

1966

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, 57 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 186 (1966)

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

C. R. Jeffery*

CRIMINAL ON THE ROAD: A STUDY OF SERIOUS MOTORING OFFENCES AND THOSE WHO COMMIT THEM. By *T. C. Willett*. London: Tavistock Publications, 1964. Pp. 343. \$6.50.

This English investigation is concerned with three basic questions: (1) Is there justification for regarding serious motoring offences as crimes on a par with other criminal offences?; (2) Is the popular image of the serious motoring offender correct?; (3) Are serious motoring offenders and their offences valid subjects for criminological study? Willett's findings support affirmative answers to questions one and three and negate question two.

The author selected six classes of offences from the Home Office Returns of Offences Relating to Motor Vehicles as constituting serious motoring offences: (1) causing death by dangerous driving, and manslaughter, (2) driving recklessly or dangerously, (3) driving under the influence of drink or drugs, (4) driving while disqualified, (5) failing to insure against third-party risks, (6) failing to stop after, or to report, an accident. Two criteria of selection were employed: (1) behavior involved in the offense included at least two of three elements (a) deliberate intent, (b) harm to persons or property, (c) dishonesty; (2) the legal definition as more serious than other motoring offenses as shown by maximum sentencing provisions.

He then presented a number of hypotheses to test the popular image of the serious motoring offender as a respectable and otherwise law-abiding citizen, whose personality and background does not predispose him to lawbreaking; who neither regards himself as a criminal nor is so regarded by the community; who usually has a non-manual occupation and is the driver of a private car; who when punished is treated much more leniently than other offenders, but once found guilty is not likely to repeat his offense; who generally appears in court as a consequence of an inadvertent, traffic accident.

A sample of 653 convicted offenders (during 1957, 1958, 1959) and their offenses, committed in a representative (age, sex, population, rural-urban distribution) Police District was examined to test the validity of the "popular image" defined above. All offenders were convicted of one or more of the author's six classes of motoring offences. The police files were the data source. The results of 43 structured, open-end interviews involving 43 additional convicted offenders (of offences within the six classification scheme) exclusive of the 653 in the documentary study were utilized for supplementary purposes.

The major, documented findings follow: (1) Twenty-three per cent of the 696 offenders had additional convictions for non-motoring offences. Willett demonstrated with several statistical comparisons that this proportion substantially exceeded the most pessimistic estimate of the proportion of persons that could be expected to have criminal records in a random sample of the population of England and Wales. Moreover, an additional 60 offenders from the documentary study were "known to the police" for non-motoring offences (were charged but not convicted); (2) Only 14 per cent of the 653 offences could be described as inadvertent accidents. The remaining were of the offenders making; (3) The offenders, the police, the courts, and the "public" did not apply the term criminal to the motoring offender. Social stigma was not incurred by a motoring offense; (4) The semi-skilled, unskilled and those employed in manual occupations were over-represented among the study sample; (5) The motor cyclist (in proportion to other drivers) was the typical serious motoring offender; (6) The modal age of the study sample was 26, and there was a marked concentration in the age group 26 and under 30; (7) One hundred thirty-four of the 653 offenders had repeated the same kind of offence or committed another motoring offence equally as serious. Twelve per cent had four or more additional motoring convictions (habitual offenders); (8) The treatment of serious motoring offenders

* Institute for Behavioral Research, The Washington School of Psychiatry, 1610 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington 9, D.C.

by the courts was much more lenient than that accorded other non-motoring offenders; (9) The courts rarely used their power to order serious motoring offenders to take additional driving tests.

