BOOK REVIEWS—*cont.*

equally well heighten the consciousness of change on the part of the student and present a common ground of agreement from which to embark upon a more critical study. The drastic changes, which Dr. Jones clearly shows, immediately precipitate a need to enquire into the reasons and implications of such changes. But it is imperative that the changing institutions should be seen within the context of the society in which they exist. The concept of the interreaction of a "constellation" of factors is as relevant to development of institutions as to that of the individual personalities and may be more easily grasped. What better example could be found than the emergence of the prison system and the prison ethos? The word "change" has been used deliberately rather than Dr. Jones' word "progress", for the latter implies judgement and a set of values which can too readily be taken for granted. Indeed, one of the most important aspects of the historical approach is to expose the danger of passing judgement on the basis of concealed values. It is all too easy to evoke a feeling of abhorence for, and pour criticism upon, the penal institutions of the past, without making explicit the values that underly such feelings and judgements. If it is important for the student of criminology eventually to approach such problems as "natural crime", "responsibility", "causation" from the point of view of the ethical agnostic, perhaps this can be best achieved initially through the past rather than the present in which he is so acutely involved.

These sentiments may well merely reflect the reviewer's own bias, in which case may he conclude by expressing his genuine appreciation for the bringing out of this most useful text-book.

NORMAN JEPSON.

. . . . . .

SOCIAL SCIENCE AND SOCIAL PATHOLOGY

Allen & Unwin. 1959. pp.376. 35s. 0d.
Barbara Wootton

Descriptive.

SOCIAL SCIENCE AND SOCIAL PATHOLOGY was published in 1959. Many favourable reviews have already been published. Social Pathology is used not in its direct sense, but its transferred sense. That is to say it refers to the abnormal conditions themselves. Lady Wootton chooses, (she gives her reasons for the choice in her introduction), to consider lawbreaking, illegitimacy, divorce, other marital separations, children, not offenders, committed to the case of fit persons, placed under supervision, sent to approved schools as in need of care and protection, beyond their parents' control, or failing to attend school, and persons without a settled way of life.

The book has three parts. The first part contains a review of the conditions of non-conformity just listed, and an examination of the way this non-conformity is spread over the population, and of the concept of poverty. There follows a review of twenty-one studies including the work of such familiar names as Healy, Burt, S. & E. T. Glueck, Carr-Saunders, Mannheim, Rose and Wilkins, and the evidence they offer as to the causes of delinquency. A remarkable chapter follows on Maternal Separation or Deprivation, a study of theories based on the age of the offender,

BOOK REVIEWS—*cont.*

and a most important and noteworthy survey of criminological prediction, especially of "Prediction Methods in Relation to Borstal".

The second part, which has been the subject of much controversy and further pronouncements by Lady Wootton is concerned with mental health and illness, the difficult and exclusive nature of moral and criminal responsibility, and contemporary attitudes in social work. In this section the reader is given an exercise in definitions and straight thinking about responsibility and culpability, and critical reviews of the roles and functions of psychiatrists and social workers as seen by themselves and others. The infiltration of psychiatric ideas and its consequences are indicated.

Part three is on methodological and practical conclusions. No-one in an administrative capacity can afford to be unaware of the comments and suggestions in this part. Designs of research, the formation of policy in the light of advances made are suggested, and the impact of some kinds of development on public opinion and general good are discussed.

There are two appendices. The first, in a curiously lengthy way, shows the range of crime. The second by Rosalind Chambers, "Professionalism in Social Work", is a compact and useful little history. There is a rather overwhelming list of references, and there is a good index.

The book is well bound and attractively printed on good paper.

Subjective

"After all this, what can we be said to know?" So asks Lady Wootton in one section of her book, and so may we ask ourselves, having read, if not remembered, the whole book. She has accomplished the difficult feats of compressing into one volume the essential contents of much of other people's work, making a critical survey of it, and organising it into a coherent picture of one aspect of man's disapproval of man. To this she adds suggestions of how other people's work might better have been done and indicates further profitable lines of reasearch. The whole of her work shows erudition and wit, that appearance of originality which springs from the proper digestion of the work of others and a certain knock-about one-upmanship which it is a pleasure to observe at work on the position and defences of others, but acutely uncomfortable when the author turns her eye in one's own direction.

