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of views followed concerning the significance of the policies and decisions made by the Penitentiaries Branch and the Parole Board to the initial assessment by the trial judge of what sentence he should impose in particular cases.

During the afternoon session, Chief Justice Ilsley opened a discussion on the effects which some of the 1961 amendments to the Criminal Code may have upon the judge's responsibility of deciding which of the alternative sentences now provided under the criminal law will best strike a just balance among the interrelated, but sometimes conflicting, objectives of protecting society, deterring other potential offenders, and the need to deter or reform the individual prisoner. In the ensuing discussion special emphasis was placed on the importance of providing the courts with comprehensive and reliable information regarding the offenders' previous background which should be taken into account, together with the nature and seriousness of the crime committed, in determining the kind and length of sentence to be imposed.

The final session of the conference was opened by the Attorney-General of Nova Scotia, Mr. R. A. Donahoe, who outlined the Provincial Government's responsibilities and plans for the future development of the correctional system in Nova Scotia. Among the subjects later discussed were the implications, so far as Nova Scotia prisons are concerned, of decisions reached at the Dominion-Provincial conference on correctional reform in 1958, the case-loads presently undertaken by the existing probation officers in the Province, and the need for an expansion in both the adult and juvenile probation staff now available to the criminal courts.

BOOK REVIEWS


The reader of this book will be forgiven if, because of its title, he is misled to anticipate that, at very least, he will read a serious study of the Beat colony in San Francisco's North Beach neighborhood. With only a cursory perusal of its contents however, he will quickly intuit that while this may at one time have been the intent of the research whence the volume derives, somewhere along the line it was laid aside in favor of the headier rewards of popular success and cocktail hour acclaim. What we are offered is essentially a glossy, "easily understandable," "informative" account of the Beat condition and its human personifications—an effort spiritually akin, though journalistically inferior, to the Vance Packard genre of social analysis, but one wholly as deficient in any rigorous consideration of the social and historical issues clearly implicated in the phenomenon of "beatness." (Cf. the considerably briefer and infinitely more provocative piece by Ned Polsky, "The Village Beat Scene: Summer 1960," 8 Dissent 3 (Summer 1961).)

The research consists of a clinical psychological workup of fifty-one certified Beats plus a certain amount of will o' the wisp participant observation by one of the authors. True, the data are here; in tedious excess, in fact—the MMPI profiles, the Rorschach and TAT protocols, the few sketchy paragraphs on social class origins, the residential statistics, etc. But these too serve mainly as window dressing, an intellectual loss leader, as it were, designed exclusively for the professional reader who, it is hoped, will find his way into the premises along with the jostling mob of wholesome, wide-eyed tourists and thrill seekers. For, having paid the price of admission, it is at once evident that the data, such as they are, bear no clear or necessary relationship to the text, which reflects (as much as an ostensible
work in social science can be made to reflect) the aesthetic of the travelogue.

The telling traces of kitsch are all here: the patronizing, cute, and “in” chapter titles (“Making the Scene,” “On the Road,” “Kicks”); the between-the-lines name dropping of prominent Beat personalities and publicists; the pandering to professional audiences through, for example, the facile “discovery” of six basic Beat personality types—“the Tormented Rebels,” “the Lonely Ones,” “the Beat Madonnas,” etc.; the liberal bracketing of all technical references by quotation marks (the “Project,” the “structured” tests, “style of life,” “raw” scores), as if to apologize to the lay reader for their unavoidable inclusion; and (in the sadly mistaken assumption that it is narratively refreshing as well as documentative) the resort to reams of Beat poetry, prose, and protest, the vast bulk of which is merely thrown in for presumed literary or human interest effect. One whole chapter with the pretentious title of “The Case for Creativity” consists entirely of such matter, save for a few lines of preface in which the authors state, wholly gratuitously I might add, “For some idea of what they [the Beats] produce, we reprint here a small anthology of Beat poetry.”

Why go on? Suffice it to say, the interested student will not find here an original, systematic, or, for that matter, particularly informed treatment of any one of a number of significant issues suggested by the book’s title. Inter alia, there is, for example, no sustained or even implicit discussion of such topics as the historical and sociological connections of the Beat bohemia with other American bohemias, past and present; the structural and functional significance of Bohemia in general, and the Beats in particular, for an advanced industrial society; the similarities and differences of this form of nonconformity to other forms extant in contemporary life; the induction processes, life contingencies and distinctive kinds of ego identity that account for the recruitment of some but not other persons of essentially similar social backgrounds to the Beat and related demi-mondes.

For the investigator in such fields as social deviance and criminology these questions remain in all their complexity and are in no measure resolved by the publication of this volume.

Fred Davis
San Francisco Medical Center
University of California


Under the English Criminal Justice Act of 1948, Attendance Centres were developed for young offenders for whom prolonged training in an approved school or borstal seemed too drastic, but for whom probation alone appeared insufficient. The opening of the first experimental centre in 1950 was followed by rapid expansion. There are now 40 centres in industrial areas, and no fewer than 2,500 young offenders were sent to them in 1960. It appears that even greater use will be made of sentences to the centres in the future, either as independent measures or in conjunction with probation orders.

