

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

conclusions were drawn and then generalized to the entire nation. Six of the more interesting statements are as follows:

1. Black/Latino females were most likely to agree that lawyers should be consulted only after other alternative problem-solving strategies have been exhausted, while white females were least likely to view lawyers as a last resort.
2. The majority of Blacks/Latinos believed that lawyers were more concerned about getting clients than serving them.
3. Blacks/Latinos were more likely to be pessimistic about lawyers' interest in understanding what their clients want.
4. Relatively more Blacks/Latinos than whites expressed a low opinion of the ethical standards of lawyers, and white females were much more favorable in their view of lawyers than any other group.
5. Whites generally were more positive than Blacks/Latinos about receiving a fair trial and about the honesty and fairness of judges.
6. Blacks/Latinos, those with lower incomes, and the less educated were most likely to agree that the system favors the rich and their concerns.

Even then the study concludes by claiming that these differences are not significant enough to suggest major variations in the overall patterns of opinions and perceptions of lawyers and the United States legal system: "Indeed, the initial results of this survey suggest that the basic pattern of responses observed for the population at large also persists with only minor variation within the various demographic subgroups. . . . In short, there seems to be a core set of opinion about most matters involving lawyers, the courts, and the legal system that transcends demographic characteristics as well as prior lawyer experience."

Clearly, the study falls far short of its own proclaimed sophistication. It is awkwardly written, shrouded in legal jargon and clumsy statistical analysis, much of which is unnecessary for a descriptive survey of this type. Its readability is certainly restricted, even for those well versed in the law and scientific methodology. Moreover, the author failed to compare these findings with other studies, most notably, "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society," "The Politics of Protest," and the "Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics." Hence, the data, without any viable comparison or synthesis, means little in itself.

The most critical omission, however, is the failure of the study to consider specific target populations such as the American

Indian. And related to this is the failure to distinguish between Latinos (Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, and Cubans) where distinctive cultural variations exist. Reservation and ghetto Indians, barrio residents, and other unique racial subcultures are not mentioned in the study, even though their legal plight is widely recognized.

-- Laurence A. French
University of Nebraska, Lincoln
