

Fall 1961

Book Reviews

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Book Reviews, 52 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 310 (1961)

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

BOOK REVIEWS

Edited by
David Matza*

THE INFORMED HEART: AUTONOMY IN A MASS AGE. By *Bruno Bettelheim*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960. Pp. viii, 309. \$5.00.

Almost twenty years after publication of his initial assessment of their import, Bruno Bettelheim has reconsidered at length the significance of the Nazi concentration camps. The camps were crucibles of self for both keeper and kept. There, the efficacy of social processes in radically changing patterns of adult conduct was writ crudely and large for all to see. The camps, Bettelheim says, were designed to produce persons fitted to a total state, both directly, and indirectly, as a threat to the population at large. But if the camps were a designed instrument, they also served to reveal those processes in modern societies, designed by no one, which less visibly and more slowly serve the same end. Inversely, analysis of the camp experience can serve men of good will by pointing to the social processes and structures which must be preserved if man as we desire him is to be preserved.

The second two-thirds of the volume may well be read first. There, Bettelheim presents a detailed account of the structure of camp activities and of the processes through which inmates adapted to this structure or perished. The end result was the "old prisoner," a man adapted to camp ways, attuned to the realities of camp life, and unfitted for life outside the camps. No evidence is presented that "old prisoners" became *permanently* unfitted for life outside the camps, although this is what Bettelheim implies and fears. In some ways, it would be surprising were it so. For if precamp life had not unfitted these inmates for camp life, why should the reverse be true? One may suspect that with the dismantling of the camps, these inmates, in time, adapted to the outside again. For one lesson of the camps would seem to be man's flexibility; while it is by no means endless, it is extensive and dramatic. These inmates, most of them, were the most flexible of all. The *value* of such flexibility is, of course, another question,

* Assistant Professor of Sociology, Department of Sociology and Social Institutions, 206 South Hall, University of California, Berkeley 4, California.

and one which gives Bettelheim much concern. He earnestly attempts to avoid judging such adaptations as occurred and preserved life; on the other hand, Bettelheim, like all of us not currently in extreme situations, believes some values go beyond life itself.

All this is perhaps more clearly seen if one gives "flexibility" a less pleasant name—"shallowness." The camps may be said to have revealed the shallowness of many of the human characteristics we value most highly—and that we therefore view as most "deeply engrained." But this may be too harsh. Perhaps it is best said that man's characteristics require the constant nurturance of daily activities in line with his values. The concentration camps teach us that man constantly creates himself; he may do so in good or evil image.

In the first third of the volume, Bettelheim traces with broad strokes evidences of processes operating in modern societies which tend to produce a sort of passivity similar to that found among "old prisoners." This section of the book would have been considerably improved had Bettelheim chosen to examine, in detail, some limited segment of life in modern societies in his search for homologies to camp life.

In all, the volume is well written and very suggestive. It suggests above all the manifold ways in which current activities shape human possibilities, at least short-run possibilities. It would have been a less demanding book had Bettelheim followed the plan of presentation suggested above, a plan which seems to represent the way he has thought through his materials. Finally, it must be said that, at times, Bettelheim reifies the value of "autonomy" into something like a law of social life, suggesting that in the long-run no society can exist with a population as docile as those produced by the concentration camps. I know of no evidence for such a proposition. Nor do I find the Nazi experience suggestive of such a proposition. More important, a belief in the existential necessity of individual autonomy can work to induce relaxation in the face of challenges to this value; for if it is necessary, there is little to worry

about. This is of course not Bettelheim's message. He believes there is much cause for alarm.

SHELDON L. MESSINGER

University of California
Berkeley

RELUCTANT REBELS. By *Howard Jones*. New York: Association Press, 1960. Pp. 234. \$5.00.

There is a growing body of literature which deals with the typical attributes and problems of correctional institutions. Varying degrees of selection of relevant problems, of adequacy of treatment of these problems, and of cumulativeness of data, are demonstrated by these studies. *Reluctant Rebels* falls within this general body of literature.

Several partially related objectives are cited in the presentation. First, the author states the intention of inquiring into why English correctional institutions achieve such meager rehabilitative results. Second, he proposes to work out techniques and a general theory whereby the correctional institution might become a full-time therapeutic community. Third, he proposes to demonstrate how certain "general principles" work out in practice in a residential school. Fourth, he proposes to compare objectively the effectiveness of two major approaches to "institutional therapy" in residential schools for maladjusted children. The author's treatment of these objectives ranges from what must be taken as expressions of personal commitment to a treatment ideology based on some work experience in a correctional residence to a demonstration of significant correlations between selected variables which are not theoretically articulated.

