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THE TWO CRIMINOLOGIES: THE DIVERGENT WORLDVIEWS OF TEXTBOOKS AND JOURNALS

Richard A. Wright
University of Scranton

Meier (1980:630) once noted that "American criminology . . . was born in textbooks." His remark actually doesn't go far enough; textbooks were important vehicles for nurturing criminological thought well into the twentieth century. Four of the founding figures of American criminology wrote textbooks: Parmelee's Criminology was the first to appear in 1918, followed by Sutherland's Criminology (1924), Gillin's Criminology and Penology (1926), and Parsons' Crime and the Criminal (1926). While few criminologists today still read Parmelee, several criminology textbooks published in the 1930s through the early 1960s proposed theories that became cornerstones of American criminological thought. Most notable, of course, are the various articulations, emendations, and qualifications of the differential association perspective to appear in editions of Sutherland's (and Cressey's) Principles of Criminology (cf. 1939, 1947, 1960). Almost as influential, however, are the statements of containment theory found in editions of Reckless's The Crime Problem (first published in 1950) and group conflict theory, originally
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SOME THOUGHTS REGARDING THE IMPACT OF CLINTON'S ELECTION ON CRIME AND JUSTICE POLICY

Raymond J. Michalowski
Northern Arizona University

The guard has changed. The laissez-faire Reagan-Bush government has passed from the stage, and a "new generation" of policy-makers led by Clinton and Gore now have their hands on the levers of state power. What changes, if any, does this transition portend for the future of crime control policies emanating from Washington?

There has been some speculation that the election of Bill Clinton signals a new direction for crime control in the United States. Only those who are good at reading mixed messages, however, are in a position to draw definitive conclusions. Part of the reason for this is that crime control issues were lower in profile during the 1992 campaign than any presidential campaign in recent memory. To understand why this was so, it is useful to look at how Bush lost the election.

Bush lost because he held a lousy hand. Economic stagnation, the erosion of real earning power, chronic high levels of unemployment, and the loss of public faith in the Reagan-Bush "let capitalists be capitalists" solution was certainly Bush's biggest liability. Subtract the laissez-faire card
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Letters to the Editors...

To the Editors:

I was disheartened by Alan Block's "review essay" of Donald Rebovich's book, Dangerous Ground: The World of Hazardous Waste Crime. The merits of his claims notwithstanding, the personalized and vindictive nature of his attack represents the dark side of academia. Surely Professor Block has the right to present his position and to refute points and views of others and in doing so we as readers become more informed. However, that right quickly becomes an abuse when it is contemptuous and nasty. Sadly, he chose this forum as a means to level an assault rather than to offer a critique. What good can possibly come from this?

I was equally dismayed by the editors' decision to publish this attack as it stands. Disagreements that bridge on fights are all too commonplace in our profession. It seems to me, however, that this fight was grossly unfair. Not only was Dr. Rebovich not allowed to put on his gloves, he wasn't even invited to the ring. The editors have an oversight responsibility here. At a very minimum, they should have allowed Dr. Rebovich the opportunity to respond in the same edition where readers could have weighted the arguments and reached their own conclusions.

For what it is worth, I served as one of two critics of Dr. Rebovich's book at an "author meets critic session" at the ASC Meeting last November. In my view the book is an excellent contribution to our understanding of both hazardous waste offenses and the issues relating to the social control of this type of illegal conduct. I encourage anyone interested in these areas to read Dangerous Ground. I am confident that most readers will come away with a different perspective than the one provided by Professor Block.

Kip Schlegal
Indiana University

1993 PHOENIX HOTEL ACCOMMODATIONS

The Hyatt Regency Phoenix Hotel is the site of the 1993 ASC Annual Meeting. Members may call 1-800-233-1234 or the direct hotel number at 602/252-1234 to make reservations. Single/double accommodations are $98.00 and when making reservations be sure to request that you want a reservation in the block of rooms reserved for the ASC meeting. Rooms have also been reserved at the Omni Adams Hotel, one block behind the Hyatt. Their phone number is 602/257-1525.

AROUND THE ASC

C. Ronald Huff of The Ohio State University was presented the Donald Cressey Award from the National Council on Crime and Delinquency at the ASC annual meeting in New Orleans. The award was in recognition of his outstanding academic contribution to the field of criminology that promotes programs and policies that are fair, humane, effective and economically sound. Also, on February 26, Ronald Huff was awarded the Paul Tappan Award from the Western Society of Criminology at their annual meeting in Monterey for his outstanding contributions to the field of criminology.

Jess Maghan, commissioner of the New York City Department of Correction Training Academy, announced his early retirement from the department in December. He has moved to Chicago to the University of Illinois at Chicago as Executive Director of the Forum for Comparative Correction at the Office of International Criminal Justice. Dr. Maghan brings with him 23 years of experience in the corrections field, including a position as superintendent of the Illinois Correction Academy.

Walter S. DeKeseredy, Associate Professor of Sociology at Carleton University, recently received Carleton University's Outstanding Research Achievement Award. Together with Katharino Kelly, DeKeseredy is in the process of analyzing data gathered from the first Canadian national survey of woman abuse in university/college dating relationships. A revised version of their first report to Health and Welfare Canada's Family Violence Prevention Division will appear in the next issue of The Canadian Journal of Sociology. This article presents data on the incidence and prevalence of physical, sexual, and psychological abuse in post-secondary school dating contexts. Subsequent reports will address issues, such as the influence of male peer group dynamics, the contribution of familial patriarchy, and the context, meaning and motive of violence in courtship.

Patrick R. Gartin received the Ph.D. from the University of Maryland in May of 1992. His dissertation title was "The Individual Effects of Arrests in Domestic Violence Courses: A Re-Analysis of the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment" and his dissertation chair was Lawrence Sherman. Dr. Gartin is an Assistant Professor at the University of Nebraska-Omaha.

Mark S. Hamm, Professor of Criminology at Indiana State University, has been awarded the Fredric Milton Thrasher Award by the Gang Journal: An International Research Quarterly published in conjunction with the National Gang Crime Research Center. In the tradition of Thrasher's classic work, The Gang (University of Chicago Press, 1927), the award was established to recognize outstanding contributions to the study of gangs. Hamm received the Thrasher Award for "innovative and groundbreaking research" published in his recent book, American Skinheads: The Criminology and Control of Hate Crime (Praeger, 1993).
THE INTENT TO KILL
Making Sense of Murder
Edward Green

After one hundred years of research into the causes of violent crime, science has devised neither a definitive explanation nor a workable cure for the epidemic of murder that plagues American society. This failure, Edward Green contends, lies in the perpetuation of a peculiar error, the elevation of background factors correlated with homicide to the status of "causes" without due consideration of how they influence the intents and purposes of killers. Neither current criminological thought about violent crime nor the criminal justice system addresses the indispensable factor in the equation of murder —

The Intent To Kill

To remedy this neglect, the author restores the killer as a calculating, adaptive actor to the homicidal scenario from which he or she has been removed by the dictates of law and science or the exaggerations of popular literature. Reconciling the scientific doctrine that homicide is a product of material forces beyond individual control with a humanistic view of the self-determination of conduct, he centers his inquiry on five broad concerns:

- The individual and group interests advanced by killing;
- The sentiments, beliefs, attitudes, and moral detachment that permit people to breach the ban on homicide;
- The uses and abuses of social-behavioral science in the murder trial;
- The empowerment afforded by the availability of guns;
- What needs to be done to suppress the murder epidemic.

The author combines perspectives from law, science, and literature to assess the relative importance of the effects of organic, psychological, and social factors on the intent to kill. He rejects the trendy platitude that all levels of explanation are equally significant; some have much more explanatory power than others. The proofs are drawn from criminological theory and research, case studies taken from court records, and true crime documentary works.

Edward Green, Professor Emeritus of Criminology and Sociology, Eastern Michigan University, is the author of Judicial Attitudes in Sentencing and contributions to leading professional journals.

April, 1993; ISBN: 0-937715-02-06; 337 pages. Hardcover $23.95
CALL FOR NOMINATIONS
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY OFFICERS
Deadline August 1, 1993.
President-Elect
Vice President-Elect
or
Executive Counselor

Members who wish to nominate candidates for an ASC office should send a short letter of recommendation and a copy of the nominees' vitae to:

Joan McCord
Department of Criminal Justice
Temple University
Philadelphia, PA 19122

AGREEMENT REACHED WITH FAIRMONT HOTEL IN NEW ORLEANS

To members of the ASC:

Many of you with confirmed reservations at the Fairmont Hotel for the 1992 Annual Meeting in New Orleans were denied access to rooms and were sent to other hotels after inexcusable delays and considerable inconvenience. We were also denied meeting rooms that had been committed to the Program Committee, creating some confusion over session and other meeting locations.

In response to this situation, the ASC Board voted to withhold payment on the master account with the Fairmont, to register a formal complaint with the hotel and the New Orleans Tourist and Convention Commission, and demand a substantial adjustment on the Master Billing to compensate for this inconvenience to ASC members. After some negotiation, the Fairmont agreed to a 15 percent reduction in the Master Billing (approximately $4,000) and the hotel manager, Mr. Steve Ferran, apologized for the problems encountered by those attending the conference.

The Board regrets the inconvenience and discomfort this situation caused for many of you. While the complaint to the Tourist and Convention Commission and the reduction in costs to the Society does not make up for the discourtesy many of you experienced at the Fairmont, we wanted you to know that the Board was very concerned and took this action.

Looking forward to seeing you in Phoenix,

Del Elliott
President, ASC

CALL FOR PAPERS--"GUNS"

Behavioral Sciences and the Law is seeking manuscripts for a forthcoming issue of the journal devoted to law and behavioral science concerns related to guns. Articles dealing with a variety of gun-related issues will be considered. Possible subject matter will include, but not be limited to: guns and interpersonal violence; gun control laws and regulations; the psychology of gun ownership and/or use; changing demographics of gun ownership and use; guns and youth; guns and crime; gun ownership and use by special groups such as the mentally ill; guns and self-defense; gun safety education; guns and the media; toy guns; guns and domestic violence; guns and the police; guns and the military; etc.

Manuscript deadline is May 1, 1993.

Manuscripts and inquiries should be directed to:
Charles Patrick Ewing
Professor of Law
State University of New York
Buffalo, New York 14260
Telephone: (716) 645-2770
from Bush's hand. Another of Bush's liabilities, ironically, resulted from the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact power bloc. Subtract the anti-communist card from Bush's hand. A lesser noticed factor, however, was that Bush had also lost his Willie Horton card. In other words, all three legs of Bush's 1988 message--the market will provide, anti-communism, and get tough with criminals (especially criminals of color)--had been reduced to little more than stumps by 1992. In losing the first two cards--trust in markets and the importance of anti-communism--Bush was the victim of history. In losing the crime control card, however, Bush was victimized by Bill Clinton himself.

There was little about Clinton's crime control record in Arkansas that Bush could taunt him about the way he mocked Dukakis as a patsy for every dark-skinned murderer in Massachusetts. Governor Clinton had signed execution orders four times during his tenure as governor, he appeared to be no fan of home leaves for murderers, and he supported limitations on death penalty appeals. What could Bush say?

There were only two crime control points on which Bush and Clinton differed significantly that entered the public debate--the Brady bill and the banning of assault weapons. Clinton supported both policies while Bush opposed them. Unfortunately for Bush, there was little political capital in this difference between himself and Clinton. Support for public access to weapons that can turn a human torso into a soup tureen in 6 seconds, or opposition to a politically popular waiting period before buying a handgun is not the stuff of political advantage in 1992 as the chatter of gunfire could be heard on any given night in some part of any major city in the United States. While Bush could whisper his opposition to gun control to his conservative supporters, it was not a political position he could afford to shout from the rooftops.

