

1975

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, 65 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 423 (1974)

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.

hypothetical) execution practices and offense rates. In sum, it is merely speculation whether the negative correlations between executions and rates of homicide would have been more substantial if execution had been more common. In this regard, it is of interest to note the size of the negative correlation ($r = -.26$, $r^2 = .068$) Schuessler reports between executions and homicides for a period (1937-1941) when the death penalty was in much more common use.⁵⁴

Summary and Conclusion

The findings summarized above are consistent with those of earlier investigations of homicide and contrary to the results deterrence theory would predict. As in past analyses, examination of homi-

⁵⁴ Schuessler, *supra* note 6.

cide data as well as figures for first and second degree murder reveal that average rates for all three offenses are consistently higher in death penalty than abolitionist jurisdictions. In addition, rates for all three offenses are consistently higher for retentionist states than their contiguous abolitionist neighbors, and execution rates in death penalty states are only slightly inversely related to rates for all three offenses.

In sum, the evidence reported here falls within the pattern of previous death penalty investigations which span five decades.⁵⁵ The findings should not be viewed, however, as simply another study questioning the death penalty. By examining the question of capital punishment with figures for capital homicide, a major objection to past investigations appears to have been met.

⁵⁵ BYE, *supra* note 1; Sutherland, *supra* note 2.

BOOK REVIEWS

KIND AND USUAL PUNISHMENT. By *Jessica Mitford*. New York: Knopf, 1973. Pp. xi, 340. \$7.95.

Miss Mitford's witty, scathing, and informed discussion of failures in the prison business is intended to stir laymen to by-pass liberal reforms and to aim for the abolition of prisons. Consonant with her repudiation of even the most enlightened and progressive prisons, she eschews lurid descriptions of stys and dungeons to focus "mainly on those large, well-ordered, highly financed prison systems" that have incorporated as their stated policy the reforms which have been advocated over the decades. Those traditional reforms are "rehabilitation as opposed to punishment, utilization of the latest scientific therapy techniques, classification of prisoners based on their performance in prison, a chance for every offender to return to the community as soon as he is ready." Whatever the acceptance of these perennially pursued reforms, whatever the rhetoric of prison administrators, whatever the intent of enlightened legislators who appropriate funds to make prisons humane, whatever the promises of solutions by technical gadgetry or scientific insight, Miss Mitford argues that prisons are doomed to fail their stated objectives and to primarily succeed only in providing cash and perquisites for those in the prison business.

Miss Mitford juxtaposes discussion of "the keepers and the kept" with chapters on "the criminal type," what "counts as crime," and the juggling of crime counting. She tersely reviews the refutations of theories which explain crime as the result of sub-species (Lombroso), body-types (Aschaffenburg), glands, low mentality, and other previously enlightened scientific explanations of criminality. A "prison type" now exists: young, poor, black, chicano, Puerto Rican—replacing yesterday's young, poor Irish or Italian. A *criminal* type does not exist because lawbreakers, unlike prisoners occur in every socio-economic strata. Even though she is aware that the same lack of alternatives and of status, the same de-humanization of the enterprise influences some to be guards as surely as it influences some to be guarded, Miss Mitford is less sympathetic to the keepers.

A trio of chapters examines the failures of the rehabilitative ideal. One implication of taking rehabilitation seriously is indeterminate sentencing. Rehabilitation can then be tailor-made for each prisoner. That is not what happens. Indeterminate sentencing provides the keepers with "total, unfettered power over the prisoners assigned to their charge." The most illustrious example, the California experiment, permits "total, arbitrary, despotic power over the destinies and liberties of

California's state prison population, not only while they are in custody, but also after they have been released on parole." Ideal and reality diverge because the indeterminate sentence permits prison authorities to continue floggings and solitary confinements as well as to gain arbitrary power to determine the amount of time a prisoner is incarcerated. The worst of both worlds triumphs. Similarly, the theme of mental illness and its corollary, individualized treatment, increases despotic power without accomplishing "cures." "In prison parlance, 'treatment' is an umbrella term meaning diagnosis, classification, various forms of therapy, punishment as deemed necessary, and prognosis, or the prediction of future behavior. . . ." Prison authorities adopt the rhetoric of treatment, but forget not that deterrence and retribution are the primary functions of the penal system set by society. An offender must do his time and in addition prove that he has been cured and rehabilitated. "For the prison administrator, whether he be warden, sociologist, or psychiatrist, 'individualized treatment' is primarily a device for breaking a convict's will to resist and hounding him into compliance with institution demands." Neither indeterminate sentencing, "treatment," sensory deprivation, aversion therapy, psycho-surgery, nor an arsenal of new drugs is presently capable of achieving rehabilitation.

A pervasive theme is the lawlessness, in two senses, of prison administration. In the first sense, there is an absence of legal redress for prisoners because of the reluctance of courts to pierce the prison veil. Although Miss Mitford notes the recent volume of prison litigation, she finds administrative discretion ample enough to dim the process due prisoners to only a pale reflection of the rule of law. More disturbingly, there is lawlessness in the sense that laws, regulations and standards which have been enacted are abused by prison authorities consistently, capriciously and callously. Her outrage at these malfeasances is subdued to an argument about setting examples for prisoners: a state without clean hands cannot rehabilitate offenders. Her poignant vignettes of the arbitrary power of prison administrators are more effective rhetorically than are many of the tomes of jargon-encapsulated research which she ridicules.

Her argument becomes most telling when it combines the theme of lawlessness with her major emphasis—the prison business. Her general thesis is that ". . . prison money, far from benefitting those at the bottom, floats or is propelled up to

the top, there to be converted into jobs for organization men and the latest in office equipment rather than into decent food or sufficient toilet paper for the prisoners." Her documentation of the piddling monies for prisoners' food reveals a scandal: when laid beside the budgetary sums actually appropriated for prisons, those piddling pennies for food are an outrage. But the outrage perceived by the prisoners is greater with respect to the arbitrariness and despotism of prison administration than it is to the inadequacy of prison diets. We need not separate the two vices; we ought to eliminate both. Business considerations abound in areas apparently remote from the budgetary analyses presented to legislators. Business acumen is reflected in the pay schedules arranged by drug companies for experimentation upon the prisoners; the ethics of experimentation upon prisoners is lost in review bureaucracies which do not prevent shoddy tampering with human lives. The realization of about \$50,000 a year from interest on the prisoner trust account for the Inmate Welfare Fund is one of those minor injustices which rankle beyond bottom-line significance. The Inmate Welfare Fund also clears \$500,000 a year from the prison canteens, the present counterpart of the "infamous company store that once flourished in remote mining towns, textile centers, southern plantations." Despite the denunciations of the old contract labor system by the prison establishment, the profitability of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., is impressive. The business advantages taken of prisoners is constantly drummed in time to the documentation of the lawlessness of these enterprises. "As summed-up by my source in the audit division, the Inmate Welfare Fund is in fact merely an accounting fiction, a convenient source of petty cash to be dipped into at will by the administration." Another apparently enlightened business venture, the work furlough program, amounts to "systematized exploitation and officially sanctioned thievery, much of it in direct violation of the law and the California constitution, all carried out in the name of 'rehabilitation' and 'inmate benefits.'"

