

The Criminologist

The Official Newsletter of the American Society of Criminology

Vol. 18, No. 2

March/April 1993

REPORT FROM THE EDITOR OF *CRIMINOLOGY*

Charles R. Tittle

At this writing, all of Volume 30 of *Criminology* is in print, the February issue of Volume 31 is in production, and most of the May issue is scheduled. Since this is about the halfway point of my editorship, it seems appropriate to take stock.

Progress Toward Goals

I began my work as editor on April 1, 1991, with three objectives in mind: (1) to maintain (and possibly improve) the quality of the journal so that it would be regarded as a prime potential outlet for the best scholars working in the crime/deviance area, (2) to reduce the time from manuscript submission to the first decision point (commonly called "turn around time"), and (3) to increase submissions. The evidence is clear that at least one of those objectives has been achieved. So far, the average time from receipt of a manuscript until the initial decision letter is written is 38 days, with the longest delay having been 64 days. For this, I and the authors who have submitted to the journal owe a huge debt of gratitude to the numerous reviewers who, with few exceptions, have not only cooperated in reviewing

Please see REPORT, page 8

WHAT DOES "DRUG-RELATED" MEAN? REFLECTIONS ON THE PROBLEM OF OBJECTIFICATION



Henry H. Brownstein
New York State Division
of Criminal Justice Services

For the study of crime, contemporary criminologists rely upon official statistics and legal definitions. Quinney and Wildeman made this point more than 15 years ago when they wrote, "Most of the

available statistics that criminologists have relied upon in their research and generalizations have been derived from official sources, that is from the statistics gathered by agencies of government" (1977:98).

Concerned by the lack of attention to the "interpretations, decisions, and actions" inherent in the process by which people produce official crime statistics, Kitsuse and Cicourel observed that "statistics routinely issued by [bureaucratically organized] agencies are social facts par excellence" (1963:139). Social facts, as Durkheim told us, are things (1964). So for researchers using official statistics and definitions, crime is likely to be explicitly or at least implicitly treated as an object, a thing independent of the social actors who participate in its realization.

When we treat crime as an object we forget that crime, like any social phenomenon, is a constructed reality. We

Please see REFLECTIONS, page 5

IN THIS ISSUE . . .

Letters to the Editors 2

Around the ASC 7

ASC Divisions News 20, 21, 22

Fellowship for Ethnic Minorities . . . 4

Report from the Editor
of *Criminology* 1

Call for Papers 3

ASC Sexual Harassment Policy 7

Position Announcements 12

Review Essay 16

Book Review 14

Letters to the Editors . . .

To the Editors:

Gerber and Weeks (1992) wrote recently about problems associated with doing research in Japanese prisons. Their research in Japan was supported by the "Fellowship for Comparative Study by American Scholars on Correctional Administration" of the Japanese Correctional Welfare Association. Because I have recently (August, 1992) returned from Japan and was supported by the same organization, I write to add further, albeit different, comments on doing cross-cultural correctional research in Japan. The main purpose of this writing is to put into a broader context points made by Gerber and Weeks based on my own experience of doing research. There are two points which merit emphasizing.

First, the primary source of funding for Gerber, Weeks and myself was actually the private Hitachi Foundation, which provides funds to Japan's Bureau of Corrections so that they may bring from abroad some scholar "to study in order to enhance inter-organizational friendship and the exchange of experience and ideas." This is potentially important to note because it sets the context for which the Correction Bureau receives foreign scholars. Not only does the Correction Bureau itself not provide the funding, but the purpose of the funding is not for "cross-cultural research" the way as it is generally conceived by Americans. Rather, it is more for the mutual exchange of information.

This was made clear to me soon after my arrival when it was informally communicated to me that the Bureau's understanding of the purposes of my visit was (in order of importance) -- to sustain the relationship between my department/university and the Correction Bureau, to learn about Japanese corrections, and lastly, to do some research. In contrast to most academic research done in American correctional facilities, the Correction Bureau expressed little interest in how my research might benefit them. I got the impression that they felt (perhaps rightly) that there was little I could accomplish within a month to help them.

From the perspective of the Correction Bureau, this ordering of importance of purposes for my visit is understandable.

Southern Illinois University has a long history with the Correction Bureau which sends one or two of its employees each year to SIU for graduate study. In respect of that relationship, the Bureau was eager to make a favorable impression upon me in terms of hospitality, which they did. Second, Japan is proud of its low crime rate and naturally would like American scholars to promote a favorable impression of Japan abroad. This also is understandable; administrations everywhere would like to impress outsiders with the good work that they are doing.

In my own research, I sought to interview psychologists who work in juvenile classification homes. My experience parallels some of the experience reported by Gerber and Weeks, particularly regarding cultural sensitivity and language difficulty. For example, my original research proposal to document how the Correction Bureau incorporates modern penological ideas through administrative regulations while still operating within the framework of their 1908 prison law was rejected as being too sensitive. Additionally, during interviews, my lack of language skills forced me to rely on translations where inevitably some of the richness of the answer was lost. However, these are common limitations faced by many interested in cross-cultural research and should not dissuade others from studying other cultures.

A final point concerns the organizational structure of the Correction Bureau and how it relates to future researchers. All personnel (including top administrators) within the Correction Bureau are reassigned to new positions every two to three years. Thus, any given researcher's experience is likely to be shaped by whoever is currently in office, though there is some institutional memory. I found this to be particularly true when I compared my experiences with others who have gone to Japan.

In summary, I would like to state that cross-cultural research is valuable, and that I am very grateful to the Correction Bureau for the opportunity to conduct research. I hope with that this letter would encourage other researchers to open dialogue with the Correction Bureau for future research and to be particularly mindful of the context.

REFERENCES

- Gerber, Jurg and Weeks, Susan L. (1992). Some reflections on doing crosscultural research: Interviewing Japanese prison inmates. *The Criminologist* 17(6): 1, 7-12.

Mark A. Small

Southern Illinois University - Carbondale

Response to Small:

As you point out, different researchers are likely to have different experiences depending on the individuals with whom they interact. It is clear that our impressions do not match yours, although both our travels occurred within the same six-month period.

First, our thirty-minute visit to the Hitachi Corporation which funded our visit seemed more an exchange of pleasantries than an effort to set the context of our visit. Second, while you found little emphasis on research as a key purpose of your visit, our experience was very different. From the beginning of our short stay it was made clear that we were expected to publish articles based on our research in Japan. To us this meant that research was important, an assessment that was reinforced by at least one individual who made critical remarks about previous recipients of the fellowship who either did not publish at all, or who published work that was not useful to the Correction Bureau.

Assuming that our interpretation of the relative importance of research was correct, we were faced with two options: we could either do research as we were trained to do, or we could write relatively superficial and congratulatory summaries of the Japanese correctional system. The first option was problematic because it seemed in violation of what "guests" (rather than researchers) should do, while the second was in violation of scientific rigor. Feeling uncomfortable with both solutions we nevertheless chose the first.

Finally, as stated in our previous article, we believe strongly in cross-cultural research and remain grateful to the Correction Bureau for giving us an opportunity to participate in it.

Susan L. Weeks and Jurg Gerber
Sam Houston State University

CALL FOR PAPERS

SPECIAL ISSUE ON RACE AND PUNISHMENT

The *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* invites original manuscripts that examine the relationships between "Race and Punishment." Manuscripts are welcome that present original empirical or theoretical research, analyses of law and/or legal theory, or historical studies. Critical overviews of theory and methodology also are welcome. All manuscripts will be subject to the *Journal's* peer review process. The standard submission requirements for *JRCD* apply to the special issue. The closing date for receipt of manuscripts is **April 1, 1993**. Please send four copies of the manuscript to:

Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency
School of Criminal Justice
S.I. Newhouse Center for Law and Justice
15 Washington Street
Newark, NJ 07102
ATTN: Todd R. Clear

The **Division of International Criminology (DIC)** is soliciting nominations for the Division's Annual Visiting Scholar Award. Each year DIC tries to support attendance at the annual meetings by a scholar from a nation where it is hard to secure foreign currency or travel funds for academic purposes. The recipient of the award should be a scholar who has contributed to the field of comparative criminology. The award carries a \$700 honorarium to help the recipient defray the costs of attending the annual ASC conference in October. The recipient will be asked to give a presentation at the Division meeting.

Please send nominations (including a *curriculum vitae* and a sample of written work, if possible) by **April 1, 1993** to:

Professor Nancy Travis Wolfe
College of Criminal Justice
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

REQUEST FOR NOMINATION DISTINGUISHED SCHOLAR AWARD

Section on
Crime, Law and Deviance
American Sociological Association

The Distinguished Scholar Award will be presented at the ASA meetings in Miami, August 1993 to the author(s) of a book or series of articles published in the last five years and constituting a major contribution to the study of crime, law and deviance. Please send your nominees in by **April 15, 1993**, and, if possible, a CV to:

Professor Joan McCord, Chair
Distinguished Scholar Committee
Department of Criminal Justice
Temple University
Gladfelter Hall, 5th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19122
Telephone: (215) 8080

REMINDER: NEW Ph.D.s AND NEWS ABOUT ASC MEMBERS

The editors would like to publish a column with the names of members or the students of members who have recently received a Doctor of Philosophy degree. Send the name of the degree recipient, the major professor (the entire committee if you like), the title of the dissertation, the department/college/university awarding the degree and any relevant information you might want to include regarding the recipient.

The editors also encourage and welcome news about members of the ASC: promotions, grants awarded, honors, new positions, sabbaticals, or anything else which might be of interest to the members.

The Criminologist

The Official Newsletter of the American Society of Criminology

THE CRIMINOLOGIST is published six times annually - in July, September, November, January, March, and May. Copyright © 1990 by the American Society of Criminology. All rights reserved. Distributed to all members of ASC. Annual subscriptions to non-members: \$7.50; foreign subscriptions: \$10.00; single copy: \$1.50. Non-member subscriptions should be ordered from the Society's membership office (address below). ISSN 0164-0240.

Editors: Jurg Gerber and Raymond H. C. Teske, Jr., College of Criminal Justice, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas 77341-2296.

Managing Editor: Kay Billingsley, Sam Houston State University, (409) 294-1689.

Published by the American Society of Criminology, 1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212, Columbus, OH 43212. Printed by Sam Houston State University Press.

Inquiries: Address all correspondence concerning newsletter materials and advertising to Editors, The Criminologist, College of Criminal Justice, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, TX 77341-2296. FAX 409-294-1653

Postmaster: Please send address changes to: The Criminologist, 1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212, Columbus, OH 43212.

ASC President: Delbert S. Elliott, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, Campus Box 442 IBS #9, Boulder, CO 80309.

Membership: For information concerning ASC membership, contact John P. Clark, Treasurer, Department of Sociology, University of Oregon, 716 PLC, Eugene, OR 97403.

Second class postage paid at Columbus, Ohio.

FELLOWSHIP OPPORTUNITY
Applicants for
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

FELLOWSHIP FOR ETHNIC MINORITIES
ONE YEAR: \$12,000
DEADLINE: JUNE 1, 1993

ELIGIBILITY: The fellowship is designed to encourage minority students, especially African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans and Asian Americans to enter the field. Applicants need not be members of The American Society of Criminology. The winner must be accepted in a program of doctoral studies in criminology or criminal justice. Individuals studying in social sciences or public policy are encouraged to apply.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES: An up-to-date curriculum vita; evidence of academic excellence (e.g., copies of undergraduate and/or graduate transcripts); three letters of reference; and a letter or statement describing career plans, salient experiences, and the nature of the applicant's interest in criminology or criminal justice, as well as an indication of race/ethnicity and of need and prospects for financial assistance for graduate study should be sent to: **SARAH HALL, Administrator, American Society of Criminology, 1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212, Columbus, Ohio 43212**

Recipient and alternates will be notified by July 1. The Society reserves the right not to award the scholarship.

