

way to world revolution again, then there is good reason to expect that with future changes in social conditions will come further changes in doctrine.

Our task is two-fold. We must strengthen our efforts in every direction to bring about those changed conditions throughout the world which will force the Soviets to reconsider their position. That task is well under way. The more difficult task remains. We must resist the temptation to relieve ourselves from the fearsome burden of uncertainty, frustration and perplexity with which we are faced by retreat into a certain world with simple answers. As Professor Fuller has so cogently said, "In our present predicament, we need above all else to keep some sense of contingency, some feeling for the pressures that lie behind the printed page, some awareness of the complexity and the possible internal contradictions in the motives of our potential enemy. We must have the intellectual forbearance to let time and nature work on our side; we must not be like the farmer in the Chinese proverb who pulled his crops out by the roots trying, as he explained, 'to help them grow.'"⁵

ROBERT S. WARSHAW†

CONTEMPORARY CORRECTION. Paul W. Tappan, Editor. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1951. Pp. xvii, 434. \$5.50.

AMONG the disabilities from which the field of correction has suffered is the lack of a comprehensive and authoritative statement of (a) the principles concerning crime and the behavior of convicted individuals which may be regarded as governing the operation and planning of our various prisons and reformatories, (b) the policies and programs in administration and treatment which have been successful or have failed, with particular emphasis upon evaluative criteria, and (c) the correctional problems which seem to bear the highest priority.

Regular readers of such specialized publications as *Federal Probation*, *The Prison World*, and the *Proceedings* of the American Prison Association may be able to piece together trends and gain insights from the shop talk of prison officials, but a single, systematic treatment of the whole field of correction has scarcely existed for the present period. *Contemporary Correction* is designed to fill this gap. It is a collection of thirty-three articles almost all specially written for this volume by thirty-one selected experts in the correctional field. These are arranged in five sections under the headings: Correction: Preliminary Considerations, Administrative Organization and Classification, Programs in the Correctional Institution, Types of Correctional Institutions, and Extra-mural Treatment.

5. Fuller, *supra* note 1, at 1166.

†Member of the third year class, Harvard Law School.

According to Editor Tappan, the volume is "predicated upon the importance of understanding the total task, as seen through the experience of outstanding authorities in each of the varied fields of correctional practice." As a matter of fact, at least ten of the contributors now hold or have held high ranking positions in the Federal Bureau of Prisons—Bates, Bennett, Bixby, Chappell, Killinger, Loveland, Fuller, MacCormick, Barnes, and Alper. Nine contributors are connected with state correctional agencies, but, with one exception, all are to be found in the agencies of three states—New York, New Jersey, and California. Other contributors may be identified as educators, executives and consultants in national associations with correctional objectives, an architect with a firm specialized in the design and construction of correctional institutions, and a magistrate.

By almost any standard the list of contributors constitutes a blue-ribbon panel of experts—but is hardly representative of penal administration in the United States. These men, functioning as they do in the Federal service and in a few of the most advanced state systems, constitute a relatively small inner circle of articulate leaders in liberal penology and "scientific" administration. What they say represents the thinking and experience in their particular institutions and systems and what they believe is thought and practiced elsewhere. From one point of view *Contemporary Correction* reveals the main currents in modern penology, but it is apparent that there is a very large segment of the prison world beyond the limits of both the Federal service and the operations in the "best" states whose practitioners are rarely heard and whose methods are virtually unknown.

Although most of the contributors have focused rather closely upon their special assignments and have refrained from extensive evaluations in other areas, there is agreement among them as to some of the top ranking problems and significant issues in the correctional field. There is substantial agreement that (a) the maintenance of professional standards and training of adequate personnel are functions which rank near the top in making or breaking both administration and treatment. Professor Reckless' excellent chapter, *Training of the Correctional Worker*, indicates the nature of the processes through which a professionalized service may be achieved. In a more general sense, there is agreement that (b) prisons are abnormal, totalitarian environments which inhibit the use and effectiveness of methods and techniques developed in and adapted to the "outside," and (c) the prison phase of the rehabilitative process is not an end in itself but a part of a total process in which the satisfactory adjustment of the offender in the community is the basic and final objective.

