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BOOK REVIEWS


In Social Science we are still confronted with the situation that self-made men, biologists, well intentioned reformists, innocent of any real knowledge in the field become audible more often than people familiar with both the theory and the practice of government or any other form of social control. It should be said that this book contains several chapters written by first rate specialists, who really know the problems of government and are at the same time familiar with the European literature, i.e. the writings of Max Weber, Roberto Michels, Hans Kelsen, and others.

In his own introductory article Roucek refers to social control as to processes, planned or unplanned, by which individuals are taught, persuaded or compelled to conform to the usages of groups. It is indeed one of the biggest errors committed by many writers on politics, propaganda and social control that they do not think of those basic unplanned processes that precede any intentional purpose: in fact the latter would not be possible without the former. It is particularly one of the errors of democratic control and democratic propaganda that this is often overlooked.

Each chapter of this book carries its own bibliography and summary. The latter is in most all chapters excellent. The bibliography, although not complete of course, lists the important publications.

Sum total: this is a book that criminologists and especially those trained in the biological viewpoints could read to great advantage.

New York City

VLADIMIR ELIASBERG


The research findings in this study are presented in two parts: The Nature of the Opiate Habit, and Opiate Addiction as a Social Problem. There is a short introduction by Herbert Blumer, a selected bibliography, and a glossary of terms used by addicts.

This should be a standard work for treatment specialists and indispensable to anyone who will deal with drug addicts. It could be studied with profit in pre-medical, in pre-legal and in pre-social work courses. It should be required reading for police officers in training. The student in social science research could well begin the study of Methods in Chapter I.

Only opiate drugs are considered. A distinction between addiction and habituation is made. Habituation is physiological and non-psychological. "The term 'addiction' is limited to users in whom the occurrence of the physiological conditions is accompanied by a 'craving' or desire independent of its biological origin." Since the person is always a social-organic-mental unity it is hard to see how "physiological factors occur in isolation" apart from a desire or an attitude. Physiological factors cannot occur in isolation. Even habitual eating is a social-psychological as well as a physical event. "The desire for the drug" can not be "an independent psychological complex". Like all human experiences it is a social-organic-mental complex. Only emotional intensity sets addition
off from habituation. Addiction is not a biochemical phenomenon; neither is habituation.

"Addiction occurs only when opiates are used to alleviate withdrawal distress, after it has been properly understood or interpreted, that is to say, after it has been represented to the individual in terms of linguistic symbols and cultural patterns which have grown up around the opiated habit." Society is indebted to the author for this contribution since it should revolutionize treatment procedures. It shows that the habit exists not alone in an individual but in society as well, which is true of any aspect of the life of the person.

Professor Lindesmith thinks the patient should not know that he is getting morphine and should not know he is suffering from withdrawal distress. There is mass education so this is not possible. What is needed is an explanation of withdrawal distress. A person is a functioning unity and when any integrated aspect of life is removed there is withdrawal distress. The degree of distress is probably greater in drug addiction but it is not entirely different from the withdrawal distress suffered every day by humans. The drug addict must not think that his problem is unique.

The reviewer does not agree with the author "that the withdrawal distress in its organic aspects is entirely outside the field of social psychology." This is an attitudinal experience with a part of the person's environment. The drug addict's environment is physical, social and mental. This is the framework that must replace the biological framework of the past.

This study is one of the outstanding contributions in the field of human behavior. There is not space here to deal with it properly. It deserves an article rather than a review.

Rhode Island State College  

L. Guy Brown


Commenting on the objectives of the Advisory Committee under whose direction the new Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure was prepared, Judge George Z. Medalie said that it was the ambition of the Committee to make it possible for any lawyer "to walk into any court room in the trial of a criminal case, or in the conduct of any of the preliminaries, and have in the side pocket of his coat, taking up less space than a packet of cigarettes, all the learning he needed or the court could possibly use on the subject." How well this particular objective was achieved is exemplified by this volume. In a small handy volume the New York University School of Law has preserved: (a) the new criminal rules; (b) the proceedings of an Institute conducted by its School of Law; (c) the table of suggested forms of pleadings, and (d) a bibliography of articles concerning the new rules.

Differences of opinion concerning the meaning and applicability of the new rules are sure to arise during the years immediately following their adoption. To resolve such differences it will be frequently necessary to have recourse to the background of their formulation, to the notes of those who served in their preparation, and to the comments of responsible groups who gave much study to their phraseology. The busy practitioner
will find here conveniently preserved all of the material necessary to the
consideration and resolution of any question arising under the Rules.

