

Fall 1963

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, 54 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 349 (1963)

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.

operating with the U.C. faculty on the project are a number of agencies including the California Department of Corrections, the police and probation departments of San Francisco and Oakland, and the San Mateo County Probation Department and Juvenile Bench. In the course of the project, the researchers are exploring new streamlined and more effective procedures for the prevention and treatment of juvenile crime problems.

A number of applicants will be ready to enter the new doctoral program in the coming fall

semester. Current enrollment of the School of Criminology, both undergraduate and graduate students, numbers about 200, and rapid growth to some 350 students is planned in the next few years.

In announcing the expanded program of the School of Criminology, Dean Lohman stated, "We have reached the point where many traditional approaches in criminology are not adequate. With our expanded program at Berkeley, we hope to seek new approaches and to keep abreast of the changing character of the crime problem."

BOOK REVIEWS

Edited by

C. R. Jeffery*

FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND DELINQUENCY.† By Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. Boston: Houghton Mifflin; London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962. Pp. 328. \$6.50; 35/-net.

This latest product of the Gluecks' long effort to dissect the phenomenon of pre-adult crime has the virtues and defects of the two previous volumes in the series, *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* (1950) and *Physique and Delinquency* (1956), in which data for some 500 matched pairs of incarcerated and non-incarcerated boys have been analyzed. Opinions, both favorable and adverse, of their ambitious research project are unlikely to be changed either by the comments of a reviewer or by examining *Family Environment and Delinquency*.

The contribution of this book to the study of juvenile behavior lies mainly in that it contains much information about characteristics of individuals and of their family relations. It is true, and unfortunate, that the Gluecks provide data "far more intensive and extensive than any as yet furnished by any researches into the causes of juvenile crime." (106) Data collection and analysis on a comparable scale by theoretically sophisticated behavioral and social scientists is long over-

due in criminology. Interpretation of the present set of correlations is severely handicapped by (1) the assumption that attributes of individuals can be placed on a "bipolar biosocial continuum" from total to partial genetic determination in relation to sociocultural influences, (2) the assumption that the position of an attribute on the postulated continuum is indicated by either (a) the fact that it varies significantly among body types (mesomorph, endomorph, ectomorph) of nondelinquents, or (b) the fact that it does or does not correlate with two or more of 44 "social factors," (3) the lack of statistical control over possible interaction effects, (4) the tendency to reify *ad hoc* psychological concepts such as *adventurousness*, *banality*, *defiance*, *stubbornness*, *feeling of not being taken seriously*, and *psychopathy*, and (5) the assumption that a scientific understanding of crime is to be found not in the realm of socio-legal conflicts and definitional processes but in "the dark places" (106) of the organism and the psyche. The persistent use of superfluous, vague, and invidious language is inconsistent with the claim that the book represents hardheaded scientific research. The Glueck values as they emerge repeatedly include (1) cleanliness, sobriety, neatness, and orderly routines for living, (2) family groupiness—well organized under a benevolent parental dictatorship that welcomes playmates into the house and avoids the nastiness of Corporal Punishment, and (3) rugged individualism where parents are concerned: the im-

* Associate Professor of Sociology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.

† A previous review of this work, by Dr. Hermann Mannheim, appeared at page 206 of the June, 1963, issue of the *Journal*. (Vol. 54, no. 2)

pression given is that parents should have gumption enough to control their children and to recognize what is obviously good-and-bad for them, and to be independent of the limitations, pressures, contradictions, and attractions of the social-cultural settings in which both parents and children find themselves. Working mothers, especially, receive little benefit of the doubt respecting their desire simply to escape home responsibilities (39, 45, 47, 111, 155).

Since the lack is to be remedied in a subsequent volume, it is hardly fair to point out the absence of theoretical underpinnings. For now, the authors have reached the conclusion that

"it is differential *contamination*, rather than differential *association*, that is at the core of the etiologic process; and contamination depends not merely on exposure but also on susceptibility as opposed to immunity." (155)

This is no improvement upon Sutherland's attempts to relate socialization and acculturation to criminality.

Again, and perhaps rather wearily, defenders and critics of the Gluecks' work, of "induction," and of the Rorschach and other data collection devices will air their differences. In spite of this reviewer's highly critical reaction to the delinquency series, he is still inclined to suspend final evaluation until the promised theoretical integration becomes available. That volume will indeed provide an occasion for a full-scale effort to determine the contribution of these studies to the development of criminology as a scientific discipline.

