Notes from the Chair

Greetings from New York City where the Nathan’s Hot Dog Eating Contest was concluded with the first chow-off in the history of the competition. We are grappling with serious legal issues throughout the criminal justice system. The US Supreme Court recently handed down landmark rulings on the continuation of the death penalty, provision of habeas corpus rights to detainees at Guantanamo Bay, denial of the death penalty to sexual rapists where the victim survived, and an affirmative decision on gun ownership. The above US Supreme Courts decisions and others guide our understanding of the legal system and its consequences. Our work as legal scholars can and should take the form of public sociology where we examine the impact of imminent changes in our legal rights as citizens.

These are my final Notes from the Chair on details surrounding the upcoming SSSP meeting in Boston. Material provided in this Spring/Summer newsletter edition includes information on division organized and co-sponsored sessions, blurbs from Jack Levin and Cary Federman regarding respective books discussed in upcoming Author Meets Critics Sessions, contributed material by Gray Cavender and Stephen Morewitz, a listing of recent law and society book publications, and general announcements.

There are some changes to report within the Law and Society Division. Emily Horowitz is our incoming chair and Mary Nell Trautner will serve as the Vice-Chair for the 2008-2010 term. Congratulations to both individuals for their victory in the recent election and much thanks to Stephen Morewitz and Suzanne Goodney Lea for their willingness to serve as candidates.

(continued on next page)
The 2008 Alfred J. Lindesmith Paper Award goes to Suzanne Goodney Lea for her submission entitled “The Social Construction Process Legitimating Police Use of Force.” Thanks to Emily Horowitz for serving as Committee Chair and much appreciation to Joan Luxenburg and Stephen Morewitz for their efforts as committee members. As winner of this year’s competition, Suzanne will chair next year’s Lindesmith Award Committee.

The Law and Society Division has organized two sessions and co-sponsored ten additional panels. These sessions cover topics as diverse as legal boundaries, restorative justice, law and sexuality, and violence. The sum total of the submitted papers should spark interesting discussion at the conference.

In addition, please remember to attend the Division Business Meeting on Thursday, July 31, at 10:30am. We will deal with important division issues and initiatives prior to turning the Chair and Vice-Chair positions over to Emily and Mary Nell. The new division leadership will seek your input on suggested topics for sessions at next year’s conference in San Francisco. In addition, Suzanne will receive her plaque as winner of the Lindesmith Award. You may want to note that the general member reception will take place Thursday evening and Past President’s reception on Friday evening prior to the Banquet. Please consider attending these events.

Several matters are on the agenda for the business meeting. First, I have funds allocated for several student members. We pay the $30 fee on a first come-first served basis. Students can contact the division chair or faculty can nominate their students for this free membership.

Second, I am recommending that we consider offering the book award every two years in order to encourage more submissions. In addition, I am seeking input on naming this award the Edwin H. Sutherland Book Award. Please send me feedback on this matter.

I would like to consider creating a lifetime achievement award for scholars or educators engaged in the study of law and society. The recipient would give a talk at conference and receive a plaque as a token of our appreciation. I will discuss the naming of this prospective award at the division business meeting.

Finally, two general issues were conveyed to Division Chairs through the SSSP. First, The Nominations Committee (as comprised by Division Chairs) is responsible for suggesting and ranking candidates for various SSSP Offices. Please let me know if you are interested in running for President-Elect, Vice-President-Elect, Committee on Committees, Board of Directors, Editorial and Publications, Treasurer, and Board of Directors Student Representative. In addition, the SSSP Division Chairs also serve to discuss proposed resolutions. Please read the announcement in this newsletter and send me information on any possible resolutions pertinent to this division.

In conclusion, thanks for the privilege of serving as your division chair over the past two years. I wish to commend Cary Federman for his support as Vice-Chair of this division. Additionally, thanks to Jen Girgen for her work on generating the newsletters sent out to our membership. Jen recently received her doctorate from Florida State University and we wish her well in a new role as a tenure-track faculty member at Salem State College.

Cary’s farewell comments and more of my own are contained within this newsletter. Hope that everyone is having a great summer. See you in Boston at the end of this month.

