

extensive bibliography are valuable resources to have available in one's personal library.

-- George E. Clarke
North Carolina Central University
Durham, North Carolina

DAVID R. WEBER (Editor). *CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE IN AMERICA, A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978, 318 pp., \$17.50.

Here is an important book which should be on the required reading list of all Americans. It is imperative reading for ethnic and minority group members. In this anthology, Mr. Weber gets to one of the fundamental issues in American society, liberty of conscience, and what the individual should do if civil authority clashes with conscience. The dualistic nature of justice in American society--one code for the whites, one for minorities; one for the rich, and one for the poor--makes this book as relevant to individual Americans today as it might have been at any point in American history.

One might quibble with Mr. Weber's selections and his disproportionate attention to the nineteenth century; however, representation in an anthology always presents problems. One might have liked to see more emphasis on thematic ties beyond the broad theme of civil disobedience. Recognition of a continuity in the Black experience concerning civil disobedience extending back at least to Benjamin Banneker would have provided another important dimension. These are only minor criticisms; the book, as it stands, makes an important contribution. The perceptive and insightful general introduction make the book worth the price.

The organization of the volume by traditions of civil disobedience as well as chronologically was a wise choice. The illumination of the traditions allows for the pointing out of differences and similarities in the American experience. It is important to know that dissenters in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were concerned and disobeyed authority in terms of religious liberty, not for social or political motivations. It is important to know that dissenters in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries disobeyed civil or governmental authority which was based on social or political motivations. Mr. Weber and the authors of the selections have important things to say about consequences, accepting individual responsibility for acts of civil disobedience which involve breaking the law, and what the future will hold in terms of civil disobedience in an American society where the individual feels less and less that anything he or she does or does not do will have any meaning, impact, or influence.

Many of the names in the selections presented will be familiar --Martin Luther King, Jr., Stokely Carmichael, A. Philip Randolph, Albert Einstein, Henry David Thoreau, Susan B. Anthony, John Greenleaf Whittier, William Lloyd Garrison, to mention a few--but all of the contributors make important statements. Each of the contributors raises challenging questions. This reviewer firmly believes that the maxim stated at the beginning of the book, "The Judeo-Christian religion has always maintained the duty to obey God speaking through conscience as superior to any civil law. . . . Touch where you will American thought and you will find this same emphasis on conscience," will not lose its influence; and while only a small minority may have the courage to carry out their convictions, this tradition will be maintained and must be maintained if justice is ever to prevail in American society for its divergent and multiethnic constituents.

-- George E. Carter
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

BARBARA A. CURRAN. *THE LEGAL NEEDS OF THE PUBLIC: THE FINAL REPORT OF A NATIONAL SURVEY*. Chicago: American Bar Foundation, 1977, 382 pp., \$25.00.

This is a substantial report sponsored by a number of legal associations (American Bar Association and American Bar Endowment) and foundations (Edna McConnel Clark Foundation and International Foundation of Employee Benefit Plans) and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. By its own assertion: "This study is the first, and to date only, such survey based on a national sample representing the adult population of the United States. Moreover, it provides a more comprehensive examination of the legal experiences and perceptions of the public than has been undertaken by any earlier survey."

The basic research objectives of this self-proclaimed study were twofold: 1) to examine the nature of the public's use of lawyers' services, and 2) to assess the public's expectations about legal services. The public, in this instance, consisted of a pseudo-random sample of 2,064 respondents drawn from a nationwide sample of block groups (randomly selected target neighborhoods). The reputable National Opinion Research Center (NORC), affiliated with the University of Chicago, was contracted to manage and conduct the survey field work which utilized a six-part questionnaire consisting primarily of structured questions and corresponding likkert-type responses (strongly agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, strongly disagree, and no response).

Interestingly, nearly two-thirds of the sample (64 percent) never used attorneys. Yet, based on these views, certain