The lack of attention to crime and crime control during the presidential campaign left most of Clinton's crime proposals in the shadows. These little-discussed proposals can be divided into three types: (1) control strategies, (2) short-term crime prevention strategies, and (3) long-term crime reduction strategies. As we recover from either post-election euphoria, or post-election blues, the time has come to ask: What are Clinton's stated crime control plans? How are they likely to fare as legislative initiatives? And would they help reduce crime and/or stem the rising tide of imprisonment that is rapidly making us the per-capita punishment capital of the world, displacing such former front runners as the Soviet Union and South Africa?

The key control strategies on Clinton's anti-crime agenda are more police and first-offender boot camps. During the campaign Clinton proposed that we "make neighborhoods safe again" by creating a "National Police Corps" that would put 100,000 new police officers on the streets. The underlying premise of this strategy is that crime levels are a direct function of police control, or, as stated in the 1992 Democratic platform "The simplest and most direct way to restore order in our cities is to put more police on the streets." During the campaign Clinton indicated that many of these new police officers could be recruited from veterans and current active military personnel. This recruitment strategy dovetails nicely with Clinton's concerns with converting the United States from a Cold War to a civilian economy. Clinton, however, has also linked the expansion of police forces to his proposal for increasing access to higher education by staffing the Police Corps with college graduates who would then repay government-sponsored college loans through a period of service as law enforcement officers. As part of his post-election proposal on higher education Clinton added another wrinkle by appearing to shift his proposal from national service after college to national service before college as a way of earning college tuition. How this pre-college service proposal will articulate with the idea of a college-educated Police Corps is murky. It is unclear whether the Clinton administration plans to support federal education funding for both 100,000 new sworn officers at the local level and some group of pre-college youth performing national service in police departments, or whether the latter will replace the former in the overall strategy of expanding law enforcement. Nor is it clear how either of these proposals will contribute to absorbing military personnel demobilized as part of the "peace-dividend." Despite these ambiguities the Police Corps is on a fast track. It already passed Congress in 1991 as part of the crime bill that eventually died in the face of Bush's threatened pro-gun veto, and it is primed to pass again. Given the strong bi-partisan support for federal aid to expand police forces, some form of a Police Corps will likely be implemented in the first year of Clinton's presidency.

Clinton's other control strategy is the "creation of boot camps for non-violent first-time offenders." I consider this to be a control strategy because evidence is building that boot camps do more to extend the reach of carceral control than they do to provide sentencing alternatives for those who would otherwise have found themselves in regular prisons. If Clinton and his advisors hope to use boot camps to ameliorate the current crisis in prison populations as they have indicated, they would do well to carefully monitor the potential netwidening effects of this particular "alternative" to imprisonment. They might also want to consider if adopting the military ideal of hyper-masculinity is, in fact, the best model for socializing troubled youth.
Whether or not the proposed control strategies of more police and more boot camps become actual policy depends largely on whether or not the federal government is willing to pay for them. The majority of cities and states are already staggering under the burden of programs mandated or promoted but insufficiently funded by the federal government. There will be little cheering in the hinterlands for a buildup of police forces or universal expansion of boot camps if federal dollars are not forthcoming to pay for them.

While Clinton’s proposals offer to provide college aid for those training for policing careers (echoes of the old LEEP program), and to pay the salaries for these new police officers while they perform several years of national service, it is silent on who would pay their salaries once the national service period is ended. Few cities are in a position to continue newly-minted Police Corps officers on their payrolls once the federal subsidies for these public service police officers end. Thus, there is the unattractive possibility that the Police Corps could turn into a revolving door of police rookies who are replaced on a biannual basis by a new set of federally funded rookies.

Clinton’s proposal to expand law enforcement also does not address the likely impact of a sudden sharp rise in the number of police on other components of the justice system. If these new recruits are at all effective in increasing the number of arrests, a court and prosecutorial system already staggering under unwieldy case burdens could very well collapse without new infusions of funding. In almost every city the number of unserved felony warrants is growing daily, and even assembly line plea bargaining cannot keep pace with growing numbers of cases in many jurisdictions.

Clinton has suggested expanding federal crime assistance. The proposed method for allocating these funds, however, appears to be strategically designed to promote certain short-term crime prevention strategies, rather than to pay for more career police officers and more boot camps. Specifically, Clinton has proposed the establishment of crime level criteria that could be used to identify “crime emergency areas.” Presumably these would be areas whose levels of crime exceed some acceptable level, much the way cities are targeted for unacceptable air quality levels (The idea of acceptable levels of crime, like acceptable levels of pollution is, in itself, a depressing innovation in crime control policy.) These areas would then be eligible for federal matching funds to “assist in the war on crime.” Obtaining these matching funds, however, would be conditional on adopting “proven anti-crime measures”--specifically, community-based policing, drug treatment on demand, and drug education in schools.

Since the 1960s the federal government has, to some extent, influenced the shape of crime control policies at local and state levels through selective funding priorities. If someone is willing to pay, we can expect pipers to appear to play the tune. Thus, it is possible that selective provision of funding may accelerate the community-policing movement, although just what this might mean is unclear. In its fullest expression, community policing involves a radical redefinition of the policing function from crime control to broad-based community service. Contemporarily, many police departments that operate under the banner of community policing have redefined the community policing agenda to mean primarily more officers on foot patrol (not a particularly new idea). If the Clinton administration does condition funding on the adoption of community policing standards, it will be interesting to observe just what kinds of specific policing strategies will be defined as constituting “community policing.” The very definition of community policing may be shaped by these decisions.

In the areas of drug-treatment and drug education, increased federal funding would have a more predictable effect. Opposition to expanding drug treatment is about as scarce as money to pay for drug treatment--both are in short supply. More money would lead to more treatment. For its part, drug education has moved alongside baseball and apple pie as an unquestioned good. We can expect that cities, towns, school systems, and police departments will all scramble for their share of a larger drug education money pie. Its my guess, and my fear, however, that once Clinton’s funding proposals are massaged by various legislative interests, the funding priorities will be shifted away from short-term prevention strategies toward more control-oriented ones. It will take substantial political work to alter the Reagan-Bush legacy of knee-jerk punitiveness among legislative bodies at both the federal and state levels when it comes to dealing with those crimes most common among the least well-off in our society.

When it comes to punishment, Clinton does have a strategy to reduce disparities between how we sanction crime in the streets as compared to crime in the suites. It involves increasing punishments for white collar crime rather than reducing those for common crimes. On the stump, Clinton promised that he would “work to pass tougher criminal penalties for white collar crimes--including environmental crimes so that serious white collar criminals serve jail time.” He also vowed that under this administration “Jail sentences will be served in real prisons, not high-tech summer camps.” While Clinton’s support for treating white collar offenders more punitively has considerable political and intuitive appeal, it also reaffirms the already overly-robust idea that crime is solved by punishment. In addition, while it is arguable that white collar offenders may, in fact, be more responsive to the threats of punishment, it is less clear that
punishing individual corporate managers is an effective strategy for minimizing corporate violations that are the products of criminogenic organizational structures. But then Clinton spoke only about "white collar crimes," not the wider and more complex world of corporate criminality.

The most significant differences between Clinton's anti-crime vision and that of the Reagan-Bush era, and the only ones that have a possibility of actually reducing levels of crime and violence in the United States, are his long-term crime reduction strategies. If nothing else, through his proposals Clinton has injected a new (or perhaps, recycled) rhetoric into the crime control debate. In a 1981 address to the National Association of Chiefs of Police, Reagan, in a political validation of control theory, said that crime was not caused by criminogenic social environments, but rather because people were "prone to evil." In Reagan's words, only the "swift administration of justice" can be relied upon to control the wicked people Wilson warned us about. In contrast, Clinton, in an address to the Democratic Leadership Council shortly after the Los Angeles uprising, sounded a different note on the causes of crime and disorder. In an impassioned discourse, Clinton characterized those who looted not as living proof of the human propensity for evil, but as people whose lives, and whose bond to the social community had been "shredded by the hard knife of experience." This hard knife according to Clinton was the product of such things as the shortage of decent jobs, a lack of quality education, exclusion from the benefits of middle-class American life, and the loss of hope in a brighter future.

Clinton reserved his harshest words for the Reagan-Bush strategies of blaming declining standards of living on job quotas in order to create "racial resentment instead of honest analysis of our economic falsehoods," and of blaming crime problems on "them," that is, on non-white, poor Americans. Clinton's speech carried clear (and to my ears, welcome) echoes of 60s-era attacks on "blaming the victim." Clinton went on to speak about the need for social inclusion, for reversing the strategies of racial isolation, of the social responsibility of government and business to redress the deprivations visited on the least-well-off in American society, and of building communities through "empowerment." All of this, of course, was campaign rhetoric. But rhetoric matters, particularly the rhetoric of presidents and other political leaders. It is their rhetoric that defines the moral climate within which the search for political solutions to social problems takes place. It is also important to note that Clinton presented his vision of long-term community building as a key tool in reducing crime in an address to the Democratic Leadership Council, his political power base inside the Party. This was the one place where Clinton least needed to tailor his message in order to attract votes. He was already the chosen leader of the DLC. If I am right about this, we have a President who gives serious consideration to the idea that crime has sociological roots beyond the existence of problematic people. This is a marked departure from the Reagan-Bush rhetoric that focused on moral weakness and the lack of punishment as the root of crime.

What does this change in rhetoric mean for the near future of crime control policy? It means that a space has been opened for a new discourse on crime. The idea that crime is an expression of a society's inability to provide meaningful and positive reasons to remain part of the social contract can once again be inserted into public discussions of crime control. The space has been opened to reconsider the Reagan-era promise that a pure market society of winners and losers will eventually produce social peace. And perhaps, most importantly, the idea that we are all members of the same society, and that we are responsible for the well-being of others (including those who are at greatest risk of becoming lawbreakers) is, for the moment, not being mocked at the highest levels of governance. Perhaps we can look forward to at least a temporary requiem for the idea that, as Margaret Thatcher put it, "There is no such thing as society. There are only people."

But a space is only that—a space. It needs to be filled with action, with effort, and with concrete change. A change in rhetoric does not, of itself, portend a change in social structures and social institutions. However, without a change in rhetoric—that is, without a change in the way we talk about crime—changes in the status quo of crime control would be impossible. The rhetorical change provides an opportunity to re-enter the public debate about crime control for those who think that such things as the deindustrialization and two-tiering of American society, the emergent pattern of economic development without job growth, intensification of racial animosity, and the growing inability of cities and states to fund their educational systems might be related to the collapsing social bond in many cities and suburbs.

For those who felt excluded from the discourse on crime control during the Reagan years, the time has come to return from exile, to put aside the emotional armor of cynicism, and to take up the task of trying, once again, to find ways in which we can build a society where crime, drug-induced escape, and self-destruction cease to be meaningful and attractive options to so many people, particularly young people.

In his crime speech to the Democratic Leadership Council, Clinton quoted Martin Luther King's proposition that "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." If we can now act as a nation to transform this rhetoric into
proposed in Vold’s monumental text Theoretical Criminology (1958).

The idea that most contemporary researchers could find anything of interest in recent criminology textbooks is almost laughable. As I’ve shown in numerous studies (see Wright 1987, 1988, 1990, 1992; Wright and Ducaci 1992; Wright and Friedrichs 1991; Wright and Yarem 1993), viewed collectively, the 38 criminology textbooks published in the last decade are a sad lot, not remotely living up to such lofty predecessors as Principles of Criminology, The Crime Problem, or Theoretical Criminology. For example:


2. Recent textbooks inadequately cover white-collar criminologies (although the coverage of white-collar crime in criminology textbooks is superior to the coverage found in criminal justice texts; Wright and Friedrichs 1991).

3. Textbook photographs depicting crimes and criminals are poorly integrated with the authors’ discussions (what texts show in their pictures often is not consistent with what authors say; Wright and Ducaci 1992).

4. Few recent textbooks embrace an up-to-date, moderate position on the determinism-free will debate in criminology (the tendency is for many authors to endorse an antiquated form of hard determinism; Wright and Yarem 1993).

