
For some years now, I have been watching a certain judge in action. Whenever he peppers his remarks with tirades, it is a dead give-away that he is going to find in favor of that particular lawyer to whom his outbursts are directed. I find myself very much in the same position. Before I can get myself to set down words of praise for the painstaking efforts, the consummate skill, and astounding erudition embodied in this small volume called Crime and the Human Mind, I am impelled first to rid myself of a catalogue of its defects, as I see them.

It is indeed nice to think of criminology as a science. But isn't such thinking really wishful thinking? Criminological knowledge will be of such a nature as to be really termed "scientific" some day, but to maintain that it is such today is an overstatement. The positiveness of this assumption by the author robs the many verities contained in the book of a genuine ring.

A glaring example of the difficulties which the author gets himself into by assuming that criminological knowledge is scientific is the formula for crime, which reads $C = (T + S) / R$. In this formula $C$ represents crime, $T$ represents antisocial tendencies, $R$ represents resistance to such tendencies, and $S$ represents the situation or setting. It is understandable that $T$ and $R$ are in a reciprocal relationship and therefore can be mathematically expressed by the numerator and the denominator of a fraction respectively. When Dr. Abrahamsen drags $S$ into this fraction, he is getting himself into a good deal of trouble. The temptations to translate abstractions into concrete mathematical formulae are alluring enough but very treacherous. If $S$ has to be included in the fraction, wouldn't it have been nearer the truth to make $S$ a times relationship rather than a plus relationship? Thus the formula would read $C = (T \times S) / R$. If the situation continues to be innocuous or neutral, then $S$ would approximate zero and the possibility for criminal conduct then would become nil. If, however, the situation were loaded with high potentialities, wouldn't the times relationship represent its explosiveness much better? Dr. Abrahamsen might have known the danger of such a formula, if he could recall the fate of one, Otto Weininger, who attempted to write a mathematical equation for Love. This bizarre attempt by Weininger has been the source of scientific ridicule ever since. It would be interesting to speculate how the author would expand his formula, if he included the other variables, such as time and geography, as he suggests in chapter iv.

It is nice to write about crime and to be the author of a book about crime, but it is well to remember in chapter iv what has been said in chapter ii. The author states "possibly crime is a compromise, representing for the individual the most satisfactory method of adjustment to inner conflicts which he cannot express otherwise. . . . The same mechanism may take place in a psychosis where the person's delusions have a compensatory character and satisfy his inner strivings and needs." All of this is quite understandable but might reconcile that thought with the statement on page 59, in
which the criminal is likened to a child, who knows no restraint and is, therefore, uncompromising. "The criminal, then, acts as a child would—if the child were permitted to. One might very well imagine what would occur if a man acted out all his wishes, fantasies and drives. He would behave explosively, feel omnipotent, never love. He would swallow ravenously or destroy rapidly what he saw and kill with avidity. This may seem an absurd description, and yet it is only a reflection of what might happen, mutatis mutandis, in a criminal or what actually happens in a child's feelings." Well what is it then? Is a criminal a compromising or uncompromising individual?

As an etiological factor in crime causation, Dr. Abrahamsen very rightly points out, the criminal career is often an over-compensation for an organic physical defect. But, strangely enough, he does not mention the name of Alfred Adler (whose contributions along this line have become classical). A strange omission, in view of the avalanche of names and references with which this book is studded, and the meticulousness with which the author gives credit elsewhere where credit is due. Can this be solely from a loyalty to Freud? The author seeks to give the impression that his chief sources of inspiration were three: (1) Freud, the analyst; (2) Malinoswki, the social anthropologist; and (3) Monrad-Krohn, the neurologist. Very little of the influence of these latter two can be noted, and if the book can be said to have a leitmotif, that would surely be Freudian psychoanalysis. Somehow or other, I get the impression that analysts would not agree too much with what he discloses. He seems to tilt the analytical lid to outsiders, very much in the nature of a free Mason, who is surreptitiously handing out bits of free Masonry to an alien world.