Admittedly, significant research on prison budgeting and expenditure is almost impossible to do well. The data is difficult to come by and is often quite deliberately organized in order to obfuscate. There is little confidence that budgetary research corresponds with the realities of expenditure. Although Miss Mitford assures us of her access to the inner workings of California's processes, her

argument is vitiated by her incomplete summary of the California budget. Her discussion of this instance of program planning and budgeting appears thorough: 38% for Security, 26% for Inmate Support, etc. But the totals provided do not add up to 100%, and the reader is no more convinced of the lucidity of Miss Mitford's budgetary analyses than is she of those of the state of California. This conclusion should not provide comfort to the prison business. The point is merely that the thrust is not driven home as neatly as it should have been.

Lawlessness extends to parole. Parole is justified by three theories: grace, custody, and contract. "Contract" theory is a farce. "Since it is obviously impossible for the parolee to abide literally by all the conditions, the agent who wants to keep his charge on the street must, and does, shut his eyes to many violations of which he is aware. But he records them nevertheless (convicts call this 'banking violations') against the day when he may decide to slam the trap shut." One surmises that Miss Mitford would rally to a defense of private property law and ordinary contract law—*any* devices to defeat arbitrariness for prisoners.

Given that abolition of the prison system is unrealistic, her short-range objective is to ameliorate the lot of the incarcerated. Her new agenda of reforms, one culled from the manifestoes and demands of present-day prisoners, includes "reducing the discretionary power of authorities all down the line, . . . reducing prison populations, . . . restoring to prisoners those constitutional rights that will enable them to organize and fight injustice within the system." But this is second-best, better only than perpetuating the status quo.

Even in these more modest terms, her argument may be found wanting. A compilation of outrages, quotations, statistics and personality profiles does not amount to a sustained defense of her thesis.

She is aware that larger questions should be asked, but she does not subject the traditional justifications to critical scrutiny. Her recitals may be most successful in supporting the claim that the present prison system does not rehabilitate. But whether we have a right to rehabilitate at the price of personality reconstruction, is not thoroughly explored. She argues that incarceration does not deter prisoners because recidivism rates are so high. General deterrence is not accomplished because so few law breakers are imprisoned. But the arguments in favor of even some versions of preventive detention are not scrutinized. The retributive theory is not discussed at all. Whether or not

these are adequate justifications for imprisonment is never asked. A more careful and sympathetic examination of the traditional justifications of punishment, not to be confused with justifications of imprisonment, might allow her a better theoretical argument against the injustices and inhumane practices she seeks to abolish.

Miss Mitford offers little discussion of the litigation strategy which might be used to correct or at least diminish the lawlessness of prisons. For example, whether the eighth amendment may become a more useful predicate for judicial review than either the equal protection clause or the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment is not discussed. Nor will lawyers learn much about the exploding law of prisoners rights from this volume.

In summary, the rhetorical attack upon the business practices of incarcerating individuals in order to rehabilitate them or to deter others exceeds the depth of the argument for abolishing prisons. Quite to her credit, the attack does not rest upon the traditional cries of inadequate appropriations, ignorance about the human psyche, or the malevolence and viciousness of correction personnel. Rather, the brunt of Miss Mitford's argument is that the prisons, screened from judicial review and external control, provide a lucrative arrangement whereby many administrators, the academic research complex, the drug companies, industries and agricultural practices dependent upon a cheap labor supply, and those custodians incapable of obtaining employment elsewhere, have a nice business going. The enterprise rests upon the powerlessness of the poor, the weak and the helpless. Amelioration of that powerlessness by increased judicial review and more power to prisoner unions will undermine the profitability of the present economic exploitation. The justifiable objectives of punishment need not suffer. Her argument is sustained by rhetorical flourishes and excellent prose. Miss Mitford's book will annoy many experts on some aspects of the prison enterprise, but it provides a welcome review of our prisons from the perspective of taking the bottom-line seriously.

JOHN BRUCE MOORE

Northwestern University

CESARE BECCARIA AND THE ORIGINS OF PENAL REFORM. By *Marcello Maestro*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University Press, 1973. Pp. xii, 179, \$7.50.

This is a biography of the Italian scholar Cesare Beccaria (1738-94) who is generally regarded as

the founder of the classical school of criminology. At the age of twenty-six Beccaria published his *Trattato dei Delitti e delle Pene* (1764), translated into English in 1767 under the title, *An Essay on Crimes and Punishments*. The first American edition of the *Essay* appeared according to some in New York in 1773 or according to others in Charleston, South Carolina in 1777. The book met with instant success and had an extraordinary influence on legislation concerning criminal and penal matters throughout the world. However, as Marcello Maestro notes, the name of Beccaria is hardly known in the English-speaking world, outside the small circle of criminologists. Even those who know of him, recall almost exclusively his contributions to penology and are unaware of the multifaceted nature of his scholarly and professional activities. This biography attempts to correct such a distorted image of Beccaria, while appropriately stressing his most famous work.

After the author gives some brief information on Beccaria's family and youth, he depicts the sad state of criminal justice in Europe and America during the eighteenth century. It is in this context that Beccaria's ideas on crime, law, and punishment developed and matured into his *Essay*. Maestro offers a detailed analysis of the *Essay's* content, stressing in particular chapters he considers fundamental like those on punishments and crime prevention. He then describes the success met by the book and analyzes the reasons for it. He feels that, "the great merit of Beccaria's book . . . lies in the fact that for the first time the principles of penal reform were expressed in a systematic and concise way, and the rights of humanity were defended in the clearest terms, with the most logical arguments." (p. 34).

