

99782

Media Magic, Mafia Mania

BY FREDERICK T. MARTENS AND MICHELE CUNNINGHAM-NIEDERER*

CRIME, AS represented by the mass media, is an issue continually before us. Researchers have spent a great deal of time examining the effect of the media on behavior and, in particular, the effect of violence in the media on the behavior of children. Others have examined the role of the media in shaping our attitude toward predatory crimes—a favorite topic of the media. In fact, whether it be television, radio, or newspapers, there appears to be a preoccupation on the part of journalists, editors, directors, and the like to provide us with the more sensational and titillating acts of violence. Violence is, and will certainly remain, an integral part of our media menu, if for no other reason than it has all the elements of being newsworthy. We are presented with neatly packaged crime stories that weave “truth,” perception, and “half-truths” together, providing both entertainment and a skewed sense of reality. In the 1984 season alone, there were 23 crime shows during “prime time” television.¹ And it is widely acknowledged that the print media are particularly dependent upon the coverage of crime in order to expand circulation.²

The American public is fascinated with stories about crime, criminals, and those charged with maintaining order—the police. The seamy side of life represents the unknown, the exciting, the captivating. Unfortunately, this form of information projection can be, and often is, dangerous in that the reality of death or the pain and suffering that one endures as a victim of a violent crime is obscured by fantasy. The “real” is difficult to discern from the fictional, and regardless of how astute one may be about the art of imagemaking, it is not long before one is captured by the lure of visual imagery.

How the media create, support, and perpetuate myths of crime, criminals, and police is in itself a story. Much has been written on this subject, but more is necessary, particularly with the maturation of the electronic media. That is, with advancements in television programming—cable, video, and the like—we can be assured that crime will remain a prime-time attraction. We must therefore ensure that what is represented remains as close to the “truth” as is humanly possible, but at the same

time provides the audience with a form of popular entertainment.

Similarly, computer technology has changed the print media dramatically. Through computer technology, it will be possible to provide the reader with a rapid means of collecting, storing, and retrieving data that were formerly either lost in the filing process or were cost-prohibitive to locate and condense. The journalist now has the tools to bring more revealing insights and continuity to the discrete events that are presented in the daily editions of newspapers. We should receive a far better and more accurate description and analysis than we were provided in the past. In short, the “hi-tech” explosion has resulted in more efficient and effective communications media that society must be prepared to accept. Because crime is an enduring social problem that will likely remain in the public’s eye, it provides the media researcher with a topic that can be examined over time.

For the purposes of this article we have selected an unusual but certainly not unimportant form of crime—organized crime—as the focus of our research. This crime typology affords us the opportunity to examine in some detail how the mass media treat crime which is organized, continues over long periods of time, and requires corruption and violence for its sustenance. Unlike street or predatory crime, which usually represents discrete events that occur within a particular time frame by individual actors and frequently results in an arrest and successful prosecution, organized crime appears to sustain itself despite the most relentless offensives.

Organized crime is and will likely remain a uniquely capitalist institution in American society. And while the annals of our communications media are filled with stories about crime, and to a lesser extent organized crime, researchers in general have avoided a rigorous analysis of how the mass media ad-

*Frederick T. Martens is an adjunct lecturer in sociology and criminology at Upsala College, Wirths Campus, Sussex, New Jersey. Michele Cunningham-Niederer is a research assistant to Professor Martens.

¹ A partial listing of crime-related programs includes (1) “Magnum P.I.,” (2) “Hawaiian Heat,” (3) “Matt Houston,” (4) “Hunter,” (5) “Miami Vice,” (6) “Partners In Crime,” (7) “Hill Street Blues,” (8) “Cover-Up,” (9) “Cagney and Lacey,” (10) “Simon and Simon,” (11) “Jessie,” (12) “Murder, She Wrote,” (13) “Scarecrow and Mrs. King,” (14) “The Fall Guy,” (15) “Hot Pursuit,” and (16) “Mickey Spillane’s Mike Hammer.” There are numerous other syndicated crime/police programs, in addition to various “specials” that are made for television.

² Drew Humphries, “Serious Crime, News Coverage, and Ideology,” *Crime and Delinquency*, April 1981, pp. 191-205; Mark Fishman, “Crime Waves As Ideology,” *Social Problems*, June 1978, pp. 531-541.

"For better and for worse," as it goes, Canadians are optimistic and still share Winston Churchill's famous quotation in the House of Commons in 1910 that : "The mood and temper of the public with regard to the treatment of crime and criminals is one of the unfailing tests of the civilization of any country."

The current Canadian correctional picture indicates that, contrary to that in America, at least partly, there are really no recent "hard-line" approaches to corrections. It reflects the Canadian "mood and temper" and still meets Churchill's test of civilization.

George Orwell's 1984 is not happening yet, happily.

REFERENCES

Canadian Federal-Provincial Task Force on *Justice for Victims of Crime*. Ottawa: Solicitor General of Canada, 1983.

Criminal Law in Canadian Society (The). Ottawa: Ministry of Justice of Canada, 1982.

Ekstedt, J. W. and Griffiths, C. T. *Corrections in Canada: Policy and Practice*. Toronto: Butterworths, 1984.

Griffiths, C. T., Klein, J. F. and Verdun-Jones, S. N. *Criminal Justice in Canada*. Toronto: Butterworths, 1980.

House of Commons of Canada (The). *Bill C-19, An Act to Amend the Criminal Code*. Ottawa: The Minister of Justice, February 7, 1984, first reading.

Landreville, P. *Le critere de recidive dans l'evaluation des mesures penales*. Montreal: Ecole de Criminologie, Universite de Montreal, 1982.

Nuffield, J. *Parole Decision-Making in Canada: Research Towards Decision Guidelines*. Ottawa Solicitor General of Canada, 1982.

Roos, R. R. and Gendreau, P. *Effective Correctional Treatment*. Toronto: Butterworths, 1980.

Sentencing. Ottawa: Ministry of Justice of Canada, 1984.

c) *A new criminal code for Canada*

The uniformed Criminal Code of Canada was enacted in 1892. It was written out of the jurisprudence of England. Since 1892, the Criminal Code has been the subject of an almost continuous process of piecemeal and patchwork amendment. There has never been a comprehensive criminal law policy upon which the amendments could be based. Underneath and between the patches there remains an ever-aging document which essentially reflects a 19th century society.

In 1970, the Law Reform Commission of Canada was established in response to demands for a review of the purpose and scope of the criminal law. Since that time, the Commission has published a host of formal reports and working papers on various aspects of the criminal law.

With the 1980's, the Canadian government has decided at last to write a new Criminal Code. In 1982, the Department of Justice published its general orientation in an official document entitled: *The Criminal Law in Canadian Society*. The purpose of the criminal law, according to the document, is to contribute to the maintenance of a just, peaceful, and safe society through the establishment of a system of prohibitions, sanctions, and procedures to deal fairly and appropriately with culpable conduct that causes or threatens serious harm to individuals and society. The purpose of the criminal law should be achieved through means consonant with the rights set forth in the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. The criminal law should be employed to deal only with that conduct for which other means of social control are inadequate or inappropriate, and in a manner which interferes with individual rights and freedoms only to the extent necessary for the attainment of its purpose.

In 1984, the Government of Canada published a policy statement on sentencing to accompany and supplement a major legislative initiative to provide the basis for more effective, equitable, realistic, and appropriate sentencing of criminal offenders. The proposed legislation sets out a clear and understandable basis and rationale for sentencing, provides better tools for taking effective action to protect the public against dangerous and persistent criminals, and gives meaning to basic concepts of justice and fairness consistent with the *Charter of*

Rights and Freedoms and modern social attitudes.

Specifically regarding probation, a general duty of the court to order a presentence report is proposed in all cases where it is considering incarcerating an individual who has not previously been incarcerated. Moreover, provision for the victim impact statement as part of the presentence report creates a mechanism to bring information related to harm or loss suffered by the victim to the attention of the court. To protect the interests of the offenders, defense counsel would have an opportunity to challenge representations made by the victim in the presentence report. Probation is also given "teeth" by making wilful breach subject to serious penalties, including imprisonment.

With respect to parole, the Canadian Government is convinced that there must continue to be some system providing for conditional release from sentences of imprisonment. There has been some system providing for such release in Canadian law since 1868, and the reasons that programs such as remission and parole have survived to this day are still relevant and compelling. First, the existence of some system of early release fulfills the humanitarian and very practical function of providing hope to imprisoned persons who might otherwise have none. Second, humaneness and common sense dictate that some possibility be provided for relief from the conditions of sentence in cases where there has been a genuine change in the offender or in the circumstances relevant to his or her incarceration. Third, provision for early release is incentive for good conduct in prison and can assist markedly in the control of prison populations. Fourth, early release can, through the provisions of flexibility in the choice of the best time and method for conditionally releasing an offender, assist in the reintegration of the offender in the community.

Conclusion

With such a vision in an official document dated 1984, it is quite clear that Canadian corrections differ markedly with American corrections of the 1980's. All in all, Canadians still believe in old-style rehabilitation. Who says "rehabilitation is dead?" In Canada, the rehabilitation ideology is still "well and alive." Who says "nothing works in corrections?" Canadians think quite the contrary—not only among practitioners but among academics (Ross and Gendreau, 1980; Griffiths, Klein and Vendun-Jones, 1980; Ekstedt and Griffiths, 1983).

blend of common sense and professional tradition that leads to this status quo. But in any case "classical" community supervision will prevail, even if research on recidivism in Canada does not indicate that the correctional system "works" any better than its American counterpart. Our best studies (Landreville, 1982), based on a 10-year followup after release from prison, indicate that 65 percent are rearrested, 55 percent are resentenced, and 50 percent are reimprisoned. Among the "regular" parolees (between one-third and two-thirds of their time served), 40 percent are imprisoned again. Among the "mandatory" parolees (after two-thirds of their time served), 65 percent are so.

- 2) If there are no real "hard-line" Canadian approaches, there are a few recent "soft-line" approaches related to: a) risk assessment, b) justice for victims, and c) a new criminal code and sentencing provisions. It is like a story of the "Hawks" and the "Doves."

a) *Risk assessment: Parole decisionmaking in Canada*

Even if it may come as a surprise to Americans, no full-fledged study of parole decisionmaking in Canada was done before the turn of the 1980's. Finally, in a 1982 study about decision guidelines initiated by the National Parole Board of Canada and carried out by the Research Division of the Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada (Nuffield, 1982), the researcher studied a random sample of 2,500 full-parole decisions in order to determine which factors were most strongly related to the outcome of the decisions. The results of this analysis were used to form a "model" or abstract description of the decisionmaking process. It was found that the seriousness of the offenses was not related in a consistent fashion to the rate at which parole was granted. Rather, the study revealed that various offender characteristics were significant to the full-parole decision, characteristics which were in turn related to the probability that the offender would be rearrested after release.

The report concluded by proposing a set of guidelines for the systematic incorporation of this predictive technique into the decisionmaking processes of the National Parole Board. It was recommended that offenders identified as "good statistical risk" be granted an operating "presumption" in favor of full-parole release at their initial date of eligibility; "poor risk" in-

mates would receive a "presumptive" decision against parole, but would be given priority status for a carefully planned program of graduated conditional releases. Procedures would be established whereby the Board could step outside its guidelines, but exceptions to these operating principles would be monitored and analyzed for their policy implications. It was suggested that this new system would address the problem of ensuring greater visibility and equity in the administration of parole policy in Canada.

This official report is well done and well intentioned. However, 2 years after its release, no followup on risk assessment and parole decisionmaking guidelines in Canada has been seriously done in practice, as if the report was taken as a piece of academia. There is no urge to move from it.

b) *Justice for victims of crime in Canada*

Concern for victims of crime has recently been an important focus of attention for criminal justice agencies, as well as for private sector groups in Canada. This concern was given explicit emphasis in an official Federal-Provincial Task Force on Justice for Victims of Crime (Report) in 1983. The Task Force was established to examine the needs of victims of crime, to inquire into their experience with the criminal justice system, and to recommend action which could be taken to improve present methods of assistance to victims.

Out of the usual string of proposals for change, two are particularly interesting for probation and parole: restitution and victim impact statements. One of the key concerns of victim advocates is to increase the possibility that victims of crime will receive financial reparation for their losses which result from criminal activity. This has led to the suggestion that a logical reform would be that of making a major use of the sanction of ordering the offender to make restitution. The main proposal requires judges to consider restitution in all cases and empowers the court to impose a jail term when the accused willfully defaults in the restitution. Probation officers would be the main agents in a restitution program. As for the other pertinent proposal, the criminal code would be amended to permit the introduction of a victim impact statement to be considered at the time of sentencing and at the time of parole. A statement from the victims to the parole board would be allowed and information on release from incarceration would be provided to the victims, if they have so requested.

Probation and Parole in Canada: Protecting the Canadian Public?*

BY ANDRE NORMANDEAU, PH.D.

Director, International Center for Comparative Criminology, University of Montreal

AMERICANS AND Canadians are really cousins in everyday life because as North Americans, they share many cultural values and many identical outlooks on democracy and politics, church and religion, family and school—life, work, and death!

However, in matters related to justice, particularly criminal justice, it seems that our paths and thinking are more diversified and, sometimes, quite different indeed.

At first sight, Canada appears to many Americans almost as another state, another state of the union. In fact, Americans tried in 1774 and again in 1812 to persuade Canadians by force to join the United States, but to no avail.

Canada has 25 million inhabitants, dispersed in 10 provinces. Half of the Canadians are Anglo-Saxons in a wide sense, one-quarter are French, concentrated mainly in Quebec, and one-quarter represent our own ethnic melting pot. Our major metropolitan cities, Montreal and Toronto, with a population of 3 million each, and Greater Vancouver, with 1½ million, resemble in many ways American cities like Boston, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Kansas City, Denver, or San Francisco.

However, the Canadian criminal scene is quite different, compared to the American scene. For example:

- a) Canada has only one criminal code, the Federal code, implemented across the 10 provinces;
- b) Crimes of violence in Canada, using the FBI index or its Canadian equivalent, represent one-third of the American rate per 100,000 inhabitants;
- c) Crimes against property represent half of the American rate;
- d) Rate of imprisonment in Canada is 100 per 100,000 inhabitants, whereas it is 250 to 300 in the United States and 50 to 75 in European democratic countries;
- e) Rates of persons on probation and parole are three times lower in Canada than in the United States; the overall "social control" of citizens is thus much less overwhelming in Canada, at least quantity wise; and

- f) Finally, capital execution has not been done in Canada since the end of the 1950's. Capital punishment was legally abolished almost completely in 1966 and completely in 1976. Rates of homicide have not increased since 1976. They even have decreased a little.

