Moran’s central thesis is that the established order, which was under intense and often violent attack, was best defended by having McNaughtan’s crime labeled as the act of a lunatic, rather than a legitimate protest against the social and economic inequities of nineteenth century England. Equally important, psychiatry supplied the mechanism for stripping McNaughtan’s act of its political meaning. According to Moran,

McNaughtan’s trial provided the fledgling psychiatric profession with a public forum in which to demonstrate the social value of their new craft. The fact that patients were confined in asylums for their political beliefs (driven mad by political events) or that “addiction to socialism” was considered a mental disease did not seem especially problematic to them (pp. 121-122).

The final section of the book considers what plea alternatives should have been available to McNaughtan. Moran argues that his defense should have been based on a political or moral justification of the act. He goes on to assert the general importance of allowing such pleas in criminal proceedings involving political acts and cites historical and modern examples of civil disobedience (not involving assassination) to support his point of view. However, he cautions that most courts view “jury nullification” as a questionable action. Thus they have historically refused to instruct the jury on their right and responsibility to nullify the law in individual cases where social morality would not be served by a guilty finding.

This last section is interesting; however, the McNaughtan case is an unusual peg on which to hang argument for permitting pleas of moral justification in criminal proceedings. Moreover, Moran does not give adequate attention of his implication that psychiatry has had and continues to have an important role in protecting the status quo. The charge is entered, but not carefully examined; this is the most disappointing aspect of the book.

Despite these shortcomings and a tendency to repeat information unnecessarily, Knowing Right from Wrong is a useful and interesting work. It fills a significant gap in our knowledge of the origins of the McNaughtan Rules and raises important questions about the potential for abuse of the insanity plea.


Reviewed by Robert L. Sadoff, MD

This relatively small but firmly packed volume depicts the so-called Cambridge Study of Delinquency, a twenty year project (1961 to 1981) that studied over 400 youngsters ages 8 to 25. The project was designed to search
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for reasons behind delinquent behavior and to follow-up youngsters who became delinquent and those who did not.

This is an extremely comprehensive in-depth study of delinquency: its roots, the careers of delinquent individuals, and prospects for treating delinquency. A variety of delinquent careers are examined and evaluated, and the results are surprising in some areas. The study shows a difference between individuals who begin their careers later in life and those whose delinquency is born out of early deprivation. The author, who is the project director and who has written extensively on the subject, points up significant features in a person's life that affect the delinquency career including marriage, moving from one area to another, and experiences of arrest and conviction.

The author adds a very important chapter entitled "What Should Be Done?" In this chapter West, Professor of Clinical Criminology and Director of The Institute of Criminology at Cambridge, offers a variety of suggestions and recommendations for preventing and treating delinquency. He is not as pessimistic as some authors in projecting the future.

This book is an excellent compilation of data with appropriate analysis and helpful conclusions. It is not for everyone in forensic psychiatry, but it is a source book of information for those students of criminal behavior, delinquency, and adolescent psychiatry on a most important topic related to future criminal behavior.


Reviewed by David A. Halperin

These two volumes represent the conscientious attempts of their editors and authors to deal with one of the most arresting and complex issues of our time — the rise and diffusion of the "new religions" or (to the detractors and/or objective observers) "cults." In a sense, they represent the polarity of differences in their approach to this area, the papers within the volume Cults and the Family approach this nexus of problems from the somewhat abstract and methodologically abstracted realm of sociology, while the brief treatise of Law on Cults approaches this issue as it is refracted through the three-quarters of a century of court experience in dealing with the intriguing