5. Several important recent criminological developments—including modern biological theories, rational choice theory, and the routine activities perspective—receive little attention in most current textbooks (Wright 1990).

6. Many recent textbooks contain numerous sloppy conceptualizations, omissions, distortions, and outright factual mistakes (Wright 1990). Elsewhere, I have concluded: “Recent criminology texts show...little overall quality and little consistency in the coverage of current [theory and research] developments” (Wright 1990:560).

But the problems in modern criminology textbooks unfortunately run much deeper. The worldview found in the typical criminology textbook actually differs from the worldview one sees in the leading criminology journals and monographs. A comparison of textbooks and journals reveals two criminologies, that differ in assumptions, ideology, and language. Far from advancing a cutting-edge perspective on criminology (a la Sutherland 1947; Reckless 1950; Vold 1958) modern textbooks for the most part offer an obsolete image of the discipline, more attune to the 1960s than the 1990s.

I urge the reader to compare any recent issue of the journal Criminology with a few recent criminology texts. First, the worldview and the language of modern quantitative social science permeates the former, but is conspicuously absent from the latter. I’m not recommending that textbook authors confuse beginning students with discussions of multiple regression and analysis of variance. However, in order to depict the discipline of criminology fairly, some exposure to elementary quantitative methods, concepts, and symbols is essential. Most textbooks usually review the measures of crime—including the Uniform Crime Reports, the National Crime Survey, and self-reports—in the first few chapters (Wright 1990). A brief digression at this point at least to define and to discuss populations and samples, the venerable mean, median, and mode, and the difference between correlation and causation would seem appropriate (these concepts then could be integrated into subsequent chapters on crime theories, typologies of crime, and criminal justice). Text authors do a major disservice to undergraduate students by pretending that the quantitative side of criminology doesn’t exist.

The theories and the assumptions that textbook authors tacitly endorse also differ from those found in major journals and monographs. As noted earlier, rational choice theory and a moderate position on the determinism-free will debate have made significant inroads in journals and monographs, but not in texts (Wright 1990; Wright and Yarem 1993). Stale recapitulations of anomie theory, differential association theory, and the labeling perspective are the theoretical bread and butter of texts; these tired arguments are supported by a strong dose of positivism and hard determinism. An oversocialized conception of the criminal as molded by the force beyond his/her control is alive and well in the typical textbook (Wright 1988; Wright and Yarem 1993).

Finally, the two criminologies are apparent when one compares the substantive topics discussed in textbooks and leading journals. Consider criminological research on career criminals and deterrence. Studies in these areas have flooded the major journals over the last twenty years. However, with a few notable exceptions (see Brown, Esbensen, and Geis 1991; Conklin 1992; Sykes and Cullen 1992), texts ignore the advances and the controversies on these topics. When discussing career criminals, text authors rarely go much beyond some passing reference to Wolfgang, Figlio, and Sellin’s Delinquency in a Birth Cohort (1972). The basic terminology of modern chronic offender research—e.g., onset, duration, termination, desistance, persistence, lambda, prevalence, and frequency—is nowhere to be found. The treatment of deterrence is possibly even worse; here many authors are satisfied merely to exhume Beccaria, display Bentham, and then refute and bury them both. With some luck, general deterrence and specific deterrence, and the certainty, severity, and celerity of punishments might be mentioned. But forget any discussions...
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of actual versus perceptual deterrence, absolute versus marginal deterrence, total versus partial deterrence, formal versus informal sanctions, initial deterrence, residual deterrence, and deterrence decay, experiential effects, and comparisons of aggregate, cross-sectional, panel, and experimental designs in deterrence research (most textbook authors certainly do).

In general, modern "textbook" criminology embraces an ideologically liberal, nonpunitive, nonquantitative, and nontechnical worldview, more akin to social commentary than to contemporary social science. In contrast, the worldview found in the leading journals and monographs tends to be more conservative, control-oriented, quantitative, and technical—properly rejecting commentary for science. If one assumes, as Meier (1980:630) does, that the importance of textbooks "...resides in their depiction to noncriminologists of the nature of the discipline, its interests and activities," then the existence of two criminologies is intolerable. What can be done to ensure that future criminology textbooks more faithfully represent criminology as a discipline?

As Coser, Kadushin, and Powell (1982) note, publishers and editors rely on three strategies to guarantee the financial success of textbooks: (1) the use of academic reviewers who read and criticize drafts of books; (2) the use of market surveys (administered to teaching faculty) to determine textbook content; and (3) the imitation of best-selling textbooks in the field. These strategies contribute to the standardization (or convergence) of textbook content in most academic disciplines. Clearly the imitation of best-sellers promotes standardization; more subtly, though, academic reviewers and respondents to market surveys tend to evaluate manuscript proposals, precis, or suggestions by comparing them to popular texts already in the field (Wright 1988). Until this standardization cycle is broken, criminology textbooks will remain mostly mediocre.

One remedy involves greater rewards for criminologists who design to write and to review textbooks. To date, the primary incentives for writing and reviewing texts have been financial and/or personal; career advancements and prestige go only to scholars who contribute (as either authors or members of editorial boards) to the leading journals. As a consequence, few luminaries in contemporary criminology have been enticed to write or to review textbooks; while a list of text authors circa 1960 reads like a "who's who" of then-renowned criminologists (i.e., Reckless 1961; Sutherland and Cressey 1960; Tappan 1960; Vold 1958), the same can hardly be said about modern authors. Text authors and reviewers cannot be expected to share the worldview of modern scientific criminology if they have not contributed to this worldview.

Second, textbook publishers, authors, and reviewers must take their responsibilities and obligations to consumers (especially students) more seriously. When I look at the current batch of criminology texts, I suspect that certain publishers, authors, and reviewers have grown complacent, more concerned about their bank balances than with accurately depicting the current trends and developments in the field. Some of the more egregious textbook gaffes (e.g., misspellings of Robert Merton and Eving Goffman, and incorrect citations of the year of the pivotal Mapp v. Ohio Supreme Court decision; see Wright 1990) suggest carelessness that borders on professional negligence.

Finally, it is up to those who adopt criminology textbooks to demand more of their readings. We all have heard one or more of our colleagues frivolously boast (sometimes after having a few drinks at a professional meeting) that they don't bother to read the texts that they assign. This too borders on professional negligence. Once instructors be-

REFERENCES


action, there is a possibility that we can begin to reverse the criminogenic ideal of self-advancement above all else that had been raised to the level of a sacrament during the past 12 years of Conservative political hegemony. If we cannot, the United States will become even more deeply divided into two nations: one consisting of those who benefit from, and support, the rules of the game, and another populated by people who are increasingly detached from rules that seem rigged in someone else's favor.

As for criminology, I suspect its center will shift with the political and funding winds, just as it has in the past. Theoretical frameworks that place the locus of crime causation close to the individual level will receive somewhat less attention, or will become more closely linked to sociological explanations of the class-based distribution of individual level dysfunctions. If Clinton sticks to his campaign rhetoric on long-term solutions to the crime problem, macro-sociological analyses will receive more attention and more funding, and there will also be a new round of novel ideas for rehabilitating drug users and other law-violators as the Conservators fervor for punishment pure and simple is replaced by a less punitive discourse. Whether these shifts in criminology will have any impact on actual crime control policy will depend less on the quality of the research than on the political acceptability of the findings. Individual and family-level research into the causes of crime fit well with the conservative social-philosophy of the Reagan-Bush administrations. Whether or not the criminological enterprise can now develop approaches to crime and punishment that point toward the types of limited-state solutions that appear to define Clinton era policy in general remains to be seen.

Overall, Clinton's approach to crime and crime control is neo-liberal. It accepts earlier liberal ideas that crime has macro-social roots, and that its reduction depends on addressing underlying social causes. It diverges from 60s era liberalism, however, in its skepticism about solutions that are created and managed by governments to the exclusion of all other parties to the equation, and in its retention of the neo-conservative belief in the efficacy of formal control, particularly policing. At their worst, Clinton's crime control policies may end up a hodge-podge of hard and soft strategies that will do little but reinforce the attractiveness of conservative crime control policies. At their best, they might coalesce into an integrated array of social-democratic strategies for rebuilding communities—strategies that start with the proposition that a society that fails to provide a humane existence for all its citizens gets the crime it deserves.

---

The FOURTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON EVALUATING CRIME AND DRUG CONTROL INITIATIVES sponsored by the National Institute of Justice in conjunction with the Bureau of Justice Assistance, United States Department of Justice will be held on June 28-30, 1993, at the Loews L'Enfant Plaza Hotel, Washington, D.C. The registration fee is $150. For more information contact:
Lisa Cowan, Institute for Law and Justice
1018 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 684-5300 telephone
(703) 739-5533 fax
POSITION ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE CRIMINOLOGIST will regularly feature in these columns position vacancies available in organizations and universities, as well as positions sought by members of the Society.

A charge of $50 for up to 40 column lines and $1 per additional line will be made for each announcement. The charge will be waived for institutional members of ASC.

It is the policy of ASC to publish position vacancy announcements only from those institutions or agencies which subscribe to equal educational and employment opportunities and those which encourage women and minorities to apply.

Institutions should indicate the deadline for submission of application materials.

The Professional Employment Exchange will be a regular feature at each Annual Meeting. Prospective employers and employees should register with the Society no later than three weeks prior to the Annual Meeting of the Society. Appropriate forms may be obtained by writing to the ASC offices in Columbus, Ohio.

To place announcements in The Criminologist, send all material to: Editors, THE CRIMINOLOGIST, College of Criminal Justice, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, TX 77341-2296. Telephone: (409) 294-1689, FAX 409-294-1653.

Florida State University. The School of Criminology and Criminal Justice invites applications and nominations for the position of Dean, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice. The School of Criminology and Criminal Justice is one of the University's sixteen colleges and schools. It is a leader among the nation's Ph.D. granting institutions in the field and is committed to scholarship in criminology and policy leadership in criminal justice. The Dean is responsible to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, provides leadership for the School’s faculty, coordination of its manifold research and service activities, and direction of its degree programs. Qualifications include a Ph.D. or other appropriate degree, strong leadership capability for sustaining and developing the School’s leading position in the field, a distinguished record of achievement in the field, strong commitment to scholarship, instruction, and service, and demonstrated ability to relate effectively to the criminal justice community. Women, minorities, and persons with disabilities are especially encouraged to apply. The position begins as early as August 1993. Salary is competitive. Letter of application, resume, and names, phone numbers, and addresses of at least three references must be received by May 10, 1993. Nominations will be welcome. Address all communications to: Charles F. Crutte, Chair, Dean Search Committee, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Florida State University, R-85, Tallahassee, FL 32308. FSU is an Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity Employer, and all applicants are assured that the search to fill this position is open to all qualified persons.

University of Missouri-St. Louis. The Criminology and Criminal Justice Department at the University of Missouri-St. Louis invites applications for a one year Visiting Assistant Professor position. The appointment will begin with the fall, 1993 semester. The Ph.D. is preferred, though ABD candidates will be considered. Areas of specialization are open, but preference will be given to persons with expertise in the areas of research methods, statistics, and corrections. Duties consist primarily of teaching undergraduate and graduate courses. Send vita and three letters of recommendation to: Scott Decker, Chair; Criminology and Criminal Justice; University of Missouri-St. Louis; 8001 Natural Bridge Road; St. Louis, MO 63121. Review of applications will begin May 15 and continue until the position is filled. The University of Missouri is an equal opportunity institution.