An undocumented and probably spurious conclusion was that the great majority of the research subjects were normal people without personality or intellectual blemishes who succumbed to temptation when circumstances were favorable and it was expedient to take a chance. Willett assumed that there is something in the normal personality that predisposes a driver to break the law. These deductions were made on the basis of what Willett called lack of evidence to the contrary. These speculations were exceptionally glaring in the light of the author's own admission that he did not have adequate data on his research subjects personality traits, I.Q.'s, or motivations. The research design and methodology were not geared to find or assess personality variables. The findings of the clinics attached to the courts of Detroit and Chicago where selected traffic violators have been referred since 1930 for psychiatric examinations indicate that personality factors play a large part in so-called traffic accidents. The failure of Willett to deal with personality variables beyond a fragmentary, impressionistic endeavor marked the major weakness of the investigation. This is understandable and probably excusable because the study was submitted as a sociological doctoral thesis.

Beyond the empirical findings, Willett made an excellent analysis of the law pertaining to motor offences; described the role played by the police; critically examined court procedures; and statistically analyzed the upward trend of motoring offences and offenders in England since 1957. He advocated a revision of the existing vague and ambiguous laws and the capricious sentencing practices regulating serious motoring offences and their offenders. Willett's empirically supported major thesis was that the serious motoring offender is a "real criminal", and that he should be recognized and dealt with as such by the public, the police, the courts, and the research criminologist.

Unfortunately, he concluded with a pitiful, unnecessary attempt to explain the driving behavior of his study sample on the basis of Sutherland's differential association theory and general criminal subculture theory. This search for a frame of reference was in addendum and did not detract from Willett's Empirical results. Hopefully, this long awaited pioneer will pursue a social-psycho-

logical study of the persistent, serious, motoring offender. Twelve per cent of his study sample constituted habitual, serious, motoring offenders—and probably comprised a criminal type of homogeneous offenders.

JULIAN ROEBUCK

Texan Western College
El Paso, Texas

VENTURES IN CRIMINOLOGY. By *Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964. Pp. 373. \$11.00.

Little purpose would be served by reviewing the substantive ingredients of this present collection of articles by the Gluecks. All of the numbers have appeared in print before, generally in major journals, (despite the disclaimer that the volume is presented "for students . . . who may not have ready access to the journals in which they appear"). The data and the arguments are rather well-known to most scholars in the relevant disciplines, partly because of the fame of the Gluecks and partly because considerable reiteration is one of their especial techniques of presentation.

Nor would any particular purpose be served by a cursory essay attempting to take one side or the other in the ongoing campaign waged by the Gluecks against their intellectual enemies, particularly sociological theorists, and by those special foes against the Gluecks. Both camps have adequately presented their views, and the present volume includes comprehensive rebuttals by the authors, plus a plethora of scattered asides belaboring dissenters and disbelievers. The Gluecks rarely forget a friend—their footnoting loyalty verges on piety—nor are they apt to find much that is redeeming in the views of an antagonist.

It might be worth a moment, however, to attempt to look at the quite unique position that the Gluecks occupy in delinquency research. They are certainly the best known and most honored laborers in the field in the world today, and they have occupied their preeminent position for at least three decades. Yet it is not inconceivable that the major portion of their work will be superseded or forgotten soon after they cease mining the voluminous empirical material they accumulated in early forays into high-delinquency neighborhoods. This they feel, and feel very deeply, would be a shame, and throughout the present volume the underlying tone is one cajoling, asking, demanding, and arguing that future research be undertaken along the path they have diligently laid out throughout their

careers. It is a moot point whether or not their call will be heeded, though they devotedly chronicle a not unimpressive list of disciples who are busily testing the efficacy of their prediction tables.

Part of the difficulty, I suspect, is that the Gluecks belong to no single academic discipline, and they are suffering the *déclasse* fate of aliens and intruders. They are very far from the mainstream of sociology, and still further from the core of law, even that law, itself rare enough, that is concerned with juvenile and family matters. In fact, it is striking how totally unconcerned the Gluecks appear to be, despite their lifelong affiliation with the Harvard Law School, with the niceties of constitutional issues regarding juveniles that are occupying their legal colleagues. Belonging nowhere, the Gluecks have to recruit followers from among individuals themselves peripheral to the academic structure, and the going is undoubtedly both difficult and rather treacherous.

