

Book Reviews

Engendering Resistance: Agency and Power in Women's Prisons M. Bosworth. Aldershot: Ashgate (1999) 120 pp. £49.50 hb

Mary Bosworth's book, which is based on extensive qualitative field work in three English women's prisons, seeks to offer a new and powerful approach to vexing criminological and sociological questions through an engagement with developments in feminist and critical theory. The book opens with a brief account of the dramatic increase in women's imprisonment from the early 1990s and provides a thumbnail sketch of the characteristics that constitute a 'typical' female prisoner before making the key points that such abstractions say little or nothing about how women experience incarceration, who they are (in any meaningful sense) and how they came to be confined. In order to answer such questions Bosworth insists that the concept of identity is best equipped to connect diverse life experiences and subjectivities to the structuring principles of gender, class, sexuality, ethnicity, nationality and so forth. It is the desire to place identity in the centre of the analysis that enables her to introduce the related concepts of agency, power and resistance in order to 'examine the effects of femininity upon women in prison' (p. 3) from a standpoint feminist methodological position that is both 'on' and 'for' the women under study and over imprisoned.

The substantive work begins with an ambitious retelling of imprisonment in the criminological literature, beginning with the 18th and 19th century religious reform rhetoric and the subsequent revisionist histories of the institution before the empirical prison sociological tradition is taken to task for implicitly invoking notions of prisoner agency but failing to advance convincing accounts of identity. This critique is extended to feminist analysis of imprisonment, as it is argued that whilst such accounts indicate how women in prison are controlled and punished through ideological notions of femininity they give little sense of how women might resist such discourses. Bosworth concludes the chapter with the related critique of the more recent accounts of legitimacy in male prisons, and argues that: 'legitimacy as it is currently configured excludes issues of identity and subjectivity' (p. 32).

There then follows an analysis of influential government reports on imprisonment for the purposes of highlighting the ways in which administrative discourses are framed in a universal language of justice and security, yet the 'documents on women in prison tend to uphold a particularist ethic of care' (p. 38). The chapter successfully indicates how penal rhetoric establishes and perpetuates a 'gender binary' that situates male prisoners as an undifferentiated norm and female prisoners as a unique population requiring gender specific treatment. Moreover, the conflict between difference and equality that lies at the centre of women's treatment in the penal system is also seen to operate at the heart of contemporary feminist theory. The issue is not simply whether women should be treated differently or the same as men, but how contradictory assumptions of responsibility and dependency are embodied in the ideal of femininity, which has profound effects on how women experience incarceration.

The opening two chapters then respectively tackle the prison literature and policy documents, to raise critical questions that the remainder of the text sets out to answer through stressing that a more sophisticated understanding of how prisoners evaluate their experiences of imprisonment is required. In this way the third chapter becomes the pivot around which the narrative revolves as it is explicitly concerned with the range of theoretical strategies and empirical techniques used in the fieldwork documented in the following two chapters. Readers familiar with prison sociology will be aware of the convention of appending a methodological postscript to research findings but, by placing such matters at the heart of the book, attention is drawn to the ways in which the narrative that both precedes and follows this chapter needs to be carefully interpreted rather than taken as self-evident. In making this case the argument is that prison research has been detrimentally shaped by a masculinist rationality and objectivity, which explains the insistence on a feminist standpoint methodology. Yet as Bosworth recognises there is an unresolved tension, and it is one that runs through the book, of the extent to which postmodern thinking is compatible with standpoint feminism.

The fourth chapter is explicitly concerned with examining the ways in which power relationships and identities are negotiated in prisons by highlighting how women evaluate imprisonment in terms of their race, class and gender membership. There is a detailed discussion of how competing institutional discourses valorise traditional, passive forms of femininity (epitomised in work and education programmes), whilst also encouraging autonomy and responsibility (in the idealisation of motherhood). The following chapter then documents the versatile ways in which women subvert dominant ideologies of femininity through asserting agency and independence. This is a nuanced analysis and does not simply celebrate the ability of the women to resist, for clear examples are given of how 'the effects of class, sexuality, gender and race often divide the prisoner community even as they unite them' (p. 152).

Original and packed with indispensable insights as this book is, there are inevitably points at which the argument might be disputed. I will briefly mention one. The sustained thesis animating the text is that power relations in prisons are contested through the agency of the prisoners. As such it offers a dynamic reading of the micro-politics of resistance in institutional settings, but is less well equipped to deal with the macro-politics of oppression and runs the risk of underplaying the brute force of custodial power. Of course, specifying the relationships between agency and structure remains the central problem in the social sciences and it is to Bosworth's credit that the issue is touched on at various points in the text. Agree with the way that the book tackles this problem or not, either way it deserves to become a classic of prison sociology and feminist scholarship.

