

Murder and Violence in Contemporary Criminology

The Subculture of Violence by MARVIN E. WOLFGANG and FRANCO FERRACUTI, London, Tavistock Publications: New York, Barnes & Noble, June 1967, 63s. Paperback 30s.

Reviewed by MARK BEESON

A REVIEWER once carelessly wrote of a psychology book that it filled a much needed gap. He was writing in the bad old days when psychology had no integrated approach. Criminologists are now acknowledging that their subject has been suffering the same malaise. The main culprit has been identified as the multi-causal "explanation". This erstwhile virtuoso has been particularly powerful in Britain, having gained from Burt's early support. It took Wilkins' *Social Deviance*¹ to expose the anti-scientific character of this man-of-straw: Wilkins also seized the opportunity to press for a less confusing, less defeatist formulation of theory.

Mannheim's *Comparative Criminology*²—the most comprehensive text so far—was more cautious in its comments on the multi-factor notion. Nevertheless, its author repeatedly expressed his hope that criminology would embrace an interdisciplinary approach. In the

typological field, for example, Mannheim declared that the need "for cross-disciplinary team work is particularly urgent in criminology. In theory this has become universally accepted; in actual practice it still very often remains a distant ideal to which mere lip-service is paid at inter-disciplinary congresses and conferences" (p. 18). Anticipating the publication of this book, Mannheim credits the authors with presenting in chapter 1 "much valuable material . . . on . . . problems concerning the object of full 'integration' between different scientific disciplines, in particular sociology, psychology and biology" (p. 287).

Wolfgang's own faith in the unitary nature of criminology is, of course, well documented. He suggested some years ago³ that, in their contributions to the science of criminology, the "separate disciplines" should properly be thought of as nothing more than "artifacts of analysis". In the exchange, he

argued, "despite its acknowledged indebtedness to other disciplines, criminology has made important contributions to the fuller understanding" of a wide range of other social phenomena (p. 159).

INTEGRATION IN CRIMINOLOGY

In sub-titling the present book "Towards an Integrated Theory of Criminology", the authors commit themselves totally to their mission. The first two chapters of the book attack the general issue of integration. It is gratifying to anyone interested in the field that one of those to whom the book is dedicated is Sellin. The other is Di Tullio, reflecting Ferracuti's origins and the publication of the Italian version of the book last year. For Wolfgang, the work continues the valuable tradition of trans-continental co-operation which he began as a Guggenheim Fellow in Italy with his classic reappraising paper on Lombroso in Mannheim's *Pioneers in Criminology*⁴

The book offers a challenge to those who approach criminology from one of the specialities on which the science depends. Inevitably, the task of reviewing the book must stimulate in the reviewer a proper modesty over his own capacity to judge a work which aspires to press integration beyond the limits achieved so far.

WHAT IS THE BOOK ABOUT?

The work appears as a blend of the efforts of one author trained in the social and cultural traditions of American criminology and the other trained in the medical and

biological traditions of European criminology. First, and at the more general level, the book is concerned to express the need for an integrated approach, particularly in criminology but also more generally in the social and other sciences. Only secondly, at a more particular level, the book attempts the application of the integrative approach to the issue which provides the title—the subculture of violence. As Mannheim notices, the authors acknowledge that: "The ultimate end of integration is grandiose and ambitious but worth the candle" (pp. xvi and 6). The authors declare: "Our immediate goal is to examine the techniques of scientific integration and to demonstrate its application by collating data and theory from sociology, psychology and biology relative to a major form of deviant conduct" (p. 6).

The book, we are assured, has been "worth the candle". The potential reader needs to know whether it is worth both ends of the candle. To those who use the term "subculture" with some glimmerings of its inadequacy, chapter 3 is useful. To those who can face the inevitable challenge of reducing theory to empirical propositions, the same chapter is invaluable. To anyone with a specific interest in violence and a sympathy for measurement, chapter 3 onwards is suggestive. Anyone who reads the first two chapters closely is likely to develop, through exasperation,

an abiding interest in violence. Chapter 5 provides stimulation, particularly to those involved in treatment.