AUSTIN TURK

Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

CRIME, JUSTICE AND CORRECTION. By *Paul W. Tappan*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960. Pp. xi, 781. Text ed., \$7.95; trade ed., \$10.95.

This is a textbook for the college course in criminology, which, in most instances, is taught by a sociologist. The author is qualified in both sociology and law and teaches in both disciplines at New York University.

It has often been remarked that criminology texts are really two books in one, since they cover both criminology and correction, each of which could occupy a book (and at least one course) in itself. Actually, criminology texts can be said to be three books in one, since, in addition to criminology and correction, they usually cover, to varying

extent, law enforcement and the administration of justice.

The book under review exceeds all current texts in its coverage of law enforcement and the administration of justice, roughly a third of the book being devoted to these subjects. They take up almost the exact number of pages devoted to the part on criminology. The part on correction is somewhat longer.

Tappan's book covers a great deal of material. It definitely inclines toward the encyclopedic. Whether this is a fault or a virtue depends very much on one's concept of the role of a textbook, if not on one's philosophy of education. Tappan discusses his well-known strictures on the juvenile court; some recent proposals concerning youthful offenders; the machinery of decision-making in the sentencing, treating, and releasing of offenders; design of correctional institutions and the classification of offenders; the usefulness of parole prediction tables; the question of the confidentiality of presentence reports; the gauging of success and failure in probation and parole; the administrative organization of probation; the history of imprisonment; operational procedures and problems in prison programs; psychotherapy; trial procedures; "mortality rate in criminal justice"; criminal responsibility; the rights of the accused; police organization; the third degree; search and seizure; and scores of other topics. And these examples draw only from the parts on correction and justice.

The part on criminology discusses, among other things, the problem of the definition of crime, criminal statistics, the concept of causation, and biological, psychological, and sociological theories of causation. One of the central issues in criminology is the theory of causation, and Tappan recognizes its very controversial nature. He himself prefers the eclectic approach which has been attacked by Cressey, Hartung, Sutherland, and others. He is not ready, as are many sociologists, to minimize or even exclude altogether the biological variable. He distrusts statistics in the study of causation, because they may overlook "some of the intangibles of personality and their interrelationships," (p. 74) a contention which would be rejected by the positivists.

Tappan on occasion commits sins in logic, a fault that is certainly not peculiar to him. In one place, for example, he says, regarding psychopathic personality: "Differently oriented experts rarely agree on either the nature or the etiology of this condition." (p. 137) At the same time, he

concludes: "It [psychopathic personality] is particularly prevalent among youthful offenders and habitual criminals." (p. 137) If the nature of this condition is rarely agreed upon, how can one know it well enough to conclude that it is particularly prevalent among certain groups? Again, in one place Tappan says: "Differentiation between the psychoses and neuroses is not clearly drawn, so that a patient may be diagnosed as one or the other by different psychiatrists." (p. 120, note 20) Despite this serious reservation, Tappan confidently concludes: "*Schizophrenia* . . . is the most common form of psychosis both in the general population and among criminals." (p. 121)

All in all, Tappan's book will appeal to those who like an encyclopedic approach to criminology and an eclectic approach to crime causation. It will particularly please those who want to encompass in their criminology course a large body of material on law enforcement and administration of justice. Here, as well as in the part on correction, Tappan vigorously presents some fresh and realistic positions, and instead of seeing the reform orientation as an all-or-nothing affair, he seeks to balance the conflicting interests and values involved. Particularly to be commended in this regard is his recognition of the importance of certain legal considerations which are all too often disregarded or repudiated by zealous reformers.

MICHAEL HAKEEM

Department of Sociology
University of Wisconsin

88 MEN AND 2 WOMEN. By *Clinton T. Duffy*, with *Al Hirsberg*. New York: Doubleday and Co.; 1962. Pp. 258. \$4.50.

The author of the book was warden at San Quentin Prison for 11 years. The title is a reference to the 88 men and 2 women executed while Duffy was warden. This is his story, not only of his reflections on capital punishment, but also of his life, his career, his philosophy of penology.

Duffy takes the reader up each of the 13 steps to the gallows without omitting a single grisly detail or an agonizing moment. If one is interested in the lurid details of death, this book should satisfy his needs. The background and life history of condemned men are discussed, always from the point of view that this man should never have been executed. Duffy complains that no one—the police officer, the lawyer, the judge, the warden, the executioner, the public—takes responsibility for

these executions. The reader might wish to contemplate whether Warden Duffy includes himself in this group.