Grambling State University. The Department of Criminal Justice is seeking to fill three tenure-track positions at the Assistant/Associate Professors level subject to approval from the Board of Trustees. Positions represent a nine-month appointment with annual review and the possibility of summer teaching. A Ph.D. in Criminal Justice or directly related field required. University teaching experience and a demonstrated record of research and publication required (ABDs may apply but are expected to have earned the Ph.D. by start of employment). Responsibilities include teaching undergraduate and graduate courses in at least two specialty areas within criminal justice, conduct research, publish scholarly work, advise students, direct graduate research, and participate in university-related service. Salary is commensurate with qualifications and experience. Appointment date is August 24, 1993. The search will remain open until the positions are filled. Grambling State University, a historically Black University, is located in the beautiful pine hills of North Louisiana. The University's academic programs have been expanded and strengthened in recent years and some of them, including criminal justice programs, are getting national reputations. The student enrollment has continuously increased for the past ten years to over 7,000 students. The Department of Criminal Justice is the largest department with over 600 undergraduate and graduate students with three degree programs (Associate, Baccalaureate, and Master of Science Degrees). Currently, the Department has 12 outstanding faculty from some of the major universities. The graduate criminal justice programs were evaluated by the State Board of Regents as the best programs in the State. Interested applicants should send a letter of application, a curriculum vitae, and at least three references to: Dr. P. Ray Kedia, Chair; Search Committee; Department of Criminal Justice; Grambling State University; Grambling, LA 71245. Grambling State University is an equal opportunity educational institution and an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.

Grambling State University. The Department of Criminal Justice at Grambling State University offers several Master's level graduate assistantships for the 1993-94 academic year. Qualifications include acceptance in the Master of Science Degree Program in Criminal Justice. Full-time assistantships consist of a stipend of up to $4,500.00. Direct inquiries to Graduate Program Director, Department of Criminal Justice, PO Drawer J, Grambling State University, Grambling, LA 71245, (318) 274-2746.
9th Annual Australian & New Zealand Society of Criminology Conference
SYDNEY
September 28 - October 1, 1993

Call for Papers/Presentations

Keynote Speaker: David Garland, University of Edinburgh

Conference Theme:
"Crime and Social Divisions"

Conveners: C. Cunneen, J. Stubbs, Institute of Criminology, Sydney University
The following focus areas have been established:

Politics, Crime and Justice
Juvenile Justice
Class, Race and Gender

Ethics, Responsibility/Accountability
Criminology and the Information Economy
Colonialism and Criminal Justice
Culture, Crime and Criminal Justice

Participants are Invited to Nominate Papers Etc. in Other Areas of Interest
Papers will comprise only part of the conference programme. Other forms of participation will be encouraged including workshops, panels and debates. If you plan to attend the conference, are willing to organize a forum/workshop/symposium, or wish to submit a paper for consideration, please send your proposed title/topic, author(s) and a single spaced typed abstract (maximum 150 words) to: The Conveners, ANZ Society of Criminology Conference, c/o Institute of Criminology, Faculty of Law, University of Sydney, 173-175 Phillip Street, Sydney NSW 2000, Tel: (02) 225-9239, Fax: (02) 221-5635, Email: fionaw@slaw.law.uow.au

7th ANNUAL NATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR PARENTS OF MURDERED CHILDREN AND OTHER SURVIVORS OF HOMICIDE VICTIMS August 4-August 8, 1993

Hosted by CONTRA COSTA COUNTY/EAST BAY and OAKLAND METROPOLITAN CHAPTERS of the SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, CONTACT:
Jean or Jack O’Hara (510) 932-6753
JoAnn Benford (evenings/weekends) (510) 654-1336

IACP Net Makes Grant Information Available

IACP Net, the computer network service of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), announces availability of grant information on-line. IACP Net monitors grants from foundations, corporations and federal sources. This information allows law enforcement agencies to target funders of police-related programs.

IACP Net also provides a law enforcement data base, a question and answer service and other networking and alert services. For more information contact IACP Net at 800-227-9640.
RESPONSE TO REVIEW ESSAY

Editors' Note: The following correspondence refers to the review essay by Alan Block published in The Criminologist, 18(2):16-20. Due to unusual circumstances, we have decided to include Rebovich's response and Block's rejoinder in this issue, but we do not anticipate to publish similar correspondence in future issues.

When I began writing my recently published book, Dangerous Ground: The World of Hazardous Waste Crime (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1992), I believed it was critical that at least a small portion of the book related to the controversy surrounding one of the few earlier works on environmental crime. As a backdrop to research in this area, I decided it was important to inform the reader that the only other major work to explore this crime area contained accusations and insinuations focusing on environmental crime enforcement corruption and that domination of environmental crime by syndicate crime families and had, eventually, been "pulled" by the publisher as part of a legal settlement in which the authors admitted to using erroneous and incorrect information. Now it appears that one of the authors of that book, Poisoning for Profit: The Mafia and Toxic Waste in America (New York: William Morrow & Company, Inc., 1985), has taken exception to my reference to the stormy history of that book and has used the guise of a "review essay" to conduct a caustic attack on me.

In the March/April 1993 issue of The Criminologist (Vol. 18, No. 2), Alan A. Block penned what is one of the most personalized "book reviews" I have seen in what appears to be an attempt to salvage some credibility from the dark episode involving his book. One must question what Mr. Block's purpose is here. Is it to provide an objective review of Dangerous Ground or, is it to vindicate himself? Judging from Mr. Block's depiction of Dangerous Ground, one would conclude that my book is, in large part, about his. It is not. He claims that I devote an entire appendix discussing his book. I do not. Of my book's 168 pages, exactly two pages of text and one page of a nine page appendix discuss his book. He also states that my description attempts to discredit his book. I am truly sorry that Mr. Block believes that I have attempted to discredit his book. There is really no need for me to do this. That discrediting began in 1985 when one of the original endorsers of Poisoning for Profit withdrew his endorsement of the book from the publisher. It continued in 1986 when Mr. Block documented that he had made mistakes with regard to the characterization of certain criminal investigations, when he had documented that he relied on sources which contained erroneous and incorrect information, when he signed an apology to one corporation and, finally, when the publisher agreed to destroy any copies of Poisoning for Profit in inventory as part of a civil settlement. (All this was described in the September, 1985 issue of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences' newsletter, Today). Examination of this documented material confirms that the most damaging evidence for discrediting Poisoning for Profit comes from the author himself. Somehow, Mr. Block seems to believe that anyone who brings up this embarrassing event in the history of environment crime research is in the business of bringing him down. My intent was to demonstrate the results of a criminal justice research project gone awry-one that points to some key pitfalls inherent in the study of white collar and organized crime in general and to some important research issues regarding the verification of accuracy of collected data.

In Mr. Block's unprofessional diatribe against me, he characterized me as a "patron" of the New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice because of that agency's willingness to permit access of data to me. According to Mr. Block, I am part of a conspiracy against him conducted by certain New Jersey officials. I am sorry that Mr. Block feels persecuted by others, but these accusations against me are baseless and simply wrong.

All this being said, what about Dangerous Ground? Regrettably, Mr. Block's "review" falls far short of presenting an objective assessment of my book. I can say that the book is a research work that has taken great care in following rigorous research standard for the operationalization of key concepts, accuracy, validity and reliability of analyzed data. Written to objectively inform, the book measures the degree of criminal organization based on a continuum carefully guided by past organized crime research. Dangerous Ground describes the role of organized crime in hazardous waste crime but does so in the context of all environmental crime, including those crimes committed by small and large waste generators. It presents a criminal world in which the intensity, duration and methods of the hazardous waste criminal act are primarily determined by criminal opportunities available in the legitimate marketplace.

Finally, it explains the dynamics of environmental crimes, the criminal maturation process of environmental offenders and obstacles to effective enforcement/prosecution of environmental offenses. My suggestion to those interested in understanding environmental crime and its control and in the protection of the environment, is to read Dangerous Ground.

One last note. While I am obviously disturbed by Mr. Block's comments, I am equally disturbed by the process used by The Criminologist in the selection of reviewers. My discussion with one of The Criminologist's co-editors revealed that Mr. Block was selected as a reviewer after he volunteered to review Dangerous Ground. Mr. Block's motives are abundantly clear, but the co-editor reported that this decision would have been reconsidered if complete information on the Poisoning for Profit civil settlement had been available and may have disqualified Mr. Block as a potential reviewer. In addition, the review responsibility would have ordinarily gone to one of the critics who participated in the Dangerous Ground--Author Meets Critics session of the last ASC Conference. My advice is that a more formal reviewer selection process be incorporated to ensure the authors are not deprived of impartial, objective reviews of their work.

Donald J. REBOVICH
American Prosecutors Research Institute

I can well understand Mr. Rebovich's unhappiness that the numerous inaccuracies in his book, many of them having nothing to do with his distortions of Poisoning for Profit, have been pointed out. Though he is disturbed and no doubt distressed, he is wrong in claiming that I volunteered to review his work in order to "salvage some credibility from the dark episode," etc., etc. I was asked to review it by a co-editor of The Criminologist immediately following the "author meets critics" session that Mr. Rebovich mentions. I presume the request came because of Mr. Rebovich's inability to answer substantive questions at the session concerning his interpretation of Poisoning for Profit. Probably the most important one dealt with his erroneous assertion that our most important sources had recanted their statements about organized crime and political corruption in New Jersey's hazardous waste industry. He could not identify the sources nor their alleged recantations at the session, and he obviously cannot do it now. Mr. Rebovich is the author of a work that asserts to describe the "World of Hazardous Waste Crime" in several states including New Jersey. Yet, he has nothing to say about a major New Jersey toxic waste hauling firm with connections to organized crime (alleged by New Jersey's toxic waste investigating unit in the late 1970s and recently confirmed by the FBI in its investigation of another slew of garbage and hazardous waste carting firms owned and operated by mobsters) that was responsible for the death of three men in an incinerator explosion in December 1984, within his stated research parameters. In this case the firm was represented by New Jersey's finest--a former Governor, a former Attorney General, a former
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In the central argument of this book, Pepinsky defines "unresponsiveness" in terms of willful disregard of others (e.g., pp. 15-16, 27), and then describes it as a "new conception of crime." Crime is a form of unresponsiveness, which manifests itself in violence. Responsiveness, in contrast, is associated with democracy in its broadest meaning. Pepinsky argues that both responsiveness and unresponsiveness reproduce themselves, so that ultimately, more responsiveness is associated with less violence.

Pepinsky offers little information about how to test this theory and little evidence to support it. Numerous examples of unsupported or barely supported assertions appear throughout the book. For example, he makes repeated assertions about the extensive criminality of the upper classes, and then says in other places that you cannot really know how criminal they are. He states that official crime rates changed drastically following the Chinese Revolution, but no citation or explanation is given to support that assertion (p. 24). He asserts that inequality does not cause violence, but that both inequality and violence stem from unresponsiveness (p. 22). The relationship between inequality and violence has been extensively researched, and to simply assert something with no reference to empirical research seems to me to be unacceptable. He also asserts that victim and offender are better qualified to determine how to respond to crime than a judge (p. 28), but cites only an article in ACJS Today, which is a newsletter rather than a refereed journal.

The absence of any attempt to marshal empirical evidence in favor of his theory leads me to wonder whether Pepinsky even believes in testing. He insists that this theory is testable (e.g., p. 5) but also argues that the central elements of theories in general are untestable (p. 9) and that the central element of his own theory is untestable—i.e., whether unresponsiveness and responsiveness reproduce themselves (pp. 32-33). Ultimately, he says that we have to rely on our daily experience rather than on research (p. 97).

The lack of faith in research is associated with what seems to be an excessive reliance on theory. He suggests that theory may be a "voice of pure reason" and that it can actually tell us something about reality (e.g., p. 127). Consistent with this, Pepinsky repeatedly relies on analogies and metaphors to make his points—heat and electrical voltage (p. 21), the tetrahedron (p. 86ff), chaos theory (p. 44ff), the Schlegel vat of violence (p. 92), and so on. Pepinsky seems to invest these analogies with a degree of reality, so that the existence of the analogy itself seems to be taken as evidence for the truth of the argument.

Perhaps this overstates Pepinsky's position, but it seems to be a tendency in the book with which I strongly disagree. In my view, theory and research are partners in the scientific enterprise, with theory interpreting the results of past research and directing the course of future research. Theory and research therefore are only meaningful in relation to each other. Theory, by itself, tells you nothing about reality—it only tells you where to look in reality (research) to see what you actually find there. Similarly, analogies are useful only if they point research in directions that ultimately prove productive.