Maestro examines at length the development of Beccaria's career, family life, and professional stature. In particular, Beccaria's contributions to the history of esthetics, to the development of economics as a discipline and as a tool for public policy-making, to the reform of many administrative and business practices in the Italian portion of the Austro-Hungarian empire are recounted in this biography.

Marcello Maestro appropriately stresses the vital role that Beccaria played in the unification of standards and measures on both a local and international level. In 1780, Beccaria developed a proposal for the creation and adoption of a decimal system and for the introduction of standards of length, weight, and capacity. These suggestions

were further developed and adopted first in France and then in all other countries of the world, with few exceptions. After this period of intense activity in teaching, writing, commerce, economics and agriculture, Beccaria became again directly involved with the reform of penal laws and with the debate on capital punishment. Maestro points out that Beccaria's reactions to the Austrian code which had been drafted as a model for the future code of the Italian provinces of the empire reveal new developments in his penal philosophy. Twenty-seven years had passed since the publication of the *Essay* and some evolution of Beccaria's thoughts did occur. In particular, Beccaria called for different penalties for different kinds of people, quite in contrast with his former principle that punishment must be closely defined in advance and strictly proportionate to the offense. The last chapter of the book narrates the final years of Beccaria's life, troubled by family difficulties and by the crumbling of the old order he had known under the pressures generated by the American and French revolutions and by the armies led by Napoleon.

As a whole, this is a competently written biography. It is a well-researched, warm, and intelligent reconstruction of Beccaria's life and contributions that should be read for its stimulation value. For those interested in understanding where the roots of our contemporary way of life lie, reading this volume will be instructive. Written with the American public in mind, the book shows that many important ideas that shaped this nation were not exclusively or originally conceived in the Anglo-Saxon world, but were first formulated and debated in countries on the continent as well. In these days of resurgent ethnic pride and reassertion of a multicultural society in America this is quite refreshing.

At a time when there is a strong resurgence of interest in restoring the death penalty in this country, the publication of a book on a man who fought for the abolition of that form of punishment in the repressive atmosphere of the eighteenth century, is welcome, timely, and hopefully will be used for the enlightenment of all those concerned. Among the weak points of this book is the rather poor description of Europe's intellectual ferment as an outgrowth of the Enlightenment, which served as background and inspiration to Beccaria's work. While the author is adequate in his description of the corruption, excesses and vagaries of existing institutions, not enough attention is paid to the foundations of Beccaria's

thought, namely the social contract theories of Hobbes, Montesquieu, and Rousseau. Also, the author does not sufficiently discuss the inherent weaknesses of the classical criminology approach, originating in its utilitarian framework, or point out that Beccaria concentrated mostly on questions of legally seeking redress for and abolition of excesses, but ignored more substantial questions of criminal motivation and social inequality. While the author succeeded in documenting Beccaria's enormous impact on the reform of the administration of justice at the time, he fell short of relating more explicitly Beccaria's work to that of subsequent criminologists, such as those of the neo-classical school.

These shortcomings, however, do not detract from the important contribution that this highly readable book will make to the future of criminology and criminal justice in this period of flux and change.

EMILIO VIANO

The American University

PIONEERS IN CRIMINOLOGY (second edition)

Edited by *Hermann Mannheim*. Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1972. Pp. xv, 505. \$14.00 (Paper \$4.75).

This book is a "second edition enlarged" of *Pioneers in Criminology* which was originally published in 1960. The first edition included seventeen chapters, each devoted to an important figure in the history of criminology, and each written by an important contemporary criminologist. These chapters had initially appeared as articles in the *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science* and were edited into a book by Dr. Hermann Mannheim, the internationally known British criminologist, who wrote the preface and introduction. The concluding chapter, "The Historical Development of Criminology," designed to make a summary statement of the pioneers in criminology and discuss trends in the field, was written by Clarence Ray Jeffery, an American.

The seventeen criminologists who were discussed included the internationally well-known figures of Beccaria, Lombroso, Tarde, Ferri, Durkheim, Bentham and Ray, as well as others important criminologists who were not as well known. The chapters on Jeremy Bentham by Gilbert Geis, and on Isaac Ray by Winfred Overholser were particularly good as were the introduction and concluding chapter. Overall, it was a fine book and

met a need for the serious students of criminology or the criminology instructor who wanted to give an additional dimension of covering the personalities of the criminologists whose contributions were being considered in class.

The second edition adds six figures considered important to the editor: Edward Livingston, Arnould Bonneville de Marsangy, Charles Lucas, Karl Roeder, William Douglas Morrison and John Henry Wigmore; a second preface by Mannheim; and an addition to the final chapter by Jeffery entitled, "American Trends in Criminology." Their lifespans fit into the 200 year span of 1738 when Beccaria was born 1944 when Aschaffenburg died.

In the current edition Jeffery raised a number of issues from Mannheim's previous writings which are briefly answered by the latter: is the sociology of criminal law to be studied in the area of criminology or sociology of law?; should criminology be made independent of criminal law?; and, should a third school of criminology be established that "transcends both the Classical and Positive Schools"?

Overall, the book is still important in the field of criminology. However, the addition of the six "pioneers" in the second edition raises a question in the mind of the reviewer, as to the criteria employed in selecting pioneers. Any book of this kind has to be judged by the names it includes as much as by the names it omits. At least three figures merit the same serious consideration as was employed in making the selections for the first edition: Edwin H. Sutherland, the Dean of American Criminologists, who has had an enormous influence on the field for almost fifty years; Sigmund Freud, whose viewpoints are apparent in any discussion of causation in criminal behavior or treatment of the criminal offender; and, Robert K. Merton who has had an important influence on almost all of the present-day crop of American criminologists. They are certainly worth more than passing reference in footnotes.

ALEXANDER B. SMITH

John Jay School of Criminal Justice
City University of New York

CRIME AS WORK. By *Peter Lelkemann*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1973. Pp. 182. \$6.95 (Paper \$2.45).

Since the early contributions of Fredrick Thrasher (*The Gang*), Edwin Sutherland (*The Professional Thief*) and William Whyte (*Street Corner Society*), the description and analysis of

criminal behavior has been a rather neglected aspect in criminological literature which deals mainly with the study of criminals or official processes.

This makes the present book of special interest to professionals in the field of criminology. The author treats the phenomenon of criminal behavior from the point of view of the sociology of work and occupation, focussing particular attention upon the technical and organizational dimensions of this behavior.