Protecting the Public in Canada

Considering the theme of this article—"protecting the public: punishment and control through community supervision"—I must say that the Canadian situation regarding probation and parole is a bit different from the major trends I perceive in many jurisdictions of the United States. In many states there is a growing emphasis on "surveillance and restraint." Selective incapacitation and intensive supervision are being used, and electronic control is even experimentally tested. There is no such trend in Canada. Based on qualitative interviews made recently with 25 probation officers, 25 parole officers, and 25 administrators and public servants related to corrections in Canada, as well as my own 3-year experience as a community parole board member, my assessment of the Canadian scene is the following:

- 1) Canada's probation and parole systems are not turning to the right or to the left, to more control or less control. Rather as we say in politics, they stay at the "extreme center." There is no significant "new" emphasis in control and punishment, and there is no significant movement towards the abolition in one way or the other of the parole system, for example. In fact, the overwhelming majority of probation and parole officers told us they were satisfied with the current middle-of-the-road and traditional community supervision. Interviews with the decisionmakers in Canadian corrections, and even with politicians related to this field, also indicated that, save some minor adjustment, the "wind of change" is not blowing across Canada. It may come in a few years, like other American ideas imported by Canada in the past, with a cultural delay and a historical gap; but my own feeling is that regarding probation and parole, this time the import will be limited and restricted. Maybe Canadians are conservative, or they use a unique

*This article is based on notes for the 9th Annual National Conference of the American Probation and Parole Association, Boston, August 26-29, 1984.

societal value perspectives. This study is offered as evidence that intensive treatment with chemically dependent, recidivist offenders can be successful.

REFERENCES

- Anglin, D. M. "Alcohol and Criminality," in M. Pattison and E. Kaufman (eds.), *Encyclopedic Handbook of Alcoholism*. New York: Gardner Press, 1982.
- Bail, J. C., Rosen, L., Flueck, J. A. and Nurco, D. N. "The Criminality of Heroin Addicts when Addicted and when off Opiates." Unpublished research paper, 1981.
- Barton, W. I. *Drug Histories of Prisons: Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities*. National Drug Abuse Conference, 1976.
- DeLeon, G. "The Therapeutic Community: Study of Effectiveness," *Treatment Research Monograph Series*, National Institute of Drug Abuse, 1984.
- Guze, S. B. and Cantwell, D. P. "Alcoholism Parole Observations and Criminal Recidivism: A study of 116 parolees," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1965, 122, pp. 436-439.
- Haworth, M. P. *Nebraska Department of Correctional Services, Chemical Dependency Program Recidivism Study on Fiscal Year 1977-1978 Clients*. State of Nebraska document, 1981.
- Lamb, R. H. and Goertzel, V. "A Community Alternative to County Jail: The Hopes and Realities," *Federal Probation*, 1975, 39, pp. 3-11.
- National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA) Treatment Research Report. *Effectiveness of Drug Abuse Treatment Programs*. DHHS Publication Number (ADM) 81-1143, 1981.
- Overall, J. E. and Gorham, D. R. "The Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale," *Psychological Reports*, 1962, 10, pp. 799-805.
- Parlor, G. G. *Alcoholism and the Criminal Justice Population. Proceedings of the Seminar on Alcoholism Detection, Treatment and Rehabilitation within the Criminal Justice System*. LEAA, NIAAA, and Federal Bureau of Prisons: Joint Conference, 1973.
- Pendery, M. L., Maltzman, I. M. and West, L. J. "Controlled Drinking by Alcoholics? New Findings and a Re-evaluation of a Major Affirmative Study," *Journal of Science*, 1982, 217, pp. 169-175.
- Pernanen, K. "Alcohol and Crimes of Violence," in B. Kissin and H. Begleiter (eds.), *The Biology of Alcoholism: Social Aspects of Alcoholism*. New York: Plenum, 1976.
- Rosenburg, M. *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Princeton, N. J. Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Roth, L. H., Rosenburg, N. and Levinson, R. B. "Prison Adjustment of Alcoholic Felons," *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcoholism*, 1971, 32(2), pp. 328-392.
- Sobell, M. B. and Sobell, L. C. "Second Year Treatment Outcome of Alcoholics Treated by Individualized Behavior Therapy: Results," *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 1976, 14, pp. 195-215.
- Travis, L. *Oregon Parole Revocation Study*. State of Oregon document, 1977.

TABLE 4. OUTCOME OF PRE-POST TESTING FOR CORNERSTONE EDUCATIONAL MODULES* (Given in Percentages of Correct Responses)

	PRE	POST
Drug and Alcohol Education (14)	45.6%	85.1%
Coping Skills Training (25)	49.2	83.0
Job Interviewing Skills (14)	43.1	78.2
Cooking (12)	60.6	80.0
Nutrition (13)	43.2	82.9
Total (78)	48.1	81.9

*N-36, () = Number of Test Items

The information in Table 4 suggests that Cornerstone clients increased their fund of basic life skill information by completing this training.

Criminal Recidivism

Table 5 presents the rates of success staying out of prison and avoiding crime for 3 years for Cornerstone graduates and the three comparison groups.

TABLE 5. RATES OF SUCCESS STAYING OUT OF PRISON AND AVOIDING CRIME FOR THREE YEARS FOR CORNERSTONE GRADUATES AND THREE COMPARISON GROUPS

	Percent Not Returned to Prison during 3-yr. Followup*	Percent Not Convicted of any Crime during 3-yr. Followup**
Cornerstone Graduates 1976-1979 (N=144)	70.8	54.2
Comparison Group I: Cornerstone Drop-outs 1976-1979 (N=27)***	25.9	14.8
Comparison Group II: Alcohol or Drug History Parolees from 1974 (N=179)***	62.9	36.3
Comparison Group III: Reported by Guze and Cantwell, 1965 (N=217)	50-55	N/A

*Includes return to prison for new crimes or parole violation.

**Includes any convictions including minor violations with fines.

***"Drop-outs" defined as staying less than 30 days.

****Taken from a 1977 parole revocation study in Oregon.

Comparison Group I, program dropouts, are demographically identical to the program graduate group. However, their self-selection out of the program may be due to particular factors that also influence recidivism. Thus, both treatment and self-selection probably affect the profound outcome differences between Cornerstone graduates and Comparison Group I.

Comparison Group II subjects do not have the chronic substance abuse nor the chronic criminal histories of Cornerstone graduates. Since criminal and substance abuse history are the primary factors

in predicting criminal recidivism, Comparison Group II would be expected to do better at avoiding criminal recidivism than Cornerstone graduates—except, of course, for the treatment results. The results show that Cornerstone graduates were more successful in staying out of prison and avoiding convictions. A Chi-square test comparing Cornerstone graduate success against Comparison Group II success, across both experimented variables, is statistically significant beyond the .01 confidence level.

Comparison Group III presents a study by Guze and Cantwell (1965) that was done with a similar population under similar circumstances. Guze and Cantwell found that their population had a 50-55 percent (depending on particular substance abuse history) success rate staying out of prison over an average of a 3-year time span. This 50-55 percent range would seem to "fit" as a comparison for measuring the success of the Cornerstone Program, given the biases inherent in Comparison Groups I and II.

Alcohol and Drug Use

With the Cornerstone population, drug-free living is probably as important a goal as crime-free living. While use of alcohol or drugs after treatment is certainly an important outcome variable, it is extremely difficult, and perhaps impossible, to measure reliably (NIDA, 1981). Recent critiques of the Sobells' study (Sobell and Sobell, 1976), for example, have demonstrated that both identified clients and their significant others profoundly minimize the identified client's drug use (Penery, *et al.*, 1982). Therefore, reported use of alcohol or drugs post-treatment is not seen as a reliable measure of substance abuse, especially with the Cornerstone population. During treatment, clients in the Cornerstone Program are monitored for drug use by urinalysis and breathalyzer tests. Because of the certainty of being returned to prison if these tests reveal drug use, most program clients remain drug-free during treatment. Less than 1 percent of the urinalysis and breathalyzer tests given are positive, and despite extensive histories of drug use, only 7 percent of the program's population is detected using alcohol or drugs during the course of treatment.

In conclusion, despite the limitations of this study due to a lack of experimental design, available results indicate that the Cornerstone program successfully impacts the lives of chemically dependent, recidivist offenders. Program evaluation data show changes from the client's perspective, the staff or clinical perspective, and positive changes from

TABLE 2. RESULTS OF PRE-POST TESTING OF ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE (N=30)*

Rosenburg Item	\bar{x} Pre-Test Score	\bar{x} Post-Test Score	t	Statistical Significance
1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	2.9	1.7	7.87	> .001
2. At times, I think I am no good at all.	2.1	3.0	-5.34	> .001
3. I feel I have a number of good qualities.	1.8	1.3	4.18	> .001
4. I am able to do things as well as most people.	1.9	1.6	2.34	.026
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	2.6	3.2	-3.81	> .001
6. I certainly feel useless at times.	2.2	2.9	-3.88	> .001
7. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	2.0	1.5	5.76	> .001
8. I wish I could have more regard for myself.	1.9	2.5	-3.08	.004
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel I am a failure.	2.6	3.4	-5.17	> .001
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.	2.5	1.5	7.92	> .001
*Rosenburg Scale (Circle One)	1	2	3	4
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree

Scale. All scale items show improvements in self-esteem from pre to post testing. Statistically significant differences were found beyond the .01 confidence level on all but 1 of the 10 scale items.

These results suggest that Cornerstone clients felt better about themselves, felt more able to cope, and felt more able to function as a result of treatment. People with antisocial personality disorders, however, tend to overestimate changes in their lives, so these results should be considered in conjunction with the results that follow.

Symptomatology

Table 3 presents the results of the pre and post testing using the Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (BPRS). The Cornerstone population tended to score at the low end of the scales at both pre and post testing. Therefore, while positive changes occurred, standard statistical analysis could not be used because of the skewedness of the scores. Results in Table 2 are presented in mean number of scales showing change: increases or decreases in symptomatology.

Three general areas of functioning show improvement from the data presented in Table 3: reduced depression (scales 9, 16, 22, 5); reduced tension (scales 1, 6); and improved in social competence (scales 3, 10, 11, 23). The scales showing worsening of symptoms as a function of treatment correspond well to informal clinical observations by staff regarding the problem issues that need to be addressed at the end of this residential treatment program.

TABLE 3. BRIEF PSYCHIATRIC RATING SCALE (BPRS) SUMMARY OF OUTCOME

BPRS Scales = 23
Cornerstone N = 30

Mean Number of Scales Showing Symptom Reduction = 8.9
Symptoms Most Likely to Have Improved (Pre-Post)

Scale Number	Name
6	Tension
23	Social incompetence
22	Helplessness-hopelessness
3	Emotional withdrawal
16	Blunted affect
9	Depression
1	Somatic concerns
11	Suspiciousness
10	Hostility
5	Guilt

Mean Number of Scales Showing Increased Symptoms = 2.0
Symptoms Most Likely to Have Become Worse (Pre-Post)

Scale Number	Name
19	Elated mood
17	Excitement
2	Anxiety

Knowledge

Change in the information base among Cornerstone clients is presented in Table 4. Table 4 shows that the average Cornerstone client knew about 48 percent of the information in the education modules on admission and about 82 percent of that information at discharge from the residential phase of the program.

residents typically are at a loss to structure their leisure time constructively without alcohol or drugs. Residents are taught to make use of community leisure time resources that are alternatives to alcohol or drug use.

Discharge and Followup.

The first 6 months following release from incarceration seem to be the most critical time in determining success or failure in the individual's adjustment in free society. Therefore, a condition of the Cornerstone Program is that residents agree to 6 months of followup treatment after discharge from the residential program. The first step in the discharge process is the development of a discharge plan and completion of the fourth level contract. Virtually all residents have a job, a place to live, and a drug-free support network before discharge. A formal graduation ritual is held in the resident's last month to mark the rite of passage and the beginning of the individual's freedom. After leaving the residential part of the program, the now "client" maintains a schedule of appointments with Cornerstone staff, the parole officer, and any other outpatient treatment programs that the client may be involved in. As successful program graduates, many clients attend a weekly group at Cornerstone for their own support and to help current residents. These groups allow residents to see, hear, and talk to people with backgrounds like their own who have succeeded. Many clients maintain contact with the program long after the 6 month minimum. If a program graduate is having difficulties, he or she may voluntarily attend the program during the day, for a few days, for help through the crisis.

Evaluation Design

The primary purpose of this outcome evaluation was to obtain information from each of the three major outcome perspectives: the client, staff, and the societal value perspectives.

The client perspective is important in the mental health field as successful treatment always involves some internal change in feeling or thinking. The recipient of service can best speak to the subjective experience of treatment. The measurement instrument used to measure subjective change in this study was the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965). This self-report inventory measures self-regard and perceived quality of life from a variety of perspectives. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale was given 2 to 3 weeks after admission and again 2 to 3 weeks before discharge (an average of about 8 months later) to all clients who entered the program during late 1983 and early 1984.

The clinical, or staff, perspective was measured by the Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (BPRS) (Overall and Gorham, 1962). This widely used scale was developed for measuring the psychiatric symptoms of the mentally ill. However, it has many scale items applicable to describing the symptoms of antisocial personality disorders. For this study, the BPRS was completed by the client's counselor at the same times the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale was completed by the client.

The societal perspective includes those variables that are so universally held as goals as to be considered standards. Societal perspective goals include abstinence or at least reduced drug use, attainment of basic skills, maintenance of employment, and avoidance of criminal recidivism. The societal perspective in this study was measured by pre-post testing of Cornerstone education modules and by a 3-year criminal recidivism study.

A 78-item "test" was developed by Cornerstone staff to measure information learned in the Alcohol and Drug Education, Coping Skills Training, Job Interviewing Skills, Cooking, and Nutrition Education modules. This test was given 1 to 2 weeks after admission and again after all the modules had been completed, about 6 months later.

The recidivism study was done retrospectively using the Law Enforcement Data System (LEDS). This computerized system lists criminal activity for Oregon, for a few other states, and for the Federal criminal justice system. Two experimental variables were used in this part of the study—first, the number of persons not returned to prison during the 3 years after their parole. This includes convictions for new crimes and parole revocations. The second experimental variable was the number of persons not convicted of any crime (including minor offenses) for 3 years after their parole. All program graduates from 1976-1979 were included in the study. No experimental control groups were available. However, three comparison groups were selected. Comparison Group I consisted of program drop-outs, operationally defined as those who dropped out of the program in less than 30 days. Comparison Group II consisted of all Oregon parolees from 1974 with some history of alcohol or drug abuse (Travis, 1977). Comparison Group III consisted of the results of a followup study done in Michigan on a similar population over a similar timeframe (Guze and Cantwell, 1965).

Results and Discussion

Self-Esteem

Table 2 presents the results of the mean pretest and post-test scores for the Rosenberg Self-Esteem

rules, and consequences, especially about violence and drug use; formal participation by residents in the daily operation of the community; strong community support for growth and change; individual responsibility for behavior; a clear system for earning freedom a little at a time; and maintenance of a core of community "culture carriers" among residents and staff as program clients come and go.

Cornerstone has a therapeutic community where the resident is as likely to receive direct input and feedback from another resident as from a counselor. The 32 Cornerstone residents are divided into two therapeutic "families." Family members are accountable to each other for their actions and behavior. The two family units meet to solve interpersonal problems and plan activities, training experiences, and work assignments. Family meetings often include confrontation between members to hold one another personally accountable. Cornerstone residents are frequently very insightful as to one another's problems. Peer confrontation is extremely meaningful for Cornerstone residents. The confrontations force self-examination of both short-term destructive behaviors and long-term destructive lifestyles. Part of the Cornerstone Program philosophy is that confrontation for inappropriate behavior must be balanced by interpersonal support for desirable behaviors that signal the beginning of personal growth and change. Family meetings, while they are at times very uncomfortable for the resident, are almost always experienced as caring, supportive events.