*Lecturer in Sociology,
University of Essex.*

EAMONN CARRABINE

Red Mafia: How the Russian Mob Has Invaded America R.I. Friedman. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co. (2000) 296 pp. \$25.95hb

In *Red Mafia*, investigative reporter Robert Friedman delves into the world of Russian organised crime, which he claims differs from the Italian La Cosa Nostra. Whereas the Italians usually refrain from harming journalists, prosecutors, judges, and innocent family members, the Russians will – in the words of a retired New York City policeman – shoot anyone: 'just to see if their gun works' (p. xvii). Friedman is the

author of *Zealots for Zion: Inside Israel's West Bank Settlement Movement* (1992) and has written numerous articles on Russian mobsters in *Details*, *Vanity Fair*, and *New York*. He impresses upon the reader the degree to which the Russian mafia is already deeply entrenched in the United States (especially Brighton Beach, Miami, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Las Vegas, and Denver) and overseas (in far-flung cities like Moscow, Hong Kong, Bangkok, Bogotá, and Toronto). It is involved in a wide variety of activities such as car theft, prostitution, gasoline boot-legging, arms smuggling, cocaine and heroin trafficking, extortion (even of players in the National Hockey League), and an array of sophisticated white-collar computer crimes like counterfeiting, credit card schemes, and insurance frauds. As Friedman points out, a large percentage of the Russian mobsters were Soviet Jews who emigrated to the United States, chiefly to the Brighton Beach area, in the 1970s. Ironically, whereas President Jimmy Carter thought he was championing human rights by supporting the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, which withheld most-favored-nation status from socialist countries that restricted Jewish emigration, he was actually welcoming in hardened criminals the Kremlin was only too happy to purge from the USSR. Lacking access to immigrants' criminal records, US immigration officials even now continue to allow citizens from Eastern Europe and Eurasia with shady backgrounds to settle in the United States.

Friedman provides colourful portraits of Key Russian mafia leaders, such as Marat Balagula, Vyacheslav Ivankov, Monya Elson, and Semion Mogilevich, many whom he interviewed in prisons and gaudy strip bars in Brighton Beach and Miami. Marat Balagula, originally from Odessa, *inter alia* expanded a gasoline boot-legging scam into the largest tax heist in US history. He set up an intricate 'daisy chain' of phony gasoline distributorships, moving large shipments of gasoline - on paper - only - from one distributor to another, creating a blizzard of paper. The 'burn company' designated to pay taxes to the IRS would turn out to be only a post office box under a false name. By the time the IRS went to collect the overdue taxes, the revenue agents would find themselves buried in a complex paper trail leading nowhere (p. 47). Balagula was finally convicted for a credit card scam and incarcerated at Lewisburg federal penitentiary in Pennsylvania; he will be eligible for parole in March 2003. Vyacheslav Ivankov, one of the most powerful of the *vory v zakone* ('thieves-in-law') ordered so many car bombings and murders that they scared off many Western corporations from investing in Russia and embarrassed Russian government leaders. Russian mafia leaders (the *Bratskii Krug*) finally arranged to 'export' him to the United States in 1992. Over the next three years, Ivankov recruited 'combat brigades' led by an ex-KGB officer and composed of former athletes and veterans of the Afghanistan war. His group got involved in gambling, prostitution, and arms sales. Finally arrested in 1995 for extortion, Ivankov continued to issue orders from his prison cell to his henchmen and even send a death threat to Friedman in 1998.

A death threat is bad enough, but another mafia boss, the Budapest-based Semion Mogilevich (known as 'the Brainy Don') apparently put out a contract on Friedman's life; the hit man was offered \$100,000 to kill the hapless journalist (p. xiii). Friedman also provides an enthralling vignette about Monya Elson, native of the Jewish ghetto in Kishinev, Moldova, who began his criminal career as an expert pickpocket, graduated to extortion, and then - after emigrating to New York in 1978 - expanded into credit card scams because: 'these Americans don't carry cash.' (p. 18). In another line of work, together with dissident writer Yuri Brokhin, Elson would rob honest jewellers. Dressing up as Orthodox Jews, replete with paste-on beards, side curls, long black coats, and black hats, they would ask to see a variety of expensive diamond stones. While Brokhin babbled in Yiddish,

distracting the shop owner, Elson switched the diamonds with zirconium. Failing to make a deal, the duo would walk out, jewels safely tucked inside their coat pockets.

Undoubtedly, Friedman writes colourfully and wittily, plying the reader with rich anecdotal information. However, like many books by journalists, *Red Mafia* lacks an overall conceptual framework and borders on sensationalism. Sweeping generalisations irritate the reader, especially given the lack of citations of sources. Friedman bases his observations on his personal interviews with mafia members and law enforcement officers, but his book will not allow the careful scholar of organised crime to replicate his research.