Attendance Centres reports upon an enquiry into these centres carried out under the auspices of the Cambridge Institute of Criminology. The staff of the Institute visited and studied nine of the centres, interviewed magistrates, probation officers, and other authorities, and made a detailed analysis of all available data concerning 1,200 juvenile offenders sent to the centres. The conduct of the offenders after discharge from the centres has been followed up, and predictive techniques have been applied, distinguishing between first offenders and those with previous offenses, and also between those who were on probation and those who were not.

The report consists of five chapters: “The Emergence of Attendance Centres as a Measure for Dealing with Young Offenders,” “The Sentencing Practice of the Courts,” “The Regime of the Attendance Centres,” “Penal Records and Social Background of the Offenders,” and “The Effectiveness of Attendance Centre Orders and the Extent to which Prediction Is Possible.” Appendices contain additional information needed to understand the centres and the study.

The book is a useful guide to the background, development and operation of attendance centres. With a few exceptions, the study and its interpretations were carried out in a workmanlike manner. It is a nonexperimental study; consequently it cannot provide safeguards such as random assignment of subjects to experimental and control groups, direct manipulation of experimental variables, and control over some of the extraneous variables that might operate during the course of the experiment. And even within the framework
of a descriptive study, certain factors in the centre's operations made it difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of the centres' programs.

First, the class of offenders is inadequately defined, as "juveniles guilty of the less serious offenses and whose delinquency could be regarded as still at an early age...[the group being] restricted to first offenders or to those who, having been found guilty on one or more previous occasions, have not previously been confined in a correctional institution (approved school, detention centre, borstal institution or prison) and whose previous treatment has therefore usually consisted in either a discharge, a fine or a term of probation." (p. 23) This describes the offenders in terms of their offenses (less serious and first) at an early age. It is overly general and unsystematic, and the youngsters so labeled undoubtedly represent a vast array of problems emerging from a variety of conditions. A classification system using social and psychological concepts, though complex and loaded with problems, would have provided a more fruitful frame of reference.

Second, the centres did not have a systematic model of treatment—an overall theory and an accompanying set of procedures and techniques to use in their work. Three general programs emerged in practice, designed: "(1) to have a punitive effect and nothing more; or (2) to combine punishment (the performance of fatigues) with a course of instruction or training; or (3) to aim solely at reclaiming and instructing. The types reflect to a large extent the personal views of the officers in charge. But all are alike in demanding high standards of discipline and show a uniformly prevailing spirit of smartness and alertness." (p. 46) This description suggests the requirement of compliant behavior through punishment. The personal views of the officers (generally police and untrained in rehabilitation work) gave rise to a variety of practices.

Third, the recording of the program activities in the various centres was not sufficiently detailed or sophisticated to offer a genuine record of the treatment process.

In summary, the lack of experimental conditions under which the attendance centres' programs were carried out, along with the absence of a clear diagnostic classification scheme, the vague definition of its treatment program, and the lack of detailed treatment records leave the reader with many questions as to who was treated, under what conditions, and with what degree of effectiveness. Other issues about the organization of services for delinquent children will come to the reader's mind. First, should the police be involved in rehabilitative work to the degree of operating centres? This reviewer considers that the police can serve most effectively in delinquency control in their traditional role. Second, is a program that derives its procedures and practices from a punitive philosophy appropriate and apt to be the most effective? Again, this reviewer considers that such a program is neither appropriate nor apt to be the most effective.

GEORGE H. WEBER
Children's Bureau
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington 25, D. C.

COMMON SENSE ABOUT CRIME AND PUNISHMENT.
Pp. 175. $2.95.

Mr. Rolph, an editor of the New Statesman and a contributor to other British and American periodicals, writes from a background of wide personal experience as a former Chief Inspector of the City of London police. In this small volume he has tried to cover a broad range of problems surrounding crime and punishment as they exist in Great Britain. The book is one of a series (Common Sense About Russia, China, Africa, Race, Religion, etc.) aimed at the general public. For the professional reader, the limitations of this kind of presentation are implicit in the publishers' instructions to series authors: "to assume no special knowledge of the subject on the part of their readers; second, to write in a manner immediately intelligible to any man or woman—or, for that matter, to any boy or girl—of average education; and, third, to be as objective as possible." In large measure Mr. Rolph succeeds in writing a lucid, sensible, informed, and humane survey of British criminal justice. However, professional criminologists may question selective emphases in the book and may feel that the need for brevity has resulted in a somewhat incomplete treatment of particular topics.

The first part of the book deals with basic definitions, theories of crime causation, and the legal requirements for the commission of specific offenses. In discussing causation, Rolph quotes from Lord Pakenham's Causes of Crime a list of nine influences that can be associated with crime, four of which (moral atmosphere of the time,
poverty, police efficiency, and punishment as a cause of crime) he singles out for special attention. This section ranges widely—from the ambivalence toward government associated with tax avoidance to the “invincible self-satisfaction” of the habitual thief; from the limitations of forensic science to the fact that “punishment without love is an unmitigated evil.” It might have been useful to include more discussion of traditional explanations of crime, particularly theories emphasizing personal characteristics of the offender, since this is an area in which public misconceptions abound.