No one can in honesty or fairness maintain that the Gluecks have not made outstanding contributions to the study of juvenile delinquency. They make a telling point, I think, when they stress that their work has always been built upon direct experiment with delinquents, in contrast to that of many writers who have at best only passing first-hand knowledge about the subject they address. And they do very well, I believe, in their stinging criticism of "differential association" theory and its particular pretensions. But this contribution, like so much of the Gluecks' writing, lacks a certain subtlety and a certain sensitivity, which, despite its merit, tends to keep possible advocates at arm's length. With the Gluecks, there is very little interpretation of findings, themselves presented flatly and rather drearily, and very little free play of the imagination.

The Gluecks point out a number of times that they have systematically carved out an area of intellectual work and have with some care undertaken studies flowing coherently one from the other. Hermann Mannheim, a very talented and perceptive criminologist, has extolled them for this trait and their diligence in manifesting it, and it is an accolade that merits reiteration. Unfortunately, of course, most virtues also have their darker side, and one of the prices of such symmetry has been a certain inability to respond to fads and to more solid fashions in intellectual endeavor. It is as yet much too early, but it should be interesting to see where the Gluecks stand, and where their critics stand, at a moment of intellectual reckoning re-

garding their contributions a few decades or so from now.

GILBERT GEIS

California State College at Los Angeles

CRIME, LAW AND SOCIETY. By *Frank E. Hartung*.

Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1965.

Pp. 320. \$9.75.

This is an interesting volume both because of its own distinctive qualities and because of what it reveals about the state of modern criminology. As the title suggests, Professor Hartung has attempted a broad and coherent statement of the causes and nature of crime and of the problems involved in societal (including legal) responses to crime. No one hoping to express a comprehensive view of these fields can expect to escape controversy, and Professor Hartung plunges into the polemics with enthusiasm and gusto.

The author has not attempted major theoretical innovations. He accepts the basic postulates of the theories of "differential association" identified with the name of the late Professor Edwin H. Sutherland: "My thesis is that sociocultural learning is crucial in the development of criminality." (p. 11). This commitment involves a number of important corollaries. It follows, for example, that crime is *not* to be conceived, in any important measure, as the product of psychic illness or pathology of the offender. Moreover, the widespread tendency to view crime as an illness or the product of illness may itself constitute a crime-engendering factor; for it may contribute to the offender's "vocabulary of motives" whereby he explains his behavior to himself in terms that avoid serious loss of self-esteem. (pp. 63-84).

The so-called compulsive criminal might be thought a major exception to any view that sees crime as a product of sociocultural learning. This Professor Hartung strenuously denies and urges that persons alleged to have committed acts of compulsive violence will be found generally to have previously indulged in violence in fact or fancy and that this "habit of violence" is in significant part the product of social conditioning. (pp. 136-166) In the same vein he attacks the notion of "irresistible impulse" as an exculpatory device in the law of criminal responsibility. (pp. 181-219) All these positions (and many more that space does not permit to be itemized) reveal the author's strongly held conviction that man is fundamentally a rational animal and that the modern tendency to see his behavior as primarily the resultant of in-

stinct and emotion robs him of dignity and responsibility.