I wish that Pepinsky had done a better job of presenting and defending his theory, especially since I think that his argument that "responsiveness" and "unresponsiveness" are testable. If this argument were supported by research, it would have profound implications for criminal justice policy. I hope that Pepinsky develops his theory in this direction in the future.

Thomas J. BERNARD
Pennsylvania State University


This is a big book on a big topic. There is much to admire: thorough scholarship and detailed critiques of the literature. As a comprehensive reference, there is nothing like it. It will stand for years as indispensable reading for anyone concerned about guns and violence.

The fundamental problem with the book is author bias, in very complex and subtle aspects of his assessments of the evidence. While he makes every effort to deny even the appearance of bias by offending both the NRA and HCI, it just won't wash. The book is not a trustworthy, impartial assessment of the evidence, but rather a well-crafted lawyer's brief dressed up as objective science. The brief is for an unorthodox viewpoint combining strange bedfellows: guns don't kill people, people kill people—but when guns are outlawed for outlaws, some outlaws won't carry guns.

Thus the book attacks the strong evidence that overall gun density is positively related to homicide, but concludes that keeping legal guns out of the hands of high risk users could modestly reduce gun crime. It attacks the hypothesis that there are "bad guns" which are particularly lethal and should be banned (skirted the evidence on semiautomatic gun sales and the tripling of gun deaths among black male teenagers from 1985 to 1990), but recommends that all gun sales should be strictly regulated through licensed dealers with access to instant records checks.

The greatest bias shows in the conclusion that widespread gun ownership detrines crime, and that limiting gun ownership among the poor and minorities would be an undemocratic and criminogenic policy. This bias leads him to estimate that up to 13% of all homicides are legal actions of self-defense, and that there are more cases of defensive "users" (undefined) of guns against crime than there are uses of guns to commit crime. As Philip Cook has shown in a recent Crime and Justice essay, these estimates require heroic assumptions about the interpretation of poorly worded surveys. And as Abraham Tennebaum has shown, the 13% estimate comes from an extrapolation to the entire U.S. of estimates from two cities, both of which estimates suffer major problems: (1) a questionable reading of Wilbanks' Miami homicide data and (2) a misinterpretation of Detroit Police classifications.

The latter point illustrates the double standard the book uses in assessing evidence for and against the author's viewpoint. On page 174 he attacks the idea of drawing conclusions from a single city about the effects of weapon type on lethality of incident outcome—studies which generally show higher homicide risks with bigger guns (against his viewpoint). But on page 170, he cites as gospel a single-city study to support his view that homicides are committed by people known to be violent. The Kansas City study of domestic homicides that he cites, however, actually showed prior violence at addresses, not among specific individuals, and has since been contradicted by other research in Milwaukee showing suspects in most domestic homicides have no prior record of assault against
their victim. He also generalizes from James Fye's New York City data on the ratio of bullets fired to deaths caused by New York City police, ignoring the evidence from other studies that this ratio varies widely across cities.

It is important that this bias appears to be completely unintentional, with the author failing to recognize his own value judgments. For example, he opposes general restrictions on gun availability (as opposed to high risk subgroups) with this argument: for every gun that would eventually be used in crime, 50 to 100 "noncriminal" guns would be kept out of the hands of abiding citizens. By my values, that argument is comparable to attacking the thousands of instances of unnecessary wearing of seatbelts that is required to save one life in an auto accident, or the thousands of unnecessary condom uses required to prevent one transmission of HIV virus. It is clear that by his cultural values, widespread gun ownership is so precious that it is worth many deaths and injuries to preserve it. This informs his interesting discussion of the politics of gun control as essentially a cultural war over rural-frontier versus European-urban visions of America. Given his clear position on one side of that war, his project to act as an impartial umpire was probably doomed from the start.

Perhaps we need to call a moratorium on criminologists doing research on topics about which they have strong visceral feelings on the independent variables, from capital punishment to Head Start. Kleck's first rate mind, like others in his position, may be wasted on projects in which his domain assumptions place him in a scientific conflict of interest. But the book is still essential reading, as long as it is read with skepticism. That is, after all, how we should read everything.

Lawrence W. SHERMAN
University of Maryland

Gary KLECK. Point Blank: Guns and Violence in America.*

Despite its flaws, Prof. Kleck's book represents to date the definitive criminological study of the role of firearms in American life, and the efforts to improve the situation through legislation. There is next to no consideration of constitutional issues or politics,* and the book is more focused on the general issue of gun ownership and ordinary restrictions rather than on the ever-changing, imaginative, and tangential mini-issues which arise--although he does effectively discredit the popular Cox newspaper using tracing data to justify a focus on so-called "assault weapons," even though Kleck, too, assumes a gun traced from a particular crime investigation was actually used in the crime in question.

Kleck presents a thorough review of existing research on why people own how many guns, to what extent they are used for protection, what impact availability has on homicide and other crimes, accidents, and suicides, the impact of various restrictions on the misuse of firearms, along with some speculation where research is incomplete (as in the chapter on suicide). In addition to summarizing and critiquing previous studies, he presents the massive amount of especially city-oriented research he has conducted. He eviscerates some of the arguments popular with "public health" types and such pseudo-experts as the news media and police leadership--such as the argument that guns are six (or 43...) times more likely to be used if gun restrictions are the leading cause of death of some kind or for some group, that guns are ineffective for protection, that public opinion supports stringent restrictions, that "children" and many other guns present an especially important problem in need of ameliorative legislation, Zimring's ambiguous intent belief, and the effectiveness of waiting periods.

Kleck shows that there is basically no relationship between general gun availability and overall rates of violence or mortality, that gun laws are unlikely to affect general gun availability, rarely affect availability to those who shouldn't have guns, and are only rarely likely to reduce any type of criminal violence--and not overall homicide or suicide rates. And he reaches the basic conclusion that the most widely discussed gun restrictions, ones which apply equally to non-criminal and criminals, will interfere with protection without reducing crime and are thus a bad idea.

The book is not without its weaknesses. He has lowered estimates of long gun use for protection from his earlier research based on shifting from an analysis of protective ownership among "good guys" to relative misuse of handguns to long guns by "bad guys." The index is inadequate, particularly where so much of the issue is often discussed in terms of persons (Cook, Zimring, Bordua) and places (Orlando, Morton, Grove, Seattle). The cost, $59.95--presumably because of the massive numbers and detail in myriad useful tables--is as monumental as the book.

Most seriously, the conclusory recommendations in chapter 11 are at odds with the findings of the preceding chapters--justified by the unwarranted assumption that somehow laws which fail at the state or local level, with interstate evasion a federal felony, will somehow work if adopted nationally--and at odds with the basic rule he enunciates as to what would constitute acceptable regulation. He posits the rule that widespread compliance by non-criminals is a must, and then recommends regulation of the private transfer of all firearms. Survey research and experience in numerous jurisdictions has shown that to be unacceptable to gun owners. For example, when California expanded its background check for handguns to all guns and from dealer transfers to all transfers, the number of background checks conducted only doubled, where it should have nearly quadrupled, with only about 5,000 private-transfer background checks, suggesting 95% non-compliance.

Despite misgivings about some of the policy recommendations, Kleck's book is essential reading for anyone seriously concerned with the factual foundations of the "gun control" debate.

*For example, one of his proposals is to add violent misdemeanants to the proscribed category of gun owners, with appeal for relief from this disability possible after some years. This ignores the fact that rights of citizenship are generally lost upon conviction of a felony, not a misdemeanor, that misdemeanor pleas may have been obtained because no rights would be lost, and that it is politically easier to prevent such an extension of proscribed categories than to protect the "relief from disabilities" procedures, which would be described in the press as the government arming violent persons.

Paul H. BLACKMAN
National Rifle Association


Since President Ronald Reagan launched the nation's most recent war on drugs in the early 1980s, the federal government has experimented with numerous strategies to eradicate illegal drug use. Zero tolerance, crop eradication, military intervention, interdiction, "Just Say No," demand reduction, and asset forfeiture have been attempts to combat what is arguably our most threatening social problem. None of these tactics, however, has stirred as much controversy or provoked more debate in the 1990s than legalization of the use of illicit substances.

As the subtitle of the volume indicates, the editors' objective is to provide diverse but balanced points of view on legalizaton as public policy and its consequences, which they accomplish most satisfactorily. Diverse, in fact, is a most appropriate descriptive for this collection of 25 essays. One of the editors, Irwin M. Brent, is a historian/genealogist; the other, Rod L. Evans, is a professor of philosophy. Chemist Limus Pauling wrote the forward and television journalist Hugh Downs provided the introduction. The contributors represent science, academia, policy
making, law enforcement, and journalism, and include several of the well known supporters and critics of legalization such as Charles Rangel, Ethan A. Nadelmann, James Q. Wilson, Milton Friedman, William J. Bennett, David F. Musto, William F. Buckley, and Arnold Trebach.

There are also authors, not so closely associated with drug policy, who analyze the legalization issue skillfully and imaginatively. Hudding Carter III, former member of President Jimmy Carter's campaign staff, and Taylor Branch, better known for her biography of Martin Luther King, Jr., share insightful commentary on how to minimize the drug problem.

Branch's cleverly written essay, "Let Koo Do It," focuses on the hypocrisy in allowing the sale and consumption of alcohol, tobacco, and some prescription drugs—substances attributed to more deaths than marijuana, heroin, or cocaine—and suggests treating them the same way the former Surgeon General waged war against them. Her discussion about an imaginary "Year One" of legalization (304-08) is an engaging assessment of Koo's model that advocates licensing private distributors to handle the drugs, taxing them just heavily enough to prevent a black market, banning advertising, and strictly enforcing laws against those who commit crimes while under the influence. The scenario Branch envisions after a year of legalization is one in which the value of illicit drugs plummet, a burgeoning prison population actually decreases by nearly 25%, citizens throughout the country enjoy a greater sense of security, and crime victims even recoup some of their losses through reduced insurance rates.

Also provocative reading is an interview with Dr. Michael Gazzaniga, a psychiatrist, who refutes some of the many erroneous but popular notions about drug use. He notes, for example, that contrary to the public's perception, "most homicides involving crack were the result not of the use of crack, but of dealer disputes," and that the claim there were 375,000 "crack babies" born in 1989 does not coincide with the government's estimate that there were only 500,000 crack babies that year (232-35).

Although legalization is a contemporary topic, if the editors publish a second edition, a historical overview assessing the adoption and implementation of drug policies during the 20th century would demonstrate that the government has been interested in drug control policy since Congress passed the Pure Food and Drug Act in 1906. Brenner (158-61), Nahas (248), and Branch (299-300) discuss, albeit briefly, how lessons of the past can be helpful in coping with the current drug problem.

Organized into six categories, the essays are well written and contain intriguing interpretations, though only one of them, John Lawrence Hill's "The Zone of Privacy and the Use of Drugs" is an original contribution. This is more of an observation than a criticism, since collectively these essays are nicely balanced viewpoints that offer the reader rational arguments for legalization, against legalization, and what Brent and Evans call "half measures" that evaluate various forms and degrees of legalization.

Because it explores many dimensions of the drug problem, Drug Legalization will appeal to both academics and general readers interested in acquiring a better understanding of the very complex and seemingly unending drug problem. These essays would also serve as a valuable classroom resource for a scholarly and comprehensive examination of drug policy.

John C. McWilliams
Penn State Univ-DuBois Campus


Nils Christie has done more to bring criminology in Europe and America together than anyone in the last hundred years. This book is yet another outstanding contribution from one of the world's leading criminologists. Like all of his work, it combines a magnificent personal quality with hard data and careful analysis. Christie says, an American it is remotely possible that people in positions to make criminal policy in this country might listen to some of his sanity. Being a Norwegian one can only hope that his work will have that effect by influencing American criminologists and students.