With reference to the first objective, he reports that in England one in every three children who spends time in a correctional school remains unreformed. The reason for this is said to be that "orthodox" correctional schools fail to recognize the major obstacle to "real" reformation. This obstacle is the negative influence of inmate groups. The major treatment focus in such schools, he continues, is the individual, a focus which is rendered ineffective because of the "harmful" effect of inmate groups. It is in recognition of the impact of group control of individual behavior that the author undertakes treatment of his second and third objectives.

The major portion of *Reluctant Rebels* deals with the previously cited second and third objectives.

Unfortunately, treatment of these objectives is inextricably mingled in the presentation. The general principles which the author purports to test happen to be the major elements of the "techniques and general theory" which he proposes to "work out" in the course of the presentation. In this way he begins with what one would reasonably expect him to arrive at in the course of a somewhat detailed discussion. He states the following as general principles: (1) that a permissive and accepting staff attitude is a basic requirement for the healthy emotional development of inmates; (2) that organized interaction and group discussion among children can give them valuable insights into personal problems and the nature of society; (3) that group experience and acceptance can lead to group loyalty and group control, which can be of value in reformation; (4) that the role of the adult (in correctional institutions) should be an important and active one and the techniques they use should be psychotherapeutic in nature. The major portion of the presentation is an elaboration of these basic suggestions, with bits of case history material, observational records, and statements by authoritative persons supporting their claim to validity. The objectives of simultaneously developing a general theory and testing propositions on which the theory is based leads to unavoidable confusion.

The fourth aim of *Reluctant Rebels* is dealt with in the appendix where the author delineates two approaches to institutional treatment of maladjusted children in England. One approach views the institution as providing a substitute for the parental love which the maladjusted child is said to lack. The other approach, he suggests, stresses the importance of good habits such as cleanliness, obedience, etc. The latter approach emphasizes greater staff aloofness. These approaches are then compared.

Two residential schools representing the "permissive" type are compared with two representing the "more ordered" type of institutional "treatment." These schools are compared along three dimensions. First, attitudes toward adults were determined. Indicators for this dimension were the children's choices of the persons in the school, children or adults, with whom they would like to spend spare time, and choices of those they "disliked being with." Second, extent of identification with the standards of the Headmaster was determined. Indicators for this dimension were correlations between rankings of children by the various

Headmasters with rankings according to popularity based on sociometric choices and rejections. Third, "the sense of security" of inmates in the various schools was determined. This was based on numbers of sociometric choices and rejections, stability of these choice and rejection patterns over time, and scores on a test which purports to measure amount of hostility shown in frustrating situations.

Quantitative evidence on the outcomes of these comparisons was presented, and the following conclusions drawn: that schools of the "liberal" type more successfully obtained a positive response from children to staff; that there is a greater degree of identification with the "ideas and standards" of staff among children of the permissive schools; and that a more liberal school leads to greater security among children. Thus the two main approaches to "institutional treatment" are compared, and the superiority of the "permissive" approach is said to be objectively established. Such an interpretation is doubtful since no figures on recidivism are presented to support the claim of a superior rehabilitative effect of the more "liberal" or treatment oriented regime.

The array of issues treated and objectives cited, combined with a highly unsystematic approach to both, partly disguise the fact that in essence *Reluctant Rebels* is a plea for the large-scale use of group therapy methods in correctional institutions. This plea seems to be based on the author's commitment to a "treatment" ideology, the rationale for which is apparently based on the following set of assumptions: Therapeutic groups, he suggests, allow individual participants a measure of "insight" into the "real" motives behind their aberrant behavior. Insight, he continues, either at the social level or on "deeper" levels, reveals to the individual the discrepancy between his "real" motives and his "pretensions." Such realization is assumed to lead to "social adjustment." This state is described as representing harmony between the needs of the individual and the requirements of the community, "which alone makes for a permanent and tension-free social adjustment." He feels that this insight-giving process must be instituted in correctional institutions if more effective rehabilitation is to become a reality.