In the chapter entitled “What Kinds of Crime?” the author explains clearly and concisely the basic elements of various specific crimes. Because of the common law background of American jurisprudence, many of the principles of British criminal law stated here apply also in this country. But in the absence of annotation, the uninformed American reader will have no way of knowing that this is so, or of recognizing instances in which it is not so. Some slight editing of the American edition could have avoided such difficulties and would have made the volume doubly informative for interested Americans. This chapter suggests the desirability of some comparable effort to spell out the elements of American criminal law, preferably in paperback form designed for mass circulation.

The remainder of the book comprises astute discussion of police practices, capital and corporal punishment, imprisonment, probation, and after-care. To some observers Rolph may seem too little concerned with the dangers of law enforcement abuse, as regards the problems of self-incrimination, search and seizure, and arrest. Perhaps in Britain, where the “war against crime” proceeds in calmer fashion than here, there is less need for worry about such matters. The chapter on capital punishment (Rolph is also co-author, with Arthur Koestler, of Hanged by The Neck) is excellent and contains a useful little chart giving arguments and counter-arguments for retention and abolition. Also very well done is the chapter on corporal punishment, with some descriptions of flogging that should give any reader pause. The author then surveys correctional developments in Britain, stressing on the one hand the indignities and social wastes of much traditional imprisonment and on the other the advantages of open institutions, group counselling, and meaningful compensated prison work. Similarly, with regard to probation and after-care, he indicates the difficulties now prevailing and avenues for future reform. His book concludes on the optimistic note (drawn from a speech by Winston Churchill) that “there is a treasure, if you can only find it, in the heart of every man.” It is our job, says Rolph, to find it.

Overall, this is an intelligent little book. Though not as comprehensively factual as a few somewhat similar efforts, such as Elkin, The English Penal System and H. Jones, Crime and the Penal System, Rolph’s provocative comments should enhance reader interest. The author displays a rare combination: awareness of practical police problems, scholarly objectivity, and a strong and progressive interest in reform.

EDWIN M. SCHUR
Tufts University


This beautifully bound book, with its blood-and-dagger dust jacket, at once impresses the reviewer as an ideal Christmas or birthday gift for the aficionado of detective lore. An examination of the contents abundantly confirms that impression. Here, retold in concise form, are Dreyfus’ sad tale of justice miscarried, the still debated Sacco-Vanzetti case, the Lindbergh kidnapping, the vampire murders of Peter Kürten, Dr. Crippen’s murder-triggered escapade (which sparked the inauguration of police radio), and many others. Pirates and highwaymen who dangled from the end of the rope centuries ago here vividly parade before our eyes. The volume transcends the usual limitations of individual criminality by giving us capsuled information on the criminality of recent group fanaticism as well, the white (KKK) and the black (Mau Mau), the brown (the Third Reich genocides) and the red (atom spies). Not only the hunted, but the hunters as well are included—in word and picture—and so it happens that Sir Patrick Hastings, the famous barrister, faces Neville Heath, the murderer (pp. 124–25), Sir Edward Henry, the daktyloscopist, keeps company with Alger Hiss (pp. 126–27), and, when the book is closed, J. Edgar Hoover comes to rest right under Guy Fawkes and his gun powder plotters (pp. 116–17).

The book covers an infinite variety of topics, including all types of criminality, criminalistics
and criminology, forensic medicine and psychiatry, as well as criminal law and procedure, all liberally cross-referred. A concise subject bibliography (pp. 345–51) leads the aficionado to additional readings, among which we find generally the more journalistic books of the pros. Aimed principally at the reflection of “expressions of popular interest in crime and... the fascination crime holds for many writers and readers” (p. 9), the book nevertheless is of some value to the criminologist in need of a quick reference to a subject of some other criminological discipline. Within its limitations, the book is quite successful in achieving the aim. The contributions are of a high caliber, though often so extremely concise as to be a bit misleading.

Sir Harold Scott (Your Obedient Servant and Scotland Yard) conducted this harmonious criminological symphony, played by 40 virtuosi of the profession, mostly British, but some foreign (American, French, German—which, incidentally, marks the geographical limitation of coverage). The publishers, it seems to me, underestimated the sales appeal of this book, for they deemed it necessary to resort to inflated claims on the inside flap: “by more authorities on the vast underworld of the lawless than have ever been brought together in one book.” The claim is false, since Branham and Kutasch’s Encyclopedia of Criminology (1949) numbered 61 contributors as against 40 in the instant volume. But what does it matter? It’s what’s on the canvas that counts, not the number of artists who painted it!

Sir Harold Scott (Your Obedient Servant and Scotland Yard) conducted this harmonious criminological symphony, played by 40 virtuosi of the profession, mostly British, but some foreign (American, French, German—which, incidentally, marks the geographical limitation of coverage). The publishers, it seems to me, underestimated the sales appeal of this book, for they deemed it necessary to resort to inflated claims on the inside flap: “by more authorities on the vast underworld of the lawless than have ever been brought together in one book.” The claim is false, since Branham and Kutasch’s Encyclopedia of Criminology (1949) numbered 61 contributors as against 40 in the instant volume. But what does it matter? It’s what’s on the canvas that counts, not the number of artists who painted it!