Lloyd Klein,
Division Chair
2008 SSSP ANNUAL MEETING INFORMATION

Boston Park Plaza Hotel & Towers, Boston, MA
July 31 - August 2, 2008

Law and Society Division Conference Sessions

Date: Thursday, July 31
Time: 12:30p – 2:10p

Session 29: Violence, Victimization and Sexual Assault
Room: Stuart

Sponsors: Crime and Juvenile Delinquency Division, Law and Society Division, Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities Division

Organizer: Melanie Carlson, University of Central Florida

Presider: Tracy L. Dietz, University of Central Florida

Papers:
“The Consequences of Violent Victimization for the Perpetration of Intimate Partner Violence: A Longitudinal Analysis,” Lisa Murphy, California State University, Long Beach

“Teen Sexual Victimization: An Exploration of Teens’ Experiences and Responses to Unwanted Sexual Contact,” Karen Weiss, West Virginia University

“Interpersonal Violence and Substance Use Among Sexual Minorities,” Amy Hequembourg and Jennifer Piccolo, University at Buffalo

“The Effect of Racial and Ethnic Change on Inter- and Intra-Group Youth Violence in Los Angeles,” Lyndsay N. Boggess, University of California, Irvine

Date: Thursday, July 31
Time: 4:30p – 6:10p

Session 37: Race, Policy, and Law
Room: Charles River

Sponsors: Crime and Juvenile Delinquency Division, Law and Society Division

Organizer & Presider: Suzanne Goodney Lea, Trinity (Washington) University

Papers:

“Police Repression and Responses to It: Three Los Angeles Cases,” Christine Petit, University of California, Riverside


“Prisoners’ Families and the Collateral Consequences of Imprisonment: Global Perspectives,” Helen Codd, Lancashire Law School

“Social Disorganization: Considering Methodological and Conceptual Alternatives,” Robert Grantham, University of

(continued on next page)
**Date:** Friday, August 1  
**Time:** 8:00a – 9:40a

**Session 54:**  
**Restorative Justice**  
**Room:** Stuart  

**Sponsors:**  
Crime and Juvenile Delinquency Division  
Law and Society Division  

**Organizer & Presider:**  
Lloyd Klein, Kingsborough Community College, CUNY

**Papers:**

“A Preliminary Evaluation of Chester High School Youth Court,” Nancy Hirschinger-Blank, Widener College, Lori Simons, Widener University, Gregg Volz Esquire, Consumer & Economic Development Research & Information Center (CEDRICK), Raymond Thompson, Chester High School, Kayla Paonessa and Stephanie Rodriguez, Widener University

“Establishing and Exercising Legal Authority in Natural Resource Management: A Study of Native American Fish and Wildlife Programs,” Jamie Dolan, University of Arizona

“De Micromis Contributors and Superfund Law: A Case Study,” Suzanne B. Maurer, Delaware County Community College and Debora J. Pfaff, American University

“Controlling Fog: A Qualitative Study on Environmental Law Enforcement,” Debra S. Emmelman, Southern Connecticut State University and Jack Dickinson, Environmental Services, City of San Jose

“Prison Stress-Anxiety and Social Support: Data from a Community Based Mediation Program,” Jill Harrison, Rhode Island College

“Revisiting the Peacemaking Perspective: Community Responses and the Mediation of Crime,” Lloyd Klein, Kingsborough Community College, CUNY and Joan Luxenburg, University of Central Oklahoma

“Shifting the Paradigm: Blending Restorative Justice in Community Managed Corrections,” Shela Van Ness, University of Tennessee, Chattanooga

“Restorative Governmentalities: The Utilization of Restorative Justice Techniques within an Urban Development Coalition,” Timothy A. McCorry, Buffalo State University and Paul Fuller, St. John Fisher College

**Date:** Friday, August 1  
**Time:** 12:30p – 2:10p

**Session 68:**  
**Legal Issues and the Environment**  
**Room:** Whittier  

**Sponsors:**  
Environment and Technology Division  
Law and Society Division  

**Organizer:** Lisa Anne Zilney, Montclair State University  

**Presider:** Randall Greenman, Montclair State University

**Papers:**

“Environmental Conflicts and Federalism: Explaining Internal Strife in Pakistan,” Tarique Niazi, University of Wisconsin