Christie's thesis is simple and straightforward:

Societies of the Western type face two major problems. Wealth is everywhere unequally distributed. So is access to paid work. Both problems contain a potentiality for unrest. The crime control industry is suited for coping with both. This industry provides profit and work while at the same time producing control of those who otherwise might have disturbed the social process (p. 11).

But of course it is not really that simple, and Christie makes that clear as well. That is why this is such an important book: complex ideas are made simple and simple solutions are given their due as complex social issues.

Since crime is an "endless supply" the crime control industry is in an enviable position: the demands for their services are limited only by a rare commodity in the modern world: humanism. Countering any tendency toward humanism is the insatiable demand of the police, courts, prisons and other bureaucracies to grow and grow and grow. Rarely, as Christie points out, will "those working in or for any industry say that now, just now, the size is about right... The crime control industry is like rabbits in Australia or wild mink in Norway. There are so few natural enemies around."

For this reason the prison population in the United States has grown to 1.2 million people or 504 prisoners per 100,000 inhabitants: the highest incarceration rate in the world. Compared to other Western countries it is astounding and absurd: five times as many prisoners per 100,000 as any European country. Five times as many as Northern Ireland where civil war is a constant of everyday life. Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium Austria, Spain and the Netherlands have fewer than eighty prisoners per 100,000 population. Only the former Soviet Union and South Africa could compete with the United States but today they are not even in the running. The police and prison industries in the United States have won the competition. The crime industry in every totalitarian country of the world must marvel at how the forces of oppression could have succeeded so well in an allegedly democratic society.

The only control that can possibly be exerted on the growth of the crime industry is normative according to Christie. People must decide: enough. So many people in prison is intolerable. Controlling fifty percent of the African American population between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five by having them under the auspices of the crime control industry is too much. This decision we must make and we must then fight the forces that will inexorably push for further growth of the crime industry.

Christie presents an abundance of data and astute analysis to buttress his argument. He is very convincing that the crime industry is out of control. That it is unnecessary, ineffective and bound to stay that way. He is equally persuasive that it is a self-perpetuating bureaucracy. Christie recognizes the difficulty of changing this trend. Since the industry itself has a near monopoly on the dissemination of information about crime and controls the research funds available to define and study the problem, only a Herculean effort by criminologists can limit the quenchless thirst of the crime industry.

At the root of the problem, Christie argues persuasively, is that the law has been moved from its traditional roots in humanism and cultural values to power, politics and most importantly an institution of production, "Through that move, law loses essential qualities, particularly its roots in the core area of human experience" (p. 180). One may argue about the origins of law being in values, but it cannot be gainsaid that there is little or no connection between humanism, culture and contemporary penal policies.

Christie concludes:
We are free to decide on the pain level we find acceptable. There are no guidelines, except in values. Those of us who work close to the penal system have special responsibilities, but not as experts...Rulers, and in democratic states politicians, invariably attempt to give the impression that theirs are rational tasks in a field where utility thinking is of obvious importance. Our counter-idea as cultural workers--or members of the intelligentsia as they would say in Eastern Europe--is to puncture this myth and baring the whole operation back to the cultural arena. The delivery of pain, to whom and for what, contains an endless line of deep moral questions. If there are any experts here, they are the philosophers. They're also often expert at saying that the problems are so complex that we cannot act. We must think. This may not be the worst alternative when the other option is delivery of pain (p. 185).

I like this book very much. I will use it in my classes and recommend it to anyone in the crime industry capable of reading. I will stress a few things that Christie does not: that the pain being inflicted in America is directed disproportionately at the poor and especially at the minority poor not because they commit more crime. Forty percent of the federal inmates are in for drug offenses. The overwhelming majority of these are poor and disproportionately they are minorities. But most drug users are white middle class men. There's more illegal drug use (including under age drinking) and enough violent crime (date rape, gang rape and statutory rape) on college campuses to justify as much crime control activity on college campuses as there is in the Black ghetto. But bureaucratic rationality in response to the realities of political power precludes filling one's arrest quota with campus raids and dictates instead rapid deployment units and undercover narcotics inundating the Black and Latino ghettos. Were the young men in the ghetto in a position to get support from institutions like the university, their parents, lawyers and people with power the police would not be so quick to find the "raw material" they need for their industry among young Black men.

And Christie is more optimistic about the power of public opinion than most U.S. criminologists can be. The power of lobbies such as the Fraternal Order of Police and the prison construction industry (in California the Correctional Officers Association is an organized lobby) is greater by far than the moral or rational persuasion of social scientists. And where are the counter-lobbies for these groups? What citizen groups exist to argue for reducing the number of police, the number of arrests and the number of prisons? Sentiments may exist in some quarters for such measures, but there are no organized lobbies: not even the ACLU, the NAACP or the National Lawyer's Guild has suggested reducing the size of the crime industry.

There is hope, however, and Christie's arguments are critical for the hope to be turned into reality. The overwhelming cost of the crime industry, its ineffectiveness and the fact that it takes scarce resources away from other needs makes it vulnerable in a time of fiscal crisis. Medical care, not crime, is seen by the U.S. public as the most important problem facing the nation in 1992. The desperate need of the educational system in the U.S. (the federal government has reduced its expenditures on education by fifty percent since 1980) puts pressure on the politicians to find the money somewhere. Criminologists can provide a rationale, hard data, and sound theory to justify transferring funds from the crime control industry to their social needs. Practical politics abetted by timely social science in a well reasoned moral persuasion could make a difference. Nils Christie has begun a discussion which is at the very center of our discipline and should dominate the minds and works of criminologists for the foreseeable future.

William J. Chambliss
The George Washington University


Spohn and Horney employ time series analysis to examine the impact of rape law reforms on reports of rape, the processing of rape cases, and the evaluation of rape cases by officials over a 15-year period, in six urban jurisdictions--Detroit, Chicago, Philadelphia, Houston, Atlanta, and Washington, D.C. Data were gathered from over 22,000 court records, and the authors interviewed judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and police officers in each jurisdiction. To date, no one has compared the impact of the various types of reforms by different jurisdictions.

Results from their quantitative and qualitative analyses illustrate that attitudes among criminal justice officials toward past rape law reforms have been positive, but yet in practice, the implementation of these reforms has benefited only comparatively few cases which involve victims of stranger rape. Thus, little impact is seen in the areas of acquaintance or date rape. Even the application of rape shield laws (evidentiary standards which prohibit, in most situations, a victim's past sexual history at trial) supported by officials in the jurisdictions studied, can be abrogated at trial if such information is deemed relevant by the judge.

Since this timely book is written straightforwardly and without statistical jargon, it is worthwhile reading for social science academicians, legal historians, legislators, policymakers, criminal court judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, rape crisis counselors, lobbyists for rape law reform, print and broadcast journalists, and others interested in the impact of legal reforms on rape cases.

Chapter 1 details the history of the development of traditional rape laws and the efforts of the rape law reform movements designed to increase arrests, prosecutions, and convictions for rape. Additionally, the authors provide an overview of the theoretical, legal and empirical examinations of the impact of the four most common rape law reforms: (1) definitional changes, (2) the elimination of the requirements that the victim physically-resist her attacker, (3) that the victim's testimony be corroborated, and (4) restricting the introduction of evidence of the victim's prior sexual conduct.

By comparing rape law in six states in Chapter 2, the authors illustrate the groundwork for their study--i.e., determining the effect of rape law reforms and how they vary. Within each of the six states, an urban jurisdiction was chosen based upon the strength of existing rape law reforms. Spohn and Horney provide a strong rationale for choosing these locales for inclusion in their study. The cities found to clearly have stronger rape law reforms are Detroit, Chicago, and Philadelphia. In contrast, the authors report that Houston, Atlanta, and Washington, D.C. have weaker rape law reforms.

In Chapter 3, Spohn and Horney review the literature on the informal and formal structure and organization of the court system. They then apply the previous literature to the six urban jurisdictions in their study, and describe the procedural differences in the screening, processing and outcome of rape cases. The authors conclude that these differences may impact upon rape law reforms within and between these jurisdictions. In their Chapter, Spohn and Horney also comprehensively examine the uses of grand jury versus the preliminary hearing, the judiciary, the prosecution, the defense, rape crisis centers, and provide arrest, indictment and conviction rates within each of the jurisdictions in their study.

Chapter 4 describes Spohn and Horney's use of official records in each of the six jurisdictions to test three expectations that rape law reformers believed would result from reform efforts: increases in the reporting of rapes to the police, the indictment of cases by prosecutors, and the conviction of offenders.

Chapter 5, which examines the impact of rape law reform on the decision-making pro-
cesses is based upon interviews with criminal justice officials in each of the six urban cities. With the exception of the rape shield law which was one of the reforms that was ranked the lowest in importance in a rape case by the officials interviewed, the other reforms failed to show any dramatic impact on the judgments of officials' evaluation of factors associated with evidence.

Chapter 6 focuses on the implementation of the rape shield laws in the six jurisdictions. The authors found that "restrictions found in even the strongest shield laws can be circumvented" (p. 155). Victims of stranger rapes, furthermore, the authors conclude, are the primary beneficiaries of the rape shield laws. The finding that all of the rape shield laws studied "allow for the introduction of evidence of past sexual conduct with the defendant" (p. 156) offers little encouragement to those victims who are raped by their husbands, acquaintances or boyfriends.

In Chapter 7, the conclusions of the study are presented. Although interviews with officials resulted in expressed general support for rape law reform, and specifically, the rape shield law, the legal changes did not produce the dramatic results anticipated by the reformers.

These findings should not leave us disillusioned. This provocative, broad-based, impact study demonstrates that rape law reforms have had a preliminary impact on the judgments of the rape event by role players in the criminal justice system. Thus, with these preliminary changes in thinking about rape cases by actors in the court system, hopefully, future follow-up studies within these jurisdictions will indicate a greater impact of rape law reforms on the reporting of rape cases, and subsequent arrests, prosecutions, and convictions for the crime of rape for all victims.

Charisse T. M. COSTON
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte


This small book is a collaborative venture between Thornton, a former Oregon Attorney General and judge of the Oregon Court of Appeals and Endo, an education professor at Tokyo International University. The book is largely the product of field research, including the gathering of official statistics of various kinds, as well as interviews and observations conducted by Thornton and Endo in the U.S. and Japan. The title of the book is somewhat misleading on two counts. First, it is not a large-scale examination of crime and its control in these two nations, rather, it is a report on lawbreaking and responses to it in Salem, Oregon and Kawagoe, Japan. The first city is the state capital, located about 40 miles south of Portland, and the center of a metropolitan area of about 275,000 population. Kawagoe, located about 30 miles northwest of Tokyo, is approximately the same size as the Salem metropolitan area. Second, the book is relatively long on descriptive material and opinions and relatively devoid of in-depth analysis.

Having said this about the book, I would hasten to note that there is currently much interest focused on Japan and in ways in which that nation differs from the United States, including responses to lawbreakers and lawbreaking. In particular, the theorizing by John Braithwaite in his Crime, Shame, and Reintegration has much to say about the positive impact of "reintegrative shaming" upon offenders, as contrasted to the negative effects of stigmatization upon criminals. And, according to Braithwaite, Japan's low crime rate is largely attributable to what he calls "communitarianism" and the practice of reintegrative shaming in that country. In this regard, the strength of the Thornton-Endo book is that it makes a beginning toward "filling in the gaps," by providing descriptive details with regard to the meaning of notions such as reintegrative shaming as they are played out in the day-to-day affairs within communities in Japan. In short, there is not much "heavy theorizing" in this book, but it does contain material that many criminologists will probably find useful.

There are fifteen brief chapters in the book, beginning with an introduction, a description of the two cities, a third on crime differences between the two communities, and a fourth on social and cultural differences between the two nations. A homogeneous population, communitarianism, and strong family bonds are said to account for low rates of deviance and criminality in Japan.