As a preliminary, it must be said that both authors are sufficiently established to withstand justifiable attack. In particular, Wolfgang's paper on Lombroso,⁴ his *Patterns in Criminal Homicide*,⁵ his editorial role with Savitz and Johnson on *The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency*⁶ and *The Sociology of Punishment and Correction*⁷ and, not least, his "Race and Crime" in Klare's *Changing Concepts of Crime and its Treatment*⁸ cannot be gainsaid, as signal contributions to the literature. The present book, however, stirs some of the anxieties which attach to *The Measurement of Delinquency*⁹ and, at its worst, babbles esoterically.

A CRASH AT THE CROSSROADS

The first, orienting chapter is short but disastrous. The first sentence is perhaps only arguably tautological, the second begs the question and is declamatory in a way that is not unequivocally supported by what follows. The third sentence ignores the dynamic nature of the discipline and the framework within which the scholar works. This is not a good start by any standards, even if it is an artifice to provoke the reader. The provocation stimulates a defensive reaction, ineffectively challenged by the authors expression of faith. What singular benefit is to accrue from this vaunted "integrative

approach"? This becomes a haunting question, linked with the tendency noticed by Mannheim for the authors to be more successful in showing what they do *not* mean by integration than they are in showing what they *do* mean. This threatens to reach idiot proportions as they quote in their notes: "Nor does our use of the term integration have any relationship to Sorokin's reference to 'integral truth', which he refers to as . . ." (p. 14). They refer the reader to 17 pages of one of Sorokin's volumes to explicate the non-meaning, although Sorokin is anything but central to their argument.

The authors take shelter by declaring that they are making a restricted analysis. They are perhaps not properly respectful of some earlier unmentioned workers, notably Moles, Lippitt and Withey¹⁰ of Michigan and, more historically, even Cabot of the Cambridge Somerville project¹¹. Equally, the authors show no appreciation of the possibility that they may set their readers a greater task of assimilation than that set by "un-integrated writers". The new style approach that the authors hope for may also let loose yet another different, albeit integrated, stream in the contemporary cacophony. Against this, what is so amiss in the modest attempt of those engaged in interdisciplinary research: "not focussing their efforts at this time upon the building of any single social science map but . . . seeking to relate some of the

disciplines that deal with similar or related problems in connection with similar or related phenomena and in this way to bring an increasing inter-relationship among these data, phenomena and conceptualisms?" (p. 9 quoting Tyler). Certainly, in the short run, it is better to read *Growth to Freedom*¹² and *Homeless Borstal Boys*¹³ as separate texts than to hold off, waiting for an integrated volume. Given too, the intervening variable of the reader's capabilities, the reading of two separate texts may *always* be preferable. The authors observe that: "the assumptions on which an individual discipline is based may be matters of doubt or may even be empirically improbable when treated in a different context. This does not invalidate a discipline as a science but it limits its range of explanation and prediction" (p. 6 quoting Tyler). There is, however, no evidence adduced to show that these limits are a severe handicap or that the integrated approach can effectively avoid the handicap. It may simply incorporate the handicap into the integrated text. The standard of chapter 1 as a whole must throw doubt on whether Mannheim's respect truly applies to the chapter. On balance, it is likelier that his remarks apply to the existing chapter 2.

A GRAB-BAG WITH HICCUPS

There is a hint that the first chapter was written more to preface the second than as an exercise in its own right. Ambiguously

titled "Criminology as an Integrating Discipline", chapter 2 opens by expanding the first paragraph of the book, with particular reference to criminology. In doing so, the first quarter of the chapter duplicates entirely, though with minor alterations and additions, including a few references, Wolfgang's earlier article referred to above³ without providing a reference to it. This duplication throws doubt on the role of the second author, since he has effected so little change in Wolfgang's original individual article. It must be acknowledged, however, that the two authors were collaborating at that time, when they jointly wrote their brief piece in the *British Journal of Criminology*¹⁴. This piece is far from irrelevant for the present book, since it presented the design for a study of violence in Puerto Rico. The present text, however, does not present any findings from the proposed study and merely refers to it once, although Mannheim's foreword also does so parenthetically. Incidentally, the more than occasional inadequacy of the index becomes apparent in the attempt to confirm this.