While the issue of treatment in correctional institutions, the major preoccupation of *Reluctant Rebels*, is a crucial one, the level of knowledge regarding this issue is not appreciably enhanced by the author's treatment of it. The main reason for this is that he begins his analysis with per-

cisely the set of assumptions which is in need of rigorous empirical testing. He simply presumes the correctness of the treatment ideology and then proceeds to suggest how it might be employed in correctional settings. The effectiveness of the treatment ideology in correctional settings must be clearly established before the question of converting such institutions into therapeutic communities becomes a relevant one. The present state of knowledge, particularly with reference to the nature of group formations in correctional settings, suggests the possibility that "treatment" is not always feasible in these institutions.

Initially, the author professes a concern for groups in correctional settings and stresses the extreme importance of group influence on individual behavior. However, his discussion deals exclusively with "therapeutic" groups and their presumed possibilities. He fails to consider seriously those unofficial behavioral imperatives among inmates which constitute what is usually referred to as informal social organization. It is in recognition of the impact of informal social organization on inmates that some sociologists suggest that treatment and custody are incompatible as goals in correctional institutions. While the issue is not closed, failure to consider this important aspect of group formation in correctional institutions weakens the usefulness of the author's contribution. It suggests that his effort to integrate psychoanalytic and sociological thought in this area is not well informed.

SETHARD FISHER

Los Angeles State College

THE CARICATURE OF LOVE. By *Hervey Cleckley*, M.D. New York: The Ronald Press, 1957. Pp. 319. \$6.50.

In 1955, the American Law Institute voted to recommend that sodomy between consenting adults in private "be removed from the list of crimes against the peace and dignity of the state." In 1957, the Royal Commission known as the Wolfenden Committee recommended that legal penalties be abolished for homosexual acts between consenting adults in private. Neither of these recommendations has been adopted, but the stature of both recommending bodies gives some indication of the level of concern about the current status of laws concerning homosexuality.

Dr. Cleckley, a psychiatrist who has achieved a reputation both in psychiatric and other circles with *The Mask of Sanity* and *Three Faces of Eve*

(with F. B. Thigpen), does not refer to either of the recommendations cited. He is, nevertheless, greatly concerned about evidence that attitudes toward sexual deviation are becoming more liberal. He sees no evidence that society is harsh in its treatment of homosexuals and, in fact, is impressed with the pains taken by society "not to persecute or even embarrass the homosexual." (p. 173) It is difficult to imagine how he would interpret the facts related in Peter Wildeblood's *Against the Law*.

His essential argument is that (1) serious confusion between psychiatric disorder and mental health is espoused or reflected in the presentation of sexual pathology in literature, (2) writers have used psychiatric and psychological concepts of sexuality to prove that homosexual and other forms of sexual deviation are natural, and perhaps even equivalent to heterosexual love, (3) contrary to popular belief, these concepts are not scientific discoveries.

He believes that such a state of affairs is dangerous: "many of them [the concepts] promote unnecessary confusion in the immature; some, I maintain, constitute an insidious and unwarranted impeachment of orthodox sexual love." (p. 8) As a consequence, he wishes to show that sexual deviation is unnatural, pathological, and dangerous, by comparing illustrations from his own clinical experience with ones chosen from literature. He also wants to establish the absurdity of many psychiatric, especially psychoanalytic, concepts such as bisexuality, which have been used by writers to justify their presentations.

The chapter headings suggest the emotional tone of the book and warn the reader against any expectation that this is a pedantic treatise, e.g., "Pied Pipers of Pathology," "Fugitives From Eros." The case material as well as the literary excerpts are highly dramatic. Clinical experience, personal anecdote, and a broad range of examples from literature are interwoven in a provocative narrative.

In reviewing concepts of sexuality such as "bisexuality, castration fear, the normal homoerotic component of the libido, instincts-inhibited-in-their-aims, and the alleged universal stage of homosexuality" (p. vii), the author points out, quite correctly, that the evidence on which such concepts depend does not meet the requirements of scientific method, and that the language in which they are couched makes it difficult to understand the exact nature of the referent. Although colorful in language and example, it is doubtful whether the criticisms of these concepts add anything to

the extensive literature already available. If, however, they produce caution in the use of glib generalizations about sexual disorders, their value may be considerable.