REMINDER: 1993 ASC GENE CARTE
STUDENT PAPER COMPETITION

We invite participation in The American Society of Criminology Gene Carte Student Paper Competition. These awards are given to recognize outstanding scholarly work of students. Following are the procedures for the 1993 competition.

WHO IS ELIGIBLE? Any student currently enrolled on a full-time basis in an academic program at either the undergraduate or graduate level.

SPECIFICATIONS FOR PAPERS. Papers may be conceptual and/or empirical. They must be directly related to criminology. Papers must be 7,500 words or less, typewritten, double-spaced on 8-1/2 x 11 white paper using standard format for the organization of text, citations and references. Submissions must be accompanied by a letter, indicating the author(s) enrollment status and co-signed by the dean, department chair or program director. Author(s) name(s), department(s), and (optional) advisor(s) MUST appear only on the title page, since papers will be evaluated anonymously.

DEADLINE. Papers must be submitted with a postmark on or before **April 15, 1993** to: **FINN-AAGE ESBENSEN, Department of Criminal Justice, 1100 Niehardt, University of Nebraska-Omaha, Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0630.** Entries will be judged by a panel of scholars in the field and, therefore, it will be necessary that **SEVEN** copies of papers be provided.

AWARDS. The 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place papers will be awarded prizes of \$300, \$150, and \$100, respectively and will be eligible for presentation at the 1993 meeting of The American Society of Criminology in Phoenix, Arizona, October 26-31. The 1st prize winner also will be granted a travel award to the meeting. The Committee may decide that no entry is of sufficient quality to declare a winner. Fewer than three awards may be given. Prize-winning students will be acknowledged at the Annual Meeting Awards Ceremony.

NOTIFICATION OF AWARDS. The author(s) of entries selected by the judges for awards will be notified in writing by August 1, 1993.

REFLECTIONS, continued from page 1

spend more time trying to measure what we have defined as crime than we do trying to understand its meaning and significance for social life. We assume that we can objectify various categories of crime and forget that the meaning or significance of any category of crime is the product of the people who are touched by it in some way. My own experience in trying to understand the meaning of drug-related crime illustrates this problem.

Early in the 1980s, before crack cocaine was widely known and before police crackdowns were the strategy of choice for pursuing drug traffickers and users, I became involved in the study of drug-related homicide. Not surprisingly, the more I learned, the more confused I became.

From the start I knew that there was no easy way to determine how a violent crime like homicide could be related to drugs. The task was made more difficult by the fact that few police departments then could even estimate what proportion of all their homicides were drug-related. Those that had identified and counted some cases as drug-related generally had considered only cases where some participant, usually the victim, was found by autopsy to have been using drugs.

My colleague, Paul Goldstein (then with Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.), had developed a framework that suggested that drugs could be related to violence in several different ways (Goldstein 1985). With his conceptualization we were able to analyze drug relatedness in terms of the various patterns of victim and offender drug use, patterns of interaction among people involved in drug trade or drug use, and even in terms of the compulsive behaviors that might result from a person's need for drugs.

Armed with this framework, we believed we could contribute to the clarification of what "drug-related" meant for the classification of homicides. With support from the National Institute of

Justice we began collecting data about homicide cases in New York, first from existing police records and later from homicide detectives while they were investigating cases. In fact, Paul's framework did prove to be a particularly useful tool for classifying cases in terms of drug relatedness. With it we were able to distinguish cases related to drug use from cases related to drug trafficking, for example, and even to explain in detail how individual cases were linked to drugs. But the fundamental definition of a case as drug-related or not never became easy.

Sometimes it's possible to argue that the involvement of drugs in a case of homicide is obvious. A young man consumes so much alcohol (we always counted alcohol as a drug) that he loses control of himself, he becomes embroiled in an argument over something that under other circumstances would not have concerned him, and he ends up killing someone. Or someone buys cocaine at a street corner and brings it home only to find that what he spent good money for is really baby powder or laxative. He returns to the corner and shoots the person who cheated him in a drug deal. These cases, in one way or another, are clearly related to drugs.

But what about the woman who stabs the man she lives with because he will not stop selling drugs? And what about, as often happens, the drug dealer who is killed trying to protect himself from people who are trying to steal his money? The answer to the question about the drug-relatedness of these cases is: It depends. For example, might the killing have happened even if something other than drugs were the product being sold?

It was not until a 1989 article that we offered a specific definition of "drug-related." In our earlier works (Brownstein and Goldstein 1988, 1990; Goldstein and Brownstein 1987) we exemplified it in terms of Paul's conceptualization, classifying cases in terms of one or more of the categories of the framework. Then in the 1989 article

we wrote, "Homicides were classified as 'drug related' only when it was believed by both the police and the researchers that drugs contributed to the outcome in an important and causal manner" (Goldstein et al. 1989:662). This definition made sense and, from an operational standpoint, it worked.

But as we continued to define drug-relatedness in this way, concerns arose about the definition. Foremost in my mind was the issue of subjectivity: a case is determined to be drug-related when informed people agree that it is drug-related. As we collected more and different types of information about homicide cases, it seemed to become more rather than less difficult to reach consensus about what was needed to determine whether or not a case should or could be defined as drug-related. And even if I could resolve the problem of subjectivity to my own satisfaction, there was still the problem of the linkages we were positing as central: What makes a relationship "important" and, of greater concern, how could we know when a relationship was "causal"?

The question of causality was more theoretical than it was one of methods or statistics. What I really wanted to know was whether or not the notion of causality was essential when talking about the relationship between drugs and violence. Because someone is high on drugs when she kills someone else, that does not necessarily mean that her being high caused the homicide. It's easy to see how the drugs in such a case were related to the killing, but not so easy to see how they caused it. And does it really matter? Are causal relationships more important to understanding drug-relatedness than are other types of relationships?

Decades ago as an undergraduate in a statistics course at Brooklyn College, I learned that concomitance is not the same as causality. Certainly there are other ways that social phenomena can be related, and perhaps it would be better to

REFLECTIONS, continued from page 5

interpret the drugs/violence nexus in broader or even different terms.

My concern over the question of causality was enlivened when I read comments by an anonymous reviewer to a paper we were working on. He or she noted that "drug-related" is not synonymous with "drug-caused," just as it does not necessarily have the same meaning as "drug-based" or "drug-induced." It seemed to me that the reviewer was saying: To say that drugs have an important relationship to a particular case of homicide does not necessarily mean that the homicide occurred because of drugs.

It is just as well if causality is not the central issue in the determination of drug-relatedness. It would be at best difficult, if not impossible, to determine whether or not a homicide that did involve drugs would not have happened in the absence of drug involvement. But that leaves "importance" as the decisive question.

If the question that must be asked to confirm drug-relatedness is whether or not drugs were involved in an important way, causal or otherwise, then the subjective nature of the meaning of drug-related is even more pronounced. Causality has a specific meaning; importance is a relative term. And the relative importance of drugs to a case of homicide is a construction of the individuals who define that case as being drug-related.

In our studies using police data, we as researchers and the police as investigators did not always agree on what made a particular homicide drug-related. Pat Ryan, who served as Project Director for one of our studies, pondered this dilemma for his dissertation and later concluded, "It should be kept in mind that the police perception of criminal events and the social scientist perception both may contain a potential bias effect, and neither might be said to truly depict reality" (Ryan et al. 1990, p. 260). For example, if the police found a body in a place they believed to be a crack house, they would call the killing drug-related.

Doing so was important to them since it would help them to establish a direction for their investigation of the case. For our purposes as researchers, understanding and explanation, we would not find that evidence satisfactory to confirm an important link between the homicide and drugs.

With support from the National Institute on Drug Abuse and as a follow-up to our studies of police data, we began interviewing people incarcerated in New York State for the homicides we had originally studied through police records (Goldstein et al. 1992). This gave us another view of the reality of how drugs were related to particular killings. It also emphasized the subjective nature of the meaning of the term "drug-related." We and the police, for example, might both classify a case as drug-related because given the evidence of alcohol consumption by the offender at the time of the killing we both would agree that he or she was high and consequently out of control at that time. But the offender might say that while he or she had had a lot to drink it was no more than he or she drank every day so he or she was not high, and in any case his or her drinking had nothing to do with the violence.

Drug-relatedness, then, is a social construct. So there will never be a simple definition that will satisfy all parties interested in whether or not drugs are related to a particular homicide, or any other social phenomenon, in an important way. For example, for policy makers information about drug-related homicide is important only if it helps them to count cases so they will know whether or not there is a problem that requires more resources. For police officers, information about how drugs are related to homicide is only important if it helps them to solve cases and to make arrests. The information needed for these two distinct purposes may not be the same, so policy makers and police officers may need to define drug-relatedness differently.

When I first became involved in studies of drugs and violence, drugs were considered by public officials, policy makers, criminal justice practitioners, news reporters, and almost anyone else who had a place to voice an opinion to be central to understanding crime. But over time people lost interest. By 1992, drugs were not even considered important enough to be an issue in the Presidential campaign.

The loss of interest in drugs took place for many reasons. As we learned more about crack cocaine, it became less exotic and its threat seemed less ominous. All the government committees and programs and bureaucrats that could be mustered against drugs were in place. Whether they accomplished anything or not, strict law enforcement efforts against people involved with drugs had become commonplace throughout the U.S. Statistics began to show that drug use was declining, at least among middle class users.

Perhaps another reason for the declining interest in drugs was the difficulties encountered by people trying to define and measure drug-relatedness. Several years ago in a review of a book about criteria used to distinguish students who are admitted to highly selective schools from students who are not, David Nyberg wrote, "The difficulty here (and for all of social science) is that we can't measure all the important things, so we make what we can measure more important than it is" (1985:7). The same can be said about contemporary studies of drugs in particular, and of crime in general.

With the emphasis in criminology on official statistics, legal definitions, and the objectification of crime, we are too focused on studying what we are able to study instead of on what we should be studying. Like anything else that people associate with crime, drugs were never as important as they were believed to have been in the 1980s. And they probably are more important in the 1990s

Please see REFLECTIONS, page 7

REFLECTIONS, continued from page 6

than they now are believed to be. However, it's not changing social conditions that determines when and where drugs are important to crime. It's the meaning and significance that people attach to drugs that makes a difference.

When we study crime we need to maintain our focus on the various claims made about it by the people who participate in various ways in its definition and realization. For drugs and crime, for example, to fully understand the meaning of "drug-related" we really need to think about it in terms of the process through which it is socially constructed. Who are the people claiming a crime is drug-related and what is their purpose in doing so? From what position in society do they make that claim? What evidence do they bring to support their claim? These questions make it difficult to understand what "drug-related" means. But they are the kinds of questions that will make it possible for us to understand and explain the relationship between drugs and crime, or anything and crime.