The "old" section of chapter 2, then, should be familiar as an earnest of Wolfgang's faith in the integrity of criminology. To the reader of Popper, the content may smack somewhat of scientistics, but this is more a characteristic of the introspective phase of the science than of Wolfgang as spokesman. The new section of the

chapter examines the major research trends in criminology. The first section, on clinical criminology, is international in scope and rather thin. It is, in any case, acknowledged to be incomplete. Its international character makes it difficult to check—it may be the only carelessness that the British borstal system is referred to as a good example of the application of diagnostic techniques in the *juvenile* field. This also seems to illustrate a confusion between diagnosis and its rigorous application in a research or scientific sense. While this clinical section raises the issue of the utility of the multiple factor approach, it does so with less clarity than Wilkins' treatment. The closing observation is that: "... the clinical criminologist is more frequently a consumer than a creator of theoretical formulations and constructs. On the other hand, the scientist, particularly the sociologist, working at the macroscopic theoretical level must rely for proof upon the functions of the clinician working through individuals who ultimately are collected together as arrays of variables and attributes for statistical manipulation and analysis" (p. 36). Rather than being a clear, succinct, critical synthesising conclusion, this seems an ambiguous, confused and question-begging invitation to perpetuate an old debate.

Next, the authors turn to an examination of the sociological tradition. The Gluecks, they imply,

epitomize the lack of integration characteristic of the science. No capital is made of the failure of the Gluecks to integrate, even within their own frame of reference, as far as the arithmetic of their methods is concerned. Pursuing their theme, Wolfgang and Ferracuti can only declaim on the penalties of isolationism, since there is no comparable indication of the benefits of a more integrationist approach. In this context, the ten pages (pp. 49–58) devoted to a more intensive review of "Current Developments in Theory and Research" are much more rewarding. Particularly gratifying is the recognition of Wilkins' contribution. The section suffers, however, from a rather uncritical approach in which some questionable work is included without any attempt to appraise its true worth.

In the course of its wanderings, chapter 2 does engage with, or at least runs parallel to, a major criminological problem. The case for an explicit guiding theory without which the "whole cosmic, organic, psychic, and sociological universes of variables are presented in unmanageable form to the investigator" (p. 59) is certainly noticed, but not expanded or zealously pursued except in relation to the inadequacies of the multiple factor school. Adherents are given excellent advice (p. 62) towards making their procedures more explicit and scientific. The "generalising theorist", too, is advised, though more

toward "operationalising" his analyses. Yet both ideal types would do well to heed *both* sets of advice. Meanwhile, this most promising section of the chapter is largely sacrificed to concentrating attention on personality as the intervening variable between the attributes of a social system and the nature of individual behaviour. This concentration links with the section devoted to the confrontation between clinical and sociological criminology (p. 67 ff.), and this suggests that fuller discussion of the general problem was excluded for the sake of the more immediate purpose.

As it is, the authors declare, there is a danger of a serious split between the two camps. Yet this declaration pays insufficient attention to differences in what represents "pay-off" to the two camps as the authors define them. The authors identify the clinical school with the "practitioners", wherever they are operating, rather than with the European school of criminology (p. 67). This narrowness is not unhelpful, since it suggests that "Social workers could have become the functional liaison between disciplines that need one another" (p. 72). The fruitfulness of this idea is unfortunately not explored, but the idea is one which confronts anyone engaged in the training of those assuming the role of social worker. It would be a diplomatic gesture for the theorist to declare that until the social worker seizes, or is acknowledged to have, this

liaison role, the theorist's contribution to action is minimal.

The closing sections of the chapter knit together the threads which the authors have picked upon in the development of the science. Yet, in the case of Wilkins, for example, the authors have done little more than flirt with his writings. Where they have followed, there is coherence. Where they divert, chaos re-establishes itself. The reader is left to resolve precisely the sort of disorder which exists in the literature as a whole. This certainly leaves the following chapter with a real task. Chapter 2, incidentally, perpetuates the worst traditions of scholarship and obscurantism apparent in chapter 1. The reader is referred to nine pages of a work of the turn of the century to elucidate the once-only use of the word "sympodial" to describe the way separate disciplines merge and develop (p. 77, Note 14).

The perennial question of the applicability of American writing to Britain is raised in the closing homily in the chapter stressing the need for training for an integrated criminology. There will be those who already see this being achieved here. They would be right to hesitate before deciding whether to accept that the contrast as the authors have drawn it applies to Britain.