As men of strong professional interests and as leaders in experimental programs, most of the contributors either implicitly or explicitly dwell upon the custody-treatment conflict which characterizes the operation of American prisons. There is a common recognition that custody interests are well entrenched (*e.g.*, ". . . despite all that has been accomplished, with few excep-

tions the patterns of established usage in penal institutions are still oriented around custodial values and relationships are patterned around the objectives of security and discipline."¹) and a sensitivity to this fact (*e.g.*, "It should be mentioned that this question of custody at times receives overemphasis amounting to fetishism to the disregard of many crying needs. Even in our juvenile institutions we put an emphasis on custodial care which is all out of proportion to that which is placed on clinical and rehabilitative work."²). In this connection, Brancale, whose paper is one of the two or three best in the book, states an important fact whose significance is just now filtering slowly into general correctional thinking and practice when he writes, "It is important to stress that the capacity to conform to institutional regimen is by no means an index of basic capacity to get along in life, and it does not necessarily mean that the interpersonal and intrapsychic difficulties are truly beginning to clear up."³

Perhaps the most controversial issues raised in *Contemporary Correction* are concerned with (a) the role of the expert, other than the judge, in the process of distinguishing the nature of the offense and in deciding what is to be done with the offender, and (b) the place and utility of the several methods of treatment or "levels" of therapy. The critical questions of who is the appropriate expert and what is the appropriate framework for coping with deviant behavior expose the rather sharp differences in basic views between the legalists and some of the "newer" specialists, primarily psychiatrists, psychologists, and sociologists. Professor Tappan in his introductory chapter, *Objectives and Methods in Correction*, is, as usual, somewhat legalistic.⁴ He is suspicious of administrative criminal law and reluctant substantially to modify the power of the judge in our existing court system to make final decisions in criminal cases under the "rule of law" and within the framework of "a fairly exact, stable, and deterrent criminal code, established and altered by a responsible legislature." While there may be substance to such fears the basic questions remain very much alive. What are the indispensable functions of the more or less exclusively law-trained individual in the criminal case? Is not the court an essentially clinical situation whether operated under omnibus criminal codes or under a multitude of specific criminal laws so explicitly and carefully written that all fine shadings of prescribed and proscribed behavior with their appropriate penalties and treatment processes are available to the executive officer? Should not the disposition of the criminal case be in the hands of behavioral experts, who, though their sciences are incomplete, are in a position to bring to behavior problems a sounder, more analytical appreciation and interpretation of all of the pertinent facts than is now so frequently manifest in judgments based upon common sense and a hedonistic psychology?

-
1. P. 215 (McCorkle).
 2. P. 192 (Brancale).
 3. P. 198.
 4. See, *e.g.*, his *JUVENILE DELINQUENCY*, (1949).

In a candid chapter, *The Court and the Correctional System*, Judge Morris Ploscowe discusses chance, bargaining, and diversity in the courts and the problems these factors create for correctional operations. He writes, "Judicial sentences may be inappropriate, ineffective, or excessive because judges do not understand the nature of the correctional problem in their community. . . . A judge only too frequently is a civil lawyer who was a good friend of the governor, mayor, or a political leader. His election or appointment to office does not endow him with the understanding of how to deal with the mass of human material that passes through his court."⁶ Ploscowe suggests that judges need to know more about the workings of the institutions to which they sentence offenders. He prescribes organized visitations, conferences, and consultations with correctional administrators.

If the heart of correction is treatment, the most significant chapters in the book should be those which discuss the assumptions, scope, techniques, and results of the various kinds of treatment attempted in modern prisons. On this score the book appears to be weighted toward a consideration of administrative organization, particularly the organization of diagnostic services, rather than treatment as such. Although there are seven chapters in the section dealing with programs in the correctional institution (including chapters on custody, medical services, education, employment, and religion), only two deal with psychiatric, psychological, and case work services, and the special technique of group therapy. Administrative developments which are singled out for special chapters are classification, the service unit, reception centers, and the Youth Authority Plan. There is uncertainty and controversy as to what treatment is or must become to solve rehabilitative problems. And unfortunately, the survey type papers which characterize this volume are not organized to attack systematically basic theoretical questions, among which the nature of treatment is certainly one of the most important. In the section devoted to promising contemporary administrative structures and techniques the point is made that even the most elaborate administrative programs do not constitute treatment. For example, Loveland writes, "[Classification] is not in itself the diagnostic, training, and treatment programs, but it is the method, the procedures, and the organization of personnel by which these programs can be directed efficiently toward the treatment of the individual."⁶ It is suggested by Kendall, for example, that administrative devices may only prepare the way for the application of more critical techniques: "The reception center is largely an agency for diagnostic study. It is not primarily a treatment institution, although many phases of the orientation program may be regarded as an essential prelude to treatment."⁷ And the ultimate significance of treatment is emphasized by Wallack: "Need one say that if there is no treatment