REFERENCES

- Brownstein, Henry H. and Paul J. Goldstein
1988 *Drugs and Homicide in New York State*. Albany, NY: New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services.
- 1990 "A Typology of drug-related homicides," pp. 171-92 in R. Weisheit (ed.), *Drugs, Crime and the Criminal Justice System*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Company and Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences.
- Durkheim, Emile
1964 *The Rules of Sociological Method*. Tr. by Sarah A. Solovay and John H. Mueller. Ed. by George E. G. Catlin. New York: The Free Press.
- Goldstein, Paul J.
1985 "The drugs/violence nexus: A tripartite conceptual framework," *Journal of Drug Issues*, Fall, pp. 493-506.
- Goldstein, Paul J. and Henry H. Brownstein
1987 *Drug-Related Crime Analysis-Homicide. A Report to the National Institute of Justice*.
- Goldstein, Paul J., Henry H. Brownstein, Patrick J. Ryan and Patricia A. Bellucci
1989 "Crack and homicide in New York City, 1988: A conceptually based event analysis," *Contemporary Drug Problems*, Winter, pp. 651-87.
- Goldstein, Paul J., Henry H. Brownstein, Barry J. Spunt and Michael Fendrich
1992 *Drug Relationships in Murder. A Report to the National Institute on Drug Abuse*.
- Kitsuse, John I. and Aaron V. Cicourel
1963 "A note on the uses of official statistics," *Social Problems* 11:131-39.
- Nyberg, David
1985 "Lucking into Harvard," a review of *Choosing Elites* by R. Klitgaard. *New York Times Book Review*, May 5, p. 7.
- Quinney, Richard and John Wildeman
1977 *The Problem of Crime—A Critical Introduction to Criminology*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Ryan, Patrick J., Paul J. Goldstein, Henry H. Brownstein and Patricia A. Bellucci
1990 "Who's right: Different outcomes when police and scientists view the same set of homicide events, New York City, 1988," pp. 239-64 in M. De La Rosa, E. Y. Lambert, and B. Gropper (eds.), *Drugs and Violence: Causes, Correlates, and Consequences*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute on Drug Abuse, NIDA Research Monograph 103.

ASC SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY

At the last meeting of the ASC Board, Saturday, 7 November 1992, the board passed the following motion unanimously:

The ASC is committed to equitable and professional treatment of all persons in all of its activities. In particular, ASC condemns sexual harassment in any form. Sexual harassment includes (1) unwelcome sexual advances or requests for sexual favors when those requests or advances are in any way associated with current or potential professional opportunities or decisions in ASC activities or (2) conduct that creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment that interferes with an individual's participation in ASC activities.

Charles Wellford chaired the final committee of the Ethics Committee-Sexual Harassment Policy. Other members of the committee were Franklyn Dunford, Ruth-Ellen Grimes, Jim Hackler, and Susan Martin.

AROUND THE ASC

Eric L. Jensen, Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Idaho, recently received the Alumni Award for Faculty Excellence in recognition of his outstanding contribution to the academic development of his students.

Jon Marc Taylor is the winner of the third annual Nation Institute/I.F. Stone Award for Student Journalism, which carries a prize of \$500 and is open to undergraduates in U.S. colleges. He is an inmate at the Indiana State Reformatory and his award-winning article, "Pell Grants for Prisoners," appeared in the January 25, 1993 edition of *The Nation*.

REPORT, continued from page 1

manuscripts quickly but have done outstanding work--thorough, professional, and helpful. It has been extremely gratifying to realize how conscientious most criminologists are in providing these helpful services to the journal and to their anonymous colleagues, particularly since these are pure labors of love.

Success in achieving the other two objectives is less clear. I had assumed that improving the turnaround time would stimulate submissions. So far this has not happened. The annual number of manuscripts submitted to the journal has remained fairly constant over the past several years (at about 150), and given that the journal prints about 25 to 30 papers per year, so has the acceptance rate (about 17% to 20%). It is possible, of course, that once this report is out, and everybody knows how quickly we process papers, the number of submissions will increase. I now suspect, however, that the number of manuscripts submitted reflects more about the volume of work being done among scholars in the crime/deviance area than it reflects about characteristics of the editorial process. Given the relatively large number of journals that print scholarly work in the crime/deviance area, and given the continued preference among most criminologists to publish in the mainstream journals of their respective disciplines, the number of submissions will probably not change much (except perhaps to decline if we become sloppy or arbitrary), no matter what I or subsequent editors do.

Nevertheless, I intend to keep trying to increase submissions. I believe that our review process improves the level of criminological work collectively as well as for individual authors. It has never been my intent simply to select the best papers for printing. We try to perform a useful service for the profession and for those who submit their work to us, even when a paper is not accepted for publication. In my opinion, the greater the number of authors who allow that service to be performed on their work, the greater the net gain for the body of criminological knowledge. It is not shameful to have a paper declined for publication, and though critics can sometimes be caustic, remember that they are also subject to that same critical review process.

Whether the quality of the journal has improved or grown in reputation to be more attractive to the very best scholars working in the crime/deviance area cannot be determined easily or effectively, at least not in the short run. There are ways of finding this out through systematic examination of citations patterns, by a rating survey, or through analysis of influences on new work in the area. But answering this question empirically probably is not worth the effort or expense. However, if compliments and appreciative remarks from authors and leading scholars about the quality of the journal mean anything, then we are on the right trajectory. A goodly number of authors whose work we have rejected have even written to praise the speed, thoroughness, and helpfulness of our reviews. These letters are always gratifying and especially appreciated.

Guidelines to Authors

Since so many people have asked me privately to identify things that would maximize the likelihood of getting a paper published in *Criminology*, it seems fitting to make public my perceptions about that. One must recognize, however, that many factors go into the decision process. Although I can outline the ideal criteria, I cannot guarantee that every paper that ends up in *Criminology* necessarily fulfills them, nor can I guarantee that every paper that fulfills these criteria will necessarily be accepted for publication. Sometimes mistakes are made (after all, judging the quality of papers is a subjective process), sometimes the timeliness of a topic will override other considerations, and sometimes an unusual combination of reviewer opinions will tie my hands (so far I have not defied the collective judgment of reviewers). Nevertheless, in the overwhelming majority of instances the following criteria are brought to bear.

First, a paper should address a significant issue in such a way that the paper makes an important contribution to the literature. The most significant work usually has theoretical import; that is, it bears on a theoretical question and either enriches the intellectual effort to explain criminological phenomena or brings empirical evidence to bear on a theoretically derived hypothesis (or hypotheses). All other things being equal, a purely descriptive paper will be less well received. Similarly, a paper that bears on a theoretical issue but does so in a well worn, repetitious

manner will be less valuable than one that brings a new approach. For example, the journal receives an unusual number of papers attempting to ascertain the extent to which "extra-legal" variables influence judicial decision making. Many of these papers make no effort to cast the work in a framework so that it can be relevant to theories like conflict or labeling or to any other theories about the behavior of organizations and/or individuals. Moreover, many of them simply repeat the procedures used numerous times before in similar papers. In many cases the net product is nothing more than another piece of empirical evidence based on a different sample, perhaps with a small aberration in finding, to be stored in the pantry of such evidence, which by now is quite full. Additional evidence is, of course, always to some extent useful, but in the business of knowledge-building, it is better if an author tries to identify the crucial theoretical questions, brings evidence to bear on those questions, and then integrates his or her findings with the existing evidence to provide an enlightening insight that helps the community of criminologists understand anomalies or consistent themes from research in the area.

This implies that good work must be set in the context of existing literature, but one should not overdo the documentation (such as citing things that are not really relevant or citing several papers where only one or two examples are needed). At the same time, however, one must show how his or her paper fits with relevant themes or problems, and key articles or books, particularly those that have been published recently. Naive papers, even if otherwise good, will surely suffer at the hands of reviewers.

Second, if a paper is empirically oriented, it should employ the most appropriate measurement procedures and analytic strategies possible. An author should measure the concepts effectively and describe the procedures so that others can judge their adequacy and replicate them. In addition, authors should consider the logic of inference being employed to make sure it does what is intended in the best way possible, and they should use appropriate statistical procedures to provide the strongest possible basis for conclusions. Where more than one measurement or analytic alternative could

Please see REPORT, page 10

CRIMINOLOGY:

An Introduction Through MicroCase®

by Rodney Stark, University of Washington

SECOND EDITION

Now students in introductory criminology can learn by *doing* real research in a micro computer lab — analyzing and comparing results from self-report, victimization and official crime rate data. Exercises in Stark's new edition let students explore drug and alcohol abuse, as well as sexual exploitation, among college students; discover whose friends are being murdered (based on a large national sample); explore the immense decline in burglary rates over the past decade, and much more.

Workbook

PART I - MEASURING CRIME

- 1: The Geography of Official Crime Rates
- 2: Victimization and Public Opinion
- 3: Self-Report Data: A College Student Sample

PART II - ANALYZING CRIME DATA

- 4: Fear of Crime: Cross-Tabulation
- 5: Auto Theft: Scatterplots and Correlation

PART III - DRUGS AND ALCOHOL

- 6: Getting Drunk in America
- 7: Drinking and Driving in College
- 8: Cocaine and Alcohol Abuse: State Rates
- 9: Doing Drugs in College

PART IV - PROPERTY CRIME

- 10: Burglary Victims
- 11: Social Disorganization and Property Crime
- 12: Student Offenders

PART V - VIOLENT CRIME

- 13: Analyzing Violent Crime Rates
- 14: Whose Friends Are Getting Murdered?
- 15: Alcohol, Drugs and Sexual Exploitation

PART VI - MULTI-VARIATE ANALYSIS

- 16: Violence and the Old West: Regression
- 17: "Mass Media" Criminology: Detecting Spuriousness

PART VII - INDEPENDENT PROJECTS

Included Software

Student MicroCase displays statistical results in effective color graphics. Options in this version include:

- Frequency, percentage and cumulative distributions (including pie charts & bar graphs)
- The full range of univariate statistics
- Cross-tabulations
- Mapping
- Scatterplots (with regression line)
- Correlation
- Regression

AGGREGATE AND SURVEY DATA

Survey

Contains 2,909 cases and 38 variables from the merged 1989 and 1990 General Social Surveys.

States

Data based on the 50 States, with 106 variables.

College

Includes 950 cases and 56 variables from an alcohol and drug use survey at the University of Missouri, St. Louis. (Conducted as part of a national study.)

Hardware Requirements:

For IBM compatibles with color graphics capacity (or Hercules Monochrome) and 512K memory. One 3.5" or 5.25" floppy drive required.

New From MicroCase Corporation

You will not have to teach your students how to use the software, nor will you need to teach them how to understand their results — the exercises are fully self-explanatory. Estimated retail price is \$19.50 (sold only as a complete package).

Complimentary examination copies of *Criminology: An Introduction Through MicroCase, 2d. Ed.*, are available for course adoption purposes only. To receive your copy, please complete all of the following information and mail to:

Disk Size	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.5"	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.25"
Course Title	_____	
Enrollment	_____	
Adoption Deadline	_____	
Office Hours	_____	
Phone	_____	

MicroCase Corporation

1301 120th Avenue N.E.
 Bellevue, WA 98005
 Phone (800) 682-7367 or (206) 635-0293
 FAX (206) 635-0953

Name _____
 Position & Dept. _____
 College _____
 Dept. Address _____
 City, State, Zip _____

REPORT, continued from page 8

be used, the author should tell the reader (honestly) why the choice was made as it was. A good approach is to do it several different ways, noting this to the reader, but reporting only one of the sets of findings. If the results come out similarly, a strong argument can be made for whatever technique is finally reported. Of course, if different measurements or analytic approaches produce different results, this must be confronted. Frequent mistakes include: taking shortcuts rather than doing the extra work to check something out, using outmoded techniques, or trying to employ more sophisticated techniques than the data or the problem warrant. Reviewers are seldom satisfied with superficial or misleading justifications for such choices. However, if your approach is sensible and you provide good reasons for it, most reviewers are sympathetic and supportive.