SUBCULTURE THROUGH A GLASS, DARKLY

With chapter 3, the content of the book switches from quixotic

epistemology to rather firmer territory. The foremost issue is the meaning of "subculture": "Generally, we build upon the assumption alluded to briefly by Shils and by Jaeger and Selznick, namely, that not all values, beliefs, or norms in a society have equal status, that some priority allocation is made, that the subcultural variants may partially accept, sometimes deny, and even construct antitheses of, elements of the central, wider, or dominant values, yet remain within that cultural system" (p. 99). This cannot for long pretend to be a *careful* statement, but it does attempt explicitness and provides a starting zone, if not a starting point. It is difficult to decide in what follows whether the carelessness is merely an irritating distraction or whether it sabotages the entire edifice. The crude anthropomorphism, for example, as the authors "use the term 'parent' to refer . . . to a larger culture that is willing to adopt a subculture voluntarily grafted to the parent because of a sufficiency in number and type of significant values commonly shared between 'parent' and 'child'" (p. 100) is touching but dysfunctional. The metaphors are mixed, the causal clause is worse than redundant. The reader has to believe he knows what the authors are getting at if he is to read on. If the reader continues, he will notice the authors identifying the obstacle presented by the absence of "objective and independent measurements of the norms of conduct"

(p. 102). This is followed by a simple bridge: "Because a subculture refers to a normative system of some group or groups smaller than the whole society, it should be possible to examine descriptively the composition of the population that shares the subcultural values. Individuals are, after all, culture carriers who both reflect and transmit through social learning, the attitudes, ideals, and ideas of their cultures" (p. 103) to "We are, therefore, suggesting at this point that there are two major types of subcultural values: (a) *tolerated concordant values*; and (b) *untolerated discordant values*. This suggested dichotomy is commonly recognised, but has not been made explicit or described value by value in sufficient detail. It calls, first, for a classification of norms assumed to be different in *kind*. But before this division can be empirically performed, we need clear ideas of the values that constitute the dominant value system so that we have a base line from which to determine the category of values that presumably are different" (pp. 110-111).

TO THE SLIDE RULE

Next, the proposal is to construct a scale of values reflecting their relative priorities and intensities and their concordance or discordance relative to the parent culture. This is sketchy stuff, hampered, for example by the introduction of "belief" into discussion intended to clarify the use of the terms

"value" and "norm". So "for operational theory we are inclined to view values as normative standards that are part of the repertoire of response which an individual may use as alternatives for action" (p. 114). Ensuing comment indicates that the authors selected the term "normative" with deliberation, as referring to "desirable". They reject the alternative, "norm", since that refers to "a standard to which a social group generally conforms or which the group manifests in conduct" (p. 114). Unfortunately, the discussion is not explicit on what is meant by the words "inclined", "response", "use", "alternatives" or "action". The reader is left uncertain how crucial these terms are. The same criticism may be applied to the authors selective list of criteria of values (p. 115) although it applies very much less to the selective list of criteria of norms borrowed, together with the context of annotations, from Blake and Davis (pp. 116-117). By something close to casuistry, the authors then prise open an inconsistency they see in Parsons' use of his categorisation of values as cognitive, appreciative or moral. They enlist Parsons' support as they propose to: "contend, values can be captured on the cognitive level by socio-psychological investigation, they can be operationally defined and measured for intensity of subscription by individuals and groups, and they can be clustered in a way

that denotes relative consistency, thereby promoting and producing a social system and sub-system" (p. 120).

The next step investigates the foundations of the measurement of values. The section is particularly memorable for the reference to Catton's attack on the problem of values assumed to be infinite (viz. human life itself, worship of God and acceptance of God's will) which notionally could not be subordinate (pp. 123-124). Catton demonstrated to his satisfaction that clergymen could discriminate between such values, the values could be scaled and could not, therefore, be regarded as "infinite", in the mathematical sense. A crucial observation in the general discussion concerns the use of the "available phenomenologically perceived culture items, first, as exterior indices of culture values, and, second, as independent criteria for comparison with the groups cognitive expression of their value orientations" (p. 125). These items presumably include the "language, art forms, mass-communication etc.", to which the authors vaguely refer. Those who find themselves in disagreement with Hoggart's *Uses of Literacy*, for example, will shudder at the difficulties of arriving at a non-controversial account of a culture in such terms.