Gerhard O. W. Mueller

New York University


Again this reviewer has the privilege of reviewing for this Journal the annual Forum. Again companion volumes to the Forum, containing additional papers, may be found in Community Organization, 1961 (published by the Columbia University Press), and in Casework Papers, 1961 and New Perspectives on Group Work: Theory, Organization, and Practice.

Formerly the Conference was called “The National Conference of Social Work,” and, while it always hoped to interest other groups, the editors now explicitly state that the Conference papers furnish a “two-way channel of communication between paid and volunteer workers, between social work and allied fields, and between the functional services and the profession.” The theme of the 88th Annual Forum was “Concern for Human Welfare: Unifying Force for Survival.” The theme is reflected in this volume in the four categories into which the papers fall: (1) “Toward the Elimination of Poverty,” (2) “Social Work Practice,” (3) “International Social Welfare,” and (4) “Perspectives.” The editors are careful to point out that “a change in the Federal Administration took place just a few months prior to the Conference,” and add that the change was reflected by welcoming “to its platform several leaders representative of the change.” Two of these leaders were President John F. Kennedy, who sent a “Message” to the Conference, and his Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff, who delivered an address entitled “The New Administration Looks at Social Welfare.” Other leaders were the new Under-Secretary of H.E.W., Wilbur J. Cohen, speaking on “Medical Care Legislation,” and the United States Senator from Minnesota, Eugene J. McCarthy, probing into “The Anatomy of Poverty.”

However, the meat of the Proceedings has always been the contribution of social scientists and social work practitioners to the field of social welfare. Here, only the third category, entitled “Social Work Practice,” properly belongs to the profession of social work. Regrettably, this third part contains only six papers out of the 21 published. Of these papers, I would single out two as particularly worthwhile for the profession. Ruth Fizdale speaks on “The Rising Demand for Private Casework Services,” a topic still controversial with many of the rank and file social workers as well as the higher echelons. Miss Fizdale has been known for her writings in this particular area for some time and has been a courageous as well as a persuasive advocate of social workers engaged in private practice. The Proceedings may thus be said to have given official recognition for the first time to the belief that the trend towards private practice among social workers has become irreversible, or to use the words of Professor Sherman Merle in the current issue of Social Work, that the clock cannot be turned back in a development which is natural and logical. What dis-
tinnitus a private practice or a private fee-
charging agency from a community agency? Is
the former "social work"? Miss Fizdale answers:
"It is clear from a review of the experience of two
private services that their clients are asking for
the same things as are the clients of social
agencies." She adds that "clients who seek private
service also reflect the inaccurate public image of
the social work profession," and goes on to appeal
to her fellow-social workers, Professor Merle
included, "to examine the causes of our own
reluctance to serve these clients."

The other paper selected for discussion here
deals with "Preventive Casework: Problems and
Implications"; the author is Howard J. Parad,
Director of Smith College School of Social Work.
Dr. Parad submits three theses. First, agencies
should provide a program of short-term, person-
to-person casework, and focus upon intervention
in the affairs of families under stress in order to
prevent family breakdown. Certainly, programs
of this sort would be supported by parole and proba-
tion workers, who often call this method a "bread-
and-butter" approach to the social problems of
their charges. Second, when this short-term
casework approach is located in a range of pre-
ventive social work activities, it may be viewed as
"early secondary prevention." Dr. Parad feels
that the prevention "outweighs its remedial
aspects." While this is quite true, I fail to see a
rational for this attitude provided that "secondary
prevention" is successful. Third, Dr. Parad
asserts that "more rational organization of family-
oriented social services will enable us to identify,
reach, and serve a larger number of families in acute
stressful situations with an increasingly effective,
planned type of preventive intervention which
makes more meaningful use of limited profes-
sional resources of time and staff." If I understand
this sentence correctly, this would imply that
reaching more families puts a strain on the pro-
fessional resources of time and staff and, therefore,
they are more "limited." It is a truism that, in the
correctional settings of parole and probation
systems, this sentence should be placed on the desk
of every executive and staff-member, as caseloads
are still by far too high to serve the individual
or his family in either a preventive or a curative
way. The author surely does not wish to be under-
stood as pleading for superficiality or poorer
quality of service. But in the course of the daily
pressures, the worker, whether in family agencies
or in correctional settings, is not always aware
how to plan preventive intervention effectively.
This is not to say that his shortcomings are his
alone; it is to say that his problems are those of
his executives, too, who must share in his re-
sponsibility to give better and more service to his
clients or patients, without diluting the quality of
service of the professionally trained individual.

The present Forum reflects, perhaps, the trends
of our time, and of the last year specifically,
because the Conference held high hopes for rapid
progress as a result of the "change" in our Ad-
ministration. Since the papers were composed and
delivered, nearly a year has passed, and some of
the hopes are reflected anew in the President's
"Message of the Union" at the beginning of the
convening Congress in 1962. These hopes are
shared by this reviewer.

HANS A. ILLING

Los Angeles

STRAFRECHT-ALLGEMEINER TEIL (Criminal Law-
General Part). By Jürgen Baumann. Bielefeld:
Verlag Ernst und Werner Gieseking, 1961.
Pp. xxiv, 623. DM 29—.