My objection to the book reaches its climax in a consideration of those portions in which the author, assuming a Gargantuan pose, attempts to envisage crime in a global sweep, and I particularly react unfavorably to his appraisal of the American Crime Scene, inasmuch as he has come to these shores from Norway not too long ago. For example, he explains the high incidence of homicide by firearms in America to its rapid development and as a hangover from its frontier culture. In this error he probably takes his cue from Franz Alexander. When he talks about crime in our South, he naively wishes to correct situations and attitudes which a Civil War could not alter too much. His generalizations about crime in Australia and Japan appear to be equally fallacious. Australia, which he cited as having a similar pioneering history to the United States, and therefore, should have a relatively high incidence of homicide by firearms, is at the same time pointed out as a country of low incidence of homicide by firearms. It is certainly a naive explanation to relate the low incidence of homicide in Japan to the escape mechanisms of hara-kiri.

Enough of pointing out defects, and now to point out the excellent contributions of this book. The erudition of this writer is unquestionable. His sincerity and wholeheartedness pulsate in every page. One marvels at his command of the language, and certainly at no time does he seem to want for words to express the thoughts which crowd his mind and the pages of this book. He is basically a humanitarian, which is in no way better illustrated than in his criticism of the manner and places in which psychiatric examinations are sometimes held.

Being a psychiatrist, he clings to the belief that a psychiatric examination could only be trustworthy, if held under optimum conditions, although he states that it is not up to the psychiatrist to determine the setting for this examination, but rather for the courts. But, if the psychiatrist is forced to conduct an examination under adverse cir-
cumstances, the psychiatrist should say so, or, as he puts it, "If the examination was unsatisfactory because made under unfavorable conditions, the psychiatrist must point this out in his testimony."

I am grateful to him for pointing out that Kraepelin, the founder of modern psychiatry, was deeply interested in forensic psychiatry, a fact not known or appreciated by the general psychiatrists, who snub and occasionally turn up their noses at psychiatrists who labor in courts, prisons, and jails. I am grateful to him for pointing out that Lombroso's contributions, now looked askance at, are still valid, because even though Lombroso was wrong in his explanations, he deserves credit for being one of the first to point out that criminal conduct is very often related to abnormal mental states. Lastly, we must give the author credit for setting down in these few pages the vast panorama of crime, and I like particularly his plans for future trends in the study of crime, that will make criminology a science, such as altering criminal careers through shock therapy, etc.; and therefore we must forgive him his overenthusiasm, if he already speaks of it as having arrived at such a stature at this early date.

D. B. Rotman*


In this book Mr. Ross has dealt with a fundamental political problem. He has undertaken to analyze the composition of the British Parliament from 1918 to 1935 by careful statistical methods and by taking into account a well-nigh overwhelming wealth of facts. As the author himself says, "the book, planned and commenced in March 1933, represents the results of nearly ten years of detailed investigation and thought." Its results are startling and interesting, and future students of the problem of parliamentary representation will have to read and weigh it with careful attention. They will benefit by it, even if they may not be able to agree with its basic conceptions and conclusions.

Some of the more striking facts should be mentioned. It has been shown that the average member of the House of Commons between 1918 and 1935 was about eight years and seven and one-half months older than the average adult in Great Britain and even twenty years older than the average member of the whole population. We also learn that more "public school" members are returned to Parliament than members of the secondary and elementary schools together, and that, among the public schools, Eton and, to a little less degree, Harrow play a specially important part. "The Harrovian has over 1,800 times and the Etonian well over 2,000 times as good a chance of entering Parliament as has the elementary boy." Comparable with the preferential position of public schools is that of the universities. The two ancient universities, Oxford and Cambridge, hold a dominant position, and can claim nearly 30 per cent of all members of Parliament. Further, the occupational representation of the House of Commons does not correspond to the occupational structure of the country. Certain occupations, like those of lawyers, company directors, and trade union officials, are greatly overrepresented, and alone provide more than half of the membership in Parliament, while
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