All of the arguments used against capital punishment are used here: the problem of executing an innocent man; the fact that men do not think of the consequences of their behavior when they murder in anger or fear; the fact that race, sex, and poverty determine who shall or shall not be executed; the man who is executed while the Governor is on the line with a last-minute reprieve; and the fact that capital punishment does not deter. Duffy discusses two cases to illustrate the latter point: one, a man who helped install the gas chamber, and who was later executed in it; and the other, a sheriff who had witnessed several executions and was himself executed later on.

If we look at punishment in terms of modern learning theory, we observe that, in order to be effective, the consequences must be attached to the behavior immediately upon the occurrence of the response. In the case of execution, the consequence is not a part of the criminal act; it follows by many years, and it is of such nature that re-learning from experience is not possible. The immediate consequence of murder or rape is reinforcing, and this is why men continue to murder and rape. A man who helps build a gas chamber is not going to be deterred from murder for the simple reason that the conditioning process involved in building a gas chamber bears no relationship to a punishing contingency attached to another entirely different behavior.

Caryl Chessman was executed while Duffy was warden, and his description of Chessman does not fit the picture of this man usually presented to the public. Chessman is described by Duffy as one of the most dangerous men he had ever met: tough, mean, contemptuous, arrogant, deviant, a troublemaker, and a menace at all times. "Chessman represented nothing," is the conclusion drawn. The tremendous cost to the State of California in executing Chessman (probably around \$500,000) is a good example of how capital punishment destroys the judicial process. The mental torture to a man who is kept in death row for 11 years is certainly as convincing an argument against capital punishment as can be found.

This is not a scholarly book. It does not tell us why capital punishment does not deter; it does not tell us why capital punishment is still used in the twentieth century. This book is regarded by the

reviewer as a well-done popular account of why we should abolish capital punishment.

C. R. JEFFERY

Washington School of Psychiatry
Washington, D. C.

THE VIOLENT GANG. By *Lewis Yablonsky*. New York: The Macmillan Co.; 1962. Pp. xiv, 265. \$4.95.

Few adults have an opportunity to share as intimately in the thoughts or to observe as closely at hand the behavior of adolescent gang members as did the author of this book. As director of a crime prevention program in the Morningside Heights area in New York City, Yablonsky became the confidant of the leaders of a "violent gang" known as the Balkans. The rise and fall of the Balkans, their alliances and strategies in opposing the Villains, and a reconstruction of the killing of a 15 year old boy by another gang, the Egyptian Kings, constitute the chief "story line" of *The Violent Gang*. Through his contact with the Balkans, Yablonsky met many other gang boys, especially gang leaders. Extensive verbatim reports from conferences and conversations with boys and from personal documents enliven the presentation. Obviously, Yablonsky has "been there." His material is rich and intensely interesting.

The violent gang is pictured as a "near group" of sociopathic individuals, as "a compensatory paranoid pseudocommunity" without stable membership or normative consensus. Programs for control of violent gangs are assessed and recommendations made. *The Violent Gang* has received considerable public notice, being featured, for example, in the science section of a national magazine in a recent issue. In part because of this, and in part because of the unique experience of its author, serious questions need to be raised concerning its conclusions.

We are told that the book is "the result of intensive study of more than a hundred violent gangs," but nowhere in the book are these gangs identified as objects of study. A variety of research procedures were employed, but the extent and nature of these is largely a mystery, and data reduction and organization are hardly mentioned. There are curious gaps in the argument. The chapter on "The Community of The Violent Gang" has almost no relevance to the "theory of the violent gang" which is presented in the previous chapter. The author says he is a sociologist, yet his interpre-

tations of case materials almost invariably are of a psychological nature, despite the obvious relevance of sociological concepts in many instances—and this is not a quarrel with psychology.

Despite such questions, the data of the book are extremely provocative. It seems clear that the gangs Yablonsky studied were not very cohesive and that many of the boys lacked social skills. A boy generally was free to belong or not belong, as he wished. The wild fantasies of boys in describing the relative "strength" of various boys, friend and foe, deserves more extended and precise analysis. Labelling gang leaders, and some other categories of members as "sociopathic" helps very little. The reader is led inevitably to wonder what criteria Yablonsky employed in arriving at his classifications, and how precisely he could fit boys and gangs into them.