While permitting the possibility that all homosexuals are not to be characterized as showing the degree of psychiatric disorder specified in this book, the author seems to give such a possibility little credence. He disagrees emphatically with Dr. Karl M. Bowman whose opinion is that "the majority of homosexuals are no particular menace to society. . . . Homosexuals are no more open to seduction than are heterosexuals." (p. 19) There is little published research evidence to document Dr. Bowman's opinion because of the difficulty in obtaining subjects who do not seek psychiatric help or do not come in contact with the law. This reviewer's research (to be published) on subjects who meet these criteria would strongly support Dr. Bowman's opinion about many homosexuals. Caution needs to be exercised about generalizations such as "the majority."

This reviewer would also disagree with the opinion that "it is obvious that the question of whether or not homosexuality is an illness, a vice, or a normal and in no way regrettable state of health, is not one that science can answer." (p. 13) Opinions about homosexuality and other forms of sexual deviation are in plentiful supply. Thus far, they have been of little help in solving the tragic and difficult problems with which society and the individuals affected are confronted. Few problems demand the objectivity and rigor of scientific method as much as these. If the same energy and resourcefulness exhibited in this book had been applied to careful research on the problem, we would be justified in having greater confidence in the opinions expressed.

EVELYN HOOKER

University of California
Los Angeles

A STUDY OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUVENILE JUSTICE IN CALIFORNIA. By *Governor's Special Study Commission*. 1960. \$1.50 (paper).

This is a detailed analysis of police, probation, and court practices in juvenile delinquency in California and, as such reports go, a good one. It makes two major contributions to the picture of child justice: First, it goes beyond mere tabulation of police and court statistics by using questionnaires to get at variations in practices and attitudes of juvenile officials. It focuses on such

questions as what standards of evidence and admissibility are used by juvenile courts (most judges described these as "relaxed criminal rules"), whether the juvenile has a right to counsel in court proceedings (he may hire private counsel but there is no need for the court to provide one nor to notify the minor or his parents of the possibility of counsel), what criteria probation officers use in deciding not to send a child to court ("needs of the child better served otherwise"), the basis of police decisions to arrest or not arrest a child (most prominent was the "nature of the offense"), and the like. In this, the report shows imagination in both data gathering and the kind of questions asked of a discretionary system of justice.

The second contribution has less to do with specific tabulations of California practices than with documentation of the vagueness and lack of uniformity in juvenile delinquency procedures. It is little comfort to realize that California, a state taking pride in its welfare development, particularly of correctional administration, retains archaic and nebulous delinquency legislation and has no better operating philosophy in this field than states less advanced. The enabling code, which overlaps "neglect," "mental deficiency," and "delinquency," contains such quaint delinquencies as "habitually visits a public billiard room" and "who is leading or from any cause is in danger of leading, an idle, dissolute, lewd or immoral life." This is no different from the situation in most states and elicits from the Report a comment to the effect that the code is "so inclusive that a majority of California's adolescents could be declared wards at any given point in time."

While there are few who would disagree with the humanitarian motives of the juvenile court and its operating premise of "the best interests of the child," what needs most to be known is how this philosophy is translated into actual practice. In some areas the Report attempts to do this, and puts questions about such significant due process and civil rights issues as freedom from self incrimination, right to jury trial, use of evidence standards, and the kinds of criteria used in situations of discretion. As might be expected in a system with few formal norms or controls, it was found that substantially less careful attention was paid to matters of evidence, to rights and due process, than in the distinct but parallel system of criminal justice. For example, probation officers who have the important screening function of deciding which children arrested by the police will proceed to Juvenile Court and which will

were asked the basis of their referral decision. The two major criteria in response were the "needs of the child" and the "seriousness of the offense." The Report commented: "Curiously enough, since the Juvenile Court is basically a legal proceeding, only one-fourth of the counties mentioned as criteria whether there was sufficient evidence that the child is within the jurisdiction of the court."

In the police field, confusion was the major characteristic. Most small departments and about one-third of the larger bureaus have no policy manual on juvenile procedures; most police departments have no special juvenile squad and among those that do, no agreement exists about requirements for recruitment and training. There is no consensus on the grounds for arrest or agreement as to what constitutes arrest. Comment: "Some police agencies consider a juvenile arrested whenever he is physically taken into custody while others do not consider him arrested unless he is formally booked or detained in jail—most departments also at times will take juveniles to the police station for interrogation in situations they do not regard as a formal arrest." Little wonder juvenile arrest statistics are sometimes baffling. Incidentally, the Report does little to clarify this. On page 1, the number of juvenile arrests in California in 1958 was reported as "more than 150,000," on page 86 the statistic is "151,000 juveniles arrested for delinquent acts," while by page 97, the total of juvenile arrests had grown to "238,376 of which almost 145,000 were for delinquent acts (58,502 for specific law violations and 86,476 for 'delinquent tendencies') . . . plus 10,662 arrested for dependency and neglect."