Third, the paper must be well organized and well written. Amazingly, this is one of the chief faults of papers submitted to the journal. Reviewers constantly complain about it because poor writing forces them to work harder to try to figure out what the author has done or has tried to do. Although almost all reviewers strive to give authors as much leeway as possible, many scholars place themselves at a distinct disadvantage by their writing. It is not too hard to account for poor writing. Most of us are so concerned with getting the ideas down, reporting the research, and arriving at sensible interpretations that the writing itself becomes

secondary. In addition, most spend so much time in the technical aspects of paper preparation and in restructuring and revising the substance that they grow sick of a paper before they can get it into smooth final form. Whatever the reason, writing is a serious and common problem. I offer the following remedies.

At the very least have colleagues read, criticize, and *edit* your paper (or at least point out where the writing needs work) before you submit it. Some authors even hire professional copy editors to help with the writing. I am not opposed to that. It is also a good idea to write the paper within the following guidelines: (1) The point of the paper, or its objectives, should be straightforward and clearly stated near the beginning so that the reader is motivated to read all the way through and has a base line for evaluating the work. (2) The argument, methods, results, and conclusions must be stated in a logical flow with a minimum of jargon. (3) The modes of expression should be smooth, and changes of focus should be connected with appropriate transitional sentences or phrases. (4) Interpretations and conclusions should link with introductory statements and findings. (5) Commitment to particular words or phrases is deadly; authors should experiment with alternative ways of saying things. (6) After the writing is complete, one should put the paper away for several days, then reread it with a skeptical eye. It is a good idea to be your own most demanding critic.

Please see REPORT, page 11

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 Tromanhauser, Chicago State University, 95th and King Drive, Chicago, IL 60628. Further information can be obtained by contacting the current Editor, Steven Lab, at (419) 372-2326.

 Springer Publishing Company

PSYCHOLOGICAL METHODS IN CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION AND EVIDENCE

David C. Raskin, PhD, Editor

"The work of experts in forensic psychology has been gathered here to formulate methods of investigating eyewitness performance and of interviewing and assessing witnesses, victims and suspects of crimes.... The sections on admissibility of evidence derived from hypnosis and polygraphs appear particularly thorough and valid... This is an important compilation of research in psychology and law on these topics." —Readings
1989 416pp 0-8261-6450-1 hard \$44.95 (outside US \$49.50)

WOMEN AND ANGER

Sandra P. Thomas, PhD, RN

Offers new and important insights into women's anger—its causes, manifestations, and consequences.
1993 330pp (est) 0-8261-8100-7 \$37.95 (prepub)

EDUCATION GROUPS FOR MEN WHO BATTER:

The Duluth Model

Ellen Pence and Michael Paymar

Converts the authors' successful manual into a useful book format—and expands the material with chapters assessing other domestic abuse interventions programs and the battered women's movement.
1993 200pp (est) 0-8261-7990-8 \$28.95 (prepub)

GERIATRICS AND THE LAW

Patient Rights and Professional Responsibilities
2nd Edition

Marshall B. Kapp, JD, MPH

New edition of this highly praised book offers a current examination of the full spectrum of geriatrics practice from a legal viewpoint. Explains complex medicolegal issues in easy-to-understand language.
1992 352pp 0-8261-4531-0 hard \$42.95 (outside US \$48.50)

JOURNAL
VIOLENCE AND VICTIMS

Editor-in-Chief: Roland D. Maluro, PhD

An exceptional forum for the latest developments in theory, research, policy, clinical practice and social services in the area of interpersonal violence and victimization.

Volume 8, 1993 • 4 issues annually • ISSN 0886-6708

Subscription Rates:

Domestic		Outside US	
Ind: \$40/1yr	\$68/2yrs	\$45/1yr	\$78/2yrs
Inst: \$75/1yr	\$115/2yrs	\$85/1yr	\$130/2yrs

536 Broadway, New York, NY 10012-3955
Tel. (212) 431-4370 • Fax (212) 941-7842

REPORT, continued from page 10

Fourth, take the referees' comments seriously. Occasionally a reviewer will be completely off base or will miss or misinterpret what you have said, but they often offer important insights, and at the very least they reflect how your work *appears* to others. Appreciation of referee input is often difficult for authors, who, of course, are emotionally involved with their papers. Nevertheless it is in your interest to assume that referees are acting in good faith. If reviewers think you didn't do something that you think you actually did, consider the possibility that your presentation might not have been clear enough rather than concluding that the referees didn't actually read your paper. If different referees make contradictory suggestions, don't throw up your hands in disgust; rather assume that this is a contro-

versial or judgmental matter and try to find a way to show that the selected alternative was chosen with appropriate consideration of the alternatives. If you are asked to revise, exhibit grace in trying to deal with the questions raised, and to demonstrate this, enclose with your revised paper a detailed description of changes made or a statement of reasons why suggested changes were not made. Petulance and/or denigration of referees almost never helps.

Concluding Remarks

I also want to communicate my openness to suggestions for improving the journal. A few people have already expressed their opinions, and when possible, I have acted on those suggestions. For example, someone suggested that referees should di-

rect authors to material they think ought to be consulted and cited, rather than making vague allusions. I began asking referees to do this, and they responded very well. On the other hand, a few potential referees (less than one percent, actually) have complained about the requirement for rapid response. Since this is a carefully considered policy to which I am committed, and which I have reassessed on several occasions, I do not intend to change it. Rather, my approach is to by-pass those for whom it is a burden (once I know who they are). So, if you think there is something I can do to make *Criminology* better, let me know. I'll think about it, consult my associate editors, perhaps even poll the Editorial Advisory Board, and if it seems worthwhile, implement it. □

FYI

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON CORRECTIONAL HEALTH CARE CONFERENCE HELD IN CHICAGO

Over 700 health professionals who provide health care to those incarcerated in the nation's jails, prisons, and juvenile confinement and detention facilities assembled in Chicago on September 24-26 for the 16th National Conference on Correctional Health Care. New standards for jail and prison correctional health services were given provisional approval by the National Commission on Correctional Health Care (NCCHC) Board of Directors. "This action follows nine months of work by a special task force created to recommend revisions in existing jail and prison standards," according to Henry C. Weinstein, MD, task force chair. The jail and prison standards were last revised in 1987. As part of the task force's review, the current standards were sent to 150 experts in the correctional health field. Several of the existing standards were extensively rewritten or reclassified from "important" to "essential" standards. Bonnie Norman, RN, representing the American Jail Association, assumed the position of Chair of the NCCHC's Board of Directors. Carl C. Bell, MD, who served as Chair during 1991-92, was recognized for his outstanding efforts on behalf of the National Commission.

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION CRIME, LAW AND DEVIANCE SECTION STUDENT PAPER COMPETITION

The American Sociological Association section on Crime, Law and Deviance announces its annual student paper competition. Paper topics can cover any subject matter relevant to the sociology of crime, law or deviance. Papers may be reports of original empirical or theoretical scholarship, or evaluations of existing research or theory. Entries must be a *maximum* of 40 double-spaced pages (including all tables, references, and appendices) and should follow the *American Sociological Review* style for citations and references. Eligible papers must have been written while the author was a college or university student anywhere in the world. (ASA membership is *not* required.) Entries may have been presented or submitted for publication elsewhere, but may not have been accepted for publication or published at the time they are submitted to this competition.

The winner will receive a \$500 travel grant to attend the 1993 ASA meetings (August 13-17, 1993 in Miami Beach, Florida) for acceptance of the award and, at the winner's option, to present the paper at a session.

The entry deadline is **March 15, 1993**. Seven copies of the paper should be sent to: Neal Shover, Department of Sociology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-0490.

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. FAX 409-294-1653.

University of New Haven. Applications and nominations for Dean of the School of Public Safety and Professional Studies are invited before February 26, 1993. The position commences with the academic year 1993-1994. The School seeks an individual to provide academic leadership, development, and growth for this newly created school that includes the A.S., B.S. and M.S. programs in criminal justice (law enforcement administration, law enforcement science, corrections administration, and security management), forensic science, fire science, occupational safety and health, air transportation management, and aviation science, as well as the paralegal program, a Center for Public Safety and an Institute of Law and Public Affairs. The Dean reports to the university's Provost. Qualifications include an earned doctorate, academic qualifications appropriate for appointment as a Professor in one of the departments, appropriate administrative experience, and the enthusiasm and leadership qualities commensurate with this senior academic position. Practical experience and/or credentials in a relevant area would strengthen the application. Salary and benefit package are competitive. The University of New Haven, the independent, comprehensive, multi-campus university based in southern New England provides quality educational opportunities and preparation for self-reliant, productive, ethical service in a global society. It offers programs in business, arts and sciences, engineering, hotel and tourism administration, and public safety/

professional studies. The Graduate School offers a broad range of graduate degrees including a doctorate in management science. Applications should include a current Curriculum Vitae and a letter discussing the candidate's strengths for and vision of the position. Send Applications/nominations to: Search #92-26, Search Committee Chairperson, University of New Haven, 300 Orange Avenue, West Haven, CT 06516. AA/EEO.

University of Missouri - St. Louis. The Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice will hire a Post-Doctoral Fellow to join a research team studying criminality and drug use. The position is for one year, beginning June 1, 1993. The successful candidate will have a completed Ph.D., strong quantitative skills, and experience in the analysis of individual and aggregate level data. Computer and other technical support are available. Salary is commensurate with qualifications and experience. Send resume, a writing sample, and the names of three references to: Richard Rosenfeld, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University of Missouri - St. Louis, 8001 Natural Bridge Rd., St. Louis, MO 63121-4499. The University of Missouri - St. Louis is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer committed to excellence through diversity. Review of applications will begin on April 15, 1993.

Rowan College of New Jersey. Associate Professor of Law and Justice Studies (full-time, tenure track, beginning, fall 1993) with eligibility for election to the position of Department Chairperson. Qualifications:

Ph.D. in Criminal Justice or related discipline with an area of specialization in police science. Applicants with J.D. and at least five years experience in police work will be considered. Candidates must possess a record of scholarly achievement which would qualify for appointment at the Associate Professor level. Evidence of effective teaching experience must be demonstrated. Send letter of application, resume, evidence of scholarly research and other relevant material to: Dr. Donna Kochis, Chairperson, Search Committee, Law/Justice Department, Wilson Hall, Rowan College of New Jersey, 201 Mullica Hill Road, Glassboro, NJ 08028-1701. Position is conditional upon funding. Rowan College is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer; applications from women, minorities, and the handicapped are encouraged. Deadline: March 31, 1993.