“Establishing and Exercising Legal Authority in Natural Resource Management: A Study of Native American Fish and Wildlife Programs,” Jamie Dolan, University of Arizona

“De Micromis Contributors and Superfund Law: A Case Study,” Suzanne B. Maurer, Delaware County Community College and Debora J. Pfaff, American University

“Controlling Fog: A Qualitative Study on Environmental Law Enforcement,” Debra S. Emmelman, Southern Connecticut State University and Jack Dickinson, Environmental Services, City of San Jose


“Social Structures of Accumulation and the Criminal Justice System,” Susan M. Carlson and Michael D. Gillespie, Western Michigan University and Raymond J. Michalowski, Northern Arizona University

“The Incarceration of a Vulnerable Population: An Examination of Transgender Correctional Policies,” Jennifer Sumner, University of California, Irvine

“Language is Leaving Me in Silence: Accounts of Deafness, Shame and Criminal Behavior in a Group of Texas Inmates,” Aviva Twersky Glasner, Bridgewater State College and Katrina R. Miller, Emporia State University

(continued on next page)
Date: Friday, August 1
Time: 4:30p – 6:10p

Session 81: Law and Sexuality
Room: Cabot

Sponsors: Crime and Juvenile Delinquency Division
Law and Society Division
Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities Division

Organizer: Lloyd Klein, Kingsborough Community College, CUNY

Presider: Cary Federman, Montclair State University

Discussant: Shela Van Ness, University of Tennessee, Chattanooga

Sponsors: Crime and Juvenile Delinquency Division
Law and Society Division
Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities Division

Date: Saturday, August 2
Time: 8:30a – 10:10a

Session 98: Institutional Ethnographic Studies of New Modes of Governance
Room: Newbury

Sponsors: Environment and Technology Division
Institutional Ethnography Division
Law and Society Division

Organizers: Ercument Gundogdu, York University

Presider: Ercument Gundogdu, York University

Discussant: Susan Marie Turner, University of Guelph

Papers:

“Outside the Law: The Same Sex Marriage Experience in San Francisco,” Kimberly Richman, University of San Francisco

“Predicting the Support of Civil Unions and Same-Sex Marriages among Social Work Students,” Eric Swank, Morehead State University

“Public Perceptions of Punitiveness for Sex Offenses,” Gini R. Deibert, Suffolk University, Mark Stafford and Jessica Rager, Texas State University, San Marcos

“Legislating Safety: The Impact of Megan’s Law and Community Notification,” Lloyd Klein, Kingsborough Community College, CUNY

Date: Saturday, August 2
Time: 8:30a – 10:10a

Session 91: Author Meets Critics: Jack Levin, Serial Killers and Sadistic Murderers: Up Close and Personal
Room: Cabot

Sponsors: Crime and Juvenile Delinquency Division
Law and Society Division

Author: Jack Levin, Northeastern University

Organizer & Presider: Lloyd Klein, Kingsborough Community College, CUNY

Critics:

Cary Federman, Montclair State University

Shela Van Ness, University of Tennessee, Chattanooga

Lloyd Klein, Kingsborough Community College, CUNY

Papers:

“Governmentality, Knowledge Production and Institutional Ethnography: Links and Divergences,” Lauren Eastwood, SUNY Plattsburgh and Glenda Gross, Syracuse University

“From the Local to the Translocal and Back,” Ercument Gundogdu, York University

“Entrepreneurial Governance of Neoliberal Welfare,” Frank Ridzi, Le Moyne College

“New Modes of Governance Work in Canada: Federal Policy Change and the Reorganization of Local Practices,” Susan Marie Turner, University of Guelph

(continued on next page)
**Date:** Saturday, August 2  
**Time:** 10:30a – 12:10p

**Session 113:** Legitimacy and Bureaucracy  
*Room: White Hill*

**Sponsors:** Law and Society Division  
Program Committee

**Organizer & Presider:** Cary Federman, Montclair State University

**Discussant:** Shela Van Ness, University of Tennessee, Chattanooga

**Papers:**

“Civil Liberties and Surveillance in the Post-9/11 World: The Fear of Counter-Terrorism,” Mathieu Deflem and Shannon McDonough, University of South Carolina

“Referendum on Rights: Maine’s LGBTQ Ballot Initiative,” Kimberly Simmons, Bates College