If any one were in any doubt about the wisdom of never being sure of anything, then this book will surely convince them. If authorities can be so easily brought down, then just where do we stand? It is trying enough to find that "experience", of which so many of us can claim so much, is often not experience at all but self-deception. But where do we go when the experts, or specialists, are themselves so much at fault, their work inconclusive, their cherished propositions not well enough examined, their statistics inadequate. It drives one back to the bland defence of the art lover or music lover, who says: "I know nothing about art (or music), but I do know what I like!" It seems we must either say we are moved to do certain things by forces we do not understand and with consequences

BOOK REVIEWS—*cont.*

which may or may not be what we intend, but we do think (by which we mean feel or believe) that what we do is right, or else have some irritating colleague ask: "But have you read Wootton?" The alternative that we should do absolutely nothing at all until Lady Wootton has collected all these footling experts together, co-ordinated their work, made them reconsider their conclusions, and formulated a policy for us is unfortunately not open to us. We have our work to do, and about it we must go, whether or not we know what we are doing.

But this is not to complain. If we are in a state of confusion, let us be glad to have that state revealed to us and no-one could complain that an effort to reveal the confusion in which we are, or into which the social sciences are leading us, has not been made. Indeed some effort is made to show us what is left after the muddle is tidied. These researches into researches, for that is what lies behind the book, represent work which all of those who, like ourselves, have opportunity for messing about with the lives other people should know well. If we have not Christian humility, or a natural respect for the views and feelings of others, or some other form of protection from arrogance and misdirection, then here we have cause to be thoughtful, for here lies in ruins a goodly number of propositions that had, to some of us at least, the air of authority, the appearance of integrity, but which turn out to be either "Not proven"; or "In conflict with the evidence", and this is good. We have too long tried to follow guides which are not guides. We have, or we should have, long since become suspicious of the world of assertions based on prejudices or inadequate samples. We still, however, have to work in this imperfect world. We need no longer be quite so blind to its imperfections.

Some reviews, whilst praising generously, have already protested at some of Lady Wootton's work, or suggested she was inadequately familiar with the literature of some topics. There are almost four hundred listed references, and much conscientious work has clearly preceded the presentation of views. Lady Wootton herself warns us that her "colleagues would, I think, dissent from some of my emphases and conclusions." There are, necessarily limitations to this kind of work which time and resources impose. An exhaustive examination of anything so uncertain and complex as human behaviour, be it for individuals or groups, is not possible. The theory on which Lady Wootton has acted, she says, is that, "There may be something to be said for trying to put scattered pieces of knowledge together inside one mind instead of leaving them distributed amongst many." She undertook this study, she says, in the belief that "Yet academic research, and particularly research in the field of human affairs, is likely to be all the better if we are not afraid, from time to time, to stop and ask ourselves where we are going and why". She generously warns us of the dangers of subjective judgements. Anybody at all who is concerned with the control and training of others, unless gifted with the most sublime self-confidence must have subscribed to Lady Wootton's theory and felt her belief. This is not to say we have no obligation to make our own subjective judgements, either about any of the

BOOK REVIEWS—*cont.*

original work with which we may be acquainted, or with Lady Wootton's appraisals of it. But it is to say that here is someone who understands the practical difficulties, and is making some attempt to see what sort of wood is obscured by so many trees.