State University College at Buffalo. The Department of Criminal Justice invites applications for a tenure track, Assistant Professor appointment to begin September 1, 1993. Salary is competitive; excellent benefit package. The College is the largest of the SUNY Colleges of Arts and Sciences. The Department has the largest combined enrollment of undergraduate and Master's degree criminal justice majors in the SUNY system. The Department currently has eight full-time, multi-disciplinary faculty including four new members appointed during the past four years. The undergraduate and graduate programs have been completely revised. Qualifications: Ph.D. in criminal justice or related field required (ABD may be considered if Ph.D. is completed prior to appointment). Candidates should demonstrate a commitment to effective undergraduate and Masters level teaching and advising, research/publications, and funded research. Primary areas of research and teaching specialization needed are Law and Society, Race/Gender and Crime or Juvenile Justice. Secondary areas are open and include: criminal justice history, victimization, criminal justice policy, computer applications, jails or drugs. Application deadline: April 1, 1993. Send curriculum vita, courses specifically qualified to teach, a statement on research plans for the next three years, and the names, addresses and phone numbers of four references to: Dr. John A. Conley, Chair, Department of Criminal Justice, State

POSITIONS, continued from page 12

University College at Buffalo, 1300 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, NY 14222. (The College and the Department specifically invites and encourages applications from women and minorities.) SUCB is an AA/EEO employer.)

California State University, Fullerton. The Department of Criminal Justice is accepting applications for a tenure track Assistant Professor position, until March 15, 1993. Area of specialization is Criminal Law, evidence, procedures and related topics. Minimum qualifications are a J.D. (or equivalent), experience as a prosecutor or public defender, or private practice with substantial experience in criminal defense. Preference given for demonstrated expertise in California law and research and teaching experience in Criminal Justice. Salary range is \$31,764-\$43,896. Send a vita and three letters of reference to Harvey Grody, c/o Division of Political Science and Criminal Justice, California State University, Fullerton, CA 92634. The university is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer.

Chapman University, Orange, California. Tenure track position effective fall, 1993, at a private university located 30 miles south of Los Angeles. Assistant rank. Salary commensurate with qualifications and experience. Ph.D. in Criminal Justice or related field, generalist with demonstrated excellence in teaching and scholarship, firm commitment to working with students, administrative experience, and a record of community involvement required. Duties include teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels as well as administration of a planned Master of Arts in Criminal Justice program at the Orange Campus and off-campus sites, requiring some travel. Send letter, resume, and three references to the Criminal Justice Search Committee, Department of Sociology, Chapman University, Orange, CA 92666. Chapman University is an Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity Employer. Minorities, women, handicapped, and Vietnam-Era veterans are encouraged to apply. Review of applications will begin April 1, 1993 and continue until the position is filled.

Aurora University, an independent university near Chicago, is inviting applications for a visiting assistant professor in Criminal Justice beginning Fall, 1993. It is a one year position, but is likely to turn into a regular position. The candidate selected will teach introduction to criminal justice and other courses in some of the following areas: police functions, organization and management, criminal law, criminal evidence and procedure, and private security. The position involves teaching nine courses, advising criminal justice majors, and engaging in professional activities and community service. A Ph.D. in Criminal Justice/Criminology is preferred with law background and law enforcement experience. Previous college level teaching experience is desirable. Salary is competitive and negotiable. To apply, send a letter expressing teaching interests and experience, a curriculum vitae and three letters of reference to: Criminal Justice Search Committee, School of Business and Professional Studies, Aurora University, Aurora, IL 60506-4892. The deadline for applications is March 29, 1993. Aurora University is an EOE/AA Employer.

The GANG JOURNAL: An Interdisciplinary Research Quarterly

(Shouldn't Your Library Include the Latest Gang Research?)

Vol. 1, No.1 Contents:
Five full papers, Views From the Field, Book Reviews. Released at the A.S.C. meeting in New Orleans. Featured Asian and Female gangs.

Vol. 1, No. 2 Contents:
Four methodology papers plus a review essay; plus an interview/focus on history (Yablonsky), Views From the Field, and two Book Reviews.

For Subscriptions Write: Yande Vere Publishing, Ltd., P.O. Box 226, Berrien Springs, MI 49103-0226. \$60.00 per year (four issues). (616) 695-3442. Fax: 616-695-6518

Attention Authors: CALL FOR PAPERS.....send four copies of your manuscript plus \$10 processing fee (non-refundable, Payable to: Gang Crime Research Center) to: George W. Knox, Editor-in-Chief, The GANG JOURNAL, Chicago State University, National Gang Crime Research Center, HWH 329, 95th Street & King Drive, Chicago, IL 60628.

BOOK REVIEW

Towards Justice?: Crime and State Control in South Africa, edited by Desiree Hansson and Dirk van Zyl Smit. Oxford University Press, Cape Town, 1990.

Reviewed by
HAL PEPINSKY
Indiana University

This introduction and eleven original chapters on topics ranging from low-intensity warfare by South African Police, to capital punishment and the doctrine of common purpose, to the resurgence of street gangs and community responses in Cape Town in the late eighties, appeared just after the inauguration of President De Klerk, when Nelson Mandela's release was still an unfulfilled promise. I was in Dar es Salaam when Nelson Mandela came to town; my hostess went to see him. Tanzania had been a refuge and training ground for the ANC. I can remember the combined sense of hope and crisis among ANC members and their allies as political exiles began to return home (Jill and I still laugh about how the Tanzanian headlines and stories always referred to the new white leader in South Africa--"the racist President De Klerk"). One sad part of reading this book is that conditions have not, at least from my vantage point, changed for the better for South Africans in the interim.

The aim of the authors is to build what Van Zyl Smit calls "a criminology for a democratic South Africa," which he contrasts to two other South African criminological traditions, "legal reformist" criminology, and Afrikaner nationalist

criminology (which sounds remarkably like what is called "positivist" or "liberal" criminology in the United States). These criminologists are in the trenches. Police death squads and goons kill white activists these days as well as black activists. They don't waste much time on jargon, and they are remarkably attuned by a sense of personal crisis to lay the criminal just-us system open for what it is.

They are well-informed about British/Canadian criminology. I found the same in another former British colony, Tanzania. Time and again as here in cross-cultural criminological literature, I keep thinking we all need to expand our global horizons. These authors apparently know virtually nothing of criminal just-us in the U.S., or if they do, they don't care to draw comparisons. Meanwhile of course, U.S. criminologists by and large know nothing of British and Canadian criminological literature, let alone what is happening in South Africa. In any event it is vital, I believe, for U.S. criminologists especially to overcome ethnocentrism and examine our crime control problems in relation to others' experience.

There are fascinating contrasts to be explored. Julia Sloth-Nielsen begins her chapter, "Corporal Punishment: Acceptable State Violence?" (p. 195): "More than 40,000 people are whipped each year in South Africa, most of them juveniles (McQuoid-Mason, 1987)." Sloth-Nielsen is apoplectic about the barbarity of the practice. At the same time I'm reminded that whipping is preferred in Tanzania too for juveniles over incarceration. The practice is defended on grounds that the

whipping is medically supervised and restricted, and stigmatizes and disables a youth far less than being locked away from home. While the legal limit for "strokes" in South Africa now stands at seven per three-year period, the limit in Tanzania stands at fourteen and I recall no time restriction on repeating the punishment.

The prison population figures we throw around in the U.S. are generally about two years old and don't include juveniles incarcerated. I'd say that right now we incarcerate our entire population at about three times the South African rate for blacks alone. So there's a trade-off. By the way, the South Africans also hang people with abandon (The Tanzanians hang about 25 per year according to the European Community, although Tanzanian authorities try to keep executions secret--another interesting practice). And there is a lot more killing on the streets, as by police, in South Africa than here, outside our urban ghettos at least. I'm reminded of the old debate between Les Wilkins and Tom Murton over flogging, and of the furor Graeme Newman caused in the U.S. when he argued that electric shock for offenders would be more humane than imprisonment. Graeme and Les spoke hypothetically. By becoming more cosmopolitan in our knowledge of criminological literature, we all stand to gain the data to see in fact what people get for making such trade-offs.

I read this book cover-to-cover the evening I received it. I heartily recommend it as enlightening reading for any criminologist.



Policing Domestic Violence

Experiments and Dilemmas

(NY: Free Press, 1992)

By Lawrence W. Sherman

- Arrest deters violence in some cities but increases it in others.
- Arrest deters violence by employed batterers but increases it among the unemployed.
- Arrest deters violence in the short run but increases it in the long run.

Policing Domestic Violence documents these dilemmas on the basis of ten years of controlled experiments evaluating police actions. The book synthesizes the results of a multi-million dollar federal research program to replicate the results of the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment in five other cities.

Policing Domestic Violence challenges the American trend towards requiring police to make arrests in all circumstances, and recommends more flexible, community-oriented domestic violence policies. It attacks the moral choice that violence against middle class women should be reduced at the expense of provoking more violence against poor women, and recommends the repeal of mandatory arrest laws.

Praise for Policing Domestic Violence:

"Sherman has followed a landmark experiment about policing with a reasoned discussion of that experiment and its aftermath. Coupling cogent discussion of issues about the relationship between research and policy with a clear description of 'replication studies,' Sherman has written a book that warrants careful examination. Policing Domestic Violence has enough detail to be used for education and enough argument to become the centerpiece of stimulating discourse for years to come."

--Joan McCord
Professor of Criminal Justice, Temple University
Past President, The American Society of Criminology

"Sherman's book provides the very best evidence about the issue, and highlights the tough choices that face us. His research is highly sophisticated and his analysis a model of clarity. The findings challenge conventional wisdom, but are nevertheless extremely persuasive."

--Wesley G. Skogan
Professor of Political Science and Urban Affairs
Northwestern University

**Policing Domestic Violence is available for \$35 from:
CRIME CONTROL RESEARCH CORPORATION**

1063 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

(202) 337-2700 FAX (202) 337-8324

Major Credit Cards Accepted

REVIEW ESSAY

Rebovich, Donald J. 1992. *Dangerous Ground: The World of Hazardous Waste Crime*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Reviewed by
ALAN A. BLOCK
 The Pennsylvania State
 University

Lest one still labors under the misapprehension that there exists a relationship between organized criminals in the waste disposal industry and the illegal disposal of hazardous waste, Donald J. Rebovich's *Dangerous Ground: The World of Hazardous Waste Crime* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1992) is here to set the record straight. And such dolts as myself (co-author of *Poisoning for Profit: The Mafia and Toxic Waste Disposal in America*, Morrow, 1985), who have misled the reading public through shabby research and erroneous findings, gulling some to accept that organized crime has had a strong hand in toxic waste disposal crimes, receive their comeuppance by Rebovich. Whether or not his trashing of *Poisoning for Profit* is accurate (it isn't), it nevertheless cannot make Rebovich's own case on hazardous waste crime, nor can my mistakes, such as they were, excuse his confusion and dubious research. Rebovich's introduction sets the low standard of what is to follow.

"It wasn't until the Love Canal disaster of 1978," Rebovich declares, that the practice of indiscriminately dumping hazardous wastes "began to change." It was the federal government's reaction "to public pressure generated by the New York State tragedy" that "set into motion laws that regulated hazardous waste disposal--laws that gave birth to the nation's hazardous waste management industry" (p. xiii). Dramatic but incorrect. The bedrock national legislation that "gave birth to the nation's hazardous waste" industry occurred in 1976 with the passage of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act known as RCRA.

This fundamental error momentarily disappears and then reappears in the opening chapter of his book. Rebovich begins the

chapter with some unenlightening discussion of RCRA (1976), but, a few pages further on, he is back to Love Canal. And again he contends that it was the 1978 Love Canal disaster that produced a "public clamour" which resulted in Congress passing "the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act" (p. 4). It is clear that this basic error is a harbinger of what is to come. For instance, by the third page of the opening chapter, Rebovich tells us that "more than 380 billion pounds of solid hazardous wastes" are annually generated while only "412 pounds of aqueous hazardous wastes" are generated (p. 2). Though, I am not familiar with the correct figure for the current production of liquid (aqueous) hazardous waste, I can guarantee Rebovich is wrong. Any hope one might have had for a thoughtful well-researched study on an important topic is further dashed when, on the following page, his citation about "midnight dumping" is off by fifty years.