**Date:** Saturday, August 2  
**Time:** 2:30p – 4:10p

**Session 127:** Offender Reentry  
*Room: Cabot*

**Sponsors:** Crime and Juvenile Delinquency Division  
Law and Society Division

**Organizer:** Kathryn Fox, University of Vermont

**Presider:** Danielle Rudes, George Mason University

**Papers:**

“‘I’m Grown’: The Role of Workplace Respect in Young Men’s Reintegration,” Emily NaPier and Elaine Wolf, Center for Community Alternatives

“Assessing Treatment Availability for Adult Sex Offenders in Kentucky: A Containment Approach,” Lincoln Sloas and Paul Steele, Morehead State University

“Resurfacing for Air but Finding Nothing but Smog: Qualitative Interpretations of Formerly Incarcerated Individuals,” Jeff Gingerich, Cabrini College

**Date:** Saturday, August 2  
**Time:** 4:30p – 6:10p

**Session 140:** Sociology of Therapeutic Jurisprudence  
*Room: Hancock*

**Sponsors:** Law and Society Division  
Mental Health Division

**Organizer & Presider:** Stephanie Hartwell, University of Massachusetts, Boston

**Papers:**

“Therapy as Social Control in a Maximum Security Prison for Women: Racial Differences in the Social Construction of Mental Illness,” Matthew Silberman, Bucknell University

“Event History Analysis of Mental Health Court Graduates,” Brad Ray, North Carolina State University

“The Effects of Mental Health Court on Criminal Recidivism, Stigma, Social Support and Self-Concept,” Christian Ritter, Northeastern Ohio Universities Colleges of Medicine and Pharmacy, Kristen Marcussen, Kent State University and Mark Munetz, Northeastern Ohio Universities Colleges of Medicine and Pharmacy

“The Old Diagnosis of ‘Dangerousness’: Should the Designation of ‘The Enemy Combatant’ become a New Category in DSM-V?” Siamak Movahedi, University of Massachusetts, Boston

“Does Civil Commitment Prevent Violence by Incapacitation?” Charles W. Lidz, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Edward P. Mulvey and Carol Schubert, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Steven Banks, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Jennifer Skeem and Candice Odgers, University of California, Irvine

“Crossing Borders: Contention and Convergence in the Response to Child Sexual Abuse Cases in the Civil and Criminal Justice Systems,” Paul Steele, Morehead State University
2001 ended and 2002 began with a bang when the energy giant Enron filed for what at the time was the largest bankruptcy in U.S. history. Within just a few months, WorldCom's bankruptcy surpassed Enron's. The Arthur Anderson accounting firm was implicated in both situations. Over the following months, new corporate collapses were revealed on a seemingly non-stop basis. These unusually large collapses came to be known as the Corporate Scandals of 2002.

The Corporate Scandals of 2002 generated three notable outcomes. First, they produced hearings in the U.S. Congress. The hearings and the magnitude of these scandals generated a second outcome: constant media attention and an accompanying public interest in the scandals. Third, congressional hearings produced legislation: the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. Among its many provisions, Sarbanes-Oxley imposes criminal sanctions (including lengthy prison sentences) if CEOs knowingly certify false financial statements. By mid-2002, it seemed that a new era of corporate regulation had emerged.

However, once President Bush signed the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and media attention shifted to other stories, that is, once the scandals were no longer at the top of the public's agenda, a different situation began to appear. Consumer advocates began to speculate as to whether the Bush Administration might try to limit the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) in its enforcement activities. Soon, a small but growing number of advocates began to argue for rolling-back Sarbanes-Oxley, or at least diminishing its scope. Tom Donohue, President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce criticized Sarbanes-Oxley on National Public Radio (12-9-05). Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson, Jr. admitted that post-Enron legislation had improved accounting practices and restored investor confidence, but said that excessive regulation and criminal prosecutions were hurting U.S. businesses (Labaton NYT 11-21-06:C1,4). Criticisms of Sarbanes-Oxley from business groups culminated in the creation of the Committee on Capital Markets Regulation. The committee has no official status although Treasury Secretary Paulson praised its creation. Commission members include business leaders from Wall Street, the accounting industry, lobbying groups, and also academics. According to the Committee's director, Harvard Law Professor Hal Scott, no one from the SEC was invited to participate because regulators "...may have a lack of objectivity" (Norris, NYT 9-13-06:C3).