The authors next apply much the same strategy in the field of values as Wolfgang used with Sellin in the *Measurement of Delinquency*⁹. The

reader may feel that this is a development which *has to come*. The authors do not disguise their own commitment to *value faith*. "We believe that despite the plethora of acts, tendencies *to act*, feelings, thoughts, attitudes, despite the multitudinous values, norms *have* an effort to locate dominant values in a culture and in its subcultural components, to classify and to measure them, should, and can be made" (p. 139).

OF NOXIOUS STIMULI

The major concern of the final section of the chapter "The Thesis of a Subculture of Violence" is: "with the bulk of homicides—the passion crimes, the violent slayings—that are not premeditated and are not psychotic manifestations" (p. 141). Slayings by those recognised as psychotic or legally insane, or by psychiatrically designated abnormal subjects are eliminated from the discussion. The reader will notice, as the authors do belatedly (pp. 162 and 270-271), that violence in pursuit of perceived rights, e.g. associated with the civil rights movement, political emancipation or the conditions of the disadvantaged, are not excluded from the chosen brief. They are, however, hardly discussed on their merits. It is wryly amusing that the authors should later wishfully declare that "commission of homicide by actors from the subculture at variance with the prevailing culture cannot be

adequately explained in terms of frustration due to failure to obtain normative goals of the latter, in terms of inability to succeed adequately with normative-procedures (means) for attaining those goals, nor in terms of an individual psychological condition of anomie" (p. 152).

The section includes very brief comments on psychoanalytic theories, medical and biological studies, psychometrics, the frustration-aggression hypothesis, containment theory (after Reckless), catharsis, child-rearing practices and aggression and social learning and conditioning. The brief notes are all too brief. The bulk of the discussion concerns the "cultural context". This last fifth of the chapter knits the preceding sections well. Mention of Selvin is welcome (p. 151) although the full implications of his later work seem to be as lost on these authors as on most contemporary sociologists.

On one page in the midst of the section, however, the reader's patience will be sorely tried (p. 156). The continuation paragraph is monumentally muddled. The following teters between considering the social approval of violence in time of war and the extent to which similar factors operate in the confrontations between individuals which result in homicide. Yet in the middle of the paragraph even the authors suspect they are at sea

as they suggest: "It may be relevant to point out that in the Philadelphia study of criminal homicide, 65 per cent of the offenders and 47 per cent of the victims had previous arrest records". Interesting, yes. Even vital. But it is surely up to the authors to make the relevance apparent and in this they fail. It is no coincidence that the page also features a misprint, a confusion of tense and the marvellous word "allelomimetic" which seems synonymous with "imitative". Meanwhile, the incidental reference to the pre-arrest rate in Wolfgang's earlier study⁵ raises again the applicability of this book to the British reader. Evidence on prior convictions from Gibson and Klein¹⁵ shows a much lower rate of prior involvement in serious incidents. From this flows doubt about the extent to which "criminal homicide" in Britain is "subcultural" or continuous with violence or aggressive offences.

Towards the end of the chapter (pp. 158-161) the authors set out seven propositions which they regard as corollaries to their central discussion. In the main, these are more like independent statements, some of them empirically based, which qualify the sense in which the terms "culture" and "subculture" are to be understood. The pages exceed a summary in sometimes introducing ideas which have not previously been discussed. Finally, the text disposes of notions

about a biological basis of aggressive behaviour, prior to the relevant discussion in the succeeding chapter. The dialectical account is also dispatched summarily. The authors have no patience with the suggestion that a contemporary culture is a synthesis in which lie the dynamics of an emerging contra-culture. This seems a gratuitous swipe at Hegel just to show how the authors stand with respect to Marx. They go to this trouble although they simultaneously write that they are not concerned with the genesis of subcultures, solely with their operation.

Throughout this long chapter, the uncertainty of what the authors wish to convey by their use of the word "aggression" is a serious handicap. Although the reader is made clear about the dramatic end of the continuum, some of the quoted studies (e.g. Bandura) refer less obviously to aggression than to the inherent properties of Bobo dolls. It is true that the authors refer to Buss's definition of aggression as: "the delivery of noxious stimuli in an interpersonal context" (p. 160) but they do not declare their own position relative to this doubtful code. In this and other respects, the book makes considerable assumptions about the reader's familiarity with certain sources. In particular, the reader would be quite lost if he had not first read at least Sutherland and Cressey's

Principles of Criminology, Cohen's *Delinquent Boys* and Matza's *Delinquency and Drift*.