The book offers a number of attractions not the least of which are the author's candor and forthrightness and his wealth of illustrative material. But, as previously mentioned, the book may also be taken as evidence of the state of modern criminological inquiry. As Professor Hartung's polemics make clear, no generally accepted paradigm or synthesis dominates the field or looms on the horizon. The situation contains many of the ingredients that, according to Professor Thomas S. Kuhn in his *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, characterized the science of optics before Newton or research in electricity in the first half of the eighteenth century. Workers in the field are unable to take a common body of belief for granted and hence each writer or at least each school is required repeatedly to restate and defend its own first principles. While the confusion and controversy thus engendered do not wholly preclude the acquiring of useful knowledge, they do largely inhibit the gains arising from the practice of what Professor Kuhn calls "normal science," wherein investigators freed from the constant necessity of defending their basic assumptions are released to deal with secondary issues suggested and made pertinent by the commonly-held assumptions. Professor Hartung and others of his school offer a synthesis or paradigm of this sort; but whatever its virtues, it has not, for a variety of reasons, occupied the field in such fashion as to make "normal science" in Professor Kuhn's sense possible. We are accordingly confronted by the continuation of more-or-less clearly defined schools of criminological thought, each with distinctive views of crime genesis and therefore divergent programs of treatment and prevention. Effective communication among the schools is hardly to be expected because the fundamental differences in assumptions preclude agreement as to what the problems of the field are, much less how they are to be solved. It can be said of Professor Hartung and others of similar views, however, that they at least have taken note of what their opponents have said and done and have attempted to subject opposing theories to some sort of reasoned critique. This awareness and concern has only rarely been reciprocated by those whom Professor Hartung criticizes. It would be a genuine contribution to the continuing dialogue apparently destined to persist in these areas if Professor Hartung's radical and fundamental attack on the view of crime-as-

disease and treatment-as-therapy were to induce thoughtful and systematic replies by its proponents. But there seems little reason to hope.

FRANCIS A. ALLEN

University Professor in the Law School
University of Chicago

CHANGING THE LAWBREAKER: THE TREATMENT OF DELINQUENTS AND CRIMINALS. By *Don C. Gibbons*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965, 299 pp., \$6.95.

Characteristically criminological theorists of the past, and even some contemporary ones, have attempted to develop broad, comprehensive and rather systematic causal theories with the ensuing effect, generally, of perpetuating doctrines specific to these separate disciplines. In this venture in applied sociology and correctional practice theory Gibbons, in reviewing the theoretical literature and research findings, utilizes a more eclectic approach than has been customary. Consequently neither crime and delinquency nor their treatment are reduced to formulistic simplicity. Even in his attempt to set his causal analysis within a typological framework Gibbons fully takes into account the diversity, sociologically and psychologically, of both criminals and delinquents.

There is not enough space to discuss all of the important features of this slender but highly significant volume but, briefly, Gibbons seeks to identify those factors which compel individuals to break the law. In his words . . . "this book argues that questions of the form: 'what causes crime and delinquency?' do not make sense, for crime and delinquency are phenomena that are as varied as social life itself. Criminals and delinquents exhibit nearly the full range of social characteristics. They are from various social circumstances, they exhibit happy and miserable family backgrounds, they show many different personality structures, and they vary in nearly every other way worth knowing. Accordingly, the sensible question becomes: 'what causes criminal behavior of type 1, 2, or 3?'"

Proceeding from this frame of reference Gibbons then presents a typology of juvenile delinquents and one of criminals each based on a pattern of social roles, or *role-careers*, described as occurring within what he refers to as "definitional dimensions" of offense behavior, interactional setting, self-image, and attitudes. Each career is also viewed within the familiar background dimensions of social class, family background, peer group associations, and contact with "defining agencies".

Nine delinquent role-types emerge in this classificatory scheme: I. Predatory gang delinquent, II. Conflict gang delinquent, III. Casual gang delinquent, IV. Casual delinquent-nongang member, V. Automobile thief—"joyrider", VI. Drug user-heroin, VII. Overly aggressive delinquent, VIII. Female delinquent, and IX. "Behavior problem" delinquent. Adult criminal behavior is then classified into fifteen role-types most of which follow, though in some instances with modifications, the standard classifications found in most criminology textbooks.

There follows a discussion of the various general forms of treatment: individual "depth" psychotherapy, group psychotherapy, client-centered therapy, group therapy, milieu management, and environmental change. Each is briefly, though carefully, described with treatment defined generally as consisting "of explicit tactics or procedures deliberately undertaken to change those conditions thought to be responsible for the violator's misbehavior." In addition, the author emphatically distinguishes between the basic characteristics of therapy and other activities and procedures which are not specifically rehabilitative.

