

only 2,500 votes to W. Walter Williams, now a leading Eisenhower consultant, in a statewide race. In view of the fact that Canwell came from the sparsely-populated "east side" of the Cascade Range, whereas Williams was a resident of Seattle, this was considered a strong showing. The only factor which could have made Canwell a contender was the publicity resulting from his chairmanship of the Un-American Activities Committee.

In 1952 Canwell won the nomination of the Republicans for Congressman-at-large. He lost the election by a slender margin to a Seattle Times reporter named Magnuson. This could be considered hopeful, in view of the Republican landslide. Yet here again, Canwell, from the least populous portion of the state, was pitted against a Seattle opponent. In addition, Magnuson is one of the most widely-known names in Washington state politics. Furthermore, it is a Scandinavian name, in a state with a larger proportionate Swedish and Norwegian minority than any other except Minnesota.

I would say that Mr. Canwell's activities in "investigating" subversives in the state had paid him well politically, even if the result to the state as a whole has not been quite so salutary.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER†

PROBLEMS OF THE FAMILY. By Fowler V. Harper. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1952. Pp. x, 806. \$9.00.

[Because the contents of this volume are drawn from several disciplines, the JOURNAL presents reviews by representatives of four professions: a psychiatrist, a law professor, a social work educator, and a domestic relations judge].

IN the preface to his book, Mr. Harper questions the validity of the concept of fault underlying the moral, religious, and legal sanctions which our society imposes for the regulation of the family. He suggests that family relations and their disorders are associated with complex, multi-determined, social and biopsychic factors, and that legal study of family problems should be enriched with appropriate source materials from the biological, social, and psychological sciences.

To his cases and text notes on the legal problems of family, marital, and sexual relations, Mr. Harper has therefore added a judicious selection of readings from the fields of psychiatry, sociology, and cultural anthropology. In these fields, behavior is evaluated on the basis of deterministic thinking, *i.e.*, as the resultant of causes or forces in the life history of the individual and of the pressures and demands of his socio-economic milieu. It is evident from the readings that the social and psycho-biological sciences are not interested in

---

†Northwest Correspondent, The New York Times.

the moral or judicial appraisal of human behavior. They are not interested in whether a human response is right or wrong in the scale of social or legal values, but rather in its bio-psycho-sociological antecedents, its purposes or functions, and its meanings. In psychiatry and psychology, moreover, there is a strong bias of interest in favor of the individual—manifested particularly in impulses to protect his psychological integrity and health—as contrasted with the legal interest in the protection of society.

But although the law itself is designed for the regulation and stabilization of social patterns, the practicing lawyer offers his services to an individual client; and in this field it is likely to be a client in a state of acute emotional crisis. Does the responsibility of the lawyer to his client end when he has offered sound legal advice and instituted proper legal procedure? To what extent should the lawyer's professional responsibility include a capacity for at least some rough diagnosis of the nature of the client's emotional stress, some skill in dealing with disturbed emotional responses, some knowledge of therapeutic community resources, and some facility in referral for specialized assistance?

One may draw a parallel between the lawyer practicing in the field of family problems and the physician dealing with problems of family health. It is estimated that thirty to sixty percent of complaints presented to a physician in the general practice of medicine are either entirely psychological in origin or are deeply interwoven with psychological factors. The recognition of the psychosomatic implications of illness is bringing major changes in medical school instruction. Emphasis is shifting from the study of disease as an end in itself to the study of man as a bio-psycho-social reaction system. The person who is ill becomes the proper study of the physician. Perhaps the person with a family problem should also be the proper study of the lawyer.

The book under review approaches the questions raised above in an indirect and tangential manner. Its intent is to stimulate intellectual interest and curiosity in the human carrier of social and psychological pathology. In carrying out its mission, it offers a reading fare which is varied and at times dramatic. For example, the section on "Sex Relations" of the chapter on "Premarital Relations" presents nine readings; of these, two are newspaper stories, two are taken from popular magazines, two from scientific journals, and three from popular books on sex (these are serious contributions, but essentially journalistic presentations of their materials).

The lively juxtapositions in the book can be seen by glancing at the first page of the "glossary of technical terms," where the term "aphrodisiac" is followed by "appellant"; "canonical disabilities" by "castration"; "coitus" by "complaint"; and "conflict of laws" by "copulation." The placing of the "glossary" at the beginning of the book advises the reader in advance that here one

". . . talk[s] of many things;  
Of shoes—and ships—and sealing wax—  
Of cabbages—and kings. . . ."

Nine of the readings are from the writings of psychiatrists: three on divorce, two on neurotic aspects of marriage, and one each on illegitimacy, adoption, sexual pathology, and alcoholism. There is always the risk, in a selection of this kind, that the reader will be burdened with concepts which cannot be understood without a background of knowledge in the field. Several of the psychiatric readings in this volume are weighted with technical psychoanalytic terminology, and one wonders what meaning they could have for the psychoanalytically unsophisticated reader.

The important contribution of this book is its recognition of the need for a cross-discipline approach to those legal problems which directly affect the psychological health of clients and, thereby, the mental health of our society. It invites the cooperation of social scientist, psychiatrist, and lawyer in a common understanding of the social and psychological implications of legal process in the field of family relations. It is a pioneering venture which will attract broad and sympathetic interest and will promote systematic study and practical pursuit.

JULES V. COLEMAN †

THIS is a remarkable casebook. For the first time in the field of Domestic Relations a casebook gives the student practical and usable material for practicing his profession in this field in a useful and honorable way. Cases which deal merely with an abstract system of legal rights and duties are not enough in the law of Domestic Relations. A lawyer who is equipped to serve the actual interests of his clients, and who has the purpose to serve them worthily, needs more than a knowledge of the abstract legal system.

He must realize the needs and possibilities of his clients as human beings, and he must be able to advise these clients about the best course for them to follow in view of their situation. This takes judgment as well as knowledge, and it takes legal knowledge enabling achievement of a particular result in addition to familiarity with rights and duties in the sense of a fixed pattern in the legal system.

Professor Harper's excellent book does prepare the student for protecting the interests of his clients and advising them about the wisest steps to take under the circumstances. Incidentally, on the analytical side, I was happy to note that he does treat alimony as part of divorce, which surely is the practical thing to do, although casebooks in recent years have not tended to follow this approach. I wish he also had merged the substantive grounds for annulment more fully with the procedural side of securing annulment. As for his treatment of jurisdiction, with all the overwhelming difficulties of migratory divorce in all its forms and of injunctive relief against migratory divorce, I did regret

---

† Associate Clinical Professor in Psychiatry, Yale Medical School.