WANT A FIGHT?

The overall content and certain idiosyncracies of style suggest that the next, short chapter is largely Ferracuti's. It is narrower but also more careful than the rest of the book. The concern raised in respect of the end of the preceding chapter that homicide may be discontinuous from aggression or violence is not stilled. The chapter endeavours to present: "Biological, psychiatric and psychometric perspectives on a subculture of violence from studies on homicide" (p. 186, Title). Having selected this brief, it is perhaps not surprising that murder among kin receives so little attention.

A related single-mindedness is apparent as the authors repeatedly insist that studies to which they refer *do* involve the operation of subcultural factors when there is a notable lack of evidence. For example: "The proclivity to violence on the part of parents who engage in this type of offense (battering children to produce the 'battered child' syndrome) can occasionally be subcultural" (p. 208).

The section on the biology of violence seems determined to dismiss the argument employing the notion of "instinct". In doing so, it perhaps pays insufficient attention to Lorenz¹⁶ particularly. After a "rapid excursus" (*sic*): "Although

some demonstrable correlations exist, we are compelled to conclude with Scott, McNeil, and Buss that there is no basic need for fighting, either aggressively or defensively, unless adequate stimuli meet the organism from the external environment. In brief, there is no physiological evidence of any stimuli for fighting in a normal organism. 'The important fact', says Scott, 'is that the chain of causation in every (well-studied) case eventually traces back to the outside'. Although there may be individual differences in the reactivity to external stimuli evoking aggression, these minor characteristics do not by themselves explain aggressive behaviour. This general conclusion, we find, is in agreement with a behavioral, subcultural approach" (pp. 200-201). Anyone want a fight? Later, in the section on psychiatric studies, there is a marvellous piece of anti-metaphysic: "In general, the less clearly motivated a murder is (in the sense that it is impossible to comprehend the motives) the higher is the probability that the homicidal subject is very abnormal. The easier it is to 'understand' (in the sense of both emotional and rational understanding) the homicidal motives, the more normal the subject is likely to be" (p. 209). Apart from confusing the *probability* of abnormality with the likelihood of greater *individual* normality, this statement

must be as superficial as it seems. Of course, the reader who follows up the sources will discover more than 150 references, and at that, the list fails to include Truman Capote's *In Cold Blood*.

The text next goes on to despatch the psychoanalytic case. The brevity with which it does so will not commend itself to the "orthodox". The authors, in the space they allot to the issue, do not attempt to penetrate the: "sylogistic circle of the doctrinal position" (p. 210).

The final comments in the chapter deal with the psychological diagnosis of the homicidal personality. It is perhaps simply bad planning that only *after* discussing studies employing the Rorschach do the authors introduce the compelling note that these analyses have never involved "blind" procedures in which the analyst is unaware of the manifestation of the homicidal tendency in his subject.

THE LAST ROUND-UP

The final chapter includes "a set of interpretative conclusions generated by relatively systematic research", "culture case studies on homicide from different countries" and comments on the "control, prevention, and treatment of violent crime" (p. 258). Age and sex, social class and race are the key issues mentioned. There is a neat piece on anomie, regarding it as a special case of culture conflict. The

"culture case studies" are fascinating guides to places from which the tourist is unlikely to return, commendable to less likeable colleagues.

In the course of these sections, however, the authors are discovered writing: "... there is no reason to believe that intensity of personal interaction is greater in number or degree among specific social groups, among lower classes, minority groups, the unskilled, or the young adult or the male population. The sentiments of attraction and hostility are widely and probably randomly distributed" (p. 267). Puzzlingly, in the context of this book, this must mean the opposite of what it says.

It is also in these sections that doubt arises over just how "ultimate" the use of violence is. In the "life-style" of the adult middle-class, this may be accepted, as they sit in judgment on the disadvantaged. But there are situations in which to deny the individual the last rites, to tie him to a contract of labour, to impugn his loyalty, to seduce his wife or otherwise assault his "rep" may arguably be more ultimate assaults than to kick him downstairs. Certainly, there is a large American minority to which the authors do not address themselves as they dismiss the ultimateness of non-violence, saying that "the Negro non-violent protest in

the United States has been successful (sic) for the same reason that Gandhi's measures succeeded—the 'administration respected the rights of others' (pp. 270–271). What, then of Newark, Detroit, New York, July 1967"? Besides this, the authors are far from showing a parallel between situations involving collective support of violence as a sanction and situations involving personal confrontations.

