

DEALING WITH DEVIANTS: THE TREATMENT OF ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR.
By Stuart Whiteley, Dennie Briggs, and Merfyn Turner. New York: Schocken Books.
Pp. 248. 1973. Price \$8.50.

This book describes three different kinds of treatment communities: a British hospital, a California prison experimental project, and a British penal after-care half-way house. Each is described by an administrative individual integral to the project. As I read the description of each group, I found myself admiring the dedication of all involved and their ability to deal therapeutically with the here and now, as well as their manner of making errors, discovering them and dealing with them. Each instance showed the avoidance of complex theorizing or clumsy evangelizing.

Stuart Whiteley describes Henderson Hospital, the descendant of Maxwell Jones's *Therapeutic Community*. Whiteley believes that it has moved away from the medical mode by the "deputation of all treatment interchanges to the total Community and its subordinate groups" (p. 39). The program is an involving, intense, almost continual group self-examination of staff and residents (a term for patients or inmates). Its best results have been achieved with patient-residents who have gone relatively far in grade school, have shown relatively good academic performance, and have histories in which "evidence of stability and ability to achieve results was reflected in the occupational and interpersonal spheres" (p. 63). But, lest anybody be tempted to be supercilious about careful selection of a healthier group, these residents are true psychopaths: 56% have had previous adult criminal convictions, and many have made little or no progress in conventional therapy.

The four-year experiment at Chino (California), described by Dennie Briggs, has also been influenced directly by Maxwell Jones, who was the primary consultant in the formation and maintenance of the project. Here too, as with Henderson Hospital (and with psychoanalytic treatment), the best results have been obtained with the psychologically healthiest. The most desirable candidates were convicted felons "under twenty-five years of age, [who] had at some time had a close relationship with some adult such as parents or substitutes, a marital or common-law relationship, some ability to relate to peers, such as crime partners, and rated at the higher levels of four or five on the Interpersonal Maturity (I level) scale of Grant. . . . this meant . . . they showed some evidence of internalized conflicts, anxiety, a discomfort with their current status, some motivation to change, and ability to differentiate social roles and to recognize responsibility for their own behaviour, sufficient ego strength, some flexibility and overall, some capacity to change" (pp. 166-167).

Merfyn Turner, the originator of Norman House, a British half-way house for discharged felons, mentions no direct contact with Jones, but was himself a resident of the British penal system before becoming a "prison visitor" (a function that sounds similar to that of the late nineteenth century American social workers, "friendly visitors" to welfare families). He describes how the group of ex-convicts helped most by the Norman House program are the passive inadequate psychopaths, largely in need of family support, direction, and human connection. Turner developed the idea of a Second House, as a half-way house from Norman House. Both houses appear to be successful in their respective missions. The average stay at Norman House is 11 months, at Second House, three years. Men have moved on, apparently quite successfully, from Second House. The group most responsive to Turner's program are described as ". . . unmarried, without friends except the superficial contacts they made in lodging houses. . . . They drifted into crime . . . they were not competent to prevent the cycle continuing" (p. 219).

These three accounts describe pioneers who tried, failed, persisted, and began to succeed. That they have been able to identify those who respond best to their particular programs is significant progress. Henderson and Chino had the best results with the healthiest people available; this is not said disparagingly. To concede it is a necessary step toward the ultimate abandonment of the shallow concept of an undifferentiated "the deviant." The idea of different categories responding to different approaches is a prerequisite to the establishment of specific and, we hope, more effective treatment. There is an infectious enthusiasm in the pages of this book. I found myself wishing that all the members of AAPL who were involved in hospital care, prison work, and half-

way houses would read it. The accounts share a quality of direct, ingenuous, honest presentation of experience without pretensions or abstract theorizing. Their authors appeared to be liberated rather than imprisoned by their experiences.

Unfortunately, the last chapter, "Matching the demands," is not on a par with the rest of the book. In trying to analyse, generalise, and reconcile their different experiences, the writers lose their internally integrated perspectives and become clumsy, if not evangelically trite. They are so concerned with being free of the currently *dis-prestigious* [my neologism] medical model that they waste their time, and the reader's time, by writing of it as if it were, to them, what communists and the taint of communism were to Joe McCarthy. There would be no point in repeating their mistake here.

My dissatisfaction with their analyses may stem from a difference in orientation, or it may be that in attempting to theorize and generalize, they are abandoning their greatest skill and talent, that of working with individual specifics in the concrete here and now to help the residents explore their inner reactions. The authors point out that in "the three projects described the conflict is allowed expression and the differing views are accepted" (pp. 228-229). What does not receive adequate recognition is that concrete and specific limits are set for and by the staff and the residents, with clear definition of the unacceptable and active support of the strivings to "self-realization." They also maintain that the "three projects are in fact dealing with *the same individual* and merely focusing upon different levels in personality development" (p. 229) [italics in original]. Perhaps they were referring to the same principle enunciated by Harry Stack Sullivan in his maxim that "We are all more simply human than otherwise." I found, however, that the encouraging thing was the realization that they were not, in practice, dealing with the same individual. Although many of the Norman House residents had been at Henderson, they were the *failures* and not in the group of ideal residents for Henderson. When any treatment fails, it is because it was not suitable for the specific individual. No data is presented to suggest that if an individual suitable for a successful Henderson experience missed the opportunity to go there, he would end up as an ideal resident of Norman House. Nor does any suggestion appear that a successful experience at Norman House would result in a suitable candidate for Henderson. The character traits of the group who did best at Chino bore some resemblance to the Henderson ideal, but no resemblance to the Norman House group.

It was exciting to realize that each project possessed its own strengths and limitations and that they were sketched in for us. One needn't agree with the authors' concept of deviant personality development to agree with their statement "What is important . . . in dealing with deviants is to be able to recognize the particular needs of the individual and make possible his entry into the appropriate treatment area" (p. 234). One might paraphrase this as "fit the disposition to the deviant individual rather than to the deviance."

I like the book. I wish the publishers had offered the authors the kind of editorial assistance they needed. It was disappointing to find that even the British misspell Prichard's name and mis-date his 1835 treatise on moral insanity (p. 19). And one wishes that someone had corrected Dennie Briggs's misconception of the history of penology in America, or the Quakers' role in it. "It was not until well into the twentieth century that solitude, silence, and penitence was [*sic*] abandoned in favour of work, disciplined conduct, schooling, trade training and religious instruction" (p. 95). Most of what Briggs considers twentieth century advances were part of the Pennsylvania penitentiary system (as opposed to the Auburn or New York system) in the early nineteenth century. "Solitude, silence, and penitence" were also part of the Pennsylvania system, but a far cry from equations with solitary confinement, total silence, and masochistic penitence as they are generally understood today. The failure of America's penitentiary systems is equalled by the failure of its modern historians to separate the successful elements from the unsuccessful ones, as the authors of this book have done with their projects.

I do hope that many will read this book. I found it honest, thoughtful, sincere, and worthy of respectful attention and reflection.

JACQUES QU'EN, M.D.
New York, New York