Not surprisingly, these corporate scandals and the Sarbanes-Oxley Act have been of interest to socio-legal scholars. The events exemplify Durkheim's (1964) classic formulation that the criminal law is the mechanism that expresses society's outrage at those who violate important norms. The congressional hearings that produced the Sarbanes-Oxley Act were a highly visible vehicle whereby Congress vented its outrage at corporate leaders who were implicated in these scandals. Indeed, as more revelations appeared and as the hearings progressed, the condemnation grew in intensity and the hearings took on the appearance of a status degradation ceremony (Garfinkel 1956).

However, these events exemplify another equally important aspect of scholarly wisdom: the notion of a web of social control. Scholars from Durkheim (1964) to Donald Black (1976) have noted that social control is maintained by the law, but also by other mechanisms of control. Sometimes, however, this point seems to be lost on the public. A recent study found that, while citizens increasingly favor punitive sanctions for executives
who commit corporate crimes, they do not favor more economic regulations, for instance, regulating the stock market (Unnever, Benson, and Cullen 2008). Perhaps the public's attitude reflects a free market ideology or perhaps it reflects a tendency both in lawmakers and in the media to highlight the importance of criminal sanctions in battles of good vs. evil, while downplaying the importance of economic regulation.

In any case, in terms of social control there are webs within webs. The law, of course, has a variety of forms, from the condemnatory power of criminal law to civil law, both tort and class action suits. Indeed, while a law like Sarbanes-Oxley provides tough sanctions that may serve both deterrent and retributive functions, non-criminal sanctions are equally important. This is especially the case in situations where those whom the criminal law would regulate are far from idle: they have tremendous political influence and try to use it to delimit the law's regulatory scope (as they are now doing with Sarbanes-Oxley). In such a setting, traditional tort lawsuits and class action lawsuits play a regulatory role.

Often as scholars we tend to focus on the criminal law, for obvious reasons: it is the big stick in social control whether in communicating society's anger and condemnation or in serving as a deterrent. But as a mechanism of control, the criminal law is only one strand in the web of legal social control (see Cullen, Cavender, Maakestad, Benson 2006:110-116). And, once the glare of the media's spotlight shifts, once Congress's outrage is no longer a highly ritualistic story of good government and corporate villains, once the day-to-day business of corporate regulation returns to normal, we as scholars must consider the importance of these other, non-criminal laws.

References
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Contributed Article

My Life As A Forensic Sociologist: Strategies For Success

Stephen J. Morewitz, Ph.D.
Stephen J. Morewitz, Ph.D., & Associates, IL and CA
Department of Sociology, San Jose State University
Department of Public Affairs and Administration and Department of Sociology
California State University, East Bay

When I founded my forensic expert witness and consulting firm, I thought that most of my work would be in ordinary criminal and civil litigation, but found that there was also a demand for sociologists who provide reliable and valid testimony in high profile legal cases. Attorneys and law firms in large metropolitan areas frequently need expert witnesses and litigation consulting services. My first firm was located in Chicago, IL, and I later expanded my offices to San Francisco and Los Angeles, CA.

My background in the sociology of sexual harassment, sexual and physical abuse, and organizations, (e.g. my book, Sexual Harassment and Social Change in American Society, 1996) has enabled me to testify as an expert witness and consultant in these fields. My work in the sociology of law, criminology, deviant behavior, and alcohol and drug abuse has provided me with the background and skills to testify about the risk factors for recidivism, offender profiles, and victim profiles.

Because of my background as a medical sociologist, health care researcher, and medical educator, I have been able to testify as an expert witness in disability-related areas of the law, such as personal injury, medical malpractice, product liability, toxic torts, workers compensation, and Social Security disability cases. I usually testify about quality of life losses and the impact of an injury or disease on social, family, occupational, and educational functioning. My books, including Chronic Diseases and Health Care (2006), Domestic Violence and Maternal and Child Health (2004), and Death Threats and Violence: New Research and Clinical Perspectives (forthcoming, 2008), are useful for supporting my expert witness testimony in these areas.

