

unsatisfactory, his example will have played the crucial role in causing moral and social philosophy to abandon the parochialism that has been so characteristic of it in this century.

JOHN M. COOPER
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

THE DANCE OF LEGISLATION. By Eric Redman. New York: Simon & Schuster. Pp. 300. 1973. Price \$7.95.

This book is a rare treat. It is the almost hair-raising story of the birth of a federal health bill told to us in the first person by the intern assisting his chief in the Senate. Eric Redman, the author, is a junior staff man of that venerable, older senator from the state of Washington, Senator Warren Magnuson. The bill is described as a rather minor one and there is no reason to quarrel with that. But minor or not, it must go through the entire gamut of steps every bill has to take to mature into a law.

Contrary to other writings about the process of law-making, this book is done so vividly and personally, it is very difficult not to identify fully with the author's anguish as the bill plods forward. This identification is magnified by the fact that very few of us know more than the bare bones facts of lawmaking and so we share most of the author's naivety. Completely eschewing the dull, lecture-like approach to civics which I recall from school, the author informs and instructs us with total reality. The bill is a living, breathing entity. Redman cares deeply for its life. He is extremely partisan without being mawkish or exhibiting "bleeding-heart" tendencies. He wants the bill to make it! His wish is so pure and simple, that regardless of your own opinion about the measure, you find yourself rooting for him unconsciously, somewhat like a John Wayne movie. The amount of information you garner trailing this bill through its intricate dance is amazing, and when you finally finish you feel fully satisfied.

The curtain raises in early 1970 when a highly dedicated Seattle pediatrician named Bergman proposes to Redman (and Magnuson, of course) the establishment of a National Health Service Corps—in Washingtonese, NHSC. The purpose of this legislation is to provide medical doctors to smaller, rural areas now deprived of health care. Idealistic young doctors and supporting medical workers would be assigned to such areas with salaries paid by the federal government for two years. Hopefully some would then continue to practice privately in those settings, while admittedly others would leave, but at least there would be two years of medicine and possibly much more. In 1967 the President's Commission on Rural Poverty had suggested such a National Doctor Corps, and as early as the 1930's the colorful Huey Long of Louisiana had opted for such reforms. The idea was not new.

Almost all would agree it was a fine idea, but there were problems. There was the ever-present question of so-called "socialized medicine." Even for the brief span of two years, that might be surmountable. Seemingly insurmountable was the "doctor draft," or service in the military, required for all doctors. It was felt that after military service most doctors want to make a living, and, therefore, would be noticeably less likely to enroll in the program, whereas if the doctor were given an alternative choice to military service, many might select it. Because of the enormous influence of the Pentagon and both Senate and House Armed Service Committees, it was certain that a change in the basic Selective Service, or draft law, could not be accomplished; without changing that draft law the bill would be doomed. But, Dr. Bergman pointed out, using and expanding the then existing U.S. Public Health Service would not require any changes in the draft laws. Unlike the Peace Corps or education that provides mere deferments, service in the U.S. Public Health Corps actually satisfied the military requirement. This appeared to be the only way to proceed with the legislation.

So much for the game plan. The first snag was that Public Health officers are limited by law and tradition to treating only sailors, Indians, and federal prisoners. How to get around that? As the book subsequently unfolds this is only the first of literally dozens of sudden traps, surprises, hangups, double-crosses, egos, selfishness, grandiose schemes, counter-cabals, and back-room manipulations that march continually along the legislative path.

The story of this bill is all bills in microcosm. Never boring in its inexorable step-by-step development, you deal personally with every twist and turn of the legislative highway. There is a need for supporting sponsors of the bill. The attitudes of various members of H.E.W. are incredible. Almost untenable is the Surgeon General's position in re the administration's overall plans. The role of many relatively minor staff members of all sides is vital. One follows the movement of the bill through committee and the nature of mandatory hearings on behalf of a bill. The parallel movements are also needed in the other legislative body, in this case, the House. The sensitivities and quirks of any and all personalities are observed as well as the use and abuse of lobbying power. The tricks of press releases are laid bare. The pressure of voting and time deadlines; the maneuvering endlessly with rational talk, with true social need, with personal points and subtle trade-offs, with national policy, with multiple group interest . . . all weave a fascinating story.

When, finally, the breathless conclusion arrives, you pause and marvel. So this is how our country works! It is both frightening and exhilarating. Democracy, American style, is truly remarkable. And in these Watergate days, you get a much more vivid introspective view of how Congress functions, and tend to better understand the complexities of actually getting something done, at least, as far as the legislative branch is concerned.

ALAN R. ROSENBERG
New York, New York

INDECENT EXPOSURE. By John M. Macdonald. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas. Pp. 180. 1973. Price \$7.95 cloth.

This slender volume provides an up-to-date review of the literature on indecent exposure, an act comprising one-third of all sex offenses reported to the police. Most of the book is devoted to exhibitionism, those acts of indecent exposure in which the offense is perpetrated "for the purpose of sexual gratification without any intention of further sexual contact." A minority of cases of indecent exposure do not constitute exhibitionism. This may occur, for example, when the exposure is secondary to schizophrenia, organic brain syndrome, temporal lobe seizure activity, or when a person is detected urinating in public.

One of the most interesting sections of the book describes the explanations exhibitionists sometimes offer to the police when apprehended, including drunkenness with amnesia, drug intoxication, zipper trouble, split pants, and the claim that they were urinating or masturbating, but not exposing. The claim that the exposure was an attempt to pick up a woman is particularly striking in view of the repeated failures experienced by men trying this technique.

Also striking is the frequent lack of care taken to prevent identification and arrest. Exposure from one's home, frequent repetition at the same locale, and the use of one's automobile with intact license plates are all quite common. Some men, when arrested, deny having exposed, but volunteer the information that they have previously been arrested for this offense. One man, for example, denied the accusation that he had exposed himself to a young woman in a laundromat, but said that he was arrested for this offense in every city he goes to. Although such "wanting to get caught" behavior is consistent with a number of interpretations, some mention of the concept of "erotic risk-taking" as advanced by Stoller¹ would have been appropriate. Stoller claims that when the female plays along with the exhibitionist, or teases him, he typically flees. But when she exhibits alarm and calls the police, he becomes excited, hates to leave, and is caught.

Between two-fifths and two-thirds of men convicted of indecent exposure admit to having committed previous sexual offenses (although only half as many have prior convictions). Moreover, between one- and two-fifths of offenders have a subsequent conviction within four years.

In addition to the high rates of occurrence and recidivism, Macdonald argues that indecent exposure is important because of "the alarm it arouses in some victims, particularly in children," and because "a few" offenders "also commit forcible rape