Apart from some statistical inconsistencies, a general criticism of the Report is that it is over-ambitious. Too many topics are covered with some rather thin results. The Report would have been better if crucial operational problems such as arrest or detention decisions were more thoroughly examined while such superficial titles, complete with tables, as "Hours Covered by Juvenile Bureau" (item: "The hours or shifts that a Juvenile Bureau covers largely depends on the functions assigned to that unit") were omitted altogether.

For reasons known only to the Editor, the Report is organized in reverse fashion from the way the juvenile process works so that it starts with adjudication and works backward through detention and intake to the police arrest material. It may be because the court is assumed more important or believed to deal with more serious cases that the major analysis is directed toward judicial behavior while there is less focus on police and pro-

bation officers. This in spite of the finding that "a majority of juvenile cases are disposed of by the police without referral to probation departments." Taking the 150,000 figure of arrests, only about 49,000 get from police to probation workers and of these only 25,000 get to juvenile court. The pre-court processes in delinquency are worthy of as thorough analysis as a part of juvenile justice as decisions on the adjudication level. These criticisms notwithstanding, the Report draws attention to issues of significance beyond the California borders. It illustrates once more the need for careful, mature research into the administration of juvenile justice and calls for a clear examination of some cloudy concepts in our treatment of youthful law breakers.

DONALD J. NEWMAN

University of Wisconsin

DELINQUENT AND NEUROTIC CHILDREN: A COMPARATIVE STUDY. By *Ivy Bennett*. New York: Basic Books, 1960. Pp. xii, 532. \$10.00.

Of the seemingly endless output of books and articles on crime and delinquency, a few stand out permanently as milestones, suggesting new directions and opening new horizons for generations of researchers. Such were the books published in 1925 by four authors in different parts of the globe, the books on which Dr. Bennett has based her "comparative study" of one hundred delinquent children. These four authors were: August Aichhorn (*Verwahrloste Jugend* was published in Vienna); Sir Cecil Burt (*The Young Delinquent* was published in England); and Drs. William Healy and Augusta Bronner (*Delinquents and Criminals: Their Making and Unmaking* was published in this country). It would seem to Dr. Bennett's credit that she has attempted a synthesis of their disparate theories with the zest of an objective researcher. While she is described as a "psychoanalyst and psychologist" (and her method of approaching the research problems and her dynamic interpretations leave no doubt about her psychoanalytic orientation), she by no means confines herself to the literature of psychoanalysis but also cites and "compares" her studies with those of Hermann Mannheim, Leo Kanner, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Margaret Mead, and Dostoevsky, whose *Brothers Karamazov* opens her bibliography. This bibliography has been arranged chronologically "to illustrate the development of the literature over the past sixty years." Although the study appears to have been concluded in 1958,

it seems that Dr. Bennett did not find any literature worth mentioning after 1953.

It is Dr. Bennett's opinion that the time is "now overdue for a separate study of some types of delinquency hitherto grouped together wholesale, and there is evidence that certain forms of non-neurotic delinquency should, rightly, be studied separately and contrasted with problems of neurotic symptoms in young offenders." In arguing that some "types" of delinquency have been differentiated "in a more or less haphazard and empirical way," she lists nine groups, as they appear in the heterogeneous literature on delinquency during the past sixty years:

- (1) The dull or handicapped delinquents "whose innate constitutional, hereditary, intellectual, and temperamental endowment, and limited ego-development mark them off as weaker than their more fortunate fellows."
- (2) "The more hopeful" delinquents, who show no great emotional disturbance and respond quickly to "suitable changes in the environment allied with training in social values." These might be thought of as "normal children in search of a normal environment" who somehow lost their way along the road to normal social adjustment.
- (3) Adolescent delinquents who show no history of misconduct prior to puberty and who, "given suitable handling and a good environment, are also potentially normal."
- (4) The delinquent from the "vicious home" (Burt) of the "delinquent-fostering milieu" (Levy) "where the child is offered faulty models of social behavior and adopts the delinquent code of his family or neighborhood."
- (5) The secondary antisocial disorders of conduct, i.e., those of children who react to an organic condition, such as epilepsy, encephalitis, etc., in delinquent or uncontrolled behavior.
- (6) The "deprived" delinquents. This group includes children with chronic deprivation in the formative years, such as institution-rearing, haphazard upbringing, or, in some cases, gross neglect.
- (7) The neurotic delinquents, which the author subdivides into four categories: (a) the isolated and usually stereotyped "ego-alien" delinquent act "which arises as the typical compromise solution to an unconscious neurotic conflict in an otherwise socially

well-adjusted personality;" (b) the "criminal from a sense of guilt," the nature of whose unconscious "need for punishment" with its controlling influences upon behavior was first described by Freud; (c) the behavior of the passive-effeminate type of delinquent boy "whose outspoken aggressive behavior is in the nature of a violent defense against unconscious instinctual temptations and at the same time a provocation and the type of treatment he consciously wishes to receive"; and (d) antisocial behavior associated with some of the various types of neurotic character disorder such as described by Aichhorn, Alexander, Fenichel, et al.

- (8) Psychopathic delinquents: As Dr. Bennett points out, this type is the least understood of all delinquents and the most resistant to treatment. Formerly referred to as the "morally insane" or "morally imbecile," this category of psychopath has been recognized by certain psychiatric schools but not by others. Dr. Bennett concurs in the widely held view that "a large number of clinical writers use the term 'psychopath' for these delinquents rather indiscriminately as a 'waste-paper basket' category to which are relegated a host of miscellaneous conditions characterized by an inability to form love relationships with any person, any by moral, emotional, and possible constitutional defects about which we know very little." Dr. Bennett expresses her view very mildly. This reviewer, more bluntly, would add that any clinician diagnosing "psychopathy" is hiding his ignorance behind a meaningless facade.

- (9) The psychotic delinquents. This group includes those delinquents whose misbehavior is thought to arise from psychotic or pre-psychotic illness both "in its gross forms and in the milder cases involving psychotic or pre-psychotic complications."

The author used for her research material fifty delinquent and fifty neurotic children selected from a total of the first thousand cases examined in a selected rural Child Guidance Service during the years from 1946 to 1949. These cases were considered fairly representative of the child population referred to the service. Her summary of results is contained in 23 factors, among which inability of intra-family relationships, interrup-

tions in the emotional relationship between parent and child, parent-child separations, and broken home life seem outstanding. In view of the 23 factors which she mentions, she concludes that a "fruitful method of research, under ideal conditions and with suitable time and staff available for the routine labor involved in such large-scale psychological case-indexing, would be to investigate five groups of children: Delinquent children; delinquent children with neurotic tendencies; normal children; neurotic children with delinquent tendencies; and neurotic children.

A further subject for research would be "to find out more about the tendency for neurotic—and some delinquent—children to imitate and take over the behavior of the opposite sex." An important beginning would be to investigate the roles of the parents towards each other. She found in many cases the mother's role in the family to be dominant, quarrelsome, and aggressive, showing little femininity or tenderness toward the child. "Such mothers are sometimes the breadwinners for the family, or they may compete with their husbands in professional fields or in the earning of money. Others openly despise and reject, or criticize and patronize their husbands, and are nagging and bullying towards them . . . Husbands appear content to be henpecked or regarded as failures and they sometimes undertake to do the housework and shopping, or to handle the babies, or they expect a great deal of 'mothering' themselves." Many of Dr. Bennett's observations and findings are familiar in this country in general terms through the writings of Margaret Mead, who pleads for reality in family life and a return to the "natural roles" of male and female.

It is difficult to praise Dr. Bennett's book enough. This reviewer considers her text a milestone in any respect: lucidity of language, scholarly research, the questioning of basic assumptions, and the wise recognition that her research is just beginning. This book should be widely read and discussed. It does not have the answers to the increasingly serious problems of delinquency. But it does deal honestly and intelligently with questions raised nearly forty years ago by Aichhorn, Burt, Healy, and Bronner. The fact that a writer still wrestles with these questions shows that we still have much to learn about juvenile delinquency.

HANS A. ILLING

Los Angeles