Yablonsky makes clear that his "theory of the violent gang" is an "ideal type" construction. Despite the disclaimer of reality fit which this model implies, and his extensive citation of the works of Cohen, Cloward and Ohlin, Miller, Bloch and Neiderhoffer, and others, the relation of the violent gang to the variety of delinquent subcultures which have been discussed in the literature in recent years is far from clear. It is difficult to believe that Yablonsky's view of gangs comes from the same city as Cloward's and Ohlin's delinquent subcultures, or the case descriptions of the New York Youth Board. Despite his "live evidence," one cannot help wondering if the "violent gang" is a caricature, rather than a characterization, based upon certain features of gang organization and his diagnosis of the personality organization of gang leaders. As presented in the book the data are inadequate to the conclusions reached.

JAMES F. SHORT, JR.

Washington State University

OFFENDERS AS EMPLOYEES: AN ENQUIRY BY THE CAMBRIDGE INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY. By *J. P. Martin*. New York: St. Martin's Press; London: Macmillan & Co.; 1962. Pp. xiii, 178. \$7.00.

The avowed aims of the author were to ascertain the attitudes and practices of a sample of employers toward the hiring of men previously convicted of criminal offenses; to assess the employment history of ex-offenders as employees; and to determine employers' reactions to employees as offenders (men already in employment who were suspected or convicted of committing criminal offenses). The

stated methodology was that of the social survey. A random sample of 97 firms in the Reading, England area comprised of 49 larger establishments (employing 20 or more men), and 48 smaller firms (employing between 2 and 19 men) supplied the data on which the study was based. Interviews with employers (administrative heads and their managerial subordinates) were recorded on detailed interview schedules. Questions of fact and hypothetical questions were utilized. Tables comparing the administrative reactions of employers to ex-offenders as employees and to employees as offenders (large firm vs. small firm) constituted the main format of the book.

Some of the more important inferences drawn from the data follow: (1) At least two-thirds of the firms in Reading had employed ex-offenders at one time or another. (2) The smaller firms took on relatively more known ex-offenders than did the larger. (3) Nearly two-thirds of the larger firms, and over 40 per cent of the smaller, hired men in some sections on a "no questions asked basis." (4) Employers regarded ex-offenders as particularly difficult to place. Offenders were handicapped for employment purposes second only to men who had been mentally ill. (5) The previous offenses of the ex-offender employees covered all of the main types. There was little relationship between the type of an offender's previous sentence and his success as a worker. (6) About 55 per cent of all the ex-offenders stayed in their jobs for at least six months, and 45 per cent for a year or more. The proportion of ex-offenders assessed as good employees was higher in the larger firms (29 per cent) than in the smaller (17 per cent). Only about 8 per cent of the ex-offenders left because they had been reconvicted, but a further 7 per cent left under suspicion of having committed offenses. (7) Less than 20 per cent of the offenders hired by the larger firms, and less than 10 per cent hired by the smaller firms, had been assisted in obtaining employment by probation or other welfare workers. (8) Where possible, firms neither prosecuted nor called the police when their employees became offenders, but dealt with the matter themselves. The seriousness of the offense, an estimate of the internal and external repercussions to the firm, and personal considerations, such as the offender's record as a worker, determined the decision to prosecute. The firms primarily used dismissal instead of court action as a disciplinary measure.

The scope of the study extended beyond the stated aims. Most of the first section dealt with a

comparison of the recruitment and personnel policies and problems of employers in Reading as they affected employees in general. At several points indirect methods were used to obtain data where more direct methods were indicated. In attempting to find out employers' practices in reference to hiring offenders, a section of the interview schedule entitled "Reasons Given for Turning Down Men Applying for Jobs" (Table 15, page 36) included 12 a priori reasons of the author. It is claimed that indirection of this kind was necessary because "firms tend not to keep records of rejected applicants." A single, direct question might have borne more fruit; e.g., "Did you turn down any applicant principally because of his criminal record?"

The sample upon which the author based his discussion of "Offenders as Employees" (Chapter III) was far from precise. It consisted of 62 "known offenders" (recalled from memory by employers) employed by large firms during a period ranging from six months to ten years prior to this study, and a sample of 41 "known offenders" selected similarly by smaller firms. It was admitted that there was no satisfactory way of estimating the total number of ex-offenders employed at any one time in any of the firms. The prior "criminal records" of these men were ascertained from their employers. "Generally speaking we could not expect employers to do more than summarize any information they might possess, and in practice we found that while most knew what offenses their men had committed, at least a third could not tell us what sentences had been imposed." A sample of employees known to be ex-offenders as evidenced by court or other documented records would have provided a more representative sample of ex-offenders. Such a sample could have been compared with a control group of employees without criminal records. Control groups were not in evidence.