Some of my more interesting high profile cases were: being asked to provide a disability evaluation for a Nazi war criminal, who was facing deportation; finding appropriate expert witnesses for death row inmates who have contacted me for help in proving their innocence; testifying in a wrongful death case of a priest who committed suicide after being forced to live in the same facility with his priest abuser; assisting the owner of a child day care center prove her innocence of child sexual abuse by obtaining an expert witness, who testified on the reliability and validity of the anatomically correct doll used in assessing the abuse.

To develop a consultancy such as mine, keep in mind the following principles:

• Always be honest.

Your good name is all that you have in this world.

• Build an academic reputation.

(continued on next page)
Maintain academic affiliations – they enhance your reputation as an expert witness and consultant; become a lecturer, or adjunct faculty member at a college or university; conduct research and publish your findings; present your findings at national and international meetings and give seminars and workshops; become a member of scientific organizations and honor societies.

- Integrate sociological theory and research into your expert witness and consulting activities.

Become an authority in the field in which you testify and consult.

- Testify in your area of expertise based on your background, training, research, and practice.

- Know your limits and boundaries.

Sociologists should testify about sociological issues only. Attorneys may try to trick you into testifying about an issue outside the scope of your expertise in order to try to disqualify you.

- Always be prepared.

Never underestimate your adversary. Do your “homework” before a deposition and let your attorney prepare you for the deposition or trial.

- Meet your clients’ needs.

If you cannot help your clients or potential clients, refer them to someone who can. Follow up with clients in a timely manner; and keep them on a mailing list. It is essential that you maintain personal contact with your clients. Satisfied clients will return, and they will refer other clients to you.

- You are in charge of marketing, advertising, and public relations.

Don’t over-advertise as an expert witness. You do not want to seem to be just a “hired gun.” Your best cases tend to be those that you get from other attorneys and law firms.

- Keep expenditures down.

Don’t spend money on an expensive office. You may do better by having a home/office arrangement. You already spend most of the time on your cell phone or Internet. When necessary, meet the attorneys in their offices.

Locate your practice in large, metropolitan areas.
Books of Interest to Division Members


Authors’ Reviews

**Steven E. Barkan, Law and Society: An Introduction** (Prentice Hall, published 2/08)

*Law and Society: An Introduction* is written to be highly accessible to the average undergraduate student. This multidisciplinary text draws on the work of anthropologists, historians, law professors, political scientists, psychologists, and sociologists to clearly outline how law is an essential social institution that shapes society, while also being shaped by it. The book emphasizes that the manner in which law and the legal system actually work often differs greatly from how they are supposed to work.

The text discusses the most important topics in the field of law and society with which undergraduates should be familiar. It does so in a highly readable format and gives very sufficient attention to theory without being too theoretical for an undergraduate audience. Current and controversial topics covered in the book include issues of racism and sexism in the legal system, tort reform, deterrence and the “get tough” approach to crime control, and jury nullification.

Brief contents:

1. The Social Nature and Significance of Law
2. Understanding Law and Society
3. Families and Types of Law
4. Law and Dispute Processing
5. Law and Social Control
6. Law and Social Change
7. Law and Inequality
8. The Legal Profession
9. Courts and Juries

(continued on next page)
**Cary Federman, *The Body and the State: Habeas Corpus and American Jurisprudence (SUNY 2006; Series on American Constitutionalism)*

Habeas corpus is the principal means by which state prisoners attack the constitutionality of their convictions in federal courts. This book traces the history of the writ and its influence on the development of federal-state relations and civil liberties from its inception in 1789 to 2002, when the Supreme Court firmly linked the rights of prisoners with anti-terrorism laws and threats to the peace and security of Americans. 

I rely on a historical-institutional approach to the study of habeas corpus that is not insensitive to the role of discourse. I pay particular attention to the arguments over federalism and capital punishment that have restricted the writ’s application over time. The writ threatens the states’ sovereign judgment to convict and execute criminals. It upsets the discourse, created by the Supreme Court, that the federal-state relationship ought not be disturbed on habeas appeals.

But I argue that habeas corpus gives those on death row more than a voice; it gives them a constitutional weapon to overturn a jury’s determination of guilt. It gives the condemned a language to rebut the charges, convictions, and misrepresentations in the same terms that were used against them. Habeas petitions turn legal language upside down, and with it, the historical understanding of federal-state relations.