Furthermore, Friedman's writing reflects a certain bias against the FBI – understandable, given the threats upon his life and the FBI's inability to protect him or even provide advice. Friedman claims that the FBI waited too long (1994) to organise its Anti-Russian Crime Unit. He compares this delay to the FBI's belated campaign against *La Cosa Nostra* in 1972, after the latter had metamorphosed into a 'criminal colossus'. The former FBI director, J. Edgar Hoover had concentrated the bureau's resources solely on his one obsession: combating domestic subversion and the perceived communist infiltration of American society.

In truth, the FBI faces real obstacles but has also scored successes (had it not arrested the mobsters named above, Friedman would not have had the material to write his book). Given the global scale of Russian organised crime, the FBI simply cannot combat it effectively without international co-operation. Nearly all Russian mafia bosses hold Israeli citizenship. Since Israel will not extradite citizens, US law enforcement authorities cannot prosecute them, thereby weakening their ability to deter mafia members from committing future crimes. The influence of the American Jewish community and stigma against anti-semitism also hamper efforts to clamp down on the Russian Jewish mobsters. The special US relationship with Israel also reinforces the mafia's power, given its entrenchment in that country. Israeli government leaders (including 'Bibi' Netanyahu) have been known to accept huge sums of campaign money from the Russian mafia, even after having been warned by the FBI and others. To his credit, Friedman informs the reader of these difficulties.

In short, *Red Mafia* is informative and well-written. Having assigned portions of the book in my Russian Politics class for undergraduate students at Clemson University, I can safely say that the book appeals to young adults. However, more serious scholars of Russian organised crime will want to read James Finckenaue's and E. Waring's (1998) *Russian Mafia in America* for a more balanced and objective analysis. Also worth reading is Paul Klebnikov's (2000) *Godfather of the Kremlin: Boris Berezovsky and the Looting of Russia*, which presents the problem of Russian organised crime in a biographical context. Another worthy supplement to Friedman's book is Chrystia Freeland's (2000) *Sale of the Century: Russia's Wild Ride from Communism to Capitalism*, which analyses the growth of organised crime as part of the larger history of post-Soviet Russia since 1990.

References

- Finckenaue, J.O. and Waring, E.J. (1998) *Russian Mafia in America: Immigration, Culture, and Crime*, Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Freeland, C. (2000) *Sale of the Century: Russia's Wild Ride from Communism to Capitalism*, New York: Crown Publishers.
- Friedman, R.I. (1992) *Zealots for Zion: Inside Israel's West Bank Settlement Movement*, New York: Random House.

Klebnikov, P. (2000) *Godfather of the Kremlin: Boris Berezovsky and the Looting of Russia*, New York: Harcourt.

Professor,
Political Science Department,
Clemson University,
South Carolina, USA.

JOHANNA GRANVILLE

Mass Imprisonment, Social Causes and Consequences D. Garland (Ed.). London: Sage (2001) 192pp. £55.00hb

'Mass Imprisonment' is the term that David Garland, the editor of this highly impressive collection of articles, uses to describe the phenomenon of the quadrupling of the United States' prison population in the last 25 years and the systematic imprisonment of whole groups of the population, primarily young black men. This essential book, originally published as a special issue of the journal *Punishment and Society* and having its roots in a New York University conference in 2000, seeks to analyse the causes and consequences of mass imprisonment: '[which] was not a policy that was proposed, researched, costed, debated and democratically agreed' (p. 2).

Sentencing policy has played a major role in the growing use of imprisonment. As Marc Mauer of the Sentencing Project observes: 'beginning in the 1970s we see a shift toward the use of determinate sentencing in a variety of forms' (p. 5), which quickened in the 1980s and was used heavily as a weapon in the 'war on drugs'. Mauer also astutely argues that higher rates of probation and parole revocation due to high case-loads leading to limited services for offenders and untreated substance abuse have increased the pressure on the prison population – something which also appears to have contributed to a record prison population in England and Wales. Indeed, it is apparent from this book just how heavily and unfortunately the UK has been influenced by US penal policy, and UK politicians by their American counterparts. As David Downes argues, the Labour Party's toughening up of their law and order strategy in the mid-1990s 'owed much to the American Democratic Party's approach to avoiding a repetition of the Dukakis debacle of 1988' (p. 58), when the presidential candidate was portrayed as being weak on law and order. In contrast, as Jonathan Simon observes, Bill Clinton appeared tough, approving an execution during his election campaign and subsequently adding 60 new capital crimes to the federal code.

A number of contributors argue that the media, as well as politicians, have contributed to mass imprisonment. Thomas Mathiesen highlights the power of the media, and writes that: 'penal policy is governed much more by the kind of news that is news-worthy and thereby saleable by television and by what is marketable political opinion in the media' (p. 32). He argues that