impression that informers were greatly needed or highly useful only in the narcotics area. Some of the writings we have seen lately seem to have that connotation. The fact is that the informer is valuable to the police in practically every spectrum of crime. Vide our illustrative cases herein. So we were very glad to see Skolnick's emphasis on the informer in burglary. Police have quietly, and not so quietly, used informers long before there was a narcotics problem. If American police are ever given enough personnel to make an affirmative drive against crime, we would like to see greatly expanded programs, led by the best brains in the detective bureaus, pointed toward acquiring advance information on what the professional repeater law breaker (who may go to work several times a week) is about to do—as well as inside information on what he has done. It is so much better to anticipate than to wait for the victim's cry. The effect on the morale of the "thief" would be unsettling. Many law enforcement agencies already have programs in this direction, of course. But in our opinion, there is vast room for expansion.

In the Bureau of Narcotics Training School, before a class of police narcotics specialists, we were elaborating on this point of using informers in all types of crime. One of the officers in attendance commented on a remarkable series of burglary solutions in a New England area. There, in 1965, certain contiguous cities were experiencing a rash of burglaries, as many as thirteen a day, often involving very substantial losses. Deployment of extra officers and numerous special experiments in operating procedures had been tried in attempts to meet the problem but were of no avail.

Eventually one police department received a telephone call of an impending burglary of a residence on that day. Officers were able to cover the premises in time to witness a break-in and to capture three seasoned burglars in the act. From these arrests there was developed a source of information which, over the next two years was to lead to 213 convictions of burglars and fences (many on multiple counts) in the affected cities and counties. A total of 101 housebreaks were cleared. The impact of this type of police activity on criminal enterprise is devastating and should

need no elaboration. Yet its importance too often goes unrecognized.\*

A somewhat unusual article, "The Role of the 'Rat' in the Prison," by Harry A. Wilmer, M.D., then consulting psychiatrist to the California Department of Corrections, appeared in the magazine *Federal Probation* in 1965. As might be assumed from the title, the emphasis of the article is against the informer—also referred to as "fink" and "stool pigeon." Dr. Wilmer states the obvious when he says:

While it is clear that the cardinal violation of the convict code is "informing," it is nonetheless rampant.†

He refers to the "inmate code" as demanding a high degree of group loyalty; it forbids any close liaison with "custody"; it incorporates the attitudes of the outside criminals, such as high value on violence, strength, exploitive sexual attitudes, and predatory attitudes toward money and property. Dr. Wilmer states that in attempting to open up communication, "therapy" runs headlong into the blocks of the convict code which forbids informing. The writer does not clearly indicate how far he would carry his theory of suppressing informing. But it seems a fair inference from his statement that he might reject all informing by prisoners even if lives and the security of the prison were at stake.

LeGrande‡ sets out incisively some arguments on the great importance of the informer to law enforcement. In a rejoinder to an article by Gerhard J. Falk§ Mr. LeGrande said in part:

Mr. Falk questions the use of informers in law enforcement. He states (p. 755):

". . . The use of informers, spies and so-called stoolies is generally defended by law enforcement officers as necessary, ex-

\* Personal communication from Sgt. William C. Nally, 12 Bernard Street, Newton Highland, Mass.

† Wilmer, Harry A.: The role of the "rat" in the prison. *Federal Probation*, 29 (1): 44-49, 1965. Reprinted by permission.

‡ LeGrande, J. L.: A re-examination of the public prejudice against the police. *American Bar Association Journal*, 51:465-468, 1965. Reprinted by permission.

§ Falk, Gerhard J.: The public's prejudice against the police. *American Bar Association Journal* 50:754, August, 1964.