5. P. 59.

6. P. 92.

7. P. 122.

program, nothing for the institution to accomplish save mere custody, the service unit can serve no purpose?"⁸

The several chapters (by Tappan, Reckless, and Brancale) which are more explicitly concerned with treatment express basically different views as to what "levels" of treatment are necessary or feasible to rehabilitate the major portion of the prison population. These views are closely related to differing theories of crime causation. Brancale argues the need for a "deep-level" emphasis:

"The average classification process, when boiled down to its essentials, consists of little more than a check list of the inmate's deficiencies and assets, with specific recommendations for rectifying or exploiting each specific finding. . . . This segmental approach to classification which is so prevalent in correctional institutions should be recognized for what it is: a superficial, impractical, nonintegrative approach which ignores the problem of offenders and their personality structure—too often one of obscure psychopathology."⁹

Tappan discounts psychopathologic cause and clinical solutions. He writes, "The prevalent idea of criminal illness is highly misleading. Criminals are not generally neurotic, psychotic, or psychopathic . . . by merely attaching a general label to the offender, one may be led to assume quite erroneously that the problem has been solved thereby or that it is necessary only to provide some vague 'psychotherapy' to resolve the difficulty."¹⁰ Tappan appears to believe that well regulated custodial programs may serve to redefine conduct for all but a small minority of prisoners. He says further, "The objective is not the cure of minor psychological aberrations or social mal-adjustments, but a conditioning to that minimum level of conformity to law in the offender's attitudes and habits that is required to restrain him from persisting criminality."¹¹ Rather than "conditioning to law" and "deep-level" therapy, Reckless emphasizes a somewhat different approach: "Social impact or implantation is proposed as the operational theory for correctional workers because it fits the level at which they can operate, namely, a peripheral social level as contrasted with the deeper levels of snarled emotional life."¹²

The final section, Extramural Treatment, seems underdone in terms of the importance of the topic and in comparison with the attention given more routine matters in other parts of the book (*e.g.*, the listing and description of all of the Federal prisons, *c. V.*). The major paper, Killinger's *Parole and Other Release Procedures*, is informative and analytical as far as it goes, but much of contemporary significance is left unsaid. Whether or not com-

8. P. 153.

9. P. 193.

10. P. 11.

11. Pp. 11-12.

12. P. 38.

munity factors (attitudes, employment practices, patterns of competition and segregation, agency values) are looked upon as being outside of the practical range of reorientation and control, nevertheless, they play such an important part in continuing and reinforcing other treatment beginnings that an extended examination would seem to be highly desirable.

Two papers may be mentioned as falling appreciably below the standard set by the others. Pray's brief paper on case work services is platitudinous and unenlightening. Fuller's chapter on medical services is a disturbing expression of narrow, antiquated theory and thought patterns. His curious interpretation of human motivation and his plea for the "therapy" of "conditioned fear" has the principal effect of producing the hope that Fuller does not speak for the whole fraternity of medical officers in prisons. McCorkle's report on method and achievement in group therapy is surprisingly brief. It lacks sufficient interpretation to represent the approach which is presently regarded as a promising "new" tool in penology.¹³

Contemporary Correction does not attempt to attack the problems of cause and prevention in any direct fashion. Although Reckless states that the frontal boundaries of correction are being extended, he indicates today's general correctional position when he says, "[T]here are legitimate reasons for saying that correction as an integrated field should stop short of prevention and should confine itself to the ways and means for effective treatment of the offender taken into custody."¹⁴

Although *Contemporary Correction* is a cross-sectional survey of current organization and practice rather than an attempt to develop or show the emerging outlines of an integrated theory of treatment, it is an important book, standing alone, and deserving a wide audience. It is a major step in bringing an increasing sense of unity and direction to the sprawling field of correction.

RICHARD R. MYERS†

13. Cf. Bixby & McCorkle, *Guided Group Interaction in Correctional Work*, 16 AM. SOC. REV. 455 (1951).

14. Pp. 35-6.

† Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, Oberlin College.