Leaving aside his Love Canal quirk and sloppiness, Rebovich, a director of research for the American Prosecutors Research Institute, selected four states--Maine, Maryland, Pennsylvania and New Jersey--to empirically survey hazardous waste crime. The data came from the prosecutors' offices in the four states and represented "all hazardous waste criminal offense cases completed between January 1, 1977, and January 1, 1985" (p. 19). He is an unabashed admirer--"all of the sample states have displayed some of the most earnest systematic efforts in the United States to control these criminal offenses via state-level enforcement agencies" (p. 19). This admiration is untouched by mention of any dissenting opinions particularly about New Jersey and Pennsylvania which have been scrutinized by many able investigative reporters and found somewhat less earnest and systematic than Rebovich.

Before discussing his research-generated conclusions, however, Rebovich first turns to slaying the old dragon. Hazardous waste crime *is not and never was* the result of organized crime conspiracies, he holds. Thus he is driven to contend with what he calls "the most controversial by far of all writings on the hazardous waste criminal"--*Poisoning for Profit*. He starts, though, with yet another mistake. "In 1984," Rebovich

says, "William Morrow and Company published *Poisoning for Profit: The Mafia and Toxic Waste in America*, a book that was to be a tinderbox in the hazardous waste/syndicate crime connection area" (p. 13). For accuracies sake, the tinderbox was published precisely one year later. Rebovich is obviously not quite there when it comes to dates, so let me push on with his more substantive judgments about my co-authored book.

Rebovich maintains that "The heart of the book, and the focus of much controversy, was the authors' claims that illegal hazardous waste disposal was operated and controlled by the mob" (p. 13). He almost correctly adds that the authors primarily addressed "hazardous waste crime in New York and New Jersey during the late 1970's." However, as Rebovich's research did not include New York State he has nothing to say about whether or not *Poisoning for Profit* was up to snuff when it came to the Empire State. Rebovich then contends that the authors claimed organized crime controlled hazardous waste disposal "by controlling hazardous waste trade associations" (p. 13). Contrary to his remarkably dense reading, *Poisoning for Profit* clearly describes organized crime's failed attempt to create a hazardous waste trade association in New Jersey. He also wrongly holds that the book "insinuates" collusion among organized criminals, politicians and law enforcement officials. *Poisoning for Profit* insinuates nothing: it describes collusion and names, which is why it was so savagely attacked.

Rebovich next tells an embarrassing tale of how the authors were supposedly sued by several significant others. But Rebovich does not quite know who sued whom. He is right in one case and wrong in another. Furthermore, Rebovich inaccurately recounts a contretemps between the author of *Poisoning for Profit* and Frederick Martens, who Rebovich describes only as a member of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, leaving out that at the time of the dispute Martens was a member of the New Jersey State Police, some of whose top officials we believed were instrumental in preventing proper investigations into public corruption and hazardous waste crimes. Among our sources for this, and I stress among, were many hours of taped interviews with State Police officers assigned to

EDITORS

Freda Adler
Rutgers University
William S. Laufer
University of Pennsylvania

EDITORIAL BOARD

Kenneth Adams
Sam Houston University
Celesta Albonetti
Texas A&M University
James Byrne
University of Lowell
Albert K. Cohen
University of Connecticut
Simon Dinitz
Ohio State University
Hans Eysenck
University of London
James O. Finckenaur
Rutgers University
Daniel Georges-Abeyie
Florida State University
John J. Gibbs
Indiana University (PA)
Don Gottfredson
Rutgers University
Stephen D. Gottfredson
Indiana University
Kate Hanrahan
Indiana University (PA)
Patricia Harris
University of Texas
Nicholas N. Kitterie
American University
Pietro Marongiu
University of Cagliari
Joan McCord
Temple University
Gerhard O. W. Mueller
Rutgers University
Marc Riedel
Southern Illinois University
Diana C. Robertson
University of Pennsylvania
Robin Robinson
Rutgers University
Kip Schlegel
Indiana University
Steven D. Walt
University of San Diego
David Weisburd
Rutgers University
Elmar Weitekamp
University of Tubingen
Marvin E. Wolfgang
University of Pennsylvania

CONSULTING EDITORS

Wanda Foglia
University of Pennsylvania
Adam Sundor
University of Pennsylvania
Jane Siegel
University of Pennsylvania

EDITORIAL OFFICES

School of Criminal Justice
Rutgers University
15 Washington Street
Newark, NJ 07102

Department of Legal Studies
The Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
2207 Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6369

Advances in Criminological Theory

A Serial Publication by Transaction

VOLUMES FIVE, SIX, & SEVEN

Volume 5 *Routine Activity and Rational Choice*

Volume Editors: Ronald V. Clarke and Marcus Felson

Articles by: Patricia L. Brantingham, Paul J. Brantingham, Maurice Cusson, Ronald V. Clarke, Derek Cornish, Ezzat Fattah, Marcus Felson, Richard B. Felson, Richard W. Harding, James J. Hennessey, Ross Homel, C. Ray Jeffery, Bruce D. Johnson, Pietro Marongiu, Mangai Natarajan, Nathaniel J. Pallone, Raymond Paternoster, Harry Sanabria, Sally S. Simpson, Max Taylor, Gordon Trasler, Pierre Tremblay, Diane L. Zahm

Volume 6 *The Legacy of Anomie*

Volume Editors: Freda Adler and William S. Laufer

Forward by: Robert K. Merton

Articles by: Freda Adler, Robert Agnew, Thomas J. Bernard, Bonnie Berry, Ko-lin Chin, Deborah V. Cohen, Jeffrey Fagan, Gilbert Geis, David F. Greenberg, W. Byron Groves, John Hoffman, Timothy Ireland, Gary F. Jensen, C. Ray Jeffery, Michael J. Lynch, Steven F. Messner, Nikos Passas, Richard Rosenfeld, S. George Vincentnathan, Elin Waring, David Weisburd

Volume 7 *Developmental Theories of Crime and Delinquency*

Volume Editor: Terence Thornberry

(In Preparation)

ESSAY, continued from page 16

New Jersey's toxic waste investigating unit that was created and directed by the New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice. In addition, we were aware of an alleged plot to frame one of the officers by others in the State Police using a woman in the prostitution business for this purpose. Instead of participating in the frame she spilled the beans to the New York State Senate Select Committee on Crime, an organization I worked with for over five years (1980-85), that conducted overall a seven-year investigation into organized crime's involvement in hazardous waste disposal. That Martens and the authors wrote some scathing public letters about the book is indeed true, but the "hot" letters were grounded on, shall I say, different interpretations about the New Jersey State Police and the enforcement of hazardous waste laws. They did not originate from an Academy member's disinterested finding.

Though Rebovich has much more to say about *Poisoning for Profit*, I will conclude this segment of the review touching on just two more points. First, Rebovich chides the authors for "the timing of data collection" (p. 14). Our analysis, he writes, was "conducted at a point early in the evolution of hazardous waste crime investigation, when duplication of enforcement operations, by fragmented enforcement agencies, was commonplace, as were interagency disputes over the suitability of those methods" (p. 14). Perhaps we should have waited for some future time when duplication, fragmentation and disputes were settled. Unfortunately, researchers conduct research at awkward times letting the chips fall where they may in the future. His scold is akin to attacking scholars for writing about the Soviet Union or Yugoslavia or Czechoslovakia or East Germany or the Republican Party during the Bush presidency, or about them during the process of disintegration, not waiting until the dust cleared. As if the dust itself was not significant. Rebovich's notion of timing is at best immature and, furthermore, masks his real contention that we took disorganization and disorientation and called them corruption.

Point two: the authors of *Poisoning for Profit* used few sources and those used had personal motives for charging government officials of corruption. On the latter

issue the charge is legitimate in some instances but irrelevant. The issue is whether or not those personally injured or outraged by corruption were accurate; did their personal experiences spring from real situations or from some hidden animus. Our answer was that it was real corruption which brought forth real anger. Rebovich, however, states that "Corruption charges made by these sources during House subcommittee hearings were ultimately refuted or satisfactorily explained" (p. 14). A search for a single citation on these claimed refutations or soothing explanations reveals no sources. Rebovich's conclusion in this case rests on thin air.

On the issue of the quantity of sources we utilized, Rebovich is again seriously mistaken. The vast bulk of material came from a large selection of investigations and hearings, all of which were clearly identified within the text. Some of those used and identified are U.S. Senate, Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, *Investigation of Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field* (Government Printing Office, 1957); Jeremiah B. McKenna, "Organized Crime in the Toxic Waste Disposal Industry;" U.S. Senate, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, *Profile of Organized Crime: Mid-Atlantic Region* (Government Printing Office, 1983); Senator Ralph J. Marino, Chairman of the New York State Senate Select Committee on Crime, *Case History of a Toxic Waste Dumper: The Manipulation of the State Department of Environmental Conservation and the Consequences of Non-Enforcement--A Report* (New York, 1982); New Jersey Senate, Committee Created Under Senate Resolution No. 4 (1958) and Reconstituted Under Senate Resolution No. 3 (1959) to Investigate the Cost of Garbage Collection and Disposal, *Hearing* (Trenton, New Jersey, 1959); New Jersey Special Legislative Commission, *Public Hearing to Investigate Certain Problems Relating to Solid Waste Disposal* (Trenton, New Jersey, 1969); New Jersey Superior Court, *State of New Jersey v. New Jersey Trade Waste Association, Hudson County Sanitation Association, et al., Indictment*, State Grand Jury Number SGJ66-80-8; New York State Supreme Court, County of Kings, *People of the State of New*

York v. A.B.C. Rubbish Removal, et al., Indictment No. R5314/73; New York City, Department of Investigation, *Investigation into the Department of Sanitation's Award of Two Landfill Cover Contracts to Perez-Interboro Asphalt Co. Inc., Contractor, JoPel Contracting & Trucking Corp., Subcontractor for the Edgemere Landfill, Queens, and the Foundation Avenue Landfill, Brooklyn* (New York, 1982); New York Senate, Select Committee of Crime, *An Investigation into Illegal Hazardous Waste Disposal on Long Island: An Interim Report* (New York, 1981), *Investigation into the Involvement of Organized Crime in Hazardous Waste Dumping* (New York, 1980), *A Public Hearing on Hazardous Waste Dumping in New York City* (New York, 1982); U.S. House, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, *Organized Crime Links to the Waste Disposal Industry* (Government Printing Office, 1981); U.S. House Committee on Energy and Commerce, *Hazardous Waste Enforcement* (Government Printing Office, 1982).

Additionally, the FBI's multi-volume transcripts of wire-tapped conversations among New Jersey mobsters in the 1960s were consulted for information on the mob's ownership of landfills in New Jersey, as were official daily summaries from a New Jersey undercover investigation into organized crime activities in the 1970s which focused on racketeer Tino Fiumara. At Fiumara's sentencing hearing on a RICO conviction in 1979 it was established that he had controlled dump sites, thereby inflating the cost of disposal, eliminated competition in garbage carting through a racketeer trade association, participated in the dumping of chemical wastes at one New Jersey landfill, and was preparing another for the same use when he was arrested.