Lady Wootton is gracious enough in her book to let her hair down a little. She does not hesitate to compare social workers with barmaids or barmen (on the grounds, one concludes, that they are all concerned to alleviate distress). She is amazed that they do not get their faces slapped, or suggests that a case worker might perhaps marry her client. Her quotations from the work of others are ably chosen for the purposes of debunking. The erotic quality of some of the passages quoted in the chapter "Contemporary Attitudes in Social Work" is curious to say the least of it. Age-old common sense is revealed beneath the fashionable trimmings of pseudo-scientific language. This freedom of speech, this courageous letting herself go makes her book enjoyable. It stirs the emotions and stimulates the mind. It suggests the possibility of reprisals. There is a heavy list of casualties amongst Royal Commissions, social scientists, psychiatrists, officials, and case workers. The reception of the book last year and since has produced the impression that everyone regards it as admirable, in general, but a little misguided in his own particular sphere.

Prediction Methods in Borstal Training.

Lady Wootton lends her considerable weight to debunking of the ability of "persons of 'informed judgement', such as magistrates, probation officers, or those who work in penal establishments", to make accurate forecasts. Mannheim and Wilkins apparently found it necessary to prove that their predictions were better than those of borstal governors, housemasters, and psychologists, despite the fact that these officers do not normally make that sort of prediction. It is not their function to do so. A curious device was used to make it appear that they did so. But this is old ground now and none of us would deny that we are soberer and wiser now about subjective judgements.

It is the function of prediction to make accurate forecasts, however. For the persons debunked prediction may be an amusing recreation, but their task is to accept the challenge however dismal the prospects. Release at some time must follow. The question of suitability has already been decided by the court, and if the court gives the sentence then presumably it also gives the result of the sentence if it is predictable. But is it predictable? What has the Mannheim-Wilkins study contributed which would give the answer to this question? In respect of any individual before the court at any particular time precisely nothing. In respect of a true random sample of a hundred individuals, and provided their scores are at the extremes of the scale, there is a clear indication that failure is more or less probable in specific percentages. If one relied on the experience tables for sentencing, then clearly after a sufficient time and number had elapsed the demonstration would become more and more convincing, or so it would at first have seemed.

BOOK REVIEWS—*cont.*

This would be, not because the individual judgement of any particular person were better or worse, but because the experience tables do not and cannot make individual judgements at all, and so cannot be used in that way. Of any individual all they can say is: "With people like him, borstal training is successful, say 67 times out of 100, or say not more than 15 times out of a 100, but as to whether this particular individual will be a success or failure we have nothing to say." For a time this looked convincing, but further work, particularly by Sir George Benson, makes it seem probable that this statement would be equally true of other kinds of treatment than borstal. "Prediction Methods and Young Prisoners." B.J.D. January, 1959. "This table is interesting in that it shows that borstal prediction discriminates, even for sentences of a fortnight." It was true of borstal simply because borstal happened to be the chosen area in the larger field. So it looks as though what the tables in fact do is bring us to a generalised statement about the value, not of one kind of training (i.e. borstal), but of a variety of penal actions. The tables therefore do not indicate after all whether borstal is suitable or not, but they are a measure of the difficulty of training, and reform, by any penal action at all; and for all we know yet for any other kind of action too.

Suitability reports to court from the Prison Commission suffer from all the risks of individual subjective judgements, so do court decisions. They indicate not so much probable outcome, but the possibility of the individual's submission to the treatment whatever the outcome might be. The administrative consequence of this position has to be worked out. The far-reaching consequences of the Mannheim-Wilkins study cannot be denied. The fascination of any kind of measuring instrument for everyone in our field is bound to give it a revolutionary potential. But is the unexpected breadth of its applicability not forseeable?

The heavy reliance of the tables on previous treatments is also, but in other terms, a reliance on previous convictions. So we learn that previous convictions indicate future convictions. The table says in effect "once a thief always a thief," or "the leopard can't change his spots," or as Lady Wootton suggests herself capital punishment prevents recidivism (but does not add that it also prevents reform). It also says, with modifications as to drunkenness, living with parents, length of longest job, and location of home, that a disposition to reconviction indicates a disposition to reconviction. This is presumably an elaborate tautology. Tautologies can have uses in the practical field of course, and added to this the nature of the tautology is modified by specific weightings. The almost relieving nature of the experience tables is their independence of subjective factors.