Unnoticed in this country in mid-1960, a
young—if not the youngest—German criminal
law professor published a handsome tome, in
eye-pleasing print and composition, with the
rather customary title Strafrecht—Allgemeiner
Teil (Criminal Law—General Part). But the title
is just about the only customary thing about the
book, which is now before us in its mature second
dition. Unusual is the mere fact that a second
dition was called for within one year. Unusual is
the fact that in today's Germany it is possible for
such a young scholar to occupy a leading chair
of criminal law and to produce a work of such
magnitude and insight. Unusual is the fact that
this teaching tool—vying for a student market
already bursting with competent teaching tools—
emanated from a publishing house which hereto-
fore, at least in this country, was not regarded as
connected with criminal law publications. Unusual
is the author's inclusion of a graph explanatory of
the various theories of mens rea (p. 314; see also
p. 115). And unusual, ultimately, is the completely
novel approach to the presentation of topics.

The author skillfully employs what we in this
country have come to call the "problem method."
interspersed in the text—, some taken from Supreme Court decisions, some hypothetical. In either case, they are "typical" of the topic which the author then discusses. The problems are well selected, suitable to stimulate student interest, and well adapted for perusal in the subsequent textual elaboration by the author. Here is one of three problem cases prefacing the chapter on prerequisites for mens rea (§25, p. 294):

"c) Mrs. F has made up her mind to seek revenge on her husband. She beats him with a hammer in order to injure him. But seeing her bleeding husband lying on the floor, she becomes frightened. Now she decides to kill her husband and she inflicts several other non-deadly blows on him with a miner's pick. Doing so she is overcome by highly intense excitement (blood affectation) and blindly continues her blows. These latter blows are deadly. Is Mrs. F. subject to punishment? (Based on Supreme Court decision BGH St 7, 327)." (See p. 301 for solution.)

This skillful use of the problem method—the first in German criminal law, to the best of my knowledge—signals an extremely important break with the German scholarly custom of abstraction in the presentation of teaching materials. It is to be hoped that the new method will be widely imitated.

The coverage of the book itself does not break with tradition. It is extremely thorough, ranging from historical, bibliographical, comparative, jurisprudential, and analytical sections through the entire slate of topics encompassed by the General Part of the German Penal Code of 1871, not in accordance with the order adopted by the Code, but in the author's own logical order, i.e., the object of the criminal law (deed and doer), the elements of criminal conduct, the metamorphosis of criminal conduct (attempts, forms of participation, merger, and concurrence), and the punishments and measures, with a concluding discussion of juvenile law.

The author has documented his statements widely, and has thus catered to the needs of the German practicing bar. He never hesitates to refer to, or to take a stand on, the views of other authors. All topics are discussed with astounding maturity, although the author will probably wish to re-examine his standpoint on a variety of issues. To take a random example of the issues in need of re-thinking, I refer to his discussion of incapacity under section 51 of the German Penal Code. (p. 159) It is unquestionably true that the existing code treats only of incapacity to form the requisite mens rea or intent, and, unlike our M'Naghten test, leaves unconsidered the capacity to act in the first place. The author explains: "The child, too, and the mentally ill person, can act, as long as they can willingly direct their physical movements." (Ibid.) It seems to me the author feels too strongly tied to the solution which the German Penal Code has adopted. Should there not equally be an acquittal by reason of insanity if a defendant was not even capable of rational action? The current solution of the German Code, of course, results in the acquittal of both types of defendants. Yet, only he who is acquitted (by reason of insanity) for want of mens rea goes to an institution for the criminally insane, while the probably worse mental case, namely the person who could not engage in rational action in the first place, is acquitted outright. Moreover, the author's statement to the effect that there is conduct whenever there is capacity to determine (will) one's physical movement is no longer tenable in the present state of medical knowledge, whether or not one subscribes to psychoanalytical theory. Granted that, for purposes of the criminal law, the concept of conduct is a legal one (p. 153), it nevertheless must not be in conflict with the teachings of medical science. Criminal laws regulate only (rational) conduct, as distinguished from (irrational) behavior, as for example that of a fully demented person in the grip of schizophrenia and moving about under hallucinations. Bodily movement there may well be, but action, in the only meaningful sense of that term, there may well not be in such cases. The author's conservative views on conduct within the insanity issue are the more surprising in view of his immediately preceding, truly remarkable discussion of conduct in general (pp. 154-55), where he expressly excludes reflexes, somnambulism, narcosis-induced behavior, etc. Surely some reconciliation of these conflicting stands is mandatory.

All in all, however, this is one of the finest pieces of German scholarship to reach us in years. It is vigorous and enlightening, and, side by side with Schöngle-Schröder's Kommentar—which emanated from the same university (Tübingen)—it is one of the best guides to the practical and the academic criminal law of Germany.

Gerhard O. W. Mueller

New York University

This journal, the official publication of the British Academy of Forensic Sciences, represents a new venture into the broader field wherein the various scientific disciplines impinge upon the law and its enforcement. For the British Commonwealth it serves to cover the same broad field of scientific endeavor which, in the United States, is covered by the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, and by the American Journal of Forensic Science.