Next Gibbons turns to some of the major obstacles to treatment in contemporary corrections, from the usual low salaries and high case loads to problems stemming from the nature of correctional organizations themselves—especially the unofficial, informal inmate organization in prisons, gaps between custodial and treatment personnel, and the problem of politically appointed parole boards.

In the succeeding two chapters Gibbons then brings together the typologies developed previously with the various forms of therapy. Specific forms and combinations of forms of therapy are recommended for offenders classified in one of the role-types. Adjuncts to therapy are also discussed and recommended along with the specifically therapeutic measures outlined. Finally the implications of the work for research are considered and some of the areas most in need of exploration delineated.

In this reviewer's opinion it is time a book such as this appeared. Its purposes are not only clearly stated but closely adhered to and accomplished. Unfortunately it will most probably not come to the attention of most correctional workers, or if it does, they will most likely ignore it. I hope not. But the fact may be that some, if not many of them may not be temperamentally or intellectually equipped to profit from it. Yet it is crucial that it not only get into their hands but that they be required, if necessary, to digest it as part of their on-going in-service training, for ultimately the

verification or modification of the typological entities will not follow solely from the continued theoretical works of criminologists of whatever background but by those directly in contact with violators and actively engaged in attempts to change their attitudes.

If, in fulfilling his role obligations, a reviewer must be critical, he can usually find adequate grounds for so doing. In the present instance, for example, one might wish for a more thorough multiple disciplinary approach drawing upon research from physiology, biochemistry, and ethnology. Also, the claims for such a program as mobilization for youth are somewhat over-optimistic in view of the fact that it is presently caught up in organizational snags and interdepartmental confusion and rivalries not to mention the severely limited job opportunities which actually exist for young people.

But these are trivial criticisms of a work which, if really put into use, could easily revolutionize correctional practice now largely characterized by a facile labelling of anything and everything done as "treatment" and where policies are so often pursued for the emotional satisfaction they give rather than for their fitness to achieve an ostensible purpose.

Summing up, this book will stand as a solid, sound, and enduring contribution to the criminological literature. It is superbly written and with a refreshingly lucid style. It is the kind of book about which one will say, in his innumerable internal soliloquies—"I wish I had written it!"

LEWIS DIANA

Randolph-Macon College

DELINQUENCY AND CHILD GUIDANCE. Selected Papers. By *August Aichhorn*. Edited by Otto Fleischmann, Paul Kramer, and Helen Ross. New York: International Universities Press, 1964, pp. 244, \$5.00.

NORMALITY AND PATHOLOGY IN CHILDHOOD. *Assessments of Development*. By *Anna Freud*. New York: International Universities Press, 1965, pp. xii + 273, \$5.00.

There are probably few criminologists who have not read Aichhorn's *Wayward Youth*, perhaps the first classic work in the field of child delinquency. Published forty years ago, it is still worthwhile reading; in fact, some of the theories advanced by Aichhorn then have not been carried out yet, although criminologists are as busy as ever testing Aichhorn's theories over and over again.

Wayward Youth has a Foreword written by

Freud. It is therefore quite fitting that his daughter, Anna, should write the Foreword to the present selection of papers, the last of which is dated 1948, three years before Aichhorn's death. The task of collecting and translating fell to three collaborators, one of whom, Dr. Otto Fleischmann, died before the translation was completed. The final shape was given to it by Helen Ross (who assisted in translating *Wayward Youth*), and the volume was published as a monograph in the Menninger Foundation Monograph Series.

Even at a glance, it is obvious that the editors here took a labor of love as a tribute to one of the pioneers of psychoanalysis and a pioneer researcher on crime and delinquency. Some of the problems, real in the Twenties in Central Europe, are of historical interest now; others are still alive, such as "Education in Training Schools" and problems pertaining to the various techniques of child guidance, as practised today mostly outside the field of corrections, but, as set forth by Aichhorn, to be applied to the correctional field as well. For instance, the chapter on "Establishing a Positive Transference" seems as valid today as at the time when he delivered the lecture in Vienna thirty-five years ago. Time and again Aichhorn stresses his thesis that the rehabilitation of the wayward should not be left to the accidental success of gifted educators, but "be the predictable result of scientific method."