Chapter 5 deals with the police in the two cities, followed by chapters on citizen involvement in crime control, the education systems, juvenile court operations, and auxiliary prevention activities. Chapter 10 describes correctional institutions in the two nations, followed by accounts of recidivism differences, crime prevention tactics, and emerging crime problems. The final two chapters have to do with the underlying causes of lawbreaking in the two countries and with the implications of the Japanese experience for crime control in the United States.

One of the descriptive highlights of the book centers on accounts of the behavior of bosoku (lawbreaking youths on motor bikes or customized cars) and the yakuzka. There are also some tantalizingly brief remarks in the book about the fears of Japanese miscreants of being shunned for their deviant acts. These snippets seem to hint that there may be more to Japanese responses to offenders than reintegrative shaming.

Still another part of the book that will be of interest to some criminologists is the description of conditions in Japanese correctional institutions. I was struck by a sense of deja vu in reading this account, in that a good bit of it read like a description of institutions in California during the heyday of the treatment era: systematic classification of prisoners, matching of offender types to particular institutions, and the like. On the other hand, it seems clear that Japanese institutions are also fairly Spartan places in which to "do time." Most of the buildings are unheated, the work hours for inmates are long, and disciplinary punishment is swift and relatively severe. There is also a feeling of deja vu in the description of Japanese family or juvenile courts, for they sound much like juvenile court ideals that emerged in the first half of the century in the United States, complete with the downplaying of due process considerations.

Thornton and Endo describe crime and delinquency prevention in the United States as essentially an inchoate "non-system," while Japan's preventive structure is portrayed as a fairly massive, pyramidal one, headed at the top by the national government and carried out by myriad local groups at the base of the pyramid. Indeed, a common thread throughout the book is that the Japanese are apparently much more inclined to embrace various forms of intrusiveness into their lives than would be most Americans. If this is so, one probably ought to be cautious about assuming that the Japanese model can be easily adapted to American practices. It may be one thing to open a koban in a neighborhood and quite another to reform our system along Japanese lines.

Don C. GIBBONS
Portland State University

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 15

Director of the Division of Criminal Justice, and a former New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection mucky-muck. I would rather be standing in my tattered shoes, all that was left when the legal sharks finished with me, than walking in the pumps of someone so seemingly naive.

Alan A. BLOCK
The Pennsylvania State University
## EDITOR SEARCH

The JOURNAL OF CRIME AND JUSTICE, a peer reviewed forum sponsored by the Midwestern Criminal Justice Association, is soliciting applications for the position of Editor. This individual is responsible for setting the editorial policy of the JOURNAL and overseeing all aspects of manuscript selection and the daily operation of the JOURNAL. The new Editor is to be appointed in September 1993 and assume full duties in September 1994. Applicants must have a demonstrated record of scholarly activity, provide evidence of past editorial experience (by past positions or manuscript reviewing), have an earned doctorate or terminal degree in criminal justice or a related field, be of senior rank at the host institution, be a member of the Midwestern Criminal Justice Association, and must provide written support from the host institution. Applications are due by August 1, 1993, and should be submitted to Edward Tromnauher, Chicago State University, 95th and King Drive, Chicago, IL 60828. Further information can be obtained by contacting the current Editor, Steven Lab, at (419) 372-2326.

## COMPARATIVE CRIMINOLOGY BOOK AWARD

The Division of International Criminology (DIC) of the American Society of Criminology is soliciting nominations for the Division's award for outstanding contributions to comparative criminology. This award recognizes annually a book or monograph that makes a significant contribution to the field of comparative criminology. To be eligible for the 1993 award, the book must have been published in 1992. For purposes of the award, comparative criminology is defined as any research that uses regional or cross-national data in an explicitly comparative way to develop theory, to test hypotheses or to advance methodologies pertinent to comparative criminology. Any work on crime, deviance or social control is eligible. Nominations will be evaluated on their contribution to the development and testing of criminological and social control theory or to comparative research methods. Winners will be announced at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology in Phoenix.

Please send nominations by August 1, 1993 to: James P. Lynch, Associate Professor, Department of Justice, Law and Society; The American University; 4400 Massachusetts Avenue, NW; Washington, D.C. 20016.

## SPATIAL SEMINAR PLANNED

August 22-25

The Illinois Statistical Analysis Center and Loyola University Chicago, with support from the J. F. Kennedy School of Government/Ford Foundation Innovations in State and Local Government program, is planning a Workshop on Crime Analysis Through Computer Mapping to be held in Chicago from August 22 to 25, 1993. This three-day conference will bring together crime analysts, statisticians, geographers and others on the firing line of spatial crime analysis, to confront statistical and technical obstacles to the use of mapped data in practical public policy decisions and to set an agenda for overcoming these obstacles. The intensive workshop will include panels, presentations, and demos on cutting-edge topics, as well as "roundtable" discussions and idea-sharing among all the participants. In addition, we hope to publish the workshop proceedings.

Attendance at the workshop will be limited to no more than 50 delegates. For additional information, contact Carolyn Rebecca Block at (312) 793-8550.

## NEW TITLES


## IN MEMORY

JUNE MORRISON

1914-1993
Advances in Criminological Theory
A Serial Publication by Transaction
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Volume 5 Routine Activity and Rational Choice

Volume Editors: Ronald V. Clarke and Marcus Felson


Volume 6 The Legacy of Anomie

Volume Editors: Freda Adler and William S. Laufer

Foreword by: Robert K. Merton


Volume 7 Developmental Theories of Crime and Delinquency

Volume Editor: Terence Thornberry

(In Preparation)
BOOK REVIEW ESSAYS


Criminology in the 1990s is the subject of two new books emanating from the two major English speaking schools of criminology in Canada--University of Toronto Centre of Criminology and Simon Fraser University School of Criminology. These two recent books on Canadian criminology characterize the nature of the discipline in Canada. The University of Toronto Centre of Criminology book Criminology: A Reader's Guide will be useful for circumspect research purposes in the selected topics. Canadian Criminology from Simon Fraser University is a dense, encyclopedic text which is a valuable contribution to the field. It provides the first truly Canadian text in criminology, with a wealth of information. For the student of crime and criminal law it will provide a significant source book on criminological topics, while the teacher of criminology is provided an array of chapters from which to select those most relevant for the students. In terms of teaching, the chapters are laid out in a useful format with numerous helpful subheadings, photos, and boxes to keep the student's attention. These two books from Canadian criminologists suggest that, while free trade may be forcing further economic integration with the United States (and possibly Mexico), the criminological enterprise continues to pursue a distinctively Canadian approach.

Criminology: A Reader's Guide is a compilation of essays by members of the faculty on their specialties, edited by three of their colleagues. It is explicitly not a textbook or exhaustive survey of the field, but an idiosyncratic guided tour of the criminological literature. The Introduction, by well-known criminologists Richard Ericson and Clifford Shearing, offers an "institutional approach to criminology," focusing upon how crime, criminality, law, and justice are "constituted" within major social institutions such as law, polity, economy, science, and culture. Noting that the Centre's researchers have largely eschewed the traditional concern with the causes of criminal behavior, they overview the interdisciplinary, multi-methodology nature of their enterprise. The Introduction concluded that an institutional approach to criminology is a conception of criminal law and justice as an ordering system functioning to allocate resources and to regulate and resolve conflict. The criminologist's task is to seek an understanding of these processes in a wider institutional context. This institutional approach will be familiar to social scientists as a conflict analysis of law and legal process.

After the above establishment of a perspective, the text is divided into three parts. Part One entails four selections on "Crime, Policing and Punishment." This is the longest and most comprehensive section of the text, reflecting the strength of the Centre's faculty in this area. The first essay by Professor Beattie is a brief but detailed analysis of "Crime, Policing, and Punishment in England 1550-1850" followed by an extensive reading list. Next is a review of "The History of Canadian Criminal Justice, 1750-1920" by Jim Phillips. Professor Phillips not only overviews the literature, but places it in the context of a theme--the history of crime, state, and society--followed by a quite useful bibliography on Canadian criminal justice. The next two pieces on "Policing" (Stenning and Shearing) and "Penology" (Ercison) are very brief reviews of major issues with annotated bibliographies. The uneveness of these latter two chapters in length and quality compared to the previous two reflects one of the problems of this collection, that is, there is a great variation in the consistency, extensiveness, and academic merit amongst the chapters.

The second part entails four essays concerning "Law, Reform, and Policy." The first essay by Peter Solomon, Jr. provides a concise overview of the political aspects of crime in the United States, Canada, and Great Britain with a fairly brief annotated bibliography. Next is "Narcotics: A Case Study in Criminal Law Creation" by Chester Mitchell, providing a brief overview of one of the clearest examples of the politics of law in Canada, followed by an informative and well-presented overview of the "Charter and Criminal Process" by law professor Kent Roach, with a recent annotated bibliography. Finally, there is a brief discussion of "Mental Disorder and the Criminal Justice System" by C. D. Webster, with a bibliography that is not annotated.

The shortest section is the third part on "Social Hierarchies, Crime and Justice" consisting of only two papers for a total of approximately thirty pages. If the institutional approach is largely concerned with ordering, regulating, and resolving conflict within a hierarchical system, this seems somewhat of an anomaly. The first article by Mariana Valverde is the only one by a woman in the text and concerns "Feminist Perspectives in Criminology." After a concise summary of the area we are provided with a useful annotated reading list. Lastly, a short paper on "Juvenile Delinquency and Juvenile Justice in Canada" by W. Gordon West is presented with yet another helpful annotated bibliography. This completes the third section which appears to have added youth and women as an afterthought to the Centre's work. This reflects the Centre's emphasis over the years.

According to the preface, this book is "intended for the general, non-specialist reader as well as for the student of criminology and those working in related fields." However, given its uneven nature and varied prose, it would be most useful as a reference for selected bibliographic sources concerning relatively narrow subject matter. The book, fortunately, reflects the state of criminology at the University of Toronto Centre of Criminology rather than the more diverse and exciting nature of criminology in Canada. For that kind of overview we must go to a text from a Western criminological centre, Simon Fraser University.

The criminology faculty of Simon Fraser University has provided a massive, near encyclopedia of Canadian criminology in its eighteen chapter, 518 pages of text
The legislation of morality is the topic of concern in Section Two, with chapters on "Prostitution" by John Lowman, "Drugs" by Neil Boyd, and "Gambling" by Colin Campbell. This is an important area for students of law and society and "victimless crimes," however, it is somewhat overdrawn. One chapter of about half the size covering the respective issues would suffice. Nonetheless, there is much here for provocative and stimulating class discussion.

Sections Three and Four address the perennial criminological question—how do you explain criminal behavior? The theories are divided into those focusing on the individual (Section Three) and those emphasizing societal causation (Section Four). Part Three has three chapters concerning theories of criminality focusing upon the individual. In the introduction to the section, the authors provide a cogent overview of the varying levels of analysis (macro/micro) and the application of theory to practice. A useful overview of the biological and psychological perspectives is presented in Chapter 7 by co-editor Professor Jackson, with a good delineation of classical and positive criminalology and a useful appendix summarizing the major theories. Menzies provides a lengthy overview of mental disorder and crime in Chapter 8. The first part is an excellent overview of the medical model and its failings, followed by a somewhat lengthy discussion of what he identifies as the "big three issues" in psychiatry and criminal law: (1) insanity and criminal responsibility, (2) fitness to stand trial, and (3) dangerousness. Unlike the previous two chapters, Chapter 9 is quite brief and addresses a relatively narrow topic—treatment of sex offenders.

We move away from the "kinds of people" theories of crime in Section Four to an emphasis upon the social causes of criminality in three chapters. The introduction appropriately notes the reciprocal (dialectical) relationship between individual and social theories. Sociological perspectives are overviewed in Chapter 20 by Professors Burch and Arnold. Compared to the previous overview of psychological theories, this is somewhat disappointing. It is half the length and requires greater development. For example, they state that class and power are guiding variables for their subsequent analysis but present little data on the nature of class and power relationships in Canadian Society.