This new journal is under the guidance of an imposing list of men all pre-eminently qualified by training and experience in their several fields. The editor is the internationally-famous Francis E. Camps, M.D., D.T.M. & H., assisted by Peter Allsop, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, and Bernard Knight, M.B., B. Ch., and by H. J. Walls, B. Sc., Ph.D., and aided by a staff of thirteen Editorial Advisors and fifteen Overseas Correspondents (including Dr. Ward Smith, of Canada, and Drs. Richard Myers and Irving Sunshine of the United States).

In its present format the journal proposes to cover a wide range of material which will be of interest to both the forensic scientist and to courts and attorneys. Each issue is to lead off with an Editorial Section consisting of "comment both serious and not-so-serious on day-to-day matters of interest and also signed notes by Advisors of the Editorial Board upon subjects about which they feel strongly."

Original papers, many of them presented at sessions of the British Academy of Forensic Sciences, will be published in the journal. In this first number are such topics as discussions of the current status of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Forensic Science (by Dr. L. Radzinowicz, President of the British Academy), on "Available Facilities for Post Mortem Examinations" (by H. A. Sissons), "Myocarditis as a Cause of Sudden Obscure Death" (by Colin Corley), and "Diminished Legal Responsibility" (by Glanville Williams).

Another interesting feature is the proposed series of thumbnail biographical sketches of "Famous Forensic Scientists." The first to be so recognized in the initial issue is Dr. Milton Helpern, Medical Examiner, New York City. A second will be a salute to M. J. B. Orfila, father of forensic toxicology.

Not only will this journal publish original papers, but it has two reference sections which serve to apprise the reader of recent developments in the field of forensic sciences. The first of these, entitled "Law for the Scientist," consists of digests of court cases, statutes, and orders, and is designed to keep the scientist and physician abreast of legal developments and to show how courts are dealing with medical and scientific matters. Inasmuch as the laws of the British Commonwealth are somewhat different from those of the United States, this section will be of only academic interest in this country.

The other reference section consists of "Abstracts and References" to scientific work published in other journals. To some extent these are merely a listing of title, author, and journal. However, many papers are briefly abstracted so as to indicate their content. These abstracts enable the reader to decide which of the articles is likely to provide information of value and thus justify consulting the original publications. This abstract service is unique in the field of English publications in forensic science and follows the excellent pattern set by the outstanding German publication Deutsche Zeitschrift für die gesamte gerichtliche Medizin. It is hoped that this section will be developed and expanded, for in the opinion of this reviewer, it alone would justify the securing of this journal.

A brief index is provided on the last pages of the first issue. Presumably, comprehensive author and subject indices will be supplied at the end of each complete volume. Dr. Francis E. Camps and his editorial staff are to be complimented on this very creditable addition to the published literature in the field of forensic science.

C. W. Muehlberger
Crime Detection Laboratory
Michigan Department of Health
Lansing, Michigan


When I wrote my book Call Girl (N.Y.: Ballantine Books 1958) I was faced with a frequent query: "How do you know that the motivation
you describe holds true for prostitutes other than
the ones you studied?"

Since then other books have described remark-
ably similar dynamics for samples chosen from
other socio-economic strata of the world of pros-
titution in both England and America. Anonymous,
Streetwalker (N. Y.: Viking Press 1960); McManus,
Not For Love (N. Y.: G. P. Putnam's Sons 1960);
Rubin, The Life (N. Y.: Macmillan Company
1961). In all three of these books the perceptive
reader could find ample evidence for what seems to
me the existence of a prostitution syndrome, with
startlingly similar symptoms. These symptoms
include vengeful hatred of men, suicidal depres-
sion, and deep feelings of worthlessness and self-
hatred.

However, believers in the myth of the happy
prostitute as depicted, for instance, in the fantasy
of Never on Sunday, were not convinced. "How
about the prostitute in non-Anglo-Saxon coun-
tries, how about the French whore, surely she is
different?"

Unfortunately for their dreams, Maryse Choisy,
the former president of the French Psychoanalytic
Society, has now published another epitaph for the
myth. Her description of the symptomatology,
character, and etiology of French prostitutes and
pimps match almost identically their American
colleagues with whom I was familiar. Even their
dialogue is strangely familiar to one who knows
their American counterparts. In the course of my
work as a psychoanalyst, I have had the opportu-
nity to study many diagnostic categories. I have
yet to see one that ran so true to form as the prosti-
tute syndrome. Never was the French proverb,
"La plus ca change, la plus c'est le meme chose,"
more apt.

Dr. Choisy has devoted the first half of her slim
volume to a careful account of the analysis of two
prostitutes, two pimps, and a profile of the custo-
mor. This first section is informative and soundly
based on clinical evidence. Then, unfortunately,
she embarks on a fanciful, completely unsubstan-
tiated voyage into speculation about a mythical
struggle between patriarchal and matriarchal forms
of society which she labels the "Penic Wars." The
evidence she adduces for these interestingly titled
struggles is infinitesimal, as is too often the fashion
with psychoanalysts, particularly when they stray
out of their area of competence. Even less well
founded is her attempt to demonstrate that the
psychoanalytic view is the nearest approach to the
spiritual ideal. It is this latter belief which leads
her to the conclusion that prostitution will not
disappear "so long as our inner attitude toward
love is not transformed." The sentiment sounds
noble; I wish I knew exactly what she meant.

HAROLD GREENWALD

New York City

CHRONICLES OF SAN QUENTIN: THE BIOGRAPHY
OF A PRISON. By Kenneth Lamott. New York: David

The penitentiary at San Quentin, for many
years not only the Big House but the Biggest
House, is treated to an informal biography by
Kenneth Lamott, who worked as a high school
teacher at the prison in 1952 and has since pub-
lished a number of sophisticated short stories and
novels. There is nothing sophisticated about this
prison chronicle, however. It is, rather, little more
than a chronological history of the institution,
facilely put together, with the author adopting
various popular and superficial postures toward
the ingredients of the story as they unfold.

For penologists, the major value of the book will
be to provide additional factual documentation
concerning correctional institutions. For the so-
called general reader, the book provides an anec-
dotal catalogue of the usual blunderings, brutalities,
contradictions, and venalities that pervade the
story of prisons in the United States. For the
serious reader, the book is severely marred by the
author's quite callow and callous attitude toward
many human and social tragedies associated with
San Quentin. It is a dangerous literary game to try
to be clever about morbid things, and only a sure-
penned veteran should attempt to play at it. Mr.
Lamott has tried and lost, and the book suffers
greatly for the effort.

The volume is, however, replete with stray bits
of historical information interesting in and of them-
selves, and Mr. Lamott, assisted in his research by
his wife, has been diligent in unearthing such items.
San Quentin, he tells us, was named not for a
Spaniard but rather for an Indian who suffered
military defeat at the site where the institution
stands, and who was later informally canonized by
the settlers in the vague belief that such a gesture
would please the Indians. We also learn that
prison hulks, anchored in San Francisco Bay, were
employed by California for housing inmates be-
tween 1849 and 1853. There is, in addition, a
worthwhile tracing of the historic benefits and dis-
advantages of public and private management of prisons as both systems alternated during the early years of San Quentin.

Two well known figures in American criminology receive only a jaundiced appraisal from Mr. Lamott. The Reverend August Drähms, chaplain (successor to the "moral instructor") at San Quentin from 1891 to 1909 is depicted as a rather forbidding and inflexible individual, though admittedly an honest and dedicated scientist. The regime and person of Clinton Duffy is also written down by the author, who describes himself as "not an uncritical admirer" of the highly-regarded warden. The stated grounds for such denigration, however, are singularly unconvincing. Mr. Lamott's major pique seems to be directed toward the fact that the Warden received too much favorable publicity.

Perhaps the most symbolic episode in the entire book is the one sentence note that in 1929, as part of a field day at San Quentin, the inmates held a contest to catch a squealing pig which was named "Parole." Certainly, the volume does nothing to challenge the metaphorical note of a recent warden of San Quentin that the institution is "a blindfolded elephant lumbering along the edge of a precipice."

GILBERT GEIS
Department of Sociology
Los Angeles State College


The purpose of this study is to discover "What can be learned from routinely available public records that is useful in the planning of delinquency prevention and treatment programs?" (p. v) These routinely available public records are the machine punched face sheet information on juveniles referred to the Los Angeles County Probation Department during 1956. The book has ten short chapters devoted to the volume of delinquency, nature of offenses, age, sex, ethnic status, marital status of parents, geographic mobility, recidivism, sources of referral, and disposition. There are also chapters on delinquency causation, questions for further study and, finally, recommendations.

Since the study seems exclusively aimed at a Los Angeles audience, its local consumers will be in a better position than I to judge its value. I found some of the statistical findings interesting and others might be, providing they are set in an interpretive framework.

Unfortunately, the study seems to have been undertaken without any serious attention to the literature on delinquency or to specific problems of agency operation. Consequently the causation discussion is quite naive, and the handling of the data often poor. Furthermore, some of the recommendations seem clearly to have been decided in advance of the research, while others could have been made by simply looking at the face sheet. These weaknesses affect both the general and local utility of the book.

The classification of offenses and the treatment of recidivism will illustrate weaknesses in the handling of data. The grouping of offenses serves no purpose well and is the result of confusing several dimensions of classification. Legal definitions, ideas of objective social harm, and presumptions about causal process are combined in a way which is unclear logically and probably without practical use. Classing auto theft with such things as drunk driving because they all involve automobiles would seem to dictate the combining of illegitimate sexual relations, homosexuality, and homicide because they all involve bodies. Why shoplifting should ultimately be called a criminal act while auto theft is called an unacceptable impulse expression remains a mystery to me.

The authors caution that recidivism among juveniles may not indicate degree of anti-social involvement. "The most delinquent youngster, no matter how many offenses he commits, will not be defined as recidivist in Probation Department records as long as he remains under Departmental supervision." The tendency for probation officers to keep a case open longer if they have evidence of a new offense destroys case closing and reopening as an index of recidivism, and the study should not have tried to use it. But this action on the part of the officers implies that they at least see recidivism as indicative of antisocial involvement and index it in some other way. Lack of attention to either the copious literature on the measurement of recidivism or to the actual operating practices of the Probation Department results in a recommendation to practitioners not to use an index they do not seem to use anyway.

The recommendations for practice and further
research presented in the study seem mostly unexceptionable, but I question whether they required that the research be performed before the recommendations could be made. In one case the issue seems to have been decided well in advance of the research. Thus, of the descriptive variables associated with variations in referral rates, the authors label age, sex, and ethnicity as "untreatable" and parental marital status as "treatable."

Leaving aside the question whether family instability is in fact "treatable" with the required frequency of success, I wonder about the lack of interest in programs that might produce changes in the lives of minority group youngsters or in programs aimed at dealing with adolescence. In fact the book seems to label as "untreatable" all factors that do not fit in with a quite narrowly conceived commitment to social casework measures. One doubts that this commitment reflects more than prejudgment.

Other recommendations lack this quality of prejudgment but probably could have been made without the research. Most of the research recommendations, though sensible in themselves, fall into this class. Simple perusal of the face sheet would have indicated that more subtle data on family life and economic conditions not now "routinely" available would be nice to have. So too with the recommendation that data be reported on a census tract basis.

Lest these judgments be interpreted as professional snobbery on the part of a sociologist derogating social welfare policy-oriented research, let me add that I am convinced of the crucial significance of sophisticated policy-oriented research for both social science and social practice. Because I believe the problem to be so important, I have reviewed this book more extensively than it would otherwise warrant.

DAVID J. BORDUA
Department of Sociology
University of Michigan


This volume contains a well-balanced set of papers describing life under the highly bureaucratized system of social relationships controlling persons in prison. The first two chapters by Goffman represent an extended version of a paper first published in 1957. They contain dramatic accounts of life in organizations highly restrictive of a person's life. Goffman describes total institutions from the perspective of the inmate, the staff, and a third point of view which represents an anthropological, functional view of how the inmate's identity is reconstituted because of the general and specific ritual and ceremonial activities of the organization.

The two chapters by Goffman and the two by McCleery are similar; both are striking accounts by observers with intimate knowledge of everyday life in total institutions. McCleery uses the political order as his model, and like Goffman relies upon implicit observations which are quite convincing. Goffman and McCleery force us to sympathize with the inmate regardless of how he was placed into the institution. The materials by Goffman and McCleery, when viewed as dramatic glimpses of a totalitarian reality which the outsider can seldom appreciate, provide a realistic backdrop for the other chapters.

Galtung’s paper, like Goffman’s and McCleery’s, points out the organizational incompatibilities involved in prison activities and employs the perspective of one who knows the organization from the “inside.” Galtung, however, provides a more concrete picture of how the prisoner’s “external” characteristics, i.e., actual incarceration and punishment, are tied to the organizational dilemmas of control and rehabilitation. These dilemmas tend to make interest in changing “internal” conditions, (i.e., the prisoner’s psychic identity) a difficult enterprise, given the institution’s authority over the prisoner and its interest in seeing him accept and benefit from therapy or treatment.

Weber’s chapter on cottage parents shows the consequences of alteration from a custodial to a treatment orientation. He stresses the benefits of a completely professionalized, clinically oriented, staff, and points to the problems which can arise when those closest to the inmate are not clinically oriented.

The chapter by Schrag represents a brief but comprehensive coverage of sociological theory by which studies of crime, criminals and prisons should presumably be oriented. Schrag’s emphasis upon sociological theory and the importance of operational definitions and clear, reproducible findings constitutes excellent coverage of what research in criminology has long neglected. His references to inmate and staff perspectives for
developing researchable typologies provides a nice link between the theoretical and methodological issues with which he begins his chapter. His own work and that of his students are admired by this reviewer as examples of application of sociological theory and methodology to criminology rather than treatment of criminology as a special field of inquiry with divergent points of view, procedures, vested interests, and value-laden objectives.

The chapters by Wheeler and Garrity, following in the tradition set by Schrag, provide systematic empirical studies derived from sociological theory and provide the basis for comparable and replicable research. Wheeler's empirical study of the differential perception of staff and inmates concerning each other's social worlds shows, for example, that there is an "overperception" of conflict. He shows that persons in more visible, more centrally located positions (and therefore with better access to communication channels), who are also more verbal and recalcitrant, are the most influential inmates in generating among other inmates the over-perception of conflict. Garrity's chapter reports research which questions the notion that prisons produce crime and always affect prisoners negatively. He shows the usefulness of Schrag's inmate typology for describing the inmate community and discusses how being typed leads to participation in different social worlds with different kinds and amounts of social control.

The chapter by Glaser and Stratton reports some preliminary findings of a study directed by the senior author. The preliminary material leads the authors to question the use of social types by Schrag and others because of the exaggeration contained in such designations. Glaser and Stratton are attempting to obtain sequential information over time on prisoners as a means of making social types more precise. Their objections imply that any system of types commits the researcher to a measurement system which must exhaust the population in question. This means that if the types are exaggerations (and their users undoubtedly recognize this), then a certain amount of error will occur consistently. The theoretical and empirical problems here are whether some prisoners (and how many) do not fit the types, and whether other types tend to emerge, or existing types change over time.

This collection of essays and research papers is an excellent follow-up of the important S.S.R.C. monograph *Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison*. *The Prison* can be used as a supplementary text in both criminology and complex organization courses and can provide professional workers in the field of penology with the latest theoretical and empirical findings in the field.

AARON V. CICOUREL
University of California
Riverside