

creational facilities, abolishment of slum conditions, bigger and better schools, alleviation of poverty, might alleviate some of the more gross manifestations of delinquency but they do not touch the basic elements which produce the condition in the first place. Neither do restrictive or punitive measures such as curfew, censorship of reading material, television and radio programs, "punish the parent" or "back to the woodshed" campaigns. So far as these measures are concerned, they merely affect the manner in which the delinquency will be expressed: they turn it into some other avenue of expression which, most unfortunately, is often mistaken for a cure. Despite all the soap-box orations promising the community deliverance in one fell swoop from the scourge of juvenile delinquency by the vigorous application of some panacea or another, the fact is that there is no *one* cure because there is no *one* cause. The multiple causation theory is the only logical explanation that has been advanced about juvenile delinquency, and it has but one fault. It has no spectacular headline appeal and the exponents of this theory, including the speaker, cannot guarantee a cure.

The most outstanding single contribution towards a better understanding of the juvenile delinquent is the research and experimentation in this field by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. The findings of a ten-year project comparing 500 true delinquents and 500 non-delinquents is reported in the volume "Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency".¹

Commencing on this research project in "Family Service Highlights"² Dr. Eleanor Glueck says:

The delinquents and non-delinquents ranged in age from 11 to 17 and were matched, case for case, not only by age, but by residence in underprivileged areas, ethnic origin, and intelligence level. They were then systematically compared on 402 factors in their family and home backgrounds, school history, leisure-time interests;

their developmental healthy history, their physical condition and body structure; their underlying character, personality and temperamental traits and the quality of their intelligence.

The delinquents as a group were found to differ markedly from the non-delinquents: (1) socioculturally, in having been reared to a far greater extent than the non-delinquents in homes of little understanding, affection, stability or moral fiber by parents usually unfit to be effective guides and protectors; (2) temperamentally, in being more restlessly energetic, impulsive, extroverted, aggressive, destructive (often sadistic); (3) in attitude, by being far more hostile than the non-delinquents, far more defiant, resentful, suspicious, stubborn, socially assertive, adventurous, unconventional, non-submissive to authority; (4) psychologically, in tending more than the non-delinquents to direct and concrete, rather than symbolic, intellectual expression, and in being less methodical than the non-delinquents in their approach to problems; (5) physically, in being essentially mesomorphic in constitution (solid, closely knit, muscular).

The evidence shows that despite the similarities in their neighborhood environment, there was a substantial difference in the qualitative aspects of their homes. In the homes of the delinquents the ties among members of the family were not as close, the parents were less attached to each other and to their children, there was less stability in the family, there was less planfulness in the management of the home; less concern for the well-being of the children; less provision for home recreation. There was less of the "togetherness" that is reflected in family group activities.

Basic, then, to the understanding of the delinquent is some understanding of the connection between his inter-personal