But their tautological nature is more serious than already described. They rely, with the exception of the location points on non-conforming criteria as listed earlier. The tautology is highly organised, but the most that can be got out of it at present is some such proposition as that non-conformity predicts non-conformity for groups of people in such an order. Lady Wootton's summary of attempts by others to get some kind of subjective judgement prediction, or causal factors

BOOK REVIEWS—*cont.*

prediction is a wonderfully healthy performance, but her exaltation of the Mannheim-Wilkins, solution of this problem tends to overlook its tautological nature. This is surprising because as she justly says on page 188, referring to the validation sample: "In these cases, which composed the middle group whose prospects of success appeared to be neither very bright nor very dim, prediction was not found to be practicable, at any rate without additional information which was not generally available even in the original sample. The very high score of successful prediction, therefore, relates only to some 60 per cent of the whole group." Mannheim and Wilkins themselves say on page 164 of "Prediction Methods in Borstal Training": Since no prediction was envisaged for the centre group, the tables may be considered fully validated." So here it is; in the centre area where it is least possible to describe a person as either a conformer, or a non-conformer the prediction study does not work, which is but to say the nearer it fits a tautological indication, i.e. less conformity gives rise to less conformity or failure, and more conformity gives rise to more conformity, or success, the more accurate it is. In the middle where it is difficult to see whether there is conformity or not it is difficult to tell whether there will be conformity or not. Nevertheless, tautological as the tables are they do give clear indications as to probable results numerically. It is one thing to say "once a thief always a thief," it is quite another to say of this 1,000 young men 680 will avoid further conviction. Administration can work on this. Further scientific work can be done on it. Experimentation can be evaluated. Better or worse results than expectation can be identified. The individual's position as an individual would, however, remain uncertain unless experimentation produced narrower results.

On page 336 of her book, in Conclusions—Practical, Lady Wootton is concerned with consequences to the community. She writes: "Yet both psychiatric methods and predictive researches of the Mannheim and Wilkins type concentrate attention solely upon the future convicted person himself, as though no-one else in the world existed. Both are concerned only to make sure that the offender will mend his ways, no matter what happens to anybody else." By "mending his ways" one supposes she means "succeeds" or "conforms" or does no harm to anybody else. If, however, one does "make sure that the offender will mend his ways", what harm to anybody else is to be expected? But apart from the lack of logic in this sort of argument the proposition itself is false. Chapter IX, 12 "Decision and Theory" of Mannheim and Wilkins makes their concern for consequences to others abundantly clear. In this section they even discuss the propriety of administrative action which flies in the face of their work because "although we may suggest that if all cases were sent to 'open' borstals (no matter what their prognosis) the success rate might increase, we might be more interested in increasing successes amongst the better type of boys, but regard the risk of absconding and committing further crime as too great a price to pay for an overall increase in the success rate

BOOK REVIEWS—*cont.*

if the bad boys received similar treatment", and again later "In either case we should not merely minimise the number of wrong decisions but minimise the amount of harm that would be done by making a wrong decision."

Even, however, if the unfortunate allegation of the lack of concern were true, which it is not, the desperate fact is that Mannheim and Wilkins' type of research cannot concentrate attention solely upon the future of a convicted person, but only on the future of groups of convicted persons. The individual as such is deliberately sacrificed on the altar of objectivity. The reward, and it is a reward, is repeatability, a yardstick by which other work can be measured.

Who are the Lawbreakers?

It may be that objectivity and individuality are as impossible to relate meaningfully as it is to square a circle, or trisect an angle, by ruler-and-compass methods.