Attorney at Law, Chicago

JAMES J. MAGNER

CHILD OFFENDER. By Harriet L. Goldberg. Grune and Stratton, New

Using the broad background and locale of cases in the New York City's
Children's Court, Dr. Goldberg, attorney and psychologist, shows the con-
siderable disregard for problem children by the community. Her canvas
portrays insufficient public action, at too late a date, insufficient public
and private facilities for youngsters needing special help.

It does not add to the stature of one school principal asked to help a
mis-behaving child: "I'll help him to jail." One cannot help wondering
about the psychology practiced by this principal, his stability, and his
vital concern for a pupil who does not fit into the educational grooves
carved by a curriculum!

There is help at hand, says Dr. Goldberg, for the youngster, only after
he is so serious a problem that he threatens the life, safety or welfare of
himself, his associates or the community. This help is available, too often,
only when the behavior pattern has become chronic, instead of aid when
it is incipient.

Perhaps two ideas stand out most clearly. Youngsters are aided—when
reached in sufficient time—either by diagnosis of mental illness, mental
deficiency or other basic difficulties.

But the volume (it is rather short) also stresses two phases of public
attitudes—from the vengeance school of thought and from the legalistic
concept of behavior.

    The vengeance school of thought says that a child who violates the rules
(school rules, home rules, adult laws) shall be punished. That punish-
ment must follow a more or less pre-determined pattern set up to cover
acts and situations, rather than persons and personalities.

    That school of thought insists that no action be taken until and unless
there is definite, provable and specific behavior by a youngster. And the
action taken must fall within prior determination of conduct.

    In this philosophy, there is little room—even within the current con-
cept of juvenile court procedures—for viewing the individual youngster
and his problems, his tensions, mal-adjustments or social milieu. There is
no room, here, for prevention, early treatment, individual differences
between youngsters in the same school, neighborhood, family.

    The physician, years ago, knew better than this mass treatment pro-
gram. But educators, community-minded persons apparently prefer to
hide their ignorance of human behavior, to hide their unwillingness to
scrutinize their own methods to look for modern methods—to hide them
all under the cloak of uniformity of action and "fair justice."

    That ignorance totally disregards the possibilities of salvaging mis-
derstood youth through the help even now available by giving young
people understanding of self and family.

    Perhaps even greater is the indictment of the confining legal concepts
surrounding the juvenile courts and their specialized branches. We still
adhere rather literally to the required minimal degree of offending beha-
vior before deeming it possible to invoke court aid to help youngsters.
Law has not yet become sufficiently flexible to help youngsters with their
problems.
Years ago, the truant officer was a two-hundred pound man, with some educational background who was chosen primarily for his size and brawn. He was the school policeman who kept the child in school by force, the boy and girl who was over-sized, or slow to learn and made him comply with the legal requirements of school attendance. That was an honest viewpoint.

But the change in name, to attendance officers, is almost dishonest—at least to the extent that the added knowledge of behavior has not accompanied the change of name. Problem children are removed from the usual schoolroom today only after much delay. Even where there is diagnosis—often late—the community has not provided the treatment facilities. We are not being honest with ourselves nor with the children.

Our laws say we may hold a boy in an institution, until one age, a girl until another age—both unrelated to the needs or possibilities of their continued treatment in correctional schools. Care for the feebleminded or insane is not too difficult to obtain, once diagnosed. That comes, in major part, because these institutions have been taken over by medical authorities, rather than correctional people. Both of these groups can be segregated and treated once someone in the community has been stirred sufficiently (or the child has acted with sufficient aggression) to secure a diagnosis.

But we have almost no facility for the child who should be removed from his home because of more or less ordinary mal-adjustment. Where is the facility for the aggressive child who is neither feebleminded nor psychotic? In the great city of New York, such facilities are meagre. One can project this into smaller communities and probably find few or no units available.

The era of mass treatment of children must come to an end. It is time to look to the individual child and to gear community patterns toward helping that youngster, without too great concern with the behavior acts he shows.