Besides the above, we interviewed working detectives from New Jersey, Rockland County, New York, Brooklyn, New York, other investigators from the region, as well as informants. We also had many of the most sensitive documents generated by the New Jersey toxic waste investigating unit, and its quarterly reports to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration which paid for the unit under a federal grant. These are the simple facts that anyone can quite plainly see.

Please see ESSAY, page 19

ESSAY, continued from page 18

Rebovich, on the other hand, does not consider state and federal hearings to have much value. Only three hearings are cited in his study--a congressional one in 1979, another in 1980, and a U.S. Senate hearing in 1983 at which I testified. What is obvious from his sources is his unfamiliarity with the long public record of organized crime's involvement in waste disposal. Moreover, a close look at Rebovich's references reveals his own indebtedness to the New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice which, as mentioned above, formed the toxic waste investigating unit, and was one of my targets in the 1983 U.S. Senate hearing. His initial access to data as well as his first publisher (1986) was the New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice. It is difficult to imagine that his error-prone attack on *Poisoning for Profit*, to which he devotes an entire appendix in this mini-work and over one-half of chapter two (a bulky chapter of almost five pages), is not motivated by his desire to please his patron.

Well over nine years ago I noted that certain New Jersey public officials had been more concerned with political damage control than with anyone opening the can of worms representing collusion among law enforcers and racketeers in hazardous waste disposal. That produced a war which is apparently not over yet. When it comes to Rebovich's discussions of *Poisoning for Profit* (as well as my Senate testimony), he reveals himself to be yet another foot soldier with an empty gun in this affair.

Beyond Rebovich's clumsy work aimed at discrediting, one must still ask whether there is anything interesting which came of his survey. Not very much, unfortunately. For instance, he reports the "average [hazardous waste offender] to be quite imaginative" in finding ways to influence the "legal environment," allowing them "to capitalize on flaws in the system to successfully protect their lifestyles" (p. 35). For many of the criminals in the treatment/storage/disposal (TSD) end of the hazardous waste line, fooling inspectors was always an imperative and, according to Rebovich, rather easily accomplished. They were inept, naive, or co-opted; some were even bribed. "In an especially bold undertaking," Rebovich maintains that "offenders hired municipal police officers as part-time security guards"

(p. 39). Furthermore, he adds, "The hiring of former state regulatory agency attorneys allowed TSD-facility operators to gain a definite edge in evading state regulations." There were also crooked labs which produced false test results that serviced TSD operators, as well as "crooked" waste brokers able to lead crooked generators to crooked TSD facilities. Rebovich is correct in noting the increasingly crucial role played by unlicensed brokers, particularly those with criminal convictions in the past, who "will 'front' for a host of inexpensive haulers and TSD-facility operators willing to dispose of the generated wastes illegally" (p. 42).

Long-term hazardous waste offenders, Rebovich argues, are like drug distributors and robbers. Though this is his statement and might be construed as suggesting, dare I say it, organized crime, Rebovich hastens to make it clear that in the New Jersey sample the TSD industry "was discovered to be quite competitive and virtually devoid of anything resembling a genuine cartel" (p. 49). Nonetheless, he adds that criminal cases were found "where interfacility cooperation in networks was developed," and that TSD facilities form a sort of "bedrock of a well-defined, quasi-bureaucratic criminal apprenticeship system" (p. 50).

In his chapter titled "Creating a Criminal Maturation System," the author notes that for some seemingly long period of time, New Jersey's TSD facilities were so poorly equipped that "many forms of hazardous waste" just could not be de-toxified. This reminds me of two incidents recounted in *Poisoning for Profit*. One concerned a completely bogus New Jersey TSD facility called Duane Marine which subcontracted from organized crime figures (confirmed I hasten to add by an FBI investigation and then successful prosecution in New York's Southern District this past year) to handle hazardous waste generated by a Ford motor company plant in Mahwah, New Jersey. Their treatment specialty consisted of dumping the waste in local sewers or rolling 55-gallon drums into the Arthur Kill waterway separating New Jersey from Staten Island. The State Police investigator (seconded to the toxic waste unit discussed above) working this TSD facility complained that the company's seized records were being re-

turned to the TSD facility before a full examination. He prevented this days before someone torched the facility.

The second involved a TSD firm called Chemical Control Corporation located in Elizabeth, New Jersey, which utilized an incinerator. Taken over by organized crime in approximately the mid-1970s (confirmed I hasten to add by investigators working the mob's control of New York's Fulton Fish market who located checks from this corporation in the hands of organized crime), the facility's equipment had become so run down that the incinerator when working was grossly inefficient. This did not stop the DEA from bringing pallets of seized illicit drugs to Chemical Control for incineration. Eventually the State of New Jersey took control of the facility. At that time there was approximately 30,000 55-gallon drums of assorted toxic wastes on the premises. Later, just before this TSD facility was torched, there were around 50,000 drums piled there. The State's mandate, of course, was to clean the site by getting rid of the drums to begin with. Was it ineptness, disorganization, disorientation, I wonder, that caused the State to stockpile more and more drums rather than moving them out?

Rebovich acknowledges that the criminal activities carried out at TSD facilities, "regrettably, characterize the industry as a whole in the 1970s and 1980s" (p. 55). Yet he carefully distinguishes between syndicate crime (organized crime as commonly understood) and what seems to have been going on at the criminal TSD facilities and the role of criminal waste brokers. In a woefully inept comparison he points out that the "average hazardous waste offender has more in common with the Ivan Boesky ideal that [sic] with that of Don Corleone" (p. 59). Thus, he finds there is no real syndicate crime associated with these businesses, well, except for some in New Jersey, where hazardous waste criminals and organized criminals have finally found a common ground, indeed, "appear to be thriving" in the waste oil industry. Though there is no citation for this I will not quibble with his description for it was the New York State Senate Select Committee on Crime which initiated one of the first investigations into this type of hazardous waste crime and, in fact, testimony by the Committee's counsel, Jeremiah

ESSAY, continued from page 19

McKenna, on this very topic was given in the disparaged 1983 Senate hearing.

One other remark about the Garden State seems in order here. Rebovich cannot seem to escape the paradox of organized crime in New Jersey though he does not wish to acknowledge it. Further equivocation: under a subtitle *Organized But Not Syndicate*, he writes the typical criminal arrangements in the hazardous waste industry "were designed for illegal profits [as though organized criminals are more concerned with charity work] without the typical hallmarks of traditional syndicate racketeering," well, except for New Jersey. There the TSD industry enjoyed a higher level of criminal organization and sophistication "and exhibited some of these syndicate properties," he confesses (p. 60).

Nevertheless, traditional racketeering in hazardous waste disposal, Rebovich reckons, could not hold because of the economic structure of the industry. Why? Too much competition and too many places where entrepreneurs could dump without any control by organized criminals. This is his major point. Without the creation of a cartel there ain't no organized crime. And if one presupposes that cartelization is the only sign of mobsters in an industry, then who can argue? But as he himself noted some appar-

ently tried and some few apparently succeeded. Not enough to characterize the sample he used, however. But, I would argue first a flawed sample. Could one expect prosecutors' offices as described by Rebovich to have turned up the sophisticated byways of official corruption and organized crime in this field when they were and "regrettably" remain unable to curtail industry crimes during the 1970s and 1980s as he states?

The second criticism in this line stems from his statement of the similarity between hazardous waste criminals and drug distributors. Lots of gangs form to distribute drugs, and some over time become formidable organizations; and some are or become parts of traditional organized crime syndicates. Some overlap with others and some have little to do with those whose background keeps them on the now withering charts of La Cosa Nostra.

For Rebovich to determine the presence or indeed contemporary absence of organized crime in the hazardous waste industry, he should expand his sample from the four states to at least include New York and to use a far fuller approach than one tied to the few successfully prosecuted cases. After all, he himself on more than one occasion has commented on the thin success of law enforcement in this area. He should

determine with some precision which politicians owned or continue to own landfills used as toxic dumps by both midnight dumpers and organized crime ones. It would also help him to review material on the organized crime element that has dominated much of the sludge management industry in the mid-Atlantic region. In the same vein, he could trace which attorneys fit into this picture by consistently acting as registered agents for criminal firms. Furthermore, an evaluation of those former criminal justice and environmental officials who moved into management and/or ownership position with firms they were supposedly investigating would also enlighten. It also seems to me he ought to go to the library and read the pre-1985 public record and then the post-1985 one including the series of hearings held by the New York State Assembly Committee on Conservation.

Finally, Rebovich would learn a great deal about his topic if he journeyed to the Manhattan office of the Southern District and did some research on the 1992 prosecution of Robert and Louis Mongelli and their firms. Long before the FBI successfully got into the act, these were the individuals and their companies I started my research with on the advice of the New York State Senate Select Committee on Crime and a couple of cops who really knew the score.

DIVISION FOR INTERNATIONAL CRIMINOLOGY

The Division for International Criminology of the American Society of Criminology currently has 238 members. Officers of the Division are:

President: Gary LaFree, The University of New Mexico
 Vice-President: Nancy Travis Wolfe, University of South Carolina
 Executive Committee: James P. Lynch, The American University
 Patricia Mayhew, British Home Office
 Marjorie Zatz, Arizona State University
 Newsletter Editor: Chris Birkbeck, The University of New Mexico

Approximately 90 people attended the luncheon held at the American Society of Criminology meeting in New Orleans. Nancy Travis Wolfe introduced the DIC's 1992 Visiting Scholar, Dr. Andrzej Siemaskzko from Warsaw, Poland. Dr. Siemaskzko spoke to the DIC meeting on "The Crime Wave in Poland: Side Effect of Democracy."

Jim Lynch announced the winner of the DIC Comparative Criminology Book Award for *The Samurai, the Mountie, and the Cowboy: Should America Adopt the Gun Controls of Other Democracies?* by David B. Kopel.

Members of the American Society of Criminology who are interested in becoming a member of the Division for International Criminology should contact Sarah Hall as the ASC offices.

NEWS FROM THE DIVISION ON WOMEN AND CRIME

by Lynne Goodstein

The Division on Women and Crime was a strong presence at the New Orleans meeting this past fall. Just in numbers alone, with 321 members the Division constitutes a large bloc within the American Society of Criminology. While members may not always agree on every detail of policy positions, there is a shared commitment to: (1) increased visibility of women in all aspects of society activities and (2) the continued advancement of research and scholarship on women and gender issues as they relate to crime, justice, and the criminal justice system.

Over the past two years the topic of sexual harassment has occupied the attention of many Division members. Betsy Stanko has contributed significantly to raising the visibility of this issue in the Society through her research on sexual harassment among members of the ASC (see *The Criminologist*, September/October 1992, Vol. 17, No. 5) and her leadership in holding Division-sponsored informal discussion sessions on sexual harassment at ASC meetings for the past two years.

The Division has also been actively involved in advocating for the passage of an ASC policy on sexual harassment. Under the stewardship of Division Chair Carole Garrison and Acting Chair Lynne Goodstein, a new policy on sexual harassment was proposed, deliberated, modified, and finally approved by the ASC board at its November meeting. This policy states that the ASC "condemns sexual harassment in any form" and goes on to specify two types of sexual harassment: (1) unwelcome sexual advances or requests for sexual favors when those requests or advances are in any way associated with current or potential professional opportunities or decisions in ASC activities; and (2) conduct that creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment that interferes with an individual's participation in ASC activities.

