one: “this shift in social control styles and practices must be viewed as dependent upon and a reflection of more extensive and deep-seated changes in the social organization of advanced capitalist societies” (p. 152).

There are a number of features about this book which make it a valuable contribution. First, Scull offers extensive statistical documentation for his position. The reader is presented with a wide variety of data that shows how and why decarceration is occurring, but the documentation is not so overwhelming as to make this tedious reading. Second, the emphasis on an historically informed, macrosociological perspective reminds us that decarceration has many historical foundations and is directly related to economic and social organization. Any study of deviance or corrections which fails to incorporate structural factors into its analysis will undoubtedly result in too narrow a view. Scull understands this and his book is a masterful attempt at demonstrating the interrelationship between deviance and social control. Third, this book critically challenges the notion that community-based treatment is more effective than institutionalization. Although there is considerable support for the position that institutional treatment is largely a failure (see Lipton, Martinson and Wilks, The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment, 1975), one is left with the pessimistic feeling, after reading Scull’s book, that community treatment is hardly any better.

Andrew Scull’s Decarceration: Community Treatment and the Deviant—A Radical View is an important contribution to the sociological study of corrections. His analysis is theoretically strong and his conclusions are persuasive. Those who are interested in policies of social control can ill-afford to ignore the analysis Andrew Scull presents.

University of Kansas  
Roger C. Barnes


Another introductory textbook is hardly a novelty at a time when even the recent offerings occupy several feet of shelf space. This text is, on the whole, a welcome addition. The authors have attempted to eliminate the “scholargok” and present an attractive readable text without losing the “nuts and bolts” of sociology. I must admit to a mixed reaction on both counts.

The text is eminently readable and illustrative material is both interesting and thought-provoking. However, the authors have not proven totally immune to “scholargok”. They have succumbed to the temptation to categorize and apply labels to these categories rather freely. This is particularly irritating in the areas of deviance and collective behavior. Their examples, while interesting and generally well presented, are numerous and lengthy. They occasionally reach the point of diminishing returns, frustrating even the earnest student. They are set in such a manner that they may be selectively assigned, just as individual topics need not be taken up in the precise sequence the authors have chosen to present them.

The “nuts and bolts” are there. As with all survey texts, they are covered with varying emphases. Denisoff and Wahrman have chosen to place strong emphasis on socialization and micro-sociological processes. This may be disturbing to those who prefer an organizational or institutional approach.

Their coverage of stratification systems was disappointing. This area is highly over-simplified. The slave system is passed over in a single paragraph plus one sentence without the slightest appreciation for the unique characteristics of the slave system as manifested in the United States. A single page and one-half is devoted to a system which is alternately referred to as “estate” or “feudal”. This is very brief coverage of an enduring and complex system. As a student of South Asia, I am struck speechless by the coverage given the caste system which repeats some very old time-worn misconceptions concerning the Indian caste system.
Review Essay: Education and the Radical Critique

“This is the fate of our times, to live in a society characterised by mechanised petrification.”

Max Weber

“(It) is men who change circumstances and it is essential to educate the educator himself.”

Karl Marx

This essay will be primarily concerned with a critical analysis of recent writings pertaining to schooling in America. Included in the analysis will be the work of Samuel Bowles, Martin Carnoy, Herbert Gintis, Michael Katz, and Joel Spring. Although these scholars of American education will provide the theoretical framework for the essay, they do not necessarily concur on all issues. As we will later demonstrate, all of the works differ in many instances, especially their policy recommendations. If there is a common thread woven throughout all of these works, it is the intellectual debt they owe Karl Marx. All of them rely heavily on Marxian materialism in their analyses, but few utilize the Marxian dialectic to its fullest. The task of the essay will be an explication of the theories and subsequent policy recommendations of the works under scrutiny followed by a critical evaluation of the theory and its proposed praxis (or lack thereof).

In the studies which form the substance of this essay, schools are seen as socializing institutions serving as instrumentalities for those in social, economic, and political control. Those in power use education to reproduce the social structure in which they are powerful. For example, Carnoy states his major thesis:

We argue that the way society organizes formal schooling is a function of the economic and social hierarchy and cannot be separated from it. We contend that the schools function to reinforce the social relations in production, and that no school