The therapeutic community operates on strictly enforced rules and policies to teach residents to be responsible and accept responsibility for their behavior. Almost all rule infractions have consequences which are discussed and determined by the family group. Consequences focus on practicing desired behaviors for self-improvement, rather than punishment. Some actions, however, have the consequence of returning a resident to prison. These are: taking drugs while on the unit, bringing drugs onto the unit, and acts or threats of violence. To insure that the community remains drug-free, urine screening for drug use is done on every resident every 3 days, and a breathalyzer test is conducted randomly and on each resident after each unaccompanied pass into the community. Failing these tests results in an automatic return to prison. Acts of violence, or even threats of violence, are not tolerated and also result in a return to prison. It is essential to keep this kind of therapeutic community safe and drug-free. If a resident is returned to prison, he or she may request readmission to the program.

In addition to the family structure, the residents elect a "resident council" as a self-governing body.

The resident council makes formal requests for changes in unit policies and procedures to the unit's management team, and deals with many other issues of concern to residents. A new resident council is elected every 4 weeks. The resident council and the family structure help residents learn the appropriate negotiating skills to deal with peers and those in authority. The residents also elect a five-person activities committee each month. The activities committee is responsible for planning activities and securing approval for unit activities from the management team.

The Treatment Contract. After the orientation treatment plan has been accomplished, it is the resident's responsibility to develop all succeeding treatment plans for himself or herself. Cornerstone has found that this process is very helpful in aiding residents to take responsibility for themselves. Each contract identifies the problem, goals, specifically what the resident will do, and time lines. Each contract undergoes stiff review and challenge. It must be approved first by the resident's counselor, family group, and finally by the therapy supervisor. A resident normally develops four contracts during the course of treatment. Each of these four stages of treatment is associated with increasing freedom to spend time off the ward and in the community. The fourth contract involves the resident finding employment, a place to live, and generally making the transition to community living.

Counseling. All residents receive a great deal of constructive input from all the staff in the program. The daily process of the Cornerstone Program (e.g., family meetings, groups, classes, time in the community) provides many opportunities for counselors to observe the residents interacting with others and to provide timely counseling interventions. The counselor also functions as something of a coach to help the resident through the process of the contract system at Cornerstone.

Several types of short-term group therapy experiences are also offered to Cornerstone residents. All residents who have a spouse, or a spousal-type relationship, are provided couple or family counseling. All residents are required to attend Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, or some other peer support group in the community to help them maintain their sobriety and to begin to develop their drug-free support network.

Skill Training. Many Cornerstone residents have never had, or have lost (from extensive drug use or incarceration), basic life skills such as meal preparation, money management, or basic work skills. Cornerstone staff persons regularly offer classes in basic education areas and basic life skills such as work skills, nutrition, and budgeting. Cornerstone

dresses organized crime. Our modest contribution will hopefully encourage further research on this topic.

Organized Crime Folklore

Perhaps it is appropriate first to examine briefly the organized crime folklore that has captured the imaginations of American society.

Much of what is or has been presented on or about organized crime is represented in stories of the Mafia or the official version, La Cosa Nostra. A 1920's phenomenon, organized crime had its origins in the "bootlegging" era of Prohibition, when the Irish, Jewish, and Italians were in competition with one another to control the liquor rackets. Ultimately, this organization of crime extended into the gambling and narcotics rackets, and the Italians were able to organize these markets better and more efficiently than any ethnic group before.³ Relating organized crime to ethnicity has been and will likely remain a critical theme of law enforcement and also the media, for other than providing an identifiable group that can be "watched," there is a grain of truth to the fact that ethnic bonds serve to unite people in a common cause.⁴ The danger, of course, occurs when this sociological reality is oversimplified and extrapolated to a whole population. This has occurred with organized crime in America, for it has become synonymous with the Mafia and Italian ethnicity. In many respects the media are at fault in this process, inasmuch as it becomes necessary to simplify and condense what are often complex social facts into neat, understandable stereotypes that the reader or viewer can identify with.

The reality of the Mafia went unnoticed for some 30 years, and it was not until the "Appalachian Convention" in 1957 that the Mafia emerged as an identifiable organization. The discovery of this assemblage of Mafia leaders throughout the nation, followed by the nationally televised testimony of the late Joe Valachi, a Mafia member turned informer; the relentless pursuit by the late Robert F. Kennedy of Mafia members engaged in gambling, narcotics, and labor racketeering; and the establishment of Federal strike forces in 1967, led to the institutionalization of an ideology—one based exclusively

on Italian ethnicity.⁵ Exotic organizational charts were presented in newspapers and on television, identifying the 24 Italian-American "families" that controlled the urban "rackets" in America. The legend was born, and today we continue to live with this image of organized crime—the Mafia as the alien criminal prototype.

Creating the Image

Information of and about organized crime generally emanates from two sources: police and informants. Any journalist or researcher who wishes to write about organized crime is dependent upon these sources to learn what is occurring in the "underworld" or the "rackets." The media do not have, nor are they expected to possess, a virgin view of organized crime. The "code of omerta," as it has been called, restricts access to information that would provide an understanding of "what is happening." For example, what was reported in newspapers and on television was from the mouth of Joe Valachi, an underworld informant. It was the police who corroborated what Valachi said. Indeed, there was a symbiotic relationship between the police, Valachi, and the media with respect to reporting the "facts" about the Mafia. Of course, we must also recognize that what Valachi testified to was learned not only from his career in crime, but also from the law enforcement officials who were "debriefing" him. That is, no individual, regardless of the status he holds within the criminal hierarchy, is privy to all the activities within the organization. Thus, events that an informant is unable to explain may be expounded upon by those who were privy to the event (e.g., through an electronic surveillance or another informant). The interchange between the police and the informant permits both to renegotiate their perception of "reality" with the ultimate goal of developing a consensus (not necessarily the truth). In an environment where an agreement between the two entities is critical to corroborating a story, such a finding is not surprising.

Of course, it must also be recognized that what the media are receiving is an edited version of reality. It could be no other way; for not being part of the criminal organization, the media are forced to rely upon the "facts" as presented by informants, the police, or both. Thus, before the media acquire the story, the events have been filtered and inconsistencies resolved. The editing process is initiated long before the media begin their examination.

Naturally, the media managers must also edit the events, packaging a story that is digestible, usually quite simple, and most importantly consistent with

³ Humbert S. Nelli, *The Business of Crime*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976; Alan Block, *East-Side, West-Side*. Great Britain: Cardiff Press, 1980; Virgil W. Peterson, *The Mob*. Illinois: Green Hill Publishers, 1983; and J.W. Joselit, *Our Gang*. Indiana University Press, 1984.

⁴ Francis A. J. Ianni, *A Family Business: Kinship And Social Control In Organized Crime*. New York: Russell-Sage Foundation, 1972.

⁵ For a compelling, though not altogether valid argument supporting this premise, see Dwight Smith, *The Mafia Mystique*. New York: Basic Books, 1975.

their view of the world. Notwithstanding technical logistics (e.g., lighting, number of columns, etc.), the editing process once again filters reality, seeking to tell a story in a specified number of minutes or words. It is a laborious process that requires input and perspective from a number of persons. For example, a copy-editor will review for grammatical content, the in-house "expert" will ensure factual accuracy, the editor will assess the public reception to the story, and so on. When the story is finally presented to the public, it is usually a product that has withstood a rigorous and critical review.⁶ This is not to suggest, however, that the product is an accurate accounting of what had occurred or that in the process, distortions of the truth for any number of reasons did not occur. Rather, what the public receives is a story that (1) limits the publisher's or producer's liability, (2) is newsworthy in that it is something out of the ordinary, and (3) provides capsulized information about someone or some event. This is not, of course, limited to the coverage of organized crime, for similar processes occur in the "reporting" of other events. Nonetheless, coverage of organized crime is a unique undertaking. Few newspapers devote full-time coverage to this topic, and fewer television or movie producers have embarked on programming anything other than fictionalized accounts of organized crime designed to romanticize and tantalize rather than to enlighten and educate. Simply stated, the mass media have done little to encourage high quality research of organized crime. Competition is woefully lacking, and as a result, we are treated to very superficial, mediocre, and sensational portrayals of organized crime.

Researching the Print Media

Obtaining access to print media data is a relatively simple exercise in basic research methodology. For example, in this study, we collected articles from the *Daily News* (New York), the *New York Times*, the *Star Ledger* (Newark, New Jersey), and the *Wall Street Journal* on the topic of organized crime and the Mafia. While these data were not necessarily systematically selected, they were nonetheless representative of the vast range of articles about organized crime that appeared in these major newspapers in the New York metropolitan area. The headlines of approximately 200 pertinent

articles appearing in these newspapers from 1969-79 were analyzed.

In order to consider newspaper coverage of our subject elsewhere, we acquired the abstracts of every article on organized crime and the Mafia published in the more prominent newspapers throughout the nation during the period 1976-80. This was accomplished through the *New York Times* Index Service, which provided us with more than 2,000 abstracts. We then randomly selected 20 percent (or 453) of these articles, analyzing the data in accordance with predefined categories (e.g., newspaper, page number, terminology, etc.). This permitted us to acquire a representative sample of news stories being published throughout the country.

In order to analyze the headlines found in the major magazines in the United States, we researched the *Readers Guide to Periodical Literature*. Under the categories of organized crime and the Mafia, we were able to acquire 180 headlines.

Lastly, we examined an obscure, yet socially relevant category: obituaries of organized crime members. The obituary clearly indicates the prominence of persons who have died naturally or "unexpectedly." Our data selection was *not* random; rather, it was a collection of obituaries we were able to acquire throughout our research process. We concluded that obituaries represent an insight into the social standing and status that members of organized crime are afforded in our society.

Selecting Headlines

"Headlines" are second only to the photograph in capturing the initial interest of the reader. The choice of words to summarize the contents of an article is both arbitrary and emotion-laden. For example, the *New York Post* featured two headlines in bold, red print, one which suggested the "Mafia" was a murderous group of "thugs" (e.g., "FEDS ZAP MAFIA : Assassination Squad Bagged in Gangster Swoop") and the other which implied the "mob" was generous, compassionate, and obviously significantly more successful than the police (e.g., "MAFIA STALKS NUN'S RAPIST : Puts Out \$25,000 Contract to Kill the Monster and His Accomplice").⁷ Clearly, the messages implied indicate the extreme divergence of public opinion toward organized crime.

New York Area Newspapers

Our analysis of the four New York metropolitan newspapers, which serve a population of more than 20 million, indicated that between 1969 and 1979 (Table 1),

⁶ Hillier Kriegbaum, *Pressures on The Press*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1972; Alan Wells, *Mass Media And Society*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1974.

⁷ *New York Post*, October 15, 1981, p. 1; and November 25, 1981, p.1.

TABLE 1. NEW YORK AREA NEWSPAPER HEADLINES ON ORGANIZED CRIME (1969-1979)

Newspaper	No. of Articles Analyzed	% of Organized Crime Articles Appearing on Page 1-4	% of Headlines Mentioning Mafia	% of Articles with No Mention of Mafia/Italian Names	% of Headlines with No Mention of Mafia/Italian Names	% of Headlines Mentioning Violence	% of Headlines Mentioning Corruption
Daily News	27	59%	31%	18%	62%	44%	8%
New York Times	47	27%	29%	39%	59%	51%	12%
Wall Street Journal	12	33%	41%	16%	58%	41%	8%
Star Ledger	116	62%	12%	62%	84%	41%	18%

- The *Daily News* (New York) and *Newark Star Ledger* (New Jersey) were significantly more likely to place headlines about organized crime and the Mafia on the first four pages than were the *New York Times* or *Wall Street Journal*. The *Daily News* placed 59 percent of its organized crime articles on pages 1-4; the *Newark Star Ledger*, 62 percent. The *New York Times* placed 27 percent of such articles on the first four pages; the *Wall Street Journal*, 33 percent.
- Interestingly, the *New York Times* and *Daily News* (New York) did not differ significantly in the use of the term Mafia in their headlines. The *New York Times* used the word in 29 percent of its organized crime headlines, while the *Daily News* used it in 31 percent. The *Newark Star Ledger* was least likely to refer to the term Mafia in its headline, doing so in only 12 percent of the pertinent articles. However, that newspaper was most likely to equate organized crime with Italian ethnicity. It did so in the text of 84 percent of its organized crime articles, while the *New York Times* made such references in 59 percent of its articles; the *Daily News*, in 62 percent.
- Fifty-one percent of the *New York Times* articles referred to violence in their headlines as opposed to 44 percent of the *Daily News* headlines and 41 percent of both the *Wall Street Journal* and the *Newark Star Ledger* headlines.
- Eighteen percent of the headlines in the *Newark Star Ledger* referred to corruption whereas only 8 percent of the *Daily News* and *Wall Street Journal* headlines and 12 percent of the *New York Times* articles referred to corruption.

Articles in Newspapers across the Nation

Our analysis of a randomly selected number (453) of articles on organized crime appearing in several newspapers throughout the country between 1976 and 1980, revealed the following:

- The *New York Times* was the most likely to carry stories about organized crime and the Mafia. Fifty-one percent of the total number of articles reviewed were from the *Times*. In comparison, only 8.4 percent of the articles were from the *Chicago Tribune*, 8.2 percent from the *Los Angeles Times*, and 7.8 percent from the *Washington Post*.
- Slightly more than 24 percent of the articles on organized crime or the Mafia appeared on the first page of the nine newspapers analyzed. The *New York Times* was most likely to have an article about "Organized crime" appear on page one.
- The term Mafia only appeared in 11 percent of the organized crime stories analyzed. However, Italian names were reported in 42 percent of the stories analyzed, usually equating the name with the term "mob" or "organized crime."
- Organized crime violence was mentioned in 19.6 percent of all the stories analyzed, whereas corruption was mentioned in 24.4 percent.
- As expected, stories of organized crime and the "Mafia" are most likely to refer to the New York metropolitan area. Thirty-five percent of the organized crime articles mentioned the New York area; 10 percent, Chicago; 7.6 percent, California; and 7.4 percent, Florida.

National Magazines

In order to contrast the magazine industry's treatment of organized crime stories, we analyzed

the headlines appearing in eight widely circulated magazines from 1970-83.

Our findings revealed that the term Mafia was most likely to appear in the headlines of *Readers Digest*, *U.S. News and World Report*, and the *Saturday Evening Post*. Mafia appeared in 43 percent of the organized crime headlines in *Readers Digest*, in 42 percent of the *U.S. News and World Report* headlines, and in 40 percent of the *Saturday Evening Post* headlines. Less likely to use the term Mafia in their headlines were the *New York Times Magazine*, *Newsweek*, *Life*, and *Time*. Mafia was used in 10 percent of the organized crime headlines in the *New York Times Magazine*, in 17 percent of the *Newsweek* and *Life* headlines, and in 23 percent of the *Time* headlines. Interestingly, between 1960 and 1980, the number of articles about organized crime increased in every election year (1964, 1968, 1972, and 1980) except 1976, when the infamous Watergate affair preoccupied the media's attention.⁸

Obituaries

The media establish a social measurement agenda regarding what they print. To be singled out and commented upon by a prominent newspaper demonstrates the importance of a person or an event within the context of the larger society. Clearly, the media, like all other institutions, operate on a system of priorities. They, through the editorial process, determine what is newsworthy or worth reporting in their limited number of pages and, conversely, what is not.

The obituary page is a "victim" of this discrimination process. Understandably, every person who dies within the city of New York cannot be "featured" in a *New York Times* obituary. Thus, the *Times* must limit its announcements of deaths to those persons who are of some social import, either those who perform some immeasurable social good or, in the case of this study, were considered the more notorious "villians" of society.