The New Orleans meeting was also the site for the second Women and Crime luncheon, sponsored by the Division. Well over 100 tickets were sold to this increasingly popular

event. Attendees were fortunate to hear a keynote speech by the President of Planned Parenthood of the State of Louisiana who shared chilling stories of the struggles Louisiana women have waged to support women's rights to obtain family planning information and safe and legal abortions.

Several Division members have made a commitment to move forward with a revision of the popular curriculum guide for courses focusing on women and gender issues in criminology/criminal justice. The guide, edited by Merry Morash and published in 1988 by the Division, is becoming rapidly outdated. Later on this spring, members of the ASC will receive a call for submissions to the new guide. The quality of this new edition will depend upon the quality of the submissions we receive, so we urge all members to consider sharing information about your classes that focus on or are inclusive of gender issues.

The Division's executive board approved a plan for organizing Division meetings differently for the upcoming 1993 meeting in Phoenix. The changes, which will be described in greater detail in an upcoming issue of *The Criminologist*, are designed to encourage greater diversity within the Division and facilitate the involvement of new, and younger, members.

In addition, Division members are hard at work on a variety of projects, committees, and task forces, including the following:

Committees: Fellows, ASC Awards, Division Awards, Nominations, Outreach, Special Events, Student Affairs

Task Forces: Lesbian, Women and Prison, Women of Color, Non-University Research, Sexual and Other Harassment, Public Policy

If you are interested in working on any of these issues, please contact Lynne Goodstein, (814) 466-0930, and she will refer you to the committee/task force chair.

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN CRIMINOLOGY

The Plenum Series in Crime and Justice

Series Editors: James Alan Fox and Joseph Weis

RAPE LAW REFORM

A Grassroots Revolution and Its Impact

by Cassia Spohn and Julie Horney

This groundbreaking text presents the results of an extensive study on the impact of rape law reforms across the United States. Spohn and Horney examine data from a cross section of urban jurisdictions spanning fifteen years, evaluating the effects of rape law reforms on the reporting of rape, the processing of rape cases, and public officials' evaluation of rape cases.

0-306-44284-1/192 pp./ill./1992/\$32.50

RACE AND THE JURY

Racial Disenfranchisement and the Search for Justice

by Hiroshi Fukurai, Edgar W. Butler, and Richard Krooth

The authors analyze the institutional and structural mechanisms that have fostered the underrepresentation of racial and ethnic minorities on juries and review substantive problems of racial representation on juries, utilizing various statistical techniques.

0-306-44144-6/258 pp./ill./1993/\$34.95
text adoption price on orders of six or more copies: \$24.95

Forthcoming . . .

CRIMINAL INCAPACITATION

by William Spelman

0-306-44383-X/approx. 300 pp./ill./1993

AFTER THE CRIME

Victim Decision Making

by Martin S. Greenberg and R. Barry Ruback

After the Crime explores the roles that social influence, emotions, and other factors play in decision making by crime victims immediately following victimization. Volume 9 in the series *Perspectives in Law and Psychology*.

0-306-44160-8/310 pp./ill./1992/\$39.50
text adoption price on orders of six or more copies: \$27.50

Book prices are 20% higher outside US & Canada.



PLENUM PUBLISHING
CORPORATION

233 Spring Street
New York, NY 10013-1578
Telephone orders:
212-620-8000/1-800-221-9369

NEWS FROM THE DIVISION OF CRITICAL CRIMINOLOGY

by
Hal Pepinsky

I'm chairing the Critical Criminology division (DCC) these next two years. We have our own newsletter, "The Critical Criminologist," which contains a number of fine essays in addition to our news. I'd encourage people who don't already get it to subscribe, and for that matter to join the division. Normally that is where I will continue to write myself. Meanwhile, the editors of *The Criminologist* were nice enough to go out of their way to ask me to write something for the general membership. I appreciate the chance to tell you about some interrelated initiatives we are taking with the other two ASC divisions--the Division on Women and Crime (DWC) and the Division on International Criminology (DIC). DWC chair Lynne Goodstein, DIC chair Gary LaFree and I have been working together, particularly on the program for next October's meeting in Phoenix. ASC President Del Elliott and Program Chair Marcia Chaiken have been marvelous about working with us. **Please advise Marcia of final program changes, as in adding names, by April 15 to go on the preliminary program.**

We are moved by a common sense that our annual meetings could use more coherence. We tend to go off to our isolated bits of the hundreds of sessions at the meeting, and scarcely have an opportunity to talk across specialities and perspectives about any general issues, let alone about the theme of the meeting. Del Elliott and I were among those who pushed a decade ago on the Executive Board to facilitate the creation of divisions and one happy consequence is that within divisions the meetings have taken on greater coherence for our members. I belong to all three divisions,

and I am well aware that in each there is a substantial group of ASC members who attend division-sponsored sessions and meetings together, and who in the process build a criminological dialogue among themselves. In all divisions we're encouraging more of the same; members are encouraged to organize sessions, and for that matter as we say among ourselves in the DCC, to infiltrate other sessions so that we don't talk only to ourselves.

This meeting we're going a big step further, building to an interdivisional plenary, "Responding to Violence" (in keeping with the theme of the meeting), which Marcia and Del are working on scheduling for Saturday. In fact, Marcia is thinking it might be good to have the plenary Saturday afternoon formally to end the meeting, closed by a Native American elder of spiritual adviser.

Plenary speakers will be reporters from four sets of two town meetings each--one set sponsored by each of the three divisions, and one sponsored by the local arrangements committee. The town meetings will be scheduled on Thursday and Friday. The local arrangements and division chairs will each recommend a convenor/reporter for the town meetings, and notify Marcia and Del in time for the preliminary program who their choices are, and who they agree themselves will chair the plenary. For the DCC I'm asking Charisse Coston to be our convenor and reporter.

The first of the two town meetings will be devoted to "issues of violence." The second will concentrate on "responses to violence." The reporter will summarize those discussions at the plenary.

In addition, Mick Hallett at Arizona State University has already undertaken to work with local arrangements Chair John Hepburn and local arrangements committee/DCC steering committee member Nancy Wonders at Northern Arizona University, to put together at least two additional sessions which will be scheduled for Wednesday or Thursday, featuring local practitioners and activists to ground our discussion of responding to violence in local problems. Marcia too has been working closely with the local arrangements committee, where among other things she is trying to arrange for a Native American opening ceremony, perhaps at the outset of a Wednesday afternoon plenary. The panels will be tied to field trips to be announced--a little broader in scope than the standard ASC prison tours. Mick has assumed responsibility for giving program information on the local arrangements sessions and tours to Marcia and Del.

Together, these sessions offer us a chance to take stock of where we stand as a body of criminologists across diverse spectra. You don't have to have paid your \$5 division dues to participate; we want to act as a catalyst to bring ASC meeting participants together in common dialogue. Please join in.

As the first old man to chair a division in the first decade of their existence (or am I the second?), I can with some distance express admiration for how much life divisions are bringing to the society. We criminologists are a small enough group for me to be well aware that the young turks in the division are viewed with some suspicion and distrust, which I think is ill-founded. My predecessor as

DIVISION NEWS, continued from page 22

DCC chair, Susan Caringella-MacDonald, worked long and hard with other division chairs to get recognition and respect from officers and executive board members of ASC. There is a pending request from division chairs that they be made ex-officio members of the board, which has met resistance.

I'm an anarchist who believes in formalism only as a last resort, and I have the agreement of my steering committee and of Lynne and Gary to hold our proposal in abeyance to see whether we cannot be granted ex-officio status as a matter of informal courtesy. Del Elliott has no problems with this approach. He welcomed Lynne and me to sit and speak at the board meeting last November in New Orleans, and he now writes me:

I will be formally inviting the Division chairs to attend the Tues. evening meeting [in Phoenix] and make brief reports. I will also recognize the chairs if they want to comment on issues before the board.

Great! That's all we wanted to begin with. I for one will try not to abuse the privilege. As long as succeeding ASC presidents act in the same spirit, our proposal for formal ex-officio recognition can safely remain on the table. I see no reason for executive board members not to welcome us or any ASC member who goes to the time and trouble to sit in the open board meetings and offer constructive input. That offers board members ideas and perspectives they might not otherwise think of among themselves, and keeps the board and rank-and-file membership in contact.

I have a request to lay now before the president-elect, Jerry Skolnick. We would like to institutionalize the practice of having each division chair recommend a representative to the annual meeting program committee. For continuity's sake, I'm recommending Charisse Coston--convenor/reporter for this fall's plenary--to be the DCC representative to the 1994 program committee. I'd ask on behalf of the divisions that the three division representatives and the local arrangements chair form a program subcommittee to carry on the coherence we're trying to build into this fall's program. I look forward to working with you, Jerry, on this and other matters.

I'd like generally to encourage ASC members to get involved in division life. My own participation has made ASC life a lot richer for me. It happens in the DCC that I have a raft of committee appointments to make. Please join the division if you haven't already, and let me know of your interest. I'll hold off on further appointments until April. We keep talking in the

division about how we want to "involve new blood," and you're it. Also, our newsletter, "The Critical Criminologist," has a 100 percent acceptance policy for submissions of reasonably short length and coherence, and editors Walter DeKeseredy and Brian MacLean keep asking for submissions.

My thanks to the editors of *The Criminologist* for this opportunity to report to you. If you want to contact me, I'm in Criminal Justice, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405 USA, tel. (812) 855-1450 (office), 855-9325 (mess.), 339-4303 (home), 855-5522 (FAX), and on BITNET--PEPINSKY@IUBACS. I look forward to hearing from you.



The Section on
CRIME, LAW AND DEVIANCE
of the American Sociological
Association announces:

Section Nominations/Elections

Members of the section are asked to provide nominations for **Section Chair-Elect, Secretary-Treasurer, and two Council positions**. Nominations should be sent by **March 10, 1993** to:

John Laub, Chair
CL&D Section Nominations Committee
Northeastern University
College of Criminal Justice
360 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115
(617) 437-3285 telephone
(617) 437-8998 fax

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

CALL FOR BOOK REVIEWS AND REVIEWERS, ITEMS CONCERNING TEACHING, RESEARCH AND SERVICE NEWS COLUMNS

Under the new editorship, *The Criminologist* will publish book reviews. While this feature will change as it evolves over the next few months, our initial preference is to publish only one or two review essays per issue (up to 1,500 words) and several relatively short reviews of individual books (less than 750 words). Readers interested in serving as reviewers are encouraged to send a letter to the editors indicating their fields of expertise.

Book authors are also encouraged to have their publishers send copies of their new books to us. The more books we receive, the faster our review section can grow.

We also plan to publish at irregular intervals three columns concerning teaching, research and service news, respectively. The aim of these columns is to make available to readers information that is of use to them in their daily work but may not be easily accessible. Suggestions for items to be published include, but are not limited to the following:

- Reviews of software packages to be used in teaching or research.
- Very brief notes on teaching aids and techniques (less than 250 words).
- Description of data files that have not yet been fully used for research.
- Opportunities for service to community, state or the profession.

Please contact the editors with your suggestions and comments at the following address:

Editors
The Criminologist
College of Criminal Justice
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, TX 77341-2296

The Criminologist

Official Newsletter of the American Society of Criminology

American Society of Criminology
1314 Kinnear Rd., Suite 212
Columbus, OH 43212
ISSN 0164-0240

SECOND CLASS
POSTAGE PAID
COLUMBUS, OHIO