After the above brief introduction to sociological perspectives, there is a much larger and well-developed chapter on women and crime (Chapter 11) by Professors Chunn and Gavigan. They provide a straightforward presentation of the extent and nature of women's involvement with crime and various explanations for this involvement, followed by discussions of how women are treated by the criminal justice system and what should be done. Yerbury and Griffiths address the issue of minorities, crime and the law in Chapter 12 through two minority groups—First Nations people and the Freedonists Dukhobors. While the authors note that race is an erroneous scientific term, they fail to address the social definition of race, i.e., colour, which, while not scientific, has much impact. You cannot treat South Asians in Vancouver, blacks in Toronto, or First Nations people in Winnipeg the same as a religious minority. The authors provide a very good overview of the two minority groups they have chosen to discuss.

The most laborious section concerns crime statistics (Section Five) presented in two chapters. In Chapter 13, Lowman and Palys present a number of approaches to interpreting official crime statistics. They present a useful critique of official statistics and the police construction of crime. The second chapter (14) on patterns in Canadian crime presents not only contemporary data on the nature and scope of crime and its major correlates (age, sex, race, class), but also much data on the spacial pattern of crime, historical trends, and international comparisons. Professor P. Brantingham has presented us with data overkill from a student's perspective, although of value as a reference source.

The emerging focus of criminology is the final section (Six) consisting of four chapters dealing with more recent concerns of criminology. This section counters the class bias of official statistics and traditional criminology by focusing upon white collar, professionals, corporate, and political crime. Crime among the professional elite is the subject of Chapter 15 by Joan Brockman. Largely concerned with the abuse of power by such professionals as lawyers, doctors and accountants, it provides a useful summary of self-regulating professions, the
power they wield, and how such abuse might be curtailed.

The power and possible harms perpetrated by corporations is addressed in Chapter 16 by Gordon and Coneybeer. A well presented review of the literature is conveniently categorized by victim groups such as consumers, workers, and community residents. The fact that such crime has violent effects through death and injury is demonstrated, dispelling the myth that such corporate crime is only economically harmful. Crimes against the environment, consumers, human rights and employees are documented, after which a useful explanatory scheme is presented. It integrates the individual/organizational characteristics with those of the larger political economy, e.g., profit maximization, growth imperative, to provide a holistic explanation which also discusses the role of the state.

Terrorism perpetrated by the state and against the state is the focus of Chapter 17, written by Professor Corrado. An historical analysis is provided, coupled with more contemporary Canadian examples. The final chapter by Gabor deals with the myth that criminals and non-criminals are easily distinguished. Entitled "Crime by the Public," it points out that many "respectable" citizens violate the law through such acts as fraud, theft, substance abuse, environmental abuse, family violence, among others. This is an important counter to the official stereotypes and ideologies of crime.

Charles E. REASONS
B.C. Public Interest Advocacy Centre
Vancouver, B.C.

Editors' Note: The following book was included in an "Author Meets Critic" panel at the 1992 meeting of the American Society of Criminology in New Orleans.

Wilbert RIDEAU and Ron WIKBERG.

Reading Life Sentences: Rage and Survival Behind Bars is the next best thing to being there. Wilbert Rideau and Ron Wikberg, with over fifty years combined prison experience at Angola, Louisiana's state penitentiary, present a vivid, realistic, and emotionally touching portrait of prison life and other parts of the criminal justice system in this 1992 edited work. Wikberg and Rideau, authors of most of the articles, claim to report the facts in a clear, objective manner. Yet Life Sentences goes beyond objective reporting. It is the next best thing to being there because it strikes an emotional chord, similar to that which I saw in my students' reactions during their recent trip to Angola. This book makes prison come alive for the reader.

Although it may be unpopular in today's "get tough with crime" political climate, I believe it is important to remind both the public, and more importantly present and future criminal justice employees, of the offender/prisoners' humanity and what the social structure of imprisonment does to all those connected with it. I am appalled that the U.S. has the highest incarceration rate in the world (News Star, 1991:1A), and that Louisiana, the state I have worked and lived in during the last seven years, "imprisons a higher percentage of its people than any other state in the country or any other country on earth" (Culpepper, 1992:1). And "Sweater of Degradation," "Sexual Jungle," "Bloodiest Prison in the United States," are just some of the epithets which have been used to describe Angola.

Yet, somehow, this book has emerged from such a time and place, and has brought both mundane and practical matters of the prison to the attention of the public and academic community. In fact, as a result of their investigative journalism, Rideau and Wikberg have been instrumental in bringing much needed social reform to Louisiana's penal system. A collection of articles previously published in the Angolite, Angola's award-winning, uncensored prison newspaper, this book covers the entire range of prison experience and problems, past and present. From the relatively light-hearted article about Leadbelly, the famous blues singer and self-proclaimed "King of the Twelve String Guitar," to the dramatic "Sexual Jungle," (recipient of journalists' prestigious 1980 George Polk Award), which describes the underworld of sexual slavery in prison, and "The Deathmen" interview with Sam, the executioner, who admits that executions are "no different to me...[than] goin' to the refrigerator and getting a beer..." (Wikberg and Rideau, 1992:5), this work underscores many classic criminological questions about the relationships between keepers, the keep, victims and other actors in the criminal justice system.

As a sociologist in a Criminal Justice program who has also taught in and studied prisons for ten years, I thought I was more knowledgeable than most about prison life. However, this book has significantly expanded my knowledge about this social institution. First, I learned things I did not know about Louisiana prisons. Second, some representations made me think about things I already knew in a way I hadn't considered before.

And finally, even though I am fairly desensitized to reading about most things that go on inside prisons, at many places this book called forth subtle emotional responses. But first let me highlight some of the things I did not previously know.

I've never thought parole particularly interesting, but after reading Rideau's "Dynamics of Parole," I find it much more so, and I also have a better understanding of the process of parole in Louisiana. I do disagree with Mr. Rideau on one point. He suggest that the state should rely more heavily on parole and should educate the public that parole often results in a longer period of supervised state control of ex-offenders than other types of releases. Rideau further argues that parole really puts the parole offender under close supervision—makes him go to work, stay out of the bars, etc. This picture of parole is ideal. In Louisiana and most other states, parole officers hardly see their parolees until revocation hearings as their average case loads are over 100.

Somehow, I had missed hearing or reading about the battle between Westinghouse and Edison, and the pivotal part which the electric chair played in the development of alternating current for everyday usage. If you too have missed this classic story, read Ron Wikberg's "Horror Show" which was
Chock full of new revelations for me: at one time, an offender could delay his own execution by serving as the executioner; beginning in 1941 in Louisiana, the electric chair, and its generator was housed at Angola, but "driven to each parish as an execution was scheduled" (Wikberg, 1992:288). Can you imagine this large old oak chair and generator on a truck traveling the two lane roads, perhaps in the middle of the night? But most important about this article is its photographs, illustrating the physical damage inflicted by Louisiana's electric chair and the resulting controversy over its continued use. It has been suggested that because of this article (originally published in the Angolite in 1990), the New Orleans Federal District Court heard arguments for the first time in 50 years concerning the electric chair's constitutionality. And although the court ruled the chair's use constitutional, "On June 25, 1991, the Louisiana legislature ... [mandated] that all executions after September 15, 1991, be performed by lethal injection" (Wikberg, 1992:303).

I have always been intrigued with the convict-guard system in the South and had thought that convict-guards were part of the southern prison system since its inception. However, initially, I discovered in "Angola's History," (and later confirmed by my own research on the history of women in Louisiana prisons), that on the contrary, Louisiana hired civilian guards, even during antebellum times at the Baton Rouge Penitentiary. In fact, S. L. James, Louisiana's infamous convict lessor from 1870 to 1901, employed civilian guards. The convict-guard system was not used for the first time until 1917, and was instituted by Warden Fuqua as an economic measure. Also relevant to my own research, I learned that even though "brutality increased dramatically" during Earl Long's administration, (thirty-seven white convicts cut their Achilles tendons in protest), a women's camp was constructed during this era (Rideau, 1992:39).

The "Sexual Jungle" demonstrates that although rape is always everywhere a horrifying, serious offense, in prison "rape victims ... repay their rapist for the violence he inflicted upon them by devoting their existence to servicing his every need for years after" (Rideau, 1992:77). Most often this "service" is for the total length of the sentence, which can be life, unless interrupted by the victim killing the rapist. The idea of the victim being bound to the rapist for years really shocked me. Although I've always been aware of this type of prison relationship, the article suggested interesting parallels for the first time. The sexual slave in prison can be compared to the battered spouse who, subjected to similar treatment, may kill her spouse to escape the abuse (Gibbs, 1993).

The most moving passage in the book for me is Rideau's "Conversations with the Dead." Not about death row inmates as I assumed, this article concerns prisoners who remained prisoners because they had been forgotten by the free-world, or because they were lost in the increased complexity of the criminal-justice bureaucracy. While interviewing Cocky Moore, one of these lost inmates who had been imprisoned for thirty-three years, Rideau has to cut short the interview:

I had to get away. Sitting in that little shanty-the old man's world-stirred the painfully chained need for some normalcy in my life: the need to ride a bike, take a swim, watch children playing; the need to hold a woman, to talk to normal people, to walk in the night with the wind in my face ... I felt smothered, as if the clammy hand of Death and reached from the grave and touched my soul. Never had the sense of Death been so real to me, so frightening. I had waded through an ocean of unrelenting struggles, danger, and unshakable pain, and there had been many times I stared Death in the eye, even turned my back on it, but it had never in all of its repulsive monstrousness, been this frightening (Rideau, 1992:57).

As of this year, Rideau has served 32 years at Angola. Despite this self-revealing quote from Rideau, he and Wikberg generally let the inmates speak for themselves. For example, Fulghum, an inmate patient at Angola's hospital, describes how it feels to watch his friend's agony and death and then watch the hearse take him away: "It starts to bugging your mind, and sooner or later you can't even think right. Sometimes I have nightmares. I lay in my bed and cry" (Rideau, 1992:172). Whatever your personal reaction to the dying prison inmate, "Conversations With the Dead," "Dying in Prison" and "The Long Termers" all clearly point to one of contemporary correction's major problems-the graying of the prison population.

In closing, I would like to say that I agree wholeheartedly with Russell Bank's (1992:5) recommendations that this book be required reading for all 50 United States governors and for all present and future Presidential and Vice-presidential candidates ... [and] anyone who has or might have the power to grant parole or clemency to a person living in an American prison.

Additionally, I believe that this book should be read by, not only every criminal justice student in Louisiana, but every college student in the United States.

In addition to the humane sociological awareness this book imparts, it is a contribution to the growing body of information about southern prisons. Southern prisons have always incarcerated a disproportionately high percentage of their populations both black and white. Even so, academic corrections literature has relatively ignored them. This book addresses in a very important sense that neglect.

My students are reading this book this semester. I recommend that you and your's do also. In fact I have seen many of my students reading this book even before I made any assignments. With a widespread adoption of this book perhaps, the seed will be planted for a diminishment of the "get tough" mentality in this country, and as recommended by the victims' family in the "Horror Legacy," a return to "justice tempered with mercy" (Wikberg, 1992:21).
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RESERVE NOW TO ATTEND THE 1993 ASC MEETING BREAKFAST MEETINGS ON MAJOR ISSUES

Major keynote speeches and roundtable breakfast discussions on important issues in studies of violent crime and its victims will be held each morning of the 1993 ASC Annual Meeting to be held October 27 through October 30 in Phoenix, Arizona. Keynote speakers and Roundtable Discussion Leaders are among the most stimulating and knowledgeable researchers on the topics to be addressed. The topics include several controversial issues including the prediction of violence and the failure of deterrence.
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Completed forms and checks should be mailed to:

SARAH HALL, Administrator
ASC Executive Office
1314 Kinnear Road--Suite 212
Columbus, OH 43212
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