The volume contains a one-page bibliography of works suggesting the background of Aichhorn's teachings but largely forgotten today, except for the writings of Freud. Such names as Aschaffenburg, Birnbaum, and even Kraepelin are of historical interest today. The editors and the publisher are to be congratulated for this monograph, which does as much honor to them as to a beloved pioneer in the field of crime and delinquency.

Anna, Freud's "only son" (as he jokingly used to call her), never has been content just to be the prophet of her famous father, or a Madison Avenue type advertiser of her father's theories. This was generally known along with her many publications, including several books and the co-editorship of the now standard annual series, *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*. The present publication, without a doubt, establishes her as an excellent child analyst-psychiatrist in her own right. To start with first things first: this book to be Anna Freud's magnum opus (as it is advertised), it is indeed amazing what a variety of ideas Miss Freud has been able to cram into so little space. The actual text comprises only 235 pages, and small pages

with big and spacious print at that! The style is marked with a simplicity which not only is hard to match but also should be an example to many analysts.

There are six chapters, each dealing with a topic in a way to obviate the need to read volumes on it, and dealing with the topic in a seemingly "definite" way. The chapters deal with the psychoanalytic view of childhood in both long-distance and close-up perspective; with the relations between child analysis and adult analysis; with the "assessment" of normality in childhood; and with the "assessment" of pathology describing general considerations as well as, specifically, some infantile "pre-stages" of adult psychopathology; and with the possibilities of therapy.

What has been condensed by the author into a few pages is difficult to discuss in detail. From the rich cake, then, one may pick out for the readers of this Journal the chapter which deals with adult psychopathology. In this chapter, Miss Freud discusses dissociation, delinquency and criminality as *diagnostic categories in childhood* (her italics). In each paragraph, she talks about steps leading to criminality: the "caretaking mother as the first external legislator," external control imposed on the drives, internalization of external drive control, the principles of mental functioning and their bearing on socialization, the furthering of ego mechanisms, the development of ego functions as a precondition of socialization, and the obstruction by id attributes of socialization, failures of socialization, the transition from family to community standards, and lastly the sexual perversions, particularly homosexuality, as they are "favored" or "prevented" in the course, or absence of, normal developmental positions.

Of the many astute suggestions which Miss Freud offers in her chapter on the possibilities of therapy, one strikes me as particularly apt: "We need to be absolutely certain of the classification of a given case before taking the choice of therapeutic element away from the patient and into our own hands, i.e., before limiting the chances of therapy to one single factor." And Miss Freud feels—humbly but, from her experience, correctly: "As our assessment stands today, however, such accuracy of diagnostic judgment seems to me an ideal to be realized not in our present stage of knowledge but in the distant future."

Her bibliography reads like a Who's Who in child analysis, both in the German and in the English literature, extending from her father's early writings, such as "On the Psychological Mecha-

nism on Hysterical Phenomena," a lecture which he delivered in 1893, to recent publications by Lois Murphy, L. Levy, or D. W. Winnicott, to mention just a few. This is a stretch of more than seventy years. The bibliography also includes ego psychologists, such as Hartmann, Kris, et al. For reasons best known to Miss Freud, Erikson is not included either in the text or in the bibliography. While *Normality and Pathology in Childhood* does not

surpass Sigmund Freud's writings as foundation of psychoanalytic theory and practice, it is a milestone beyond Freud's writings as *the* text in child psychology which no serious student of psychology can afford to overlook. Anna Freud has given us a gift which perhaps later generations will be more appreciative of than the present.

HANS A. ILLING

The Hacker Clinic, Beverly Hills