Dr. Goldberg points out the unwillingness of judges to accept the diagnosis of psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers at their face value. Judges, they say, know more about human conduct than other professional people. Actually, responsibility for this comes down hard upon the heads of these same professional groups. In many states, as in mine, any physician (general practitioner known to the judge) is legally competent to act as a commissioner in lunacy. The professional groups have been asleep at the switch too long. Despite their reputations, they have been complacent. They have left untouched, in many areas, their major job of publicity and public relations, even from a selfish viewpoint... which says that only psychiatrists (recognized by their own profession) may diagnose mental illness, etc.

The writer has been active in the defense (from a social worker’s position) in more than one murder charge. While the personality of the defendant (well investigated and studied) called for probation, the legalistic-moralistic view prevailed: “Murder has been committed and there is only one way to deal with murder... by imprisonment (even though thousands of years of experience has shown the futility of imprisonment).”

Dr. Goldberg’s court cases mean that her records deal, generally, with persons of small means. In the reviewer’s experience as a private social worker, the same situation is often found. The school—even in middle-class areas—fails to spot the failing child until two or more semesters
have passed or the child who is aggressive or who is troubled . . . until considerable time elapses or the behavior becomes more serious. And when diagnosis is finally made, the question is ever-present: Where the public or private facilities within the means of even middle-class families?

Perhaps this is the time for a revolutionary attack on the current concepts, the current lethargy—away from mass treatment which has lulled us into slumber and to individualized attention to the personality of the child.

We feel that the author (who is not related to the reviewer) has done a major service. We hope her views help to stir up that degree of dissatisfaction with present methods which is the prelude to advanced knowledge and treatment.

Counselling Service, Detroit

W. A. Goldberg, Ph.D.


The authoress, like her distinguished brother, Jawalarlal Nehru, and all other members of their family, was imprisoned for political activity. In this book, she tells in some detail what life is like in an Indian prison and gives vivid pen-pictures of twelve women she came to know there. Some were "politicals" like herself; others, of the "criminal" class. She describes their experiences resulting in confinement, and the institutional conditions to which they were then subjected under which such unfortunate women are expected to learn dignity and self respect.

This is not a professional treatise nor an objective study of the subject of institutional treatment in India. Rather, it is a discursive presentation of selected case histories, subjective in approach, by a person who was understandably moved by her own experience of confinement and by the hardships of less fortunate women whom she met while in confinement. It has for its purpose a protest against the conditions under which women must be confined, and the absurdity of any contention that, within such a brutal atmosphere, any reformation can be accomplished. She points this out in these words "... punishment as it is meted out in jails can never reform human beings. The very denial of human dignity arouses the evil instincts of the convict instead of creating the necessary desire for a social existence".

Valuable or not for us, this book is, nevertheless, interesting and moving. It presents a graphic introduction to this little known phase of penal treatment of women offenders in India. It will leave the reader with the hope that this plea for penal reform will not go unheeded, and that it is the forerunner of many others to follow which will awaken the social consciousness of the people of India to the concept and enlightened practices of progressive penology.

U.S.N. Correctional Institutions, Portsmouth, N. H.

Edmund R. East


The author describes this book as a discussion of the neuroses—"those manifold miseries which are embraced within the general category of psychasthenia, neurasthenia, hysteria, and the allied functional nervous
disorders." The borderline disturbances of human personality that lie in "no man's land" between the neuroses and forms of insanity receive special attention. Several chapters are given to making clear for the layman such mental illnesses as paranoia, dementia praecox, and others.

The student of juvenile delinquents and criminals will turn to Dr. Sadler's Chapter XIV—"Compulsions and Obsessions." Every individual from his childhood on has his compulsions or drives toward what will satisfy one and another of his fundamental interests. It may be an interest in adventure, possession, sex experience or social recognition. It is the part of wisdom in parents and teachers to guide the expressions of the inner urges of children in such ways that social codes are not violated by their behavior. Violations of the codes are to be interpreted as symptoms of drives that have been twisted or perverted in the course of growth. Sometimes they are in the form of subconsciously "getting even with the Old Man" or "the Old Woman" as in the loveless home in which the child lacks the sense of security that his nature craves.

It will occur to the reader that for mental and moral health nothing is more important than that future parents and teachers should assimilate such material as that in which this book abounds. It is rich in extracts from case histories that the author has accumulated and digested in the course of many years of professional practice. Thirty-four chapters cover as many subjects and the whole is a comprehensive clearly-written volume.

Evanston, Illinois

ROBERT H. GAULT