The book is based mainly on interviews with forty-five incarcerated chronic property offenders. Making extensive use of verbatim accounts by the subjects, the author demonstrates the applicability of various dimensions of work to the illegitimate worker as has been done to the legitimate. The application of traditional occupational concepts such as training, specialization, craftsmanship, work-ethic, and career-crystalization to criminal behavior provides the reader with deep insights into the criminal world of property offenders from a rather unusual perspective. Special attention is paid to safe-cracking as an example of surreptitious crimes on the one hand, and to bank robbery as an example of crimes with victim confrontation, on the other.

The increasing technological complexity in safe construction as well as other developments (e.g., credit economy, burglary alarm systems and night depositories) exemplify the continuous war of technological escalation in this field. In armed robbery the need of organizational and social skills rather than technical skills is demonstrated. Here the ability to control people who are under stress is vital to the successful completion of the "job".

The significance of prison experience to the criminal is presented as comparable to that of college or university training to the non-criminal: it is there where the illegitimate career takes on form and structure. The author discusses in detail the various processes by which technical as well as perceptual skills are acquired both in prison and in the field of action.

The main shortcoming of the book lies in its unidimensionality. Even from the point of view of the sociology of work, it is of vital interest to analyze occupational aspects of criminal behavior in relation to other aspects of the "worker's" life-style such as family, leisure and social network, etc. This wider perspective might facilitate a better understanding of the "professional" behavior of the criminal. Another untouched topic is the problem of retirement from work which is

gaining increasing attention in the sociology of work.

However, despite these and some other moderate annoyances, this book may be considered a positive contribution both to the sociology of work and to criminology.

SIMHA F. LANDAU

Center for Studies in Criminology and Criminal Law
University of Pennsylvania

PORNOGRAPHY AND SOCIAL DEVIANCE. By *Michael J. Goldstein* and *Harold S. Kant* with *John J. Hartman*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972. Pp. 194.

The authors tell us that the inspiration for this relatively slim volume was a pilot study supported by the President's Commission on Pornography and Obscenity.

In the face of that announcement of research heritage and avuncularity, one is at first willing to suspend skepticism over the possibility of such a short piece of work succeeding in "bringing together principles of psychology and law to generate public discussion and further research," (although research and public discussion may be, and often are, generated as easily by random remarks and cocktail chatter), or that the book will, "impart a new perspective on the pornography issue to the people responsible for legislative decision-making." (although there is little evidence that legislators have ever made much use of the new perspectives offered by systematic research commissions and studies). Since, however, these goals seem minimally demanding and since the authors themselves assert that they, "are not so presumptuous as to believe that the present investigation shall be definitive," this book cannot, in its own terms, be considered a disappointment. However, for those interested in perhaps coming closer to a comprehension of the relationship between pornography and sexual deviance, for those wanting to understand the age-old fascination with the underlife of sexual behavior and its relationship to action, this book does little to help. Beneath a veneer of orderly chapters one finds oversight, contradiction, and (surprisingly in so few pages) repetition.

Two oversights seem inexcusable. In spite of chapters entitled, "What is Pornography?" and "Pornography and Obscenity: Its Definition and Control in a Free Society," the authors nowhere offer a clearly stated working definition of their own which guided them in research. The term

"erotic" which is throughout used interchangeably with "pornography" remains equally undefined. While various definitions from the literature are offered and we get a glimpse of the authors' assumptions via interview excerpts, no thematic principle of pornography or epistemological ideal against which empirical data might be evaluated and understood is offered either. Instead we are presented with research excerpts and quick summaries and conclusions. However, when we learn, for example, that the authors find some of their respondents admitting erotic stimulation via a Ladies Home Journal article and others aroused by Playboy photographs and still others excited by live displays of nudity, the theoretical necessity for an articulation of what constitutes pornography becomes most apparent. Indeed, even if the definitional conclusion turns out to be that no absolute definitional criteria exist, that too deserves the attention of this book.

The second and equally devastating omission concerns the authors' failure to clearly define their notion of sexual deviance. Again, as was the case with the notion of pornography, the authors seem to take for granted a definition of the term. Here, however, the implications penetrate the assumed point of the book: does pornography, or more precisely the *use* of pornography, lead to sexual deviance or vice versa? Yet if one knows not what sexual deviance is, how can one ever arrive at even the most tentative sort of answer? If sexual deviance is identical with active antisocial behavior with regard to sexual behavior, then one set of findings seems to obtain: that the relationship is somewhat weak. If, however, sexual deviance is to be defined as sexual behavior which deviates from the publicly stated norm, including even deviance without victims, then the authors' conclusions of the relatively minor causal relationship between pornography and sexual deviance seem contradicted by many of their own findings. When a respondent admits, "I think I tried everything I was shown," one can only assume that pornography does affect those exposed to it. Whether the effect is defined as sexual deviance or simply as sexual experimentation or variation is crucial as far as the public opinion, discussion and policy are concerned. Indeed, as much as the public and its legislators are concerned with the effect of pornography on sexual deviance, so too are they interested in *defining* these terms. The two issues seem inextricably bound up together. To neglect the latter

dimension of the issue is to fail to capture the scope of the questions involved.

The authors divide their study population into four categories. The first of these is comprised of those, "known [by whom we are not told] to be extensive users of pornography." What constitutes extensive use is never clearly defined. Instead the reader is thrown upon his own assumptions where to draw the line between use, and the larger category, extensive use. The authors present us with the kinds of quotation marks which in fact quote no one and are supposed to take the place of clear articulation. Extensive users are described as those, who frequent "adult" bookstores, patrons of "skin-flick" movie theatres. While few of us would question whether or not such persons qualify as users of pornography, one yearns in a book that purports to be a "research program," for a greater characterizational precision. Do users, for example, see *themselves* as a discrete group or is the category simply a heuristic device constructed by the authors? Hints that more might be said about this group exist in the authors' explanation that extensive users in the sample were drawn from both a wife-swapping association and from the readership of an underground newspaper. Beyond such oblique references, however, the criteria for membership in the extensive user category remain unclear. To trust that the responses reported from those characterized as users are typical one must at first be clear as to what exactly that type is, a point overlooked by the authors.