Throughout this text, I treat habeas corpus discursively as a means to understand legal change and the political development of civil liberties over time. The broad institutional and discursive approaches of this book separate it from more narrow habeas studies.


This book is quite personal. In it, I refer as much as possible to my interviews and correspondence with killers, my conversations with killers’ parents, spouses, friends, neighbors, groupies, even victims (the few who managed to escape), and my testimony as an expert witness. Having studied the most heinous kinds of violent crimes for more than 25 years, I felt it was time to make my findings as well as my feelings accessible to a broad audience of intelligent laypeople, criminal attorneys, law enforcement personnel, and students. Serial and mass murderers are discussed, but so are cases of youth violence, domestic homicide, and sexual predators.

Based on my experiences studying the phenomenon, I have come to be convinced that an excessive desire for power and control motivates far more killers than most of us have been led to believe. Certainly, some murders are inspired by the profit-motive, others are committed out of profound jealousy or a desire for revenge. Many homicides result from a heated verbal exchange that escalates into a deadly physical confrontation. A few murders—perhaps the most bizarre—are perpetrated when a killer feels totally rejected by human beings and decides to kill for the company of corpses.

But a craving for power and control frequently plays a prominent if little understood role in motivating premeditated murder and especially the apparently senseless slayings that so frequently make the headlines and the eleven o clock news. The killers are intent on establishing their efficacy. They are sick and tired of being ignored or ridiculed or bullied or humiliated. And they attempt to establish or to re-establish control over the lives of other people. They can do so through rape, torture, and murder; but they may also play a cat and mouse game with the police. They can maximize the pain and suffering of their victims, but they may also attempt to achieve a degree of fame in our popular culture.

As a society, we play right into the hands of the worst sorts of offenders by giving them exactly what they want: We place their images on t shirts, trading cards, and the cover of celebrity magazines. We purchase murderabilia over the internet, log into killer websites, buy books containing killer art work, music,
and poetry, and pay thousands of dollars to purchase their self-portraits. In the process, we encourage the copycat phenomenon among youngsters who have been humiliated by their schoolmates on an everyday basis and are looking desperately for some way—legitimate or illegitimate—to feel good about themselves. They hear our message loud and clear: Want to feel special—like a big shot? Just kill someone. And while you are at it, kill as many people as possible. That’s how you make the cover of People Magazine.

Going beyond the details that characterize killers and their crimes, I also attempt to apply a sociological perspective, wherever it is appropriate to do so. Chapter 2 includes a discussion of the increasing presence of sadism in popular culture. Chapter 6 contains an analysis of hate-motivated homicide. Chapter 8 addresses the role played by the culture of silence in school shootings. Chapter 12 analyzes “brainwashing” in murders committed by teams of killers. Chapter 15 discusses the process by which small communities become stigmatized by a well-publicized murder. In the final two chapters, I discuss certain policies and programs designed to prevent and respond to extreme forms of violence—measures to combat juvenile murder, the community approach to sex offenders, the impact of tip hotlines, and the efficacy of the death penalty.

Announcements

Announcing the Publication of the Agenda for Social Justice, Solutions 2008

The SSSP is pleased to offer you the Agenda for Social Justice, Solutions 2008, which represents an effort by our professional association to nourish a more "public sociology" that will be easily accessible and useful to policy makers. It is also a way to give something back to the people and institutions that support our scholarly endeavors. We hope that you find it helpful in your challenging work of crafting successful solutions to contemporary social problems. In all, it contains 11 pieces by SSSP members, covering a variety of social problems in three sections: global issues, Americans at risk, and health & welfare. This is an effort on the part of scholars at the Society for the Study of Social Problems to disseminate the findings in social problems research as freely and as widely as possible. The web page for the project is located here: http://www.sssp1.org/index.cfm/m/323. On that page, you can download the full version, and you can link directly to the one-page briefs and individual chapters. The chapters are available for free download, and may be suitable as cost-effective supplementary readings in many social problems-related courses.