The text then takes a stimulating operations research approach to control, prevention and treatment, relating this to the issue of prediction. Oddly, these pages (pp. 284–289) are rather bare of references. Wilkins, who gave these ideas a lot of their impetus, is unmentioned. In a piece on the application of systems analysis, the authors carry this approach forward, although in so doing they have mis-read the works of Greenhalgh (pp. 292–293).

There is then quite a banal piece on the effect of changes in communication, transportation and medical technology on the proportion of fatal assaults, followed by "social engineering" proposals for "dispersing" subculturists. The reader begins to wonder how far the middle-class are prepared to go in employing their command of the power-structure. Such scepticism is nobbled as the authors quote Tumin, suggesting that to doubt the problematic nature of social

problems is to envy the licence of those who engage in proscribed behaviour (p. 308).

In their discussion of "treatment", the authors proposals for intervention are more legitimate and less radical. It is not clear, however, just what the "therapist" is to *do* once he appreciates the role of the subculture in the aetiology of the presenting behaviour.

The potential of this last chapter is high. But the brief is merely to throw out ideas for consideration. The burden of providing the consideration is thrust on the reader.

This is the epitaph on the book as a whole. It demands considerable effort from the reader, its usefulness depends upon the reader crystallising the meaning for himself. The traditional modesty of the last paragraph of the book, however, shames the savage reviewer: "We hope that our work might be considered useful as a bibliographical guide, as a review of the current stage of criminological research and theory, as a clear statement of our thesis of a subculture of violence, as a comprehensive summary of criminological knowledge about homicidal and other assaultive behaviour, and as an encouragement to the development of integrated scientific theory and research" (p. 316).

The first of these is nowhere mentioned as an objective of the

book, the second is approached, but incompletely, the third is lamentably missed. The fourth has, in some measure, been achieved. The fifth, despite the book's

shortcomings, may yet prove to have been "worth the candle". As much and more perhaps, could readily be achieved by a greater readership for Berger's incomparable *Invitation to Sociology*¹⁷.

REFERENCES

1. Leslie T. Wilkins, *Social Deviance: Social Policy, Action and Research*, London: Tavistock Publications, 1964; Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
2. Hermann Mannheim, *Comparative Criminology*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965.
3. Marvin E. Wolfgang, *Criminology and the Criminologist*, 54 J. Crim. L., C. & P.S. 155 (1963).
4. Hermann Mannheim (ed.), *Pioneers in Criminology*, London: Stevens & Sons, 1960, Ch. 9.
5. Marvin E. Wolfgang, *Patterns in Criminal Homicide*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1958.
6. Marvin E. Wolfgang, Leonard Savitz and Norman Johnston (eds.), *The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency*, N.Y.: Wiley, 1962.
7. Norman Johnston, Leonard Savitz and Marvin E. Wolfgang (eds.), *The Sociology of Punishment and Correction*, N.Y.: Wiley, 1962.
8. Hugh J. Klare (ed.), *Changing Concepts of Crime and its Treatment*, Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1966. Ch. 2.
9. Thorsten Sellin and Marvin E. Wolfgang, *The Measurement of Delinquency*, N.Y.: Wiley, 1964.
10. Oliver Moles, Ronald Lippitt and Stephen Withey, *A Selective Review of Research and Theory on Delinquency*, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1959 (Mimeo.).
11. Edwin Powers and Helen Witmer, *An Experiment in the Prevention of Delinquency: The Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study*, N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1951.
12. Derek Miller, *Growth to Freedom*, London: Tavistock Publications, 1964.
13. Roger Hood, *Homeless Borstal Boys*, London: Bell, 1966.
14. Franco Ferracuti and Marvin E. Wolfgang, *Design for a Proposed Study of Violence: A Socio-Psychological Study of a Subculture of Violence*, British Journal of Criminology (1963) 3:377-388.
15. Evelyn Gibson and S. Klein, *Murder*, London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1961.
16. Konrad Lorenz, *On Aggression*, London: Methuen, 1966.
17. Peter L. Berger, *Invitation to Sociology*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966.