The data summarized in the tables were too discrete. In fact, the absence of statistical techniques increasingly considered essential in the analysis of data such as these is distressing. The author felt it necessary to break down the main data under two headings, large and small firms. Though this reviewer believes this to be an unnecessary, and perhaps misleading dichotomy, even the reduced sample size thus obtained could have been used as a basis for inferences concerning the related populations, and for verifying the hypothesis that they do in fact differ. No such test was made. Only per-

centage occurrences were reported, with no attempt to use a simple statistical test such as Chi-Square.

The term "offender" occurred throughout the study with varied meanings: men convicted in court, ex-prisoners, men who performed illegal acts but were not brought before a court, men caught stealing by their employers, criminal suspects, men who committed illegal acts outside the firm in which employed, men who admitted offenses to employers, and men who had been in trouble with the police. This inclusive definition was used by the author in an attempt to get at offenders who were not necessarily acted upon officially; however, in this writer's opinion, a more delimited definition was indicated.

This work marks respectable efforts in a pioneer field of criminology. Any criminologist interested in offenders as employees will profit from a study of Mr. Martin's carefully worded, extensive interview schedules. His research design with some modification merits a larger sample.

JULIAN ROEBUCK

Louisiana State University

JUSTICE FOR THE CHILD—THE JUVENILE COURT IN TRANSITION. Edited by *Margaret K. Rosenheim*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe; 1962. Pp. 240. \$6.95.

As part of the observance of its Fiftieth Anniversary, the School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago presents the contributions of nine distinguished scholars who discuss the future direction of the Juvenile Court, which had its origin in Chicago. The contributors are two juvenile court judges—The Honorable Paul W. Alexander and Orman W. Ketcham; two professors of law—Monrad G. Paulsen and Paul W. Tappan; an attorney—Alex Elson; two practicing social workers—Paul W. Keve and Elliot Studt; and three professors of social welfare—Howard E. Fradkin, Alfred J. Kahn, and Margaret K. Rosenheim, the editor of the volume who presents the issues. Because she does not consider it her task to juxtapose or reconcile the various points of view, the major appeal of the book will depend upon the special interests of the sophisticated reader.

Judges of the Juvenile Court will undoubtedly be interested in Judge Alexander's striking review of the attacks on court procedures and with Judge Ketcham's charge to the judges to require compliance by the state in the matter of sufficient

appropriations for adequate staffing and auxiliary services.

The major issues discussed by the lawyers and the professors are the extent to which the present court procedures violate the constitutional rights of the child and his parents. In a very learned chapter Paulsen stresses the undesirable consequences of a badly drafted law. Elson, writing on due process, lists among the necessary safeguards, concern with detention before a hearing, advising the parent and the child of their right to counsel, and the appointment of court counsel where the parties are unable to employ counsel. He advocates a separation of the procedure so that a hearing, in which the juridical facts and the commission of the offense by the child are established, will always precede the hearing on the treatment to be imposed.

Several authors suggest changes in the role of the judge. Some believe he should confine himself to legal decisions and leave the question of disposition to those whose area of competence lies in the social welfare field. Keve outlines clearly the alternatives open to the judge of a large court who faces growing administrative tasks and who must decide whether to relinquish the administrative duties to a separate administrative body or to accept the responsibility himself.

Keve and Fradkin highlight the importance of good intake. Keve reminds the reader that "the range of delinquency problems referred to the court is immense—from murder cases and armed robberies to trespassing, throwing snowballs, and vague acts of incorrigibility. The serious cases should unquestionably be routed to the court promptly, and a properly operating intake service will interpose no delay in such cases. By the same token, the minor cases should be handled in ways that avoid unnecessary court appearances. When the whole matter is truly minor and little more than normal mischief, it should not go to court, because it will only reduce the time the judge could use for more crucial cases."

Addressing himself to the changing role of the court in the community, Kahn suggests that the Juvenile Court has been too long regarded—and regards itself—as the hub of the entire system for dealing with children in trouble. He suggests that if the court will see itself as "a part of the system, it will be functioning most effectively."

For this reviewer, Tappan's discussion of the origin of Juvenile Courts throws a fresh light on the old Chancery vs. Criminal origin debate. Be-

cause the Chancery Courts were exclusively concerned with protecting the property interests of well-to-do wards, and in Common Law very young children were regarded as capable of criminal intent, in England great numbers of children were subjected to whipping, branding, mutilation, and death.