It may be also that in attempts to examine and predict non-conformity we fail to examine the whole state of affairs; overlooking the guilt of the community. Lady Wootton's ardent endeavour to pin the label of criminality on erring motorists overlooks the communities' disregard of elementary safety conditions for the roads generally and the long misappropriation of the Road Fund. This is not to say we should decry responsibility particularly on the part of motorists, but it seems inconsistent to indicate the blurring of the line between sickness and sin of one group of non-conformists, and etch it in more deeply for another. The curious thing about the whole investigation so far as crime is concerned is the recognition of the unsatisfactory nature of criminal statistics, but overlooking the impossibility of making reliable statements about the criminal population if all one's information is obtained only from those caught and convicted. In recent research reference has been made to admission of stealing by university students and school children. How can one hope to distinguish between the criminal and non-criminal population if there is no way of knowing which is which?

If less than half reported crime is followed by detection, how can we even know whether the non-criminal population is non-criminal? The conception of a criminal and non-criminal division of the population as valid description is quite probably nonsense anyway. As Lucian Bovet wrote (Psychiatric Aspects of Juvenile Delinquency—1951): "Certain personal or social factors, in themselves neither pathological nor specific, will by their degree of intensity cause an individual to be given the legal classification of delinquent, whilst psychologically there is little, if anything, to distinguish him from others who have escaped legal sanctions." It is doubtful if valid conclusions can be drawn from work on samples so clumsily selected. The range of available data is also painfully short.

Lady Wootton suggests overcoming this (page 322) by an extension of the "still exiguous literature of criminal and other anti-social biographies." She goes on to forsee the handling by electronic devices of far more variables, and the problems arising and then shies away from what is becoming the skeleton in the criminological cupboard—causation. Are we after

BOOK REVIEWS—*cont.*

all going to be left by the social scientists with the profound reflection that the law-breakers are those caught breaking the law?

Recommendation.

At least borrow this book for Lady Wootton has performed a great service for us all. Much of what she has written can be made the subject of contentious argument, but the essence of her work, the assessment of the work of scientists "for the interested layman", should be the subject of continuous study and report. The field concerned in individual reports need not be so wide as that covered by Lady Wootton, but being able to consult such reports, would put people like prison and borstal officers of all grades in the way of knowing what it is essential they should know. They often have neither the time nor skill to know it by the critical reading of the multitudinous out-pourings, some published, some not, of social scientists, not all of whose work it seems will withstand rigorous examination. In the meanwhile and probably for a long time to come, there is little doubt that "*Social Science and Social Pathology*" will be a standard reference book and guide.

A. GOULD.

. . . . . .

THE JURY IS STILL OUT

By Irwin D. Davidson and Richard Gehman Peter Davies. 1959. pp.303. 21s. 0d.

IN JULY 1957 a 15-year-old boy called Michael Farmer was beaten, kicked and stabbed to death by a gang of his contemporaries in New York. Most of the eighteen accused of attacking him were put up in the juvenile court; but seven of them were over fifteen and were tried by Judge Davidson of the Court of General Sessions, New York County, on a charge of first degree murder. This book is an account of the trial. The blurb claims that "told with outrage and compassion it is a story with a sobering lesson for all of us." What is this lesson?

The crime itself was a shocking one not only because of the youth of its victim, but also because of the youth of its perpetrators. Farmer, whether he himself belonged to a gang or not, was a fatal casualty in the incessant warfare of gangs like the Egyptian Kings, the Dragons, the Jesters, the St. John's Killers, the Boy Chaplains and the Baby Mau Maus, into which a considerable part of the youth of New York seems to be organised. The victim was caught alone and one at least of his assailants used a knife. The surprising thing is that such deaths do not occur more often; just as it is surprising that when gangs of boys fight in Britain, broken bones are not too frequent, Our *murderous* hooligans are older. It is indeed astonishing that among children such as those described in this book, who live according to queer rules of their own and regard law and the police with hatred, killing is very much less frequent than among adult and even normally law-abiding citizens in peace time.

To those who want to know what juvenile delinquents—or rather the particular sort of juvenile delinquents brought up in the near-slums of New York—are like, this book throws some light, but not much in proportion to its size. From juvenile witnesses we learn that these gangs are well organised. They are run by a Presi-