Our inquiry into this aspect of measuring social esteem revealed that the *New York Times* had

reported on its obituary page the deaths of Carlo Gambino, the boss of the Gambino Crime Family, Vito Genovese, the boss of the Genovese Crime Family, Joseph Zerrelli, the boss of the Zerrelli Crime Family of Detroit, Michigan, and Nicholas Civella, the boss of the Civella Crime Family of Kansas City, Missouri. Organized crime figures of lesser prominence were also cited on the obituary page.

Our analysis of the contents of the obituaries revealed that the deceased's criminal history, appearances before crime commissions, and his stature within the crime family were reported. Conspicuously missing were the names of the deceased's siblings. And in every article, the term Mafia was used. However, not only were the unsavory deeds of the deceased reported; usually mentioned were their "good" character or deeds. For example, Carlo Gambino was described as a "quiet godfather. . . who kept muggers off the street." Vito Genovese led a "quiet life. . . he was a good father who raised his children to be well-behaved, honest, and religious. . ." And Joseph Zerrelli was "an intensely private man. . . a good father. . ." The implication, of course, was that if we look hard enough, we can find good in everyone, even the most notorious "criminals" in society. Interestingly, all the bosses mentioned above received a Christian burial, which created a moral dilemma over whether a person who has had a career in crime is entitled to this sacred right.

Public Policy Implications

The role of the media in shaping our attitudes toward organized crime (or any other public issue, for that matter) is profound and compelling. As we have attempted to demonstrate through our research, the media's role is far more extensive than that of a passive observer and communicator of reality. The media's choice of vocabulary, their ability to associate criminal traits with ethnicity, and their selection of what to print and what to ignore, strongly shapes how we think and respond to organized crime. For example, our research clearly demonstrated that regardless of the media's use of the term Mafia, they will consistently associate "organized crime," "the mob," "the rackets," or any other pejorative term with persons of Italian ethnicity. This form of ethnic stereotyping can have some long-lasting economic and political effects, as witnessed in the case of former Vice Presidential candidate Geraldine Ferraro, who was the victim of such an ethnic association when the *Wall Street Journal* reported her late father-in-law's relationship to a prominent crime "boss." The implication, of

⁸ It is of interest to note that weeks prior to the 1984 election, the *New York Times* featured a number of consecutive stories on organized crime (e.g., the Mafia); see October 4, 7, 8, and 19.

⁹ The *New York Post* reported on the Ferraro-Zaccaro "organized crime connection" on October 17, 1984 ("Zaccaro In Another Real Estate Probe"); October 18, 1984, in which the article speaks of the "pistol-whipping" of mobster "Legs" Diamond by the boss of Ms. Ferraro's father; on October 22, 1984 ("Zaccaro Urged Lang Sale To Crime Boss, New Charge of Links To Mob"); on October 23, 1984 ("Former Zaccaro partner Booted for Mob Bribery"); and on October 24, 1984 ("Gerry Linked To Charity With Mob Ties"); and on October 31, 1984 ("Gerry: My Husband's No Thief"). Also see the *Wall Street Journal*, September 13, 1984 and October 1, 1984, p. 33.

course, was that Italian-Americans, particularly those from the New York metropolitan area, are likely to have acquired their wealth or stature from their ancestor's association with crime. What in effect is being implied is that the New York metropolitan area is more prone to organized crime activities than any other sector of the country. This belief is no doubt amplified by the media; we found in our research that the media in the New York metropolitan area were more likely to report on organized crime than were media in other regions. This, quite logically, leads us to conclude that (1) those in the northeastern region of the country are more likely to be the victims of organized crime because of the relatively large concentration of Italian-American crime syndicates (seven crime families); (2) the intelligence and investigative apparatus of law enforcement agencies are attuned to and more likely to identify these criminal organizations; (3) the media are more likely to allocate their resources to uncovering this form of criminality since it is so pervasive; (4) New York, the media center of the world, is more likely to influence public policy through its reporting of organized crime activities; and/or (5) little is being done by law enforcement agencies or the media in other regions of the country to identify the organized crime problem. Clearly, the disturbing aspect of the media coverage is that both a region and an ethnic group have been stigmatized by the proficiency of the law enforcement agencies and the media in identifying and responding to this form of criminality.¹⁰ The negative image that such proficiency begets raises the question as to whether such efforts discourage economic investment in a particular region or discourage Italian-Americans from seeking national political office for fear of receiving adverse publicity. Conversely, it would be grossly unethical for the media to place political or economic interests above that of "educating" the public to the nefarious activities of organized crime or the alliances that criminals share with political candidates, or their spouses, and politicians. There is, however, a fiduciary responsibility on the part of the media to balance their "reporting." In short, the power of the media to distort and obscure reality through "negative reporting" must be tempered with a level of internal vigilance and circumspection which en-

sures that latent prejudices and biases are not inflamed. Of course, the obligation is difficult to maintain given the relationship of traditional organized crime to persons of Italian ethnicity. In a very real sense, the media are the victims of this sociological reality; on the other hand, the media amplify the reality of organized crime merely by giving the reporting of organized crime high priority. The fact that organized crime is given this priority attaches to it a degree of importance that implies its significance in our society.

Unfortunately, the media's representation of organized crime as the Mafia adhering to a "family structure" has dominated and continues to skew law enforcement's and the public's perception of organized crime in other regions of the country. Because the northeastern model of organized crime has been posited as the all-inclusive model, other regions of the country are quick to point out that they do not have an organized crime problem like that found in the northeast. In other words, what is being said is "we don't have the number of Italian-American crime syndicates you have, hence, we can't have organized crime." Indeed, it is this perception of "organized crime" that has allowed other regions of the country to avoid undertaking a serious commitment to identifying organized crime groups in these regions of the country. It was not until Joseph Bonanno moved to Tucson that Arizona had an organized crime problem. James Fratianno was the first informant to identify organized crime in California. And Colorado eliminated its organized crime problem when the Smaldone's were incarcerated. In effect, what has occurred is that the "northeastern model" has become so powerful in terms of defining the reality of organized crime that the media and law enforcement in other regions of the nation have ignored equally deleterious forms of organized crime. Interestingly, 21 sheriffs from Georgia and Tennessee have been indicted for corruption related to narcotics trafficking, a finding that is at the very least an indicator of the organization of crime.¹¹ This situation is not unlike that found during the prohibition era in the thirties. Is this not organized crime, absent Italian ethnicity and northeastern influence? It is clear that when one incorporates such variables as population density, media concentration, and law enforcement intelligence and investigative resources, the organized crime problem in the northeast does not significantly differ from that of other regions in the nation. What differs perhaps is the scale and sophistication, not the presence.

In its mandate to educate and inform, the media

¹⁰ Stories of organized crime, similar to stories about drug use, almost exclusively rely upon the police for their information. See Robert Bomboy's *Major Newspaper Coverage of Drug Issue*. Washington, D.C.: Drug Abuse Council, 1974. Also see *Media, Power, Politics*. New York: The Free Press, 1979, p. 110-125.

¹¹ *The New York Times*, "New Era, New Problems for South's Sheriffs," September 10, 1984, p. 1.

may also discourage public action in the so-called "war against organized crime." It may very well be that society's relative ambivalence toward organized crime is a direct result of the media's treatment of organized crime. Callous and cynical to the "wars" that are mounted, usually before an election, the public voices little outrage unless it experiences the immediate impact of organized criminal conduct. In fact, the opposite may occur; the reporting of violence and corruption, which accounted for almost half of all newspaper articles analyzed, has had a paralyzing affect. The people feel helpless against what they perceive as the awesome power of organized crime. When pictures of prominent organized crime members are featured on the cover of the most prestigious and widely circulated Sunday magazine, the *New York Times Magazine*, and on the obituary pages of the *New York Times*, there is an implication that these "gangsters" made it—they achieved success despite resorting to illegal methods. What may be perceived as public apathy may in fact be tacit admiration. This is one of the many contradictions which arise when enlisting the support of the media in the "war against organized crime."

¹² The *New York Times Magazine*, June 5, 1977; and February 5, 1978. Also see the cover of the *Philadelphia Inquirer Magazine*, February 27, 1983, for a full cover photo-sketch of Nicodemo Scarfo, the "boss" of the former "Bruno Crime Family"; *Tampa Magazine*, April 1982, for a full cover photo of "mob boss" Santo Trafficante; *Parade Magazine*, August 19, 1980, for a full cover photo of "mob boss" Carlos Marcello, "The Man They Call America's No. 1 Mobster"; and *New Jersey Monthly*, April 1980, for a cover headline, "The Mafia Road Map and House Tour," with a picture of the killing of Willie Moretti.

The Amplification of Organized Crime Ideology

In this article, we have addressed the implications of what the print media convey in their "reporting" of organized crime. What were not addressed, and are perhaps more important, are the visual media. For example, in our research, we came across two photographs on the front page of the *New York Times Magazine*. The first was that of Leroy "Nicky" Barnes, the single largest heroin trafficker in New York (according to the article); the second was that of the late "mob boss" Angelo Bruno.¹² Clearly the impact of photographs of these individuals on the cover of the most prestigious Sunday magazine, which is afforded world-wide exposure, is both profound and lasting. Regardless of the contents of the articles which followed, it is quite clear that these individuals had acquired considerable power, influence, and wealth. The impact of a visual medium compared to that of the print media is far more convincing and powerful, for words have a way of losing or changing their meaning over time, whereas pictures seem to retain their intrinsic value.

With the electronic age upon us, it is readily apparent that visual media dominate the communications industry. The cable industry and the video cassette revolution will surely increase the air time afforded visual media. This will undoubtedly result in a new market for films on crime—in particular, organized crime. If the media are to bring to their viewers the quality of programming that they

TABLE 2. CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS: ARTICLES ON ORGANIZED CRIME IN NATIONAL NEWSPAPERS (1976-1980)

Newspaper	1976		1977		1978		1979		1980		1976-1980	
	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total
New York Times	108	63%	48	54%	35	52%	30	42%	24	44%	245	51%
Wall Street Journal	5	3%	5	6%	1	1%	6	8%	1	2%	18	4%
Houston Chronicle	3	2%	3	3%	1	1%	3	4%	1	2%	11	2.4%
Chicago Tribune	3	2%	5	6%	4	6%	9	13%	8	15%	29	8.4%
Miami Herald	4	2%	15	17%	3	4%	2	3%	4	7%	28	6.6%
Washington Post	16	9%	7	8%	15	7%	4	6%	5	9%	47	7.8%
Los Angeles Times	9	5%	3	3%	2	3%	9	13%	9	17%	32	8.2%
Atlanta Constitution	-	-	1	1%	-	-	2	3%	-	-	3	-
San Francisco Chronicle	-	-	2	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
TOTALS	171	86%	89	100%	67	74%	72	92%	54	96%	453	88.4%

*Where the number of articles and percentages do not add up to column totals, the remaining articles reviewed appeared in various other newspapers.

TABLE 2A. PLACEMENT OF ARTICLES AND TERMS

	1976		1977		1978		1979		1980		1976-1980	
	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total
Article Appeared on Page 1	40	23%	22	25%	15	22%	12	17%	19	35%	108	24.4%
Mafia Mentioned in Story												
Headline	26	15%	15	17%	6	9%	6	8%	3	6%	67	11%
Italian Names Used but Mafia Not Mentioned	64	37%	29	33%	31	46%	32	44%	27	50%	183	42%
Violence Mentioned	31	18%	21	24%	17	25%	17	24%	4	7%	90	19.6%
Corruption Mentioned	35	20%	15	17%	9	13%	19	26%	25	46%	103	24.4%

TABLE 2B. STATES MENTIONED IN ARTICLES

	1976		1977		1978		1979		1980		1976-1980	
	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total	No. of Articles Analyzed*	% of Total
New York/New Jersey	59	35%	28	31%	26	39%	25	35%	19	35%	157	35%
Florida	3	2%	16	18%	4	6%	3	4%	4	7%	30	7.4%
California	-	-	8	9%	3	4%	7	10%	8	15%	26	7.6%
Arizona	-	-	8	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-
Chicago	5	3%	5	6%	5	7%	11	15%	10	19%	36	10%
Nevada	-	-	4	4%	4	6%	7	10%	-	-	15	4%
Georgia	-	-	-	-	3	4%	2	3%	-	-	5	1.4%
Cleveland	-	-	-	-	2	3%	-	-	1	2%	3	1%
New Orleans	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Washington State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	4%	2	.8%
Washington, D.C.	7	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	6%	10	2%

TABLE 3. MAGAZINE HEADLINES ON ORGANIZED CRIME (1970-1983)

Magazine	Number of Organized Crime Articles Analyzed	Headlines Mentioning Term Mafia		Headlines Not Mentioning Mafia	
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Time	55	13	23%	42	77%
Newsweek	39	7	17%	32	83%
Life	29	5	17%	24	83%
Saturday Evening Post	15	9	40%	6	60%
Readers Digest	16	7	43%	11	57%
New York Times Magazine	10	1	10%	9	90%
New York Magazine	9	3	33%	6	67%
U.S. News and World Report	7	3	42%	4	48%

TABLE 4. PRE-ELECTION AND ELECTION
YEAR MAGAZINE COVERAGE
(1960-1980)

Year	Number of Articles
1960	5
1961	0
1962	3
1963*	20*
1964*	11*
1965	5
1966	6
1967*	12*
1968*	13*
1969	33
1970	18
1971*	8*
1972*	24*
1973	5
1974	5
1975*	4*
1976*	4*
1977	11
1978	17
1979*	18*
1980*	17*

*Note: 1963-64: 31 articles; 1967-68: 25 articles;
1971-72: 32 articles; 1975-76: 8 articles
1978-80: 35 articles.

should, serious issues that challenge conventional organized crime ideology must be addressed. If "Scarface" and "Once Upon A Time" are any examples of the sequels we can expect to "Godfather I and II" or "Honor Thy Father," it appears that alien criminal conspiracy theory will again be used to promote antiethnic prejudices. It is one thing to say that Cubans, Italians, Blacks, or Jews are involved in organized crime. It is still another to project an image, skewed and distorted, of all members of these ethnic groups having a greater proclivity toward this form of criminality. The visual media have the ability and capacity to amplify upon these ethnic stereotypes by ignoring their ethnic qualities. To glorify organized crime and, at the same time, unfairly stigmatize entire ethnic minorities, encourages not only ill-defined public policies but, more importantly, undermines the ethnic pluralism and richness that has allowed capitalism to succeed.

News of the Future

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN CORRECTIONS

By JOHN P. CONRAD

Visiting Fellow, The Institute of Criminology, Cambridge University

THE WISHFUL THOUGHT

WITH A long memory like mine, it's not hard to see how our sentencing system drifted into its present absurdity. In the old days, a felon was packed off to prison where he did a lot of hard time for the explicit purpose of punishment. Misdemeanants got jail, probation, or both. In some states there were—and still are—certain classes of crime—for example, second degree burglary, forgery, and auto theft—which could be left to the judge to classify as either a felony or a misdemeanor. Almost any thoughtful observer could find something to criticize in this binary sentencing structure, but none of the criticisms excited our law-makers to make major changes. It was a simple system and had all the advantages of simplicity. It was easy to understand, easy to administer, and everyone involved in it, from the criminal to the judge, knew where he stood.

Prisons were tough and intended to administer punishment as the deserved consequence of committing a serious crime. A secondary intention was to discourage criminals from persisting in their antisocial careers. These intentions were less than successfully executed—much less—but the unimpressive results do not seem to have worried even those persons with most at stake.

Probation was for misdemeanants and nobody was interested enough in the outcome to find out how effective it was and for whom. After all, a misdemeanor probationer who came back to court too often could be swatted with a few months in jail as a condition of his next probation. Not much was expected of probation officers. Some worked very hard at their jobs, but it must be allowed that there were others who did not. It was quite possible to draw a paycheck for probation services while devoting most of one's time to political or other unrelated activities.

The drift to absurdity began in the seventies. Prison costs began their relentless course to dizzy heights that astound penny-pinching veterans like myself, while prison space became so crammed with refractory humanity that wardens and their supporting casts were—and some still are—preoccupied with population problems almost to the exclusion of any of their other responsibilities. Something had to give. What gave was the statutory definition of probation. It gradually became available to an increasingly wide selection of felons, with little or no provision for amplified supervision of the felons selected. The wishful thought was that prison populations could be reduced by placing felons of the less dangerous species on probation without hazards to the general public. After all, as that mythical warden was so often reputed to have said, most of the men and women in prison could be released immediately without risk to the safety of the streets.

As Joan Petersilia points out in her study of California probation¹ (on which I am going to comment in this space), we now have two classes of probation: felony probation and misdemeanor probation. Not much difference between the two as prac-

ticed on the streets, but a distinction that is open to statistical investigation. Petersilia and her associates at Rand have done what should have been done many years ago. They have carefully studied the outcomes of felony probation. Their results confirm most of my worst suspicions. There never was any good reason to suppose that nominal probation would produce positive results with serious felons, and it doesn't.

THE CONDITION OF PROBATION

As every reader of *Federal Probation* surely knows, money for probation services is hard to get. Some large probation departments have barely survived the recent economic crunch. It is easy for a budget analyst to consider the services that a probation officer with a caseload of a hundred or more performs and decide that those services can't be worth the taxpayers' money. To those who live by the cost-benefit mystique, it seems to follow that funds for increased probation services should be disallowed—no use throwing good money into ineffective programs, is there?

That kind of policymaking led to these results:

TABLE 1. PERSONNEL IN CALIFORNIA PROBATION AND CORRECTIONS AGENCIES 1975 AND 1983

Agency	1975	1983	% Change
Probation agencies	7,455	5,229	-29
Department of Corrections	8,360	10,136	+21

SOURCE: *Crime and Delinquency in California*, California Bureau of Criminal Statistics, 1983.

The increase in prison staffing isn't difficult to justify, but the decrease in probation staffing is the statistical expression of the absurdity to which criminal justice administration has fallen. During the 8 years that passed between the critical dates on this simple table, legislatures took steps to increase the total probation caseload with more felon probationers. County boards and executives responded by decreasing the number of probation officers hired to supervise them.

Absurd policies get absurd results. Petersilia and her associates studied a sample of 1,672 felony probationers in two of the largest counties (Alameda and Los Angeles), over an average period of 31 months. The object was to determine the percentages of recidivism by instant offenses grouped in three classes: drug sale/possession; burglary, receiving stolen property, and auto theft; robbery and aggravated assault. In all, there were 150 drug dealers, 1,133 burglars and the other species of thieves, and 389 robbers. Eighty-eight percent of these people got substantial amounts of time in the county jail as a condition of probation.² These sentences were plainly

¹ Joan Petersilia, Susan Turner, James Kahan, and Joyce Peterson, *Granting Felons Probation: Public Risks and Alternatives* (Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, 1985).

² No attempt was made to study the effects of the jail time on the members of the sample. The Alameda county jail during the period of this study was notorious for overcrowding and undermanning. The Los Angeles county jail has never been noted for order and penological decorum. The impulse toward retribution is understandable, but it makes no sense to impose retributive sentences that increase the criminality of those sentenced.

retributive—whatever rehabilitation can be accomplished through incarceration won't be done in a county jail. Six or eight months of incapacitation merely delays a return to crime and, where the offender has lost his job, may make a resumption of mugging or thievery a matter of urgency.

Over 80 percent of those in the sample were placed on probation for a 3-year stretch, enabling Petersilia to follow most of them for about 31 months and some for much as 40 months. That followup had numerous objectives: the research group followed the sensible maxim that when you plan to collect data, all the important questions that the data could possibly answer should be asked. For a full accounting, see Petersilia's report. Here I'm going to limit the discussion to nominal probation, its effectiveness, and its alternatives.

No new criminal charges were filed against 47 percent of the 1,672 probationers during the 30-40 month test period. For the 53 percent (886 offenders) who did get into more trouble, 2608 charges were filed. The breakdown for this impressive figure was:

Violent crimes, including robbery	24%
Property crimes.....	51%
Drug sale and possession.....	14%
Miscellaneous	11%
Total.....	100%

The elapsed time from probation grant or release from jail until the first filed charge was brief: 15 months for the drug offenders, 5 months for the property offenders, and 8 months for the violent offenders. The only bright spot to be seen in all this statistical gloom was the considerable number of property and violent offenders who didn't get into trouble.³ Petersilia notes that "after 27 months of probation, virtually none of the property or violent offenders who had not already had an arrest leading to filed charges subsequently had one." [p. 25] Drug offenders don't follow this rule—during "any five-month period after release on probation, the percentage of drug offenders who have first charges filed against them is the same."

What to do? Nominal probation doesn't work for most felony probationers. Why on earth should it? For the square john who gets himself into trouble—as, for example, the politician convicted of being on the take, or other "white collar" offenders—the probability of recidivism is low, even though probation seems too lenient a disposition for those who have betrayed a trust. Some "virgins" in crime retreat from their careers for various good reasons.

But the men and women under Petersilia's scrutiny were neither square nor virginal. A lot of them have had their careers nipped in the bud, as the 47 percent slice of non-recidivism suggests, but the majority have been caught too late to be nipped.

In spite of the declamations of the hard-liners, prison should not be and cannot be the answer for this mass of probation violators. I have said it before in this space, and I'll say it again, we have to persist in the intensification of probation. It's not an easy way out of the crime problem, but it's the only way that makes any sense.

THE STATE OF THE INTENSIVE ART

In an earlier contribution (see *Federal Probation*, December 1983), I reported on my own observation of Intensive Probation

³ Petersilia suggests that the non-recidivating violent and property offenders had simply "retired,"—another topic for much closer scrutiny. If these people were ending their criminal careers, we ought to know more about the influences that turned them to other choices.

⁴ Billie S. Erwin, *Evaluation of Intensive Probation Supervision in Georgia* (Atlanta: The Georgia Department of Offender Rehabilitation, August 1984).

⁵ For an account of the "SIR" program, see *Supervised Intensive Restitution*, author and date not indicated, published by the Alabama Department of Corrections. Data by which an orderly evaluation can be assembled are regularly collected, but I am not informed as to plans for a study as extensive as that conducted by Mrs. Erwin in Georgia.

Supervision (IPS) as administered in Georgia. Petersilia has surveyed its practice in New Jersey, New York and Washington as well. Because evaluation of these programs is still no more than tentative, she is more guarded in our recommendations than I will be. She concludes her review with the cautious warning,

If ISP's do control recidivism, they should become available to the courts as a sentencing alternative for convicted felons. However, their acceptance will depend in part on the ability of the courts to decide which alternatives are appropriate for which offenders. [p. 74]

We now have the first results of an evaluation of the Georgia IPS.⁴ It would be pleasant to report that with all the hard work of an enthusiastic staff, recidivism had been reduced to a vanishing point. That was neither expected nor achieved. Of the 575 offenders assigned to IPS between July 1982 and December 1983, there were 125 revocations (21.7 percent). When the evaluation was limited to those assigned in 1982 only, the revocation percentage was 24.3 percent. The "regular" probationers had a failure percentage of 11.9 percent, a figure that is open to several interpretations, the most plausible of which is the more serious offenses of which the IPS crowd had been convicted. Interestingly hardly any (0.8 percent) violent crime was charged against the IPS people, but then, very few of them had been convicted of such offenses initially.

I am particularly impressed with the finding that 90.2 percent (out of a total of 131) of the drug-related offenders had violation-free IPS careers. That figure suggests that at least for some types of narcotics offenders, the regular surveillance offered by IPS is the support that is needed. I'd like to see a thorough study of this matter. What really goes on between staff and probationer to account for this remarkable success? The Georgia report notes that

The 24-hour availability which characterizes intensive supervision is not unlike key elements in alcohol and narcotics treatment programs which emphasize that help is only a phone call away. [p. 46]

Maybe so, but we could use a lot more discussion of the content of those phone calls. Like any good program evaluation, this study of Georgia IPS suggests numerous topics for closer examination for the purpose of program improvement.

In Alabama, the initial steps toward intensive supervision programs were directed at getting convicts out of prison a few months early rather than keeping them out in the first place.⁵ Otherwise the Supervised Intensive Restitution ("SIR") program is generally similar to the earlier initiative in Georgia. Caseloads of 25, two staff persons assigned to each caseload, five contacts a week, and required employment with community service. Too soon to expect a thorough evaluation, but the signs point in about the same direction as the Georgia IPS.

Both programs screen out violent offenders, and Alabama also screens out drug offenders for the most part. I think this caution is not only natural but advisable at this early stage of innovation. In Alabama, the state attorney-general professed himself to be shocked at the notion that any Alabama convict was reaching the streets before his assigned date of release. He was able to give vent to his great displeasure over some particularly villainous men who had been afforded the privilege of intensive supervision, apparently dismissing as insignificant the much increased control that would be exercised over their activities. With critics like that in the offing, managers of programs like IPS and SIR are well advised to be prudent in their selection policies.

Without personal exposure to the New York, New Jersey, Washington, and Wisconsin intensive programs, and without any data on their progress, I can't comment on how these states are getting along with the intensification of probation and parole. This is the only winning game in town, the best news that we penologists can offer the crime-fearing and taxpaying public. If continuing success comes out of their evaluation, we can turn the wishful thinking that Joan Petersilia has so trenchantly

analyzed into a reasonably successful penology. In the meantime, I hope that our readers will obtain her report and summarize its contents for the edification of legislators and judges. To my way of thinking, Petersilia on *Granting Felons Probation*

is the most important criminological research to be reported since World War II. With replication in some dissimilar settings it may show the way at last to a rational sentencing system and eventually to the substantial reduction of urban fright.

Looking at the Law

BY LISA A. KAHN

Assistant General Counsel

Administrative Office of the United States Courts

URINALYSIS AND THE FOURTH AMENDMENT

PROBATION OFFICERS who wish to require clients under their supervision to submit to urinalysis tests should realize that the taking of urine samples constitutes a search for the purposes of the Fourth Amendment. While this does not mean that such requirements are impermissible, it does suggest that tests of this nature should not be conducted unless a special condition of probation has been imposed by the court or unless the probationer freely consents to the procedure.

The constitutionality of mandatory urinalysis examinations has been upheld by Federal courts in a number of contexts, notwithstanding the fact that the tests were viewed as falling within the ambit of the Fourth Amendment. In *Division 241 Amalgamated Transit Union (AFL-CIO) v. Suscy*, 538 F.2d 1264 (7th Cir. 1976), the Court of Appeals found that bus drivers had no reasonable expectation of privacy under the Fourth Amendment with regard to submitting to blood and urine tests following their involvement in serious accidents or when they were suspected of being under the influence of drugs or alcohol. More recently, Federal district courts have sanctioned the practice of urine testing of prisoners (see *Storms v. Coughlin*, 600 F.Supp. 1214 (S.D.N.Y. 1984)) and government employees engaged in extremely hazardous work who were suspected of drug use (see *Allen v. City of Marietta*, 601 F.Supp. 482 (N.D.Ga. 1985)).

While no Federal court has yet had occasion to examine the legality of a special condition of probation requiring a probationer to submit to urinalysis, the state courts which have ruled on this issue have uniformly upheld the condition. See, e.g., *Macias v. State*, 649 S.W.2d 150 (Tex. Ct. App. 1983); *State v. McCoy*, 263 S.E.2d 801 (N.C. Ct. App. 1980); *State v. Gardner*, 619 P.2d 847, 95 N.M. 171 (N.Mex. Ct. App. 1980). It would not be unreasonable to presume, therefore, that if the issue were ever presented to a Federal court, the same conclusion would be reached.

In analyzing the legality of requiring probationers to submit urine specimens, courts have recognized that, while probationers are protected by the Fourth Amendment against unreasonable searches and seizures (see *Morrisey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471 (1972); *Owens v. Kelley*, 681 F.2d 1362 (11th Cir. 1982)), they are subject to limitations from which ordinary citizens are free, *United States v. Consuelo-Gonzalez*, 521 F.2d 259, 265 (9th Cir. 1975). These limitations are permitted because probationers have been convicted of crimes, and have thereby given the state a compelling interest in limiting their liberty in order to effectuate their rehabilitation and to protect society. *Owens v. Kelley*, *supra*, at 1367. It follows that restrictions on otherwise inviolable constitutional rights can be justified to the extent actually necessitated by the legitimate demands of the probation process.

To determine the propriety of a urinalysis (or any kind of search), it is necessary to evaluate whether it constitutes an unreasonable search and seizure under the Fourth Amendment. This involves balancing the competing considerations of an individual's expectation of privacy against the government's need

to conduct the search. See *Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520 (1979); *State v. McCoy*, *supra*. It has been held that probationers have a diminished expectation of privacy (see *Owens v. Kelley*, *supra*, at 1367-68), but that the government has an interest in deterring the use of illegal drugs by probationers in order to aid in their rehabilitation, as well as an interest in enhancing the ability of the probation officer to detect unlawful narcotics activities in which his clients may engage. See *Macias v. State*, *supra*. Under the circumstances, then, it is not surprising that courts tend to strike the balance in favor of the government when evaluating whether a probationer may legitimately be required to submit to urinalysis tests.

As noted above, most of the cases in which the legality of urine testing of probationers has been upheld have involved special conditions of probation requiring urinalysis. See *Macias v. State*, *supra*; *State v. Gardner*, *supra*, and *State v. McCoy*, *supra*. Part of the analysis has tended to focus, therefore, on the legitimacy of the condition, rather than on the legitimacy of the search *per se*.¹ The Fifth Circuit has held that a probation condition is not necessarily invalid simply because it affects a probationer's ability to exercise constitutionally protected rights. *United States v. Tonry*, 605 F.2d 144 (5th Cir. 1979). The test to determine whether a probation condition is unduly intrusive on constitutionally protected freedoms depends on whether the condition is "reasonably related" to the purposes of the Probation Act. *Id.* Where a probationer is known to be a drug user or has been convicted of a drug-related offense, the requisite "reasonable relationship" between the search condition and the rehabilitation of the probationer is obvious. A condition of probation requiring the periodic submission of urine specimens where neither of these two factors is present would, however, be far less likely to withstand court scrutiny.

In sum, the imposition of a special condition of probation requiring a probationer who is a drug user or who has been convicted of a drug offense to submit to periodic urinalysis examinations at the request of his probation officer is an effective means of obtaining a urine sample without violating a probationer's Fourth Amendment rights. Whether a defendant may be required to provide a specimen of his urine in the absence of a special condition of probation is, however, somewhat problematic. While it may be that a demand of this nature made only when the probation officer has probable cause to suspect the probationer of narcotics use would be upheld on the basis of the probationer's general obligation to comply with the instructions of his probation officer, it is possible that such a practice would be viewed as an unconstitutional infringement of the probationer's Fourth Amendment rights. If the probation officer wishes to secure a urine specimen from a client whom he has reason to believe may be using drugs and no special urinalysis condition has been imposed, he may consider merely asking the probationer to consent to a urinalysis examination. Provided the probationer gives his consent freely and not because he perceives that his failure to comply with the request will have negative repercussions for him, he can claim no infringement of his Fourth Amendment rights. This method of obtaining urine samples, i.e., with the consent of the subject, can of course be followed at other stages of the criminal proceedings as well, such as during the presentence or pretrial services investigation. It is important, however, that regardless of when the request is made, it be conveyed by the probation or pretrial services officer as merely that—a request—and that an effort be made to avoid

¹ But see *Smith v. State*, 298 S.E.2d 482 (Ga. 1983), wherein the requirement that a probationer, upon request, produce body fluids for analysis was held to be reasonable as an aid in determining compliance with the condition of probation prohibiting use of controlled substances.

any explicit or implicit coercion, including misrepresentations or psychological pressure, in order to ensure the voluntariness, and hence the constitutionality, of the resulting search.

DUAL PUNISHMENT FOR RECEIPT AND POSSESSION OF FIREARM

The Supreme Court was recently presented with a case involving the imposition of consecutive sentences for receipt of a firearm in violation of 18 U.S.C. §922(h)(1) and for possession of the same firearm in violation of 18 U.S.C. App. §1202(a)(1). See *Ball v. United States*, 105 S. Ct. 1668 (1985). The petitioner in the case was a previously convicted felon who had been arrested when the police found him in possession of another person's revolver that was reported missing. The government and the defendant had conceded that both the possession count and the receipt count rested on the same conduct. The question for the Supreme Court to resolve was whether an individual who has been prosecuted simultaneously for violation of §§922(h)(1) and 1202(a)(1) could be properly convicted and punished for the two offenses.

In its analysis the Court referred to a test of statutory construction stated in *Blockburger v. United States*, 284 U.S. 299 (1932), to determine whether Congress intended the same conduct to be punishable under two criminal provisions. The appropriate inquiry under *Blockburger* was "whether each provision requires proof of a fact which the other does not." Since proof of illegal receipt of a firearm necessarily includes proof of the illegal possession of that weapon, the Court concluded that Congress could not have intended to subject a felon to two convictions for the same criminal act.

Accordingly, the Supreme Court held that, while the government did not err in seeking a multiple-count indictment for violations of both §§922(h)(1) and 1202(a)(1), the accused could not properly suffer two convictions or sentences on that indictment. Even though the defendant was in fact found guilty on each count, the district court should have entered judgment on only one of the offenses. In accordance with this ruling, the Supreme Court vacated the judgment in *Ball* and remanded the case to the district court with instructions to vacate one of the firearms convictions.

MIRANDA WARNINGS AT PRE-PLEA INTERVIEWS

In *United States v. Gonzalez-Mares*, 752 F.2d 1485 (9th Cir. 1985), the issue of the need to provide *Miranda* warnings at a pre-plea interview conducted by a probation officer was raised. The defendant in the case had originally been charged with illegal transportation of aliens and aiding and abetting illegal entry of aliens. Prior to entering her guilty plea, the defendant was interviewed by a probation officer who was preparing an oral presentence report which he intended to take to the magistrate immediately following the defendant's guilty plea. In response to one of the probation officer's questions, the defendant denied ever having used any other names in the past and denied having a criminal record. The probation officer thereupon advised the court that the defendant had no record and recommended that she be placed on probation.

The following day the probation officer performed a thorough record check and discovered that the defendant had provided false information regarding her prior record and prior use of different names. The defendant was thereupon indicted for attempting to influence and obstruct the due administration of justice under 18 U.S.C. §1503 and for making false statements to the probation officer in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1001. The defendant appealed her conviction on the ground that the statements made to the probation officer were inadmissible because she had not been given any *Miranda* warnings prior to the interview.

The Ninth Circuit rejected this contention. The Court of Appeals pointed out that *Miranda* warnings are only required in connection with "custodial interrogations." The test of whether an interview constitutes an investigation for *Miranda* purposes is whether "under all of the circumstances involved . . . the questions are 'reasonably likely to elicit an incriminating response from the suspect' [citations omitted]." Since the questions posed

by the probation officer regarding the defendant's prior record and use of other names were not directly related to the fact of the crime with which the defendant was charged, and since the defendant's responses were not used to help prove prior criminal activity, the pre-plea interview could not be said to be a custodial "interrogation." The interview was more akin to a routine presentence interview which the Ninth Circuit had previously held was not a critical stage in the criminal proceedings which necessitated *Miranda* warnings. See *Baumann v. United States*, 692 F.2d 365 (9th Cir. 1982). Even though the defendant in *Baumann* had been interviewed after his conviction rather than before, the holding in that case was nevertheless found to be controlling since (1) the questions the probation officer asked the defendant in *Gonzalez-Mares* were not likely to elicit incriminating responses, and (2) the defendant's responses were in fact used only for the purposes of sentencing. The defendant's conviction for obstruction of justice and making false statements to her probation officer was accordingly upheld by the Ninth Circuit.

PROBATION REVOCATION: CONSIDERATION OF PREVIOUSLY NOTED VIOLATIONS

May a district court, at a probation revocation hearing, consider probation violations which previously served as the basis for a modification of probation conditions? The Eighth Circuit was faced with this question in *United States v. Young*, 756 F.2d 64 (8th Cir. 1985). The defendant in *Young* had originally been placed on probation with the standard conditions, as well as a special condition that he participate in an alcoholism treatment program. He subsequently violated his conditions by failing to attend the program he had been placed in and by leaving the judicial district against the express orders of his probation officer. Rather than use the violations to initiate a revocation action, the probation officer obtained a modification of conditions requiring the probationer to participate in a residential alcoholism treatment program. After only a month, however, the probationer was expelled from the program for his poor attitude and lack of cooperation, and he was thereupon arrested on his probation violation. On the basis of the earlier unauthorized trip out of the district, his failure to participate in alcoholism after-care, and his more recent failure to complete the community treatment center program, the district court revoked the defendant's probation and sentenced him to 2 years' imprisonment.

The defendant asserted that the district court abused its discretion in basing the revocation decision on violations which had previously been considered in its order modifying the conditions of his probation. He contended that the district court, by considering these violations in connection with the modification order, had waived the right to base its revocation decision on the same violations. The Eighth Circuit disagreed. The pre-modification violations, coupled with the probationer's more recent failure to complete the CTC program, demonstrated his continuing failure to comply with conditions of probation. The initial decision of the district court to modify rather than revoke probation was conditioned on the probationer's agreement to avail himself of residential alcohol treatment. When he failed to carry out the terms of his agreement, the court was justified in considering anew his previous violations.

CONCURRENT SENTENCES: AUTHORITY OF ONE DISTRICT COURT TO BIND ANOTHER

Suppose a defendant is indicted for separate offenses in two different Federal district courts, and that one of the courts after convicting the defendant imposes a custody sentence of, e.g., 18 months, to run concurrently with any term of imprisonment the defendant might receive upon conviction in the other district. Does this mean that the second district is precluded from ordering a separate custody sentence to run *consecutively* to the previously imposed 18-month sentence? According to the Eleventh Circuit, it does not. See *United States v. Merrifield*, 755 F.2d 895 (11th Cir. 1985). District court #1, in imposing sentence in a case before it, cannot in effect bind district court #2, in which

a criminal case is still pending against the defendant, to make its sentence run concurrently with that imposed by district court #1. If district court #2 chooses to impose a term of imprisonment and orders that this term is to run consecutively to the previous sentence, the defendant's only means of challenging this order is

by filing a motion under 28 U.S.C. §2255 (or, if timely, a Rule 35 motion to reduce sentence) with district court #1, which originally sentenced him with the expectation that he would serve the two sentences concurrently.

Reviews of Professional Periodicals

THE JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY

Reviewed by EUGENE H. CZAJKOSKI

"The Impact of Mental Hospital Deinstitutionalization on United States Prison Populations, 1968-1978," by Henry J. Steadman, John Monahan, Barbara Duffee, Elliot Hartstone, and Pamela Clark Robbins (Summer 1984). At least since 1939, when a researcher named Penrose set forth the idea, there has been a widespread belief that a functional interdependence exists between prisons and mental health systems. The hypothesis is that large-scale discharge of persons from mental hospitals results in dramatically increased prison populations. It is the familiar hydraulic perspective which suggests that the volume of deviance is more or less constant, and if one system serving the deviant population is compressed it inevitably results in another deviant-serving system expanding in population.

Indeed, that's what seems to have happened in the years following the great deinstitutionalization movement in mental health. As mental hospitals have decreased in population, prison populations have exploded. The co-variance is unmistakable, but the nature of the interdependence has yet to be made clear. The study reported in this article provides considerable clarification.

Deinstitutionalization in mental health simply means promoted exit from mental health confinement facilities into community-based facilities where mental patients are free to circulate in the community. Hydraulic theorists expect that prison populations will swell as mental patients move from hospital confinement to prison confinement. In the decade between 1968 and 1978, the mental hospital population fell 64 percent to 147,000 while the prison population rose 65 percent to 277,000 (a startling correlation of -.87). But, as shown in this study, things are not as simple as they appear.

In a difficult and complex undertaking, the researchers analyzed the prison/mental hospital population changes using the years 1968 and 1978 as a time frame. Random samples of admittees, all male and all over 18 years of age, were drawn from six geographically representative states (California, Arizona, Texas, Iowa, New York, and Massachusetts). The final sample for analysis totaled 6,273 of which 3,897 were prisoners and 2,376 were mental patients. Various findings failed to support the proposition that prisons and mental hospitals are functionally interdependent, even though it is indisputable that the prison population increased in the same historic period that the mental hospital population decreased. Among the findings were:

1. Although the mental hospital population declined dramatically, the admission rate was stable. The deinstitutionalization trend did not attenuate hospital admissions; it merely reduced the length of stay.
2. Mental hospitals began serving a different clientele (e.g., younger patients) while the composition of the prison population remained steady.
3. For the most part, the number of prison admittees having prior mental health hospitalization did not increase out of proportion to the general increase in the number of prisoners. As a matter of fact, "During the period of maximum deinstitutionalization of mental hospitals, the percentage of former patients among the ranks of prison admittees decreased in as many study states as it increased."
4. There was a major increase in the proportion of mental hospital patients who "had regular and often serious involvement with the criminal justice system."

In sum, the researchers found little evidence of a shift of former mental hospital patients to prisons. Deinstitutionalization in the mental health system cannot account for the rise in the prison population. However, there was an increase in the arrest rate of mental patients by 1978, perhaps in part due to the younger average age of patients being served by mental hospitals. That this increase in the arrest rate of mental patients was not reflected in the prison population strongly suggests that local jails buffered the situation. Thus, it may be that it is the local jail and not the state prison that is functionally interdependent with the mental hospital. In any case, it appears that an indirect relationship exists between correctional and mental health institutions rather than a direct relationship. The relationship is complex and involves many mediating factors.

"Differential Sentencing Patterns Among Felony Sex Offenders and Non-Sex Offenders," by Anthony Walsh (Summer 1984). One interesting thing about this article is the author's somewhat apologetic attitude about possibly significantly challenging what he apparently thinks is the current and established doctrine in regard to sex offenders. After initially pointing out how little empirical research has been done on the question of whether sex offenders receive disproportionately more lenient sentences than non-sex offenders and after comparatively illustrating America's stringent (puritanical) posture toward sex offenders (only the Soviet Union and its satellites seem to parallel us), the author tries to defuse certain negative reactions, presumably from feminists. He makes statements such as: "Sexual assault is invariably committed by the powerful (adult men) against the relatively powerless and innocent (women and children)." More specifically, he says that "lest it be thought that we are waxing too sympathetically toward the sex offender let us state that there are many sex offenders who are justifiably incarcerated." At one point, the author rings in the tattered but still hallowed name of psychoanalysis to safely refer to the psycho-biological origins of the male's urge for illicit sex, contrary to feminist dogma which holds the view that the matter is mainly one of humiliation and violence. He states in a footnote

While this statement may be viewed as offensive by some, it is almost a psychoanalytic truism. The sex act is an expressive act of psychobiological origin that is regulated by social mores. While other crimes used in this study are also regulated by the mores, they certainly do not emanate from inner urges in the "normal" male.

So the author seems sensitive to ideological reactions to his study. He states at the beginning that "... certain feminist theorists maintain that sex offenders receive overly lenient treatment." The findings of his study show that the opposite is true.

Data for the study involved every felony sexual assault case in a metropolitan Ohio county during the years 1973 through 1981 inclusive. These cases were compared to a sample of felony non-sex offenders. Cases examined were exclusively male. Severity of sentence was measured by the Felony Sentencing Worksheet (FSW), a numerical device regularly used in the county studied. The FSW incorporated factors such as statutory gravity of the offense, the amount of victim financial losses and/or physical harm, whether a weapon was used, etc. In addition, factors such as IQ, race, type of attorney, trial vs. plea bargaining, etc. were taken into analysis. The author created a sentencing severity scale unique in measuring all types of sentences (probation, fine, state prison, jail, work release, etc.) and permitting additive scoring of mixed sentences.

There are at least two subsidiary findings to the basic finding that sex offenders receive more severe sentences than non-sex offenders, other things being equal. One is that

Sex offenders, however, are significantly more likely to be older, to have a higher mean annual income, to have higher oc-

cupational status, to have been married and employed at the time of conviction, and not to have used a weapon in the commission of their crimes. Sex offenders, therefore, possess more of the ties binding them to society that are said to produce judicial leniency.

The other subsidiary finding is "while 83 percent of the victims of sexual assault were not overtly harmed only 3 percent of the victims of non-sexual assault escaped harm". Sexual assault, in producing greater sentencing severity, is able to override factors usually employed to mitigate sentences.

Even if we are, as a nation, uptight or puritanical about sex, sex crime should not be underestimated as a societal disease. In our zeal to rid ourselves of an especially detestable crime, we have perhaps allowed the ascendancy of rhetoric over certain facts. The fact asserted by this study suggests that at least one feminist position may be self-defeating. Feminist interest in reducing rape through increased penalty might be better served by not promoting the idea that rape is essentially an act of violence having little to do with sexual appetite. According to this study, the sex aspect is an aggravating factor when applied to crimes that are otherwise only considered violent or assaultive. Substituting a violence-centered explanation for a sexual one may not only lead to greater leniency for rapists, it may also divert attention from whatever help might be offered in reference to psycho-biology and psychoanalysis.

THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF CRIMINOLOGY

Reviewed by HARRY W. SCHLOETTER

"Feminism and Delinquency," by Josefina Figueira-McDonough (October 1984). Josefina Figueira-McDonough of the Michigan State University and Institute for Social Research University, Michigan conducts a review of criminological literature on women since the mid-1970's which shows the interest between feminism and crime. She feels that two main factors are responsible for the concern over the possible linking of feminism to women's criminal activity.

The research sample data is from a survey of male and female high school students who completed self-administered questionnaires in the spring of 1980. A sample of 10th graders was randomly drawn from nine high schools in four communities in one midwestern county. The number of male and female respondents were nearly identical; however, the analysis used only data from females because the hypotheses concerned how feminist orientations affect aspirations for women. The respondents reported on a variety of delinquent behaviors in which they might have engaged over the past year. The tables provide the reader with various measurements of self-reported delinquency involvement as well as complicated assessments of results obtained.

Some of the findings of the author are:

1. Lower class position depresses aspirations leading to lower school performance and high social activity which strongly predict delinquency.
2. The contribution of feminist orientation to this predominant explanatory path is minimal.

She concludes with "our findings suggest that the influence of feminist orientation on illegitimate behavior is far more complex, less linear, and much more tenuous than suggested by some criminologists."

"Disturbances Associated with Football Matches," by Eugene Trivizas, Attorney at Law, Lecturer in Criminology and Penology and Honorary Research Fellow, University of

Reading (October 1984). A continuing law enforcement problem has to do with incidents either inside or outside football stadiums. Every season, according to the author, an average of 4,370,119 persons attend home football matches in 11 football clubs situated in the metropolitan police area. Of the above number, an average of 626 individuals are arrested. The goal of Dr. Trivizas' paper is to:

1. Present a typology of incidents taking place during football crowd disorders which result in arrests and court appearances.
2. To examine the way police discretion is exercised in selecting charges when prosecuting those arrested in such incidents.

The data for the study were obtained from police files and other official documents relating to football hooliganism. The type of interactional patterns evident are discussed, with numerous descriptive illustrations offered. The various combinations of incidents are shown with personal observations included.

Some of the types of offenses discussed include unlawful assembly, riot, rout, affray, assaulting, obstructing the highway, threatening, abusive or insulting words or behavior with intent to provoke a breach of the peace, and possession of offensive weapons. The elements of the incidents are included, and concise reasons for the selections of charges is given.

A practical classification of the incidents is provided. The article is very readable and deals with a serious on-going problem.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ORTHOPSYCHIATRY

Reviewed by CHARLES E. SMITH, M.D.

"Homelessness in America: Myths and Realities," by Carol T. Mowbray, Ph.D. (January 1985). In this interesting opinion piece, the author comments on the proliferation of reports on homelessness which have appeared in the press over the past year or so. She observes that these reports reflect inaccuracies, "well-meaning guesses," and, in some instances, biased perspectives. To make her point, she focuses on four common misconceptions about the homeless which she classes as myths. She sets down her conceptions of what these situations actually represent, drawing on her experience in reviewing the literature, making site visits to shelters, and collecting data as part of a Federally funded research project on homeless mentally ill persons.

At the outset, she dispels the myth that people visit shelters and soup kitchens for free meals and handouts as part of their choosing to be on the streets. She feels that this cannot be true because the shelters are unpleasant, unprivate, crime-ridden places where no one would want to be if he had other options. She classes the food which is given out in these places as "abhorrent" and sees nothing in this kind of existence which would attract anyone. On the contrary, she sees life centered on shelters and soup kitchens as an inhumane existence which diminishes self-respect, aggravates existing mental health problems, and provides little impetus or help to escape.

The author goes on to denote as mythical the notion that large numbers of homeless people are products of deinstitutionalization, which has dumped mental patients out of the state hospitals into the community without aftercare planning or support. She points to the wide variation in the range of estimates of the numbers of homeless persons with backgrounds of psychiatric hospitalization, which suggests to her that the data are invalid. She is most concerned that when homelessness is

viewed as a by-product of deinstitutionalization, other more direct causes of homelessness such as poverty, unemployment, scarcity of affordable housing, decrements in income-assistance programs, and displacement from affordable housing by urban renewal projects may be in her words "camouflaged." Thus, the author observes that "blaming deinstitutionalization contributes nothing to solving the problems."

The final myths which the author seeks to dispel are that homelessness is a new problem and that the solution to the problem is money for more shelter beds. The author points out that the poor have always been with us, though at this time they may simply be more visible since they are on the streets and not in jails, mental hospitals, shabby hotels or rooming houses, or other substandard housing. She objects to the notion that the problem may be solved by providing more shelter beds. She sees this as basically a short-term solution which once again tends to deny the reality of the problem. The author closes with a plea that we stop pretending that homelessness is not a real problem and that we not use the plight of the homeless to perpetuate biases and as a basis upon which to propose false and simplistic solutions.

"Malignant Post-Vietnam Stress Syndrome," by Robert Rosenheck, M.D. (April 1985). This clinical note provides a timely conceptualization of a disabling mental syndrome which is being seen with increasing frequency in a variety of mental health care settings. The post-traumatic stress disorder, which has also been called war neurosis, post-traumatic neurosis, combat fatigue, and combat neurosis, is thought to result from exposure to

severe or life-threatening stress. Persons suffering with this disorder have a tendency to re-experience the original traumatic event, with numbing of responsiveness, cognitive dysfunctions, and autonomic reactions to reminders of the original traumatic event.

The post-Vietnam stress syndrome is a product of the unique nature of the combat experiences which were encountered in the Vietnam war. It is thought that the disordered reactions to these combat experiences are often aggravated by the controversy and unsupportive attitudes toward the Vietnam war, which continue to be so prevalent among the general population. The author emphasizes the disabling nature of the post-Vietnam stress syndrome and the destabilizing effects which it has upon veterans who suffer with the disorder.

The author describes a malignant form of the post-Vietnam stress syndrome which is characterized by dramatic violent behavior, social isolation, intense self-loathing, and a tendency to re-experience war trauma in extreme ways which significantly compromise reality testing. He describes episodes of domestic violence which were triggered by the disorder, and, in this respect, he sees the disorder as life-threatening.

The author believes that the malignant post-Vietnam stress syndrome is prone to occur in persons who have a basic defect in their capacity to experience and master their emotions. He hypothesizes that persons who are unable to contain or master their feelings may demonstrate destructive, explosive behavior in the presence of intense, unpleasant emotions, which inevitably occur in prolonged combat and in the course of intimate and dependent interpersonal relationships.

Your Bookshelf on Review

EDITED BY J. E. BAKER

FEDERAL AND STATE CORRECTIONS ADMINISTRATOR, RETIRED

Celebrating Twenty Years of Excellence

The Pursuit of Criminal Justice: Essays from the Chicago Center. Edited by Gordon Hawkins and Franklin Zimring. University of Chicago Press, 1984. Pp. 358. \$30.00.

Once in a while a collection of essays and articles on the subject of criminal justice is published that is eminently readable from beginning to end. This book, a collection of commentaries, essays, and articles selected to highlight almost two decades of the output of the Center for Studies in Criminal Justice of the University of Chicago Law School, is just such a work.

The Chicago Center is linked geographically to the Chicago School of Criminology, but the nexus is also established by an essentially empirical approach to problems and issues which avoids the espousal of grand theory or the grinding of special axes. The final link to the Chicago School *qua* methodology and philosophy is provided by the late Hans W. Mattick, trained in the 1940's and 1950's by Chicago School sociologists. The book is dedicated to Mattick, former codirector of the Center and author of three of the articles in the volume.

As Don Cressey has noted, "most criminologists are fuzzy thinkers." Not so with these writers. Norval Morris, former director of the Center, contributed two selections: the first on the death penalty, the second on mental illness and the criminal law. Morris coauthors two more selections (with Michael H. Tonry). It would, I think, be difficult for any scholar, or for most serious practitioners in the field of criminal justice, not to have read some of writings of Morris, one of our more articulate colleagues.

An incisive mind and an excellent prose style are combined in the works of Frank Zimring, who writes the preface to the book and contributes two pieces on the incidence of juvenile crime and our criminal sentencing practice and philosophy. Zimring also coauthors (with Gordon Hawkins) an article on deterrence and the criminal law.

Hans Mattick's concise writing appears almost blunt in contrast to the richer styles of Morris and Zimring. But the reader will put down the book after reading Mattick well aware that this very practical and down to earth criminologist was an intellectual match for the other contributors to the book.

Other authors who provide rich, if eclectic, contributions include James B. Jacobs, Hans Zeisel, Johannes Andenaes, Mark Haller, Gordon Hawkins, Michael Tonry, and Dallin Oaks.

A final comment. It is interesting to note that many of the articles in the book, written in the 1970's, anticipated major issues and policy questions in the 1980's. And that is one of the benchmarks of competence in scholarly research. In summary, this book is a refreshing work in styles and content and one that deserves to be widely read.

Chicago, Illinois

EDWARD TROMANHAUSER

The Mafia and Toxic Waste Disposal

Poisoning For Profit—The Mafia and Toxic Waste in America. By Allan Block and Frank Scarpetti. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1984. Pp. 361. \$18.95.

A fashionable form of analysis among a small minority of criminologists, Marxist or radical criminology, sometimes refer-

red to as the "New Criminology," is an attempt to attribute the vast majority of crime to the political economy of society, namely capitalism. Marxist criminologists argue that it is equally if not more important to study those who make and enforce the law as it is to study those who are stigmatized as "criminals." Block and Scarpetti make a feeble attempt to do just that in their recent text, *Poisoning For Profit*. Not only do they fail to uncover the evidence to support their thesis—that organized crime is responsible for the illicit disposal of toxic waste in America—they violate the fundamentals of research methodology and opt for a very superficial and popularized treatment of an unusually complex subject.

The authors, apparently more comfortable with hyperbole and rhetoric than factual documentation, make a shallow attempt to link the illegal disposal of toxic waste to traditional organized crime—the Mafia. Focusing their research predominantly in the northeast—New York and New Jersey—and overwhelmingly relying on newspaper accounts—the authors assert that

available evidence indicates . . . illegal disposal of hazardous waste products has in recent years increased dramatically . . . Part of this is due to the entry of organized crime figures . . . Garbage haulers and their organized crime affiliates expanded their operations from solid waste disposal to the field of toxic waste disposal . . .

Subsequently, the authors contend, "Organized crime did not create America's hazardous waste problem, but mobsters in the business of dumping toxics for huge profits have contributed to it." Cleverly, they equate the criminal conspiracy among solid waste carters in New Jersey with the illegal disposal of toxic wastes, using the term "hazardous waste." It is clear from a reading of this text that the authors have developed little understanding of how the solid waste industry in northern New Jersey was controlled by organized crime, and equally important, they have failed to recognize the fundamental differences between the structure—both market and regulatory—of the solid and toxic waste industries. Rather, they imply that because mobsters were involved in the control of the solid waste industry in northern New Jersey, it is only a logical extension of this factual finding to conclude they had control of the toxic waste disposal industry. Nothing could be further from the truth, and had the authors taken the time to examine what was perhaps the most exhaustive investigation into this thesis conducted by the U.S. Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, they would have found that "organized crime involvement in the toxic waste industry [is] largely inferential . . ." This is a clear case of beginning research with a predisposed conclusion and attempting to fit the facts to the conclusion. Notwithstanding the lack of providing sources for their data, the authors present us with merely a hypothesis which they contend is a valid conclusion based on the evidence. Had these authors meticulously examined the facts—as shown in the criminal and civil cases that were brought throughout the country involving the illegal disposal of toxic wastes—they would have found that very few had anything to do with traditional organized crime. Why Scarpetti, a well-respected criminologist, would allow his name to be added to such a sloppy and inaccurate description of organized crime's control of the toxic waste industry in America, is certainly troubling. In short, this text has ignored virtually every principle of ethics, fairness, and methodological principle. The conclusions reached provide compelling evidence to those who question the scientific rigor of Marxist criminologists.

For example, the authors contend that "more is known [about the solid waste (note: not toxic) disposal industry in] the New

York-New Jersey area because of the magnitude of the problem there and because law enforcement has been particularly active in investigating organized crime and its activities." "New Jersey," the authors argue, "took the most innovative approach." Subsequently, the authors argue that New Jersey "downplayed organized crime influence and involvement [in the illegal disposal of toxic waste]." Had the authors done their homework, they would have also "downplayed" the role of the Mafia in illegal toxic waste disposal, for the facts *do not* warrant the assertion that traditional organized crime elements maintained control of the toxic waste industry in New Jersey, as had been *proven* in the solid waste industry. What we have are two authors who were more intent on fitting data to an ideologically based theory than providing us with a serious treatment of an emerging environmental problem, the likes of which will as they point out, "make victims of us all."

Ironically, the authors conclude that increased penalties for illegal toxic waste disposal are a part of the solution. Marxist criminologists believe that the capitalist state is inherently corrupt. Yet Scarpetti and Block's suggestion—to invest even more power in the state—would only enhance the corrupt extortionate activities of the state. It is a convoluted answer to what the authors have asserted throughout the text: "the complex power of organized crime thwarted New Jersey's handful of dedicated police..." I would suggest that these authors go back to the drawing board, perhaps independent of one another, and bring to this most serious environmental and criminological problem the basic research and methods skills that they were apparently taught but chose not to use. The real danger of such "reporting" is, of course, that the laws which may be enacted as a result of the public hysteria that such a text may engender will have a greater effect on organizing the illegal toxic waste market than will the influence of organized crime.

East Orange, New Jersey

FREDERICK T. MARTENS

More Pioneers

Criminology in the Making. By John H. Laub. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1983. Pp. 274. \$24.95 (hardbound); \$10.95 (paperback).

One of the research tools that probation officers and other criminal justice professionals should find appropriate to their work experience is oral history. The book reviewed here is an excellent example of using that method for scientific investigation. In 1977, John H. Laub, then a student of criminology at New York State University at Albany, experimented with using oral research techniques by interviewing criminologist Hans W. Mattick. Laub's efforts with Mattick encouraged him to try to interview and retain the personal histories of other prominent American criminologists using Mannheim's *Pioneers in Criminology* as a model. His method gave the criminologists who agreed to this research an opportunity to elaborate on their own life experiences for the reader. From these conversations Laub has produced a dynamic work that fills the gap between criminal justice science and the human person. Describing his own efforts, Laub states that "Personal history and social theory act together as a dialectic."

By Using an oral history approach, Laub allows the reader an opportunity to acquire the special flavor of the interviewee's feelings about criminological history including personal details which make the person interviewed live and breathe.

Theories have their own merit, weight, scientific basis, usefulness, and outcome, but hearing from the person who actually created the theory speaking in the context of his own social environment gives any work an added dimension. Thus, Laub brings to life Hans Mattick, Leslie Wilkins, Solomon Kobrin, Daniel Glazer, Edwin M. Lamert, Donald R. Cressey, Thorsten Sellin, Albert K. Cohen, and Lloyd E. Ohlin and gives

each of them an opportunity to talk about themselves as human beings. They are discovered by the reader as people born in a living setting of history, experiencing the difficulties of childhood, working at part-time jobs, finding universities, getting signed up for courses, pushing their way through the establishment, finding opportunities for teaching, interacting with students, and developing their own theories for the vast problems of crime. The author asks the criminologists who their mentors and friends were and who suggested they undertake a particular research program or project. The youthful student of criminology is given a chance to lean over the shoulder of the greats in criminology and get a feeling for their experiences.

Laub suggests that his work is only a beginning in using oral history to document and identify the theorists in criminology, that others should follow in this process and use his book as a tool for learning. He has given such an excellent model that students should find the task relatively easy. Most of us are not world changers but we are just "pushers" moving our culture in slight degrees by our efforts. Many of us feel like Mattick: "I am not a person of note to the field of criminology." From Cressey we learn that Sutherland was a "gentle" teacher. As we read the pages of *Criminology in the Making*, we discover that many of the American criminologists happened upon their life occupation by accident. Thus, a student can begin to find the "road" of the inventor and the innovator. Not all is planned in advance—sometimes things happen by chance.

A general goal of the criminologist is explained by Cressey: "I am trying to reduce the amount of pain and suffering in the world." Naturally, others would not agree with that position, but surely it is encouraging to hear idealism advocated.

This work appears to be a very worthwhile effort, one that might be used as suggested reading in a criminology class. Criminal justice professionals will find reading it a very pleasant and exciting experience.

Trenton State College, New Jersey

EUGENE KELLY

A Standard Text Improved

Introduction to Corrections, (3rd ed.). By Vernon Fox. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Publishers, 1985. Pp. 493. \$24.95.

Dr. Vernon Fox has projected his well-known first and second editions of *Introduction to Corrections* well beyond his original work of 389 pages issued in 1971. This was a necessity considering the myriad of new developments in the corrections field from new court decisions to the latest expansions in dealing with those who become involved with the criminal justice process.

The text deals less with early developments in the criminal justice process and concentrates far more on areas pertinent today. The author explains the inner workings of today's penal institutions, has expanded the discussion of community corrections and diversion programs, and has included an excellent section on juvenile offenders and current methods used in their programs and services. Dr. Fox has taken "first things first" in his text which makes for a more logical presentation of the subject of corrections. He also takes us into the future of corrections, a feat that few would attempt. Throughout his many years of involvement in the field, his predictions have been uncannily accurate.

The text is a "must" for anyone working in corrections or within the criminal justice system. Although highly suited to college courses in corrections, it should be required reading for law enforcement students. This text would help to "bridge the gap" in new police officers' knowledge of corrections and make them more efficient on the job.

The book is liberally supplied with footnotes and references—fine sources for additional reading. Added to this is an excellent bibliography. An excellent summary of each chapter is provided which is helpful for reviewing purposes. Another ad-

vantage of the book is its exercises and study questions for each chapter.

If I were to be limited to one book for my correctional reference or to purchase one book to assist me in the field, it would be this third edition of *Introduction to Corrections*. In my opinion, this third edition will continue the Fox tradition of providing the leading text on corrections today.

Burgin, Ky.

WILLIAM E. BAIN

Reports Received

Annual Report, 1984. Community Corrections Department, Ramsey County, 740 American Center Building, 150 East Kellogg Boulevard, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101. Pp. 50. Statistical and other data related to the operations and activities of the department for 1984 are presented.

Combating Drug Abuse and Related Crime. United Nations Social Defence Research Institute, Rome Italy. Publication No. 21, July 1984. Pp. 151. Funded by the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control, this is a report of comparative research on the effectiveness of socio-legal preventive and control measures in different countries on the interaction between criminal behavior and drug abuse.

Everyday Violence in Contemporary Sweden. The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention, Brottssforebyggande radet, Atlasmuren 1, S-113 21, Stockholm, Sweden, January 1985. Pp. 309. The phenomenon of violent crimes from a situational and an ecological perspective is examined.

Justice Report. Canadian Criminal Justice Association, 55 Parkdale Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, K1Y 1E5. Vol. 2, No. 2, March 1985. This periodical is published in English and in

French (combined issue). The lead article, "Young Offenders: Whose Opportunities? Whose Obligations?" discusses the Young Offender Act which replaced the Juvenile Delinquents Act on April 2, 1984.

Books Received

Stimulating the Exceptional Child: Strategies for Teaching Communication and Behavior Change to the Mentally Disabled. By Chris Kiernan, Rita Jordan, and Chris Saunders. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1984. Pp. 311, \$8.95.

Back in Control: How To Get Your Children to Behave. By Gregory Bodenhamer. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1984. Pp. 114. \$7.95.

The New Short-Term Therapies for Children: A Guide for the Helping Professions and Parents. By Lawrence E. Shapiro. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1984. Pp. 180. \$7.95.

Dealing with Delinquency: An Investigation of Juvenile Justice. By Jay S. Albanese. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc., 1985. Pp. 130. \$8.75.

Crime Free: Stop Your Chances of Being Robbed, Raped, Mugged or Burglarized by 90 Percent. By Michael Castleman. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984. Pp. 239. \$16.95.

Criminal Justice Politics and Women: The Aftermath of Legally Mandated Change. Edited by Claudine SchWeber and Clarice Feinman. New York: The Haworth Press, Inc., 1985. Pp. 133. \$19.95.

The Trials of Israel Lipski: A True Story of a Victorian Murder in the East End of London. By Martin L. Friedland. New York: Beaufort Books, Inc., 1985. Pp. 219. \$14.95.

It Has Come To Our Attention

Recent Studies by Josefina Figueira-McDonough, a professor of social work at Michigan State University, have revealed no direct link between feminism and delinquency. Her conclusion—that feminists usually will not jeopardize their career goals by tangling with the law—is contrary to that of some criminologists who believe that feminism breeds crime because it affords women greater opportunities—both legal and illegal. According to Figueira-McDonough, the significant increase in Michigan's female prison population from 1968-78 was not because of feminism but because of increased convictions for "crimes of survival"—crimes which resulted from easier access to stealing or which were motivated by increased economic pressures on women. Figueira-McDonough also found that convictions increased because women lack experience in dealing with the courts. She based her conclusions on studies of women in Michigan prisons, the court system, and the effects of feminist orientation on male and female 10th grade students.

The Department of Criminology, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, has several graduate assistantships available now and may have others available for the Fall 1985 semester. Also, the department has received a grant to develop a new journal, *Criminal Justice Policy Review*. For further information, contact the Department of Criminology, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 210 Walsh Hall, Indiana, Pennsylvania 15705; telephone: (412)357-2720.

The American Probation and Parole Association will be holding its 10th annual institute from September 22-25, 1985 in Houston, Texas. The conference, which will focus on "Probation, Parole and Community-Based Corrections: Opportunity, Innovation and Progress," will include workshops and intensive training sessions on topics ranging from the criminal personality to legislative trends. For more information, write to: APPA

Registration, P.O. Box 53630, Houston, Texas 77002, or call (713)521-4132.

T.I.E. (Training, Industries, Education), in cooperation with the Illinois Correctional Association and the Correctional Education Association, will be holding a national conference in Chicago from September 29-October 1, 1985. For further information, write to Illinois Host Committee, 1301 Concordia Court, P.O. Box 4902, Springfield, Illinois 62708-4902, or call Peggy Ashline at (217)522-2666.

The Training Resource Center of Eastern Kentucky University is sponsoring a national correctional trainers conference, October 17-18, 1985, in Lexington, Kentucky. Innovations in correctional training, model curriculum, and training standards will be among the topics discussed. Those who wish to make presentations at the conference should submit a one-page abstract, before August 1, 1985, to: Training Resource Center, 105 Stratton/EKU, Richmond, Kentucky 40475-0957. Further information may be obtained by writing to the above address or by calling (606)622-1155.

The National Commission on Correctional Health Care, the American Correctional Health Services Association, and the American Medical Association are co-sponsoring the ninth national conference on correctional health care. The conference, which will be held November 7-9, 1985 in Chicago, is geared to professionals in correctional and medical fields. Speakers will address correctional, medical, legal, and administrative issues, and workshops on current correctional health care topics will be featured. A call for papers has been issued. For further information, contact the National Commission on Correctional Health Care, McClurg Court Center, 333 East Ontario, Chicago, Illinois 60611; telephone: (312)440-1574.

Contributors to this Issue

JOAN PETERSILIA: Criminal Justice Program Researcher, Rand Corporation, since 1975. B.A. (1972), Loyola University; M.A. (1974), Ohio State University. President, California Association of Criminal Justice Research; Vice President Elect, American Society of Criminology. Author of "Criminal Careers of Habitual Felons" (Rand Corporation, 1977); "Criminal Career Research: A Review of Recent Evidence," in Norval Morris and Michael Tonry (eds.), *Crime and Justice: Annual Review of Research* (1980); "Racial Disparities in the Criminal Justice System" (Rand Corporation, 1983); "Granting Felons Probation: Public Risks and Alternatives" (Rand Corporation, 1985).

BARBARA BOLAND: Senior Research Associate, Institute for Law and Social Research (INSLAW, Inc.), since 1978. B.A. (1967), University of Illinois; M.A. (1968), University of Michigan. Research Associate, Urban Institute, 1971-78. Coauthor of "The Effect of the Police on Crime," *Law and Society Review* (1978); "Age, Crime, and Punishment," *Public Interest* (1978). Author of "Fighting Crime: The Problem of Adolescents," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* (1980); *Prosecution of Felony Arrests* series (1979, 1980 editions and 1981 edition in draft).

BRIAN FORST: Director of Research, Institute for Law and Social Research (INSLAW, Inc.), since 1977. B.S. (1964) and M.B.A. (1965), University of California at Los Angeles. Economist, Public Research Institute, 1968-74; Senior Research Analyst, INSLAW, Inc., 1974-77. Associate Editor, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. Author of *What Happens after Arrest?* (1977); "Selective Incapacitation: An Idea Whose Time Has Come?" *Federal Probation* (1983).

FRANCIS T. CULLEN: Associate Professor, Criminal Justice Program, University of Cincinnati, since 1982. B.A. (1972), Bridgewater State College; M.A. (1974) and Ph.D. (1979), Columbia University. Assistant to Associate Professor, Western Illinois University, 1976-82. Coauthor of *Toward a Paradigm of Labeling Theory* (1978); *Reaffirming Rehabilitation* (1982); *Rethinking Crime and Deviance Theory* (1984); *Corporate Crime Under Attack* (forthcoming).

GREGORY A. CLARK: Doctoral Student, Criminal Justice, Sam Houston State University. B.S. (1980) and M.A. (1982), Western Illinois University. Coauthor of "Public Support for Punishing White-Collar Crime: Blaming the Victim Revisited?" *Journal of Criminal Justice* (1983); "Attribution, Salience, and Attitudes toward Criminal Sanctioning," *Criminal Justice and Behavior* (forthcoming); "Dissecting White-Collar Crime: Offense Type and Punitiveness," *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice* (forthcoming).

JOHN F. WOZNIAK: Assistant Professor of Sociology, Western Illinois University, since 1979. B.A. (1972), University of Pittsburgh; M.A. (1978), West Virginia University. Author of "Fighting the Appeal of Repression," *Crime and Social Justice* (1982); "The Rise of the Elderly Offender: Will a New Criminal Be Invented?" *Crime and Social Justice* (forthcoming); "The Impact of Social Supports on Police Stress," *Criminology* (forthcoming).

PHILIP E. LAMPE: Professor of Sociology, Incarnate Word College, since 1970. B.A. (1959), Conception Seminary; M.A. (1967), Southern Illinois University; Ph.D. (1973), Louisiana State University. Member, Association for International Development, Mexico, 1960-65; Researcher in Community Development, Southern Illinois University, 1965-67; Assistant Professor, Southeastern Louisiana University, 1967-69. Author of "Justice and the Criminal Justice System," *Social Justice Review* (1980); "Sex Differences in Perception of Crime and Criminals," *International Journal of Women's Studies* (1982); "Ethnicity and Crime: Perceptual Differences Among Blacks, Mexican

Americans and Anglos," *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* (1984); and numerous other publications.

DAVID C. PERRIER: Assistant and Associate Professor, St. Mary's University, since 1976. M.A. (1970), Dalhousie University; Ph.D. (1976), York University. Member of the Atlantic Association of Sociologists and Anthropologists and the Atlantic Provinces Criminology and Corrections Association. Author of "Nova Scotia Police," *R.C.M.P. Quarterly* (1982); "Police Stress: The Hidden Foe," *Nova Scotia Forensic Psychiatric Bulletin* (1983) and *Canadian Police College Journal* (1984).

F. STEVEN PINK: Law Student, Dalhousie Law School, since 1982. B.A. and B.Comm. (1982), St. Mary's University. Author of "Community Service Order Report," Nova Scotia Correctional Services, Department of the Attorney General (1983).

JAY S. ALBANESE: Professor, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Niagara University. B.A., Niagara University; M.A. and Ph.D., Rutgers University. Author of *Justice, Privacy, and Crime Control* (1984); *Dealing with Delinquency* (1985); *Organized Crime in North America* (1985).

LOUIS LIEBERMAN: Associate Professor, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, since 1973. B.A. (1961), Reed College/New School; M.A. (1964), New School for Social Research; Ph.D. (1981), New York University. Associate Professor, Georgia State College, 1972-73; Research Director, Welfare Research, Inc., 1977-79; Director of Research, John Jay Institute on Alcoholism and Substance Abuse, 1982-present. Coauthor of *Authority and Addiction* (1969); *Major Modalities in Treatment of Drug Abuse* (1971).

JAMES F. HARAN: Chief Probation Officer, U.S. District Court, Brooklyn, New York, since 1967. B.A. (1945), Mt. St. Alphonsus College; M.A. (1967) and Ph.D. (1982), Fordham University. Social Investigator, New York City Department of Social Services, 1950-51; Field Supervisor, New York Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children, 1952-54; Probation Officer, 1955-62, and Supervisory Probation Officer, 1963-66, U.S. District Court, Brooklyn, New York; Coordinator of Probation Training Programs, Federal Judicial Center, Washington, D.C., since 1973. Coauthor of "The Imprisonment of Bank Robbers: The Issue of Deterrence," *Federal Probation* (1977); "The Armed Bank Robber" A Profile," *Federal Probation* (1984).

GARY FIELD: Project Director and Program Director, Oregon Mental Health Division, since 1978. B.S. (1968), Portland State University; M.S. (1972) and Ph.D. (1974), Washington State University. Psychologist, Mendota Mental Health Institute, Wisconsin, 1974-78. Author of "Group Assertive Training for Severely Disturbed Patients," *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry* (1975); "Community Programs for Chronic Patients," *Innovations* (1977); "Application of the Training in Community Living Program to Rural Areas," *Journal of Community Psychology* (1980); "A Client Outcome Study of a Community Support Demonstration Project," *Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal* (1982).

ANDRE NORMANDEAU: Professor of Criminology, University of Montreal, since 1970. B.Sc. (1964), University of Montreal; M.A. (1966) and Ph.D. (1968), University of Pennsylvania. Officer, Probation and Parole, Department of Justice, Government of Quebec, 1968-70; Parole Board Member (part-time), Quebec, 1980-85. Director, International Center for Comparative Criminology, University of Montreal, since 1984. Author of *Public Opinion and Crime* (1970); *Deviance and Society* (1975); *Armed Robbery in Quebec* (1980); *Armed Robbery in Montreal* (1985); and numerous articles.

FREDERICK T. MARTENS: Adjunct Instructor, Upsala College, since 1979. B.A. (1971), Fairleigh Dickinson University; M.A.

(1974), City University of New York; M.A. (1981), Fordham University. Author of *Police Intelligence in Crime Control* (1982).

MICHELE CUNNINGHAM-NIEDERER: B.A. (1978), Allentown College. Member, MENSA, Ltd.

REVIEWERS OF PERIODICALS

EUGENE H. CZAJKOSKI, D.P.A., is Dean, School of Criminology, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

HARRY W. SCHLOETTER is Chief Probation Officer (Retired), U.S. District Court, San Francisco, California.

CHARLES E. SMITH, M.D., is Professor of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

BOOK REVIEWERS

WILLIAM E. BAIN is Deputy Warden, Northpoint Training Center, Kentucky Corrections Cabinet, Burgin, Kentucky.

EUGENE KELLY is U.S. Probation Officer (Retired), U.S. District Court, Camden, New Jersey.

FREDERICK T. MARTENS is Adjunct Instructor, Sociology and Criminology, Upsala College, East Orange, New Jersey.

EDWARD TROMANHAUSER is Associate Professor of Criminal Justice, Chicago State University.