This reviewer agrees with Tappan that most casework personnel, including probation officers, have not been inculcated with the criminological doctrines of social defense or of individual liberties. He believes that court sentencing should depend upon authoritative and juridical conclusions as well as upon social and clinical considerations. To protect the community and the personal rights of the child requires a combined social and judicial wisdom of high order.

A refreshing and challenging addition to our knowledge of the court's effect is Elliot Studt's report of her study of the way those whom the court serves see the process. In her wide experience in the field she has discovered that many older delinquents are neither anxious nor hostile, but only bored and irritated. Many perceive the Juvenile Court and its representatives as "inept and essentially unable to deal with realities." "It is not easy," she says, "to recommend the organizational patterns that would give better direction to our youth in the middle period between childhood and maturity. The solution would be more 'adult-in-training' roles through which adolescents can express themselves acceptably. The parent in the court is frequently not helped in a constructive way to see himself as accountable for his child's behavior. On the contrary, court action often seriously damages the child's perception of his parent's worth." Dr. Studt suggests a study of those cases in the Juvenile Courts that are parent referred, since these parents "represent a self-selected voluntary group of clients, who for some reason associated with the image of the court in the community, have chosen this agency above others as a source of help."

The comprehensive index assists the reader in synthesizing points of view if he wishes to do so. The University of Chicago's School of Social Service Administration is to be congratulated on the high order of the contributions.

SOPHIA M. ROBISON

Adelphi College, Institute of the Social and
Behavioral Sciences
Garden City, New York

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN AN INDIAN SETTING

By *Hansa Sheth*. Bombay: G. H. Bhatkal, for the Popular Book Depot; 1961. Pp. 295. 15 Rs.

Here we have a very informative book about the problem of juvenile delinquency in Bombay proper and the state of Bombay, prior to its separation into two ethnic states. For those interested in the development of juvenile court laws and juvenile court organization, the first part of the book will be of major interest. Among other things, some differential legal handling of the delinquency problem in India is noted as far back as 1850. From then on, a series of acts led steadily to the present day coverage of the problem, which culminated in an All India Children's Act in 1960.

Especially noteworthy are the Bombay Children's Act of 1924 and the legislation which extended its provisions in 1948; these are models of socio-legal consciousness. Destitute, uncontrollable, delinquent, and victimized (by adults) children are covered under the Bombay provisions. The juvenile court in Bombay, as well as other places in India, is basically a part of the total criminal court system. By law probation officers can be appointed by the state government as well as by welfare agencies empowered by the governments to operate probation service, remand homes, and certified schools—the latter two being what we call detention homes and training schools in the States. The first Juvenile Aid Unit in an Indian police department was established in the police organization of Bombay proper in 1952. One interesting provision is that usually a child must be brought before a juvenile magistrate within 24 hours after he has been detained.

The last part of the book deals with the sociological dimensions of the problems of delinquency in Bombay state, Greater Bombay, and to some extent All India. The number of cases of youthful delinquents increased in Bombay state from 1941 until 1950 and then declined. There is an interesting U-shaped trend in the sex ratio of boys to girls among the offenders: 20 to 1 in 1941, 7 to 1 in 1950, and 14 to 1 in 1956. This trend undoubtedly reflects certain socio-economic changes and reporting practices. Sociologists will be interested in the ratio of 100 males to 60 females in the general population of Greater Bombay (city). Family life in the big city is unstable. Migrants from the back country and other parts of India have flocked into Bombay, where there is an acute housing and job shortage. Families of delinquents are large, un-

educated, and suffer from poverty. Children are often exploited by adults who use them in nefarious businesses, such as the sale of illicit alcoholic concoctions. Young girls are often exploited by employers when they hire out as domestics.

One dimension of delinquency is much different in Bombay state than in the USA. Juvenile offenders 11 to 13 years of age have a higher percentage than those 14 to 16 years: 42% versus 32%. The opposite would be true in our country. This may reflect the early start in street life, since

many of the delinquent children in India have no house in which to live, but live under palm trees, and most children have no schools to attend. Hence the earlier participation in delinquency.

This book is a publication of a doctor's dissertation in Sociology at the University of Bombay; it represents a monograph which contains much comparative material for those of us who are trying to understand the problem of delinquency.

WALTER C. RECKLESS

Ohio State University