Call for Resolutions

Dear Division Chairs,

One of the important ways that your division can have some impact on social problems solutions is by proposing a resolution for the approval of the general SSSP membership. The SSSP will then circulate the resolution to the appropriate legislative, administrative, or NGO bodies that you specify.

I strongly suggest that you email your membership to generate ideas for a resolution. You can then take responsibility for crafting a resolution--for some guidance in how to do so, if this is new to you, look at...
previous SSSP resolutions here: http://www.sssp1.org/index.cfm/m/189. Resolutions should explain why there is a need for the resolution (the "whereas" section), and propose specific actions to remedy the problem (the "now, therefore, be it resolved" section). They should also state to which legislative, administrative, or NGO bodies the resolutions should be sent. If you need help crafting a resolution, I may be able to help.

Please send me any proposed resolutions as soon as you have them drafted. New proposals can be accepted at the Annual Meeting itself, but it is much better to have your proposal printed up by SSSP staff ahead of time for group discussion.

Resolutions will be presented by you or your proxy at a meeting all Division chair or their proxies should attend on Thursday, July 31 from 12:30pm 2:10pm. They may be edited at that meeting, and will be voted on for recommendation to the membership. Then those resolutions recommended will be presented at the general SSSP membership meeting.

Thank you for the work that you all do,

Carrie Yang Costello
2007-2008 Vice President

Associate Professor of Sociology
Department of Sociology
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
P.O. Box 413
Milwaukee, WI 53201
414-229-6942
fax 414-229-4266
costello@uwm.edu

Farewell and Welcoming Statements

Farewell Statement From Lloyd Klein

It has been an honor to serve as Chair of the Law and Society Division. Cary Federman and I have worked hard to organize some sessions and co-sponsor others with various SSSP divisions. Cary’s input and assistance in the various committees and presence at the various SSSP meetings has been invaluable. I also wish to thank Jen Girgen for her assistance in compiling these newsletters. Jen will move onto the professional ranks as she assumes the position of Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at Salem State College.

There are so many individuals responsible for the work that we do in the activities of this division. I wish to thank Gray Cavender, Stephen Morewitz, and many others for contributed newsletter articles or announcements. I am also grateful for the efforts of Suzanne Goodney Lea, Emily Horowitz, Stephen
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Morewitz, Bruce Arrigo, Mathieu Deflem, Joan Luxenburg, and others for their efforts in organizing or participating within division sessions. Much thanks to Otis Grant for his support as former division chair. Of course, we could not fulfill our division roles without the assistance of Tom Hood and Michele Koontz. Finally, I am continually impressed with the interesting mixture of veteran sociologists, junior faculty, and graduate students contained in the division membership list. Everyone has so much to offer in the study of law and society. Cary and I pass the torch to Emily Horowitz and Mary Nell Trautner as the new Division Chair and Vice-Chair. Please assist Emily and Mary Nell in the process of organizing or participating in sessions for next year’s meeting.

Farewell Statement From Cary Federman

To the Law & Society Division,

I write at the end of my three-year tenure as co-chair of the Law & Society Division of SSSP. Lloyd Klein and I leave the Division in excellent hands. Both Lloyd and I have the greatest respect and admiration for the incoming co-chairs, Emily Horowitz of St. Francis College and Mary Nell Trautner of the University of Buffalo.

The Law & Society Division is a remarkable division. We celebrate the diversity of our members and examine key issues in law and society from critical perspectives. I would like to thank the members of the Division for making these three years challenging and enjoyable. I hope I have been worthy of your trust. I wish all the members, and especially our new leadership, all the best for the next three years.

Sincerely,

Cary Federman
Department of Justice Studies
Montclair State University
Montclair, New Jersey 07043

Welcoming Statement From Mary Nell Trautner

I would first like to thank the Law and Society membership for giving me this opportunity to serve the division. I'd also like to thank Lloyd and Cary for their terrific leadership over the past two years. They have left us with a vibrant division and an outstanding array of panels at this year's SSSP meeting in Boston. They will certainly be a tough act to follow.

I am looking forward to working with Emily and the other members of the Division to build upon the strong foundation we are inheriting. I hope that many of you will attend the Division business meeting with ideas and suggestions for the Division as a whole and for the 2009 meeting in particular.

I'm looking forward to seeing you in Boston!

~ Mary Nell Trautner