The second group of respondents is described as, "those whose sexual behavior is considered antisocial (convicted rapists and child molesters)." Child molesters are later more precisely detailed as male- and female-object pedophiles. The incumbents of this category were drawn from relatively new inmates at Atascadero State Hospital, a California institution for the criminally insane. That such persons might be quite eager to please their interviewers or that they might have a vested interest in purposively controlling the self-presentations implied in their responses to questions is a point that the authors acknowledge. We are told that the questionnaire construction had some built-in safeguards here, but these are not as fully presented as they might have been. Particularly with this group, which represents perhaps the apex of the imagined horrible effects of pornography, the reader must be convinced of the validity and reliability of the findings if the book is to succeed in its educative effort.

The third group, "a sample including transsexuals seeking sex change operations, homosexuals and lesbians," is apparently composed of sexual deviants whose behavior is not actively antisocial. These are the nonincarcerated deviants. One is forced to this perception of the underlying connective thread for this category because the authors propose no alternative criteria. Classifications are useful devices for social scientists, but they demand theoretical or intellectual justification and explanation. We learn, however, that not all sorts of transsexuals, homosexuals and lesbians are included herein. Rather, only those who asserted that status openly were interviewed for the sample. While one may sympathize with the researchers logistic and technical difficulties in gathering a sample of such sexual deviants, one must recognize as well the atypical possibilities inherent in the sample and accordingly wonder about the consequent accuracy of the findings.

Consider, for example, the case of transsexuals awaiting a sex change operation which has taken years of preliminary preparation and anticipatory socialization. These persons have learned the importance of convincing others of the genuineness of their need for sexual change. Faced with an interview which asks how much or indeed whether erotica and pornography have influenced their sexual behavior such individuals might be most careful in over-estimating its importance. To suggest, even to themselves, that their deviance was brought about by pornography is to endanger a carefully constructed psychic view of reality and, in more strategic terms, to endanger the possibility of transit from one sex to another. Transsexual operations are not lightly embarked upon and transsexuals know that. Thus, when the authors report that this group seems to indicate little influence from pornography, one reads with interest but also with some degree of skepticism—how can one be sure?

One more point ought to be made with reference to this third category. While the researchers have listed lesbians among those sampled, no real attention is given to the female use of pornography. All interview excerpts and descriptive material take a strictly male perspective (be it hetero- or homosexual). One wonders whether women have, in the opinion of the authors, nothing significant to say about their use of pornography or whether the authors simply neglected them. Such a lacuna in the data offered is a great disappointment, particularly at a time when social science is offering

us more and more insight into the world and worldview of women. One would wish to see the seamier side of that world as well.

The last group utilized by the researchers is a control: a matched sample drawn from the general population. We are told, in connection with this last group, that while the members of the other categories were willing to discuss and offer various sorts of information about their sexual experiences, the control group members were not. Yet we have already seen the assertive quality of some of the components of these earlier sample members and have suggested some possible reasons for their desire to control and shape the flow of information coming from them. The control group represents no such vested interests. Still, the authors are tempted to suggest that, "[s]ince most of the data do suggest that the controls stand apart from other groups studied, it is entirely possible that through some quirk of sample they represent the deviant group, while others reflect the attitudes and experiences common to the general population." Nothing the authors present seems to justify that sort of supposition. While the authors stop short of that conclusion, one wishes their critical eye had been focussed more on the others in the study.

Perhaps more disturbing than the problems of definition and epistemological clarity, are the rampant inconsistencies that appear at times as contradictions. One cannot help occasionally feeling that each author worked separately and reached his own ends. Consider the following sets of remarks and the implications one draws from them when they are juxtaposed:

Pornography, however, is neither stimulating nor cathartic, instead serving as a means of warding off anxiety, disgust and guilt about his [i.e., the rapist's] disturbing daydreams.

Earlier one finds:

The guilt response to erotica, then, is largely confined to those individuals who engage in antisocial patterns of sexual behavior [e.g. rapists], involving aggression or assault on another.

Does pornography then ward off or make for guilt? The authors seem unclear on the matter. That many of the unclaritys become most apparent as one enters the late chapters on the implications of the research makes such faults doubly disturbing.

The assumption that public policy can, and indeed ought to be based on scientific inquiry is not

a new one. It has in large measure been the basis of governmental interest in furthering scientific research, both in the social and natural sciences. That interest, embodied in the form of research grants and public commissions, may all too often tempt researchers into using data as facile substantiation for preconceived policy positions. This sort of activity is of course a subversion of the very point of scientific inquiry which is different from legal argument.

While one would be presumptuous and probably wrong to assume that the authors in question have used their book and its accompanying data simply as a slick packaging of a policy position, the weakness of the data organization so severely strains the limits of credibility that one can imagine frustrated readers arriving at quite cynical conclusions. Criminologists and other scientists who subject the everyday norms, mores and customs of humanity to the test of scientific research must be particularly scrupulous in their efforts to investigate taken-for-granted points of view. Should the slightest doubt remain as to the validity of their findings, common attitudes, no matter how fallacious, may become more strongly embraced than ever. Even the weakest case is strengthened by a successful defense against a weak challenge to it.

Criminologists cannot, indeed no scientist can, depend on sympathetic readers, especially when the goal is the offering of new perspectives. Durkheim long ago pointed out the relativity of such terms as normal and pathological. Those who would challenge the labels of particular phenomena as pathogenic would best remember that norms change slowly even in the face of cogent arguments. Disorganized research, on the other hand, has not the slightest chance for fostering attitudinal change.

In fairness, perhaps, one last point deserves to be made in connection with this book. As explained earlier, the book grows out of work commissioned by the United States government and the authors write with the hopes that legislators and the public might be swayed somewhat by their work. Legislators and the public seem seldom to read or heed commissions. Perhaps that unconscious occupational hazard of commission work has overtaken the authors—namely, one writes things with no real expectation that they will be read. In the case of this book, such expectations seem to be in order.

SAMUEL C. HEILMAN

Queens College

CASE STUDIES OF DRUG ABUSE AND CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR. By *Paul B. Weston* and *Robert W. Cole*. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, 1973. Pp. xx, 172. \$5.95.

This book should be viewed from three perspectives: what the authors attempt to do, what their efforts imply, and what the book could have been.

According to their preface, the authors gathered official case materials on many types of drug abusers for the purpose of teaching a course on the problems of drug abuse and its relationship to criminal activity. They then presented these cases, grouped into chapters by type of person involved and by their drug-related behavior patterns. A fairly standard typology of drug use emerges: (1) Ghetto and Barrio—Crime and Drug Abuse; (2) Wayward Girls—Runaways (and drug use); (3) Play Groups of the Drug Scene—Crime Gangs; (4) Armed Robbery (and drug use); (5) Dealing in Drugs; and (6) Drug Sellers. Each chapter is introduced by a statement of some standard theory of deviant behavior, presumably accounting for the specific type of cases to be illustrated. Following each case and each chapter, the authors offer a series of questions for use in classroom discussions.

If this book is to be judged strictly in terms of the authors' purpose in putting it together, then the following comments are in order:

The drug-associated types of behavior seem a bit outdated, offering such archaic terms as "wayward girls" while ignoring the emergence of middle-class and upper-class drug use of both young persons and adults. (This latter omission probably reflects the availability of case materials. The current crop of drug users are seldom "busted" and on such occasions usually employ lawyers who manage to spare them the case-building procedures that the lower class and more helpless drug abusers must endure.)

The brief theoretical discussions introducing each section are often phrased as known facts rather than theories. There is an almost complete disregard for both the applicability of these theories to the current drug scene and the past challenges that have been leveled at them. For instance, Cloward and Ohlin's thesis of delinquency and opportunity (1960) is stated in such a way as to make it sound like accepted truth instead of what it actually is—a theory and a highly controversial one at that (p. 1). The authors also imply that Thrasher's classic sociological study of Chicago gangs is current enough to explain the drug-fun gangs of today without any revision (p. 31).

Utilization of actual case materials compiled by various officials employed in the processing of drug abusers means that the data has the inconsistencies of category coverage endemic to these sources. For instance, details in such categories as family relationships of the user, case conferences, medical examination, school reports, psychological and/or psychiatric evaluations, social workers report, and interrogation material may be lengthy, minimal, or totally missing from a given case. Thus generalizations the students might be tempted to draw as to causation are ruled out by the haphazard condition of the case data.

Certainly one's sympathy must go out to the innocent students using this book. Without either adequate theoretical guidance or systematic data, they are required to construct discussion answers to such questions as the following:

What factors in (case's name) environment contributed to his drug abuse and criminal behavior? (a frequent opening question)

How can this young man's behavior be changed? (p. 12)

Does Maxine Kenny's experience with sex as a runaway preclude any effective treatment program and satisfactory adjustment to life? (p. 39)

Did this juvenile's family fail him? (p. 73)

What appears to be the primary causes of Tommy Krell's drug use and dealing in drugs? (p. 103)

What the book implies by this approach and by queries such as these is more serious than the fact that the questions are currently baffling even the experts. The authors are in effect saying that the official file material offers sufficient data for the understanding of the case under consideration.

Increasingly, behavioral scientists are finding that this is not true. As insight-generating data, the official file has two major flaws: (1) it lacks detailed data on the subject's perspective; and (2) it is a reflection of the perspective of its contributors.

Attention to the first point would require a substantial addition of ethnographic and/or depth interview material to strengthen the book. Undoubtedly this material is not available, but psychological testing, discussions with high school counselors, questioning by police, psychiatrists or social workers is no substitute for it. Neither can the subject's perspective be pieced together from such routinely collected data as the relationship

between the subject's parents, or the subject's relationship to them, to his siblings or peers. The cleanliness of the home, the monthly income, the religious practices, and other such "background" factors do not give an understanding of the world the subject operates in *as he sees it, in detail and over time*.

The tragedy of this book is that the authors overlooked the research gold that these case materials do offer—not facts, but data gathered and presented in such a way as to reflect various correctional and rehabilitative ideologies. A great deal about how drug abuse cases are written up, presented, and ultimately disposed of could be garnered from such a content analysis. Omissions and inconsistencies would become data in such an enterprise by their very absence. Comparisons of official attitudes and approaches toward drug use by boys vs. girls, whites vs. non-whites, first-timers vs. repeaters, persons with intact homes vs. those not, etc., could be very fruitfully made. Additionally, such questions could be more reasonably answered by students than the impossible problems now posed by the authors.

JACQUELINE P. WISEMAN

University of California—San Diego

DECISIONS IN THE PENAL PROCESS. By *A. Keith Bottomley*. South Hackensack, NY: Fred B. Rothman and Co., 1973. Pp. xvii, 227. \$11.75.

Professor Bottomley, lecturer in Criminology at the University of Hull, has attempted to identify the various factors affecting decision-making at various stages in the criminal justice system. The book is comprised of five major chapters: Criminal Statistics and Social Attitudes, Police Discretion in Law Enforcement, Pre-Trial Decision-Making, The Sentencing Process, and Prison Classification and Parole. Each chapter illustrates the importance of individual factors in criminal justice and analytically documents the reasons for variation at each stage.

The first chapter on Criminal Statistics and Social Attitudes is representative of the manner in which Professor Bottomley summarizes what is known about the subject and suggests relevant implications. He reviews the impact on criminal statistics of such diverse topics as: cultural, sub-cultural, and contracultural changes in ideology and attitudes toward conformity, authority and sanctions; the role of legislation in shaping and being shaped by social attitudes; the reasons for reporting and not reporting crime according to

victimization studies; and the efficiency of police departments and the public's perception of the relative detection rate on reporting.

Each chapter is an excellent analysis of the issues affecting decision-making at that particular stage of the criminal justice system (Bottomley prefers to use the term process rather than system to indicate the lack of integration between the various parts). The lack of integration and cooperation between the various stages of the criminal justice system are attributed to differing operational and ideological factors which motivate agents at each stage. The two models suggested by Packer, the Crime Control Model and the Due Process Model are utilized by Bottomley as heuristic ideal types in accounting for much of the observed conflict.

The book is an excellent reference source in identifying significant factors affecting the penal process. In addition, the book is invaluable to American criminologists for the review of much of the work done by English scholars such as McClintock, Mannheim, Gibbens, Hood and Radzinowicz to mention but a few. The review of various English Committees' and Commissions' findings such as the Perks and those on Justices of the Peace were also of considerable interest. The summary of the empirical research is skillfully integrated into the book making it enjoyable as well as informative reading. Certainly every criminologist should have a copy on the reading shelf, and the book would be appropriate for an advanced criminology or criminal justice course. Professor Bottomley is to be congratulated for synthesizing, condensing and analyzing the information criminologists have gathered on decision-making in the penal process.

JOSEPH E. SCOTT

The Ohio State University

BEFORE ADDICTION: HOW TO HELP YOUTH. By *Florence Lieberman, Phyllis Caroff, and Mary Gollersfeld.* New York: Behavioral Publications, 1973. Pp. ix, 131. \$7.95.

In recent years well known groups, such as the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice (1967), the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse (1972), and the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973), have urged the prevention and treatment of adolescent drug abuse.

Despite such efforts Behavioral Publications (72 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10011)

apparently regarded a manual on this subject as imperative, especially for parents worried about the possible use of drugs by their children. This study tries to satisfy this laymen's need, but unfortunately falls short of its goal. Even though academic credentials and wide experience make the three co-authors eminently qualified to write such a book, they do not really tell concerned parents how to help their children avoid drug problems.

These experts merely furnish a melange of bromides, generalities, and contradictory proverbs, the last of which is most striking because, like one prominent law of motion, some maxims are counteracted by others. Illustrative of such conflicting tendencies are the following ideas: Parents are right to fear adolescent drug abuse, but they should listen seriously to their children. Drug problems stem from an unsatisfactory home life, but peer-group forces outside the home are overwhelming. Parents are primarily responsible for keeping their children out of such troubles, but they have less control over their offspring than ever. Drug prevention is a cardinal goal, but so is therapy. Drug treatment is necessary, but many therapists fail because of an inability to keep a detached perspective.

Such offsetting cliches run through the three main segments of this book: "Part I. Youth and Drugs," "Part II. All About Therapy," and "Part III. Therapy Is Not Enough." This style is generally readable, although jargon and chattiness sometimes intrude. In sum, this book may offer worried parents considerable sympathy but little help.

JAMES A. GAZELL

San Diego State University

DEFENDING CRIMINAL CASES BEFORE JURIES: A COMMON SENSE APPROACH. By *Irwin Owen.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973. Pp. viii, 219.

The art of trying cases is said to be in a poor state. Whether the situation was ever better is difficult to say. Francis Wellman lamented over the problems caused by untrained lawyers who attempt to try cases more than 50 years ago. But even if the level of courtroom practice is not deteriorating, there is certainly ample room for more and better training in trial advocacy. Trying a case can be remarkably demanding, requiring both a bank clerk's passion for detail and a stage director's sense of timing and story line. Any new re-

sources for improving skills should be welcomed by the bar.

Irwin Owen's summary of the lessons he has learned in practice makes only a modest contribution to the growing body of trial practice material. His book is relatively brief and is written in a style that may be described as chains of short observations hung on each other. Owen's lessons may be studied in more detail, or with more drama, elsewhere. A good many of his points are straightforward and sound, such as his warning against appearing insincere before a jury, or his admonition to put important points before the jury three times during a trial. Some are so aggressively general as to be virtually useless, such as his descriptions of a good trial lawyer as part introvert and part extrovert. Still others seem plainly wrong. He answers the extremely hard question of whether the defendant should take the witness stand with an unequivocal yes (or, as he puts it, "YES, YES, YES!"). This advice will come as quite a surprise to the many criminal defense lawyers who use the defendant's privilege of silence successfully. Similarly, Owen's advice to use a jury in all but the most shocking cases, such as child molesting, is too broadly stated. The decision to waive a jury depends on a large number of factors, including the nature of the case, the witnesses, the defendant and the judge. (That is, it is one of those basic litigating decisions that draws on everything the lawyer knows about the case and the courts.) Indeed, it is the complexity of such decisions that makes trial practice an art, irreducible to a discrete set of rules for a practitioner to master. As in any art, the informed and skilled exercise of judgment is all.

Owen is astute enough to understand that trial technique, in the end, must be learned through repeated practice.

You must constantly remind yourself in defense work that the book hasn't been written that will supply you with a firm suggestion for every situation. You will have to decide in each individual case, and learn from your painful mistakes.

Following this admonition, Owen spices his book with numerous vignettes of trials, mostly his own. One very good way for a lawyer to learn about trying cases is to observe others closely. Owen's stories provide a decent approximation of watching him perform in court. As with most trial technique books, these examples are the most instructive part.

But if Owen's book is limited as a guide of how to do it, it nevertheless provides a fascinating glimpse of the successful practice of criminal law in rural Oklahoma, where most of Owen's work seems to have been done. Some of his devices sound like luxuries to practitioners in crowded urban courts. The jury panels are small, for instance, so Owen can collect information on how prospective jurors have voted before, and he has time to visit small town banks, which, he informs us, are very helpful with pertinent information about jurors who happen to be their customers.

Surprisingly, the concept of reasonable doubt plays a small role in Owen's trials. Very few of the described cases resulted in acquittals, and some that did were freaks, such as the acquittal of a defendant who admitted raping a seventy year old woman: the woman was disagreeable and was heartily disliked by some local landlords who were known to members of the jury. Owen stresses the importance of reasonable doubt, but it does not come across prominently in his examples.

The relative unimportance of reasonable doubt may be attributed to the Oklahoma practice of sentencing by the jury. To keep the possible sentence low, Owen has to present the defendant as nicely as possible. He is obviously skilled at this. He obtained a very short sentence for a habitual burglar, for instance, who contritely admitted his crime, and went on to fascinate the jury with his stories of his drug habit and the problems of ex-convicts. Sometimes he misses, however. He was "banged" in a bad check case where the defendant was a former dog catcher. Owen emphasized the modest employment in the hopes of obtaining sympathy, but found out too late that some of the jurors had had their dogs caught. Where the court imposes sentence, as in Illinois, it would be quite odd to go before a jury and admit the crime, as many of Owen's defendants do. As a result, the trial process in Illinois focuses much more sharply on the issue of guilt or innocence—that is, on proof beyond a reasonable doubt. The requirements of practicing before a sentencing jury have influenced much of Owen's advice and somewhat diminished the usefulness of his book for an attorney whose primary concern before a jury is establishing a reasonable doubt.

Jury sentencing appears to account for Owen's admonition to put the defendant on the witness stand in every case. A lawyer trying a case before a sentencing jury is faced with a difficult choice. The jury probably does not really understand the

privilege against self-incrimination and will resent a defendant who refuses to tell his side of the story. Unless the lawyer can obtain an acquittal, the jury's resentment will come back to haunt the defendant in the sentence it imposes. Owen plays for the lower sentence. Jury sentencing also gives Owen a way of handling the difficult ethical problem of putting a defendant on the stand who had admitted his guilt to his attorney. If the jury only decides guilt or innocence, the attorney must either watch his client take a dive, elicit testimony from his client which he believes to be untrue, or keep his client off the stand. The second alternative is quite troublesome, and Owen rejects the third. But he can use the first alternative regularly with the justification that he is seeking a better sentence for his client who will probably be found guilty anyway.

JONATHAN M. HYMAN

Northwestern University

PAROLED BUT NOT FREE: EX-OFFENDERS LOOK AT WHAT THEY NEED TO MAKE IT OUTSIDE. By Rosemary J. Erickson, Wayman J. Crow, Louis A. Zurcher and Archie V. Connett. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1972. Pp. xi, 129. Hard \$9.95, Paper \$4.95.

This study of sixty men on parole in San Diego, California, is an attempt to remedy the systematic neglect of prisoners and ex-prisoners as a source of information about the impact of the penal system and the need for services to ex-offenders.

The first, and most useful part of the study consists of edited interviews (conducted by ex-felons trained as interviewers) with fourteen of the parolees, portraying some of the trials and tribulations of men released from prison, along with something of their pre-prison backgrounds. The second, and much weaker part, attempts to interpret the interviews in the light of major theoretical perspectives in criminology, and reports additional findings from psychological tests administered to the parolees.

Unfortunately, this analysis is not terribly informative. While some of the interviews show that when ex-convicts attempt to explain their criminal involvement they sometimes draw on theories quite similar to those sociologists have employed (e.g. bad companions, or material goals that cannot be attained through legitimate means), they do not demonstrate the adequacy of these theoretical perspectives for explaining parolee behavior. No relationship between interview content and

subsequent parole failure is evident. Indeed, differences between the successful and unsuccessful parolees are not reported. Interviews conducted at several stages of parole might have helped to elucidate the dynamics of parole failure, but this was not done. As a result of these omissions, *Paroled But Not Free* adds little to the work of such investigators as Elliot Studt and John Irwin, who have already written extensively on the parole experience.

A major omission from the report is any discussion of the obstacles the parole system itself creates for the parolee. While implementation of the parolees' recommendations for provision of services to ex-convicts could hardly do much harm and might do some good, they are not terribly imaginative, and indeed differ little from what any sensible person might propose.

DAVID F. GREENBERG

New York University

THE PREVENTION OF CRIME. By Stuart Palmer. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1973. Pp. 277. \$12.95.

Palmer tells us, "We know from a scientific standpoint a great deal about the root causes of crime and delinquency." Because valid theory is available, he states, effective measures of prevention can be implemented. It is difficult, however, to extract a clear understanding of Palmer's theory from his text. His approach is an unintegrated amalgam of frustration/aggression, opportunity, subcultural and labeling theories. An attempt by the reviewer to summarize the conceptual framework would provide more formulation and synthesis than the author himself. However, one theoretical element seems relatively certain and central: economic conditions. Repeatedly, Palmer suggests that the frustration and alienation caused by "disadvantaged" competition for success is the "root cause" of crime. "Frustration is one driving force behind violation of the criminal law," he notes at one point. "A major form of frustration is one-sided, uneven economic competition where the individual wants to win and yet is doomed to lose. A shortage, especially in the lower socio-economic strata, of persons who can serve as non-criminal role models is another primary source of crime." The mixture of ideas about opportunity structure together with ideas about role models nicely illustrates the book's theoretical confusion. (Concerning role models incidently, Palmer en-

courages reinforcement of traditional sex role stereotypes for crime prevention.)

Despite the theoretical stress on economics, none of the proposed prevention programs concern economic institutions. Palmer discusses the schools, police, courts, probations and prisons. Proposals are made for the improvement and more efficient operation of each institution. Emphasis is placed on educating children, the public and the professionals about crime causation and more proficient role performance. Most reforms represent liberal views, although "police-controlled television scanners in high crime areas" are included (with the usual precaution about "big brother watching here"). Strengthening secondary institutions, however, does not change primary economic conditions. Thus, the book principally concerns the repression rather than the prevention of crime, through the elimination of repressive institutions.

In "A Concluding Word" Palmer writes that it is "reasonable to expect" competition, inequities in power and wealth, generational conflict, racism and imperialism "to continue for many, many years." With the continued dominance of the orientation of this kind of book, no doubt they will.

JON SNODGRASS

California State University, Los Angeles

THE ENGLISH PRISON OFFICER SINCE 1850: A STUDY IN CONFLICT. By *J. E. Thomas*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972. Pp. xv, 248. \$10.00.

Thomas maintains that in order to understand prisons, the study of the prison staff must be given serious attention as well as the prisoner community. He seeks to correct this lack of focus by discussing the role of the prison officer in the highly centralized English prison service from its inception to the present. Thomas sets out to demonstrate that the central figure in the English prison system is the uniformed guard, and that the views of prison guards have had a direct and important

impact on the operation of the prison system. As such, Thomas' book is a useful contribution to historical penology.

His central hypothesis is that the custodial tasks of the prison—traditionally the main concern of the prison officer—have increasingly become more difficult because of the reformatory goal in penology. The demands of custody and rehabilitation have not only eroded the officer's authority, but the total effect has contributed to his feelings of alienation. Thomas argues that in Victorian times the organizational goals of custody and rehabilitation were clear. However, the abolition of the "separate system" had the effect of making reformation a "primary" goal of the service—a process that so undermined the prison service that it brought forth the Mountbatten Report seventy years later. According to Thomas, the organization of treatment technologies—inmate association, prison hostels, and home visits—bypassed the prison officer. Presumably, the reformatory goal increases inmate movement and the initiative of prisoners, but at the same time it destroys social control. One could, of course, argue that increasing an inmate's initiative and responsibility is more likely to lead to rehabilitation, and in the final analysis to control.

The book does raise some interesting points about the alienation of the English prison guard and the role of specialists in the prison setting. The analysis lacks depth, however, as prisons for women were excluded from the study, and the excellent organizational studies of prisons by American sociologists were not incorporated in the analysis. Consequently, Thomas does not confront and deal effectively with the issue of competing and conflicting organizational goals; nor does he recognize and deal with the fact that the increasing social control problems revealed in modern society are now reflected in the prison setting.

ROSE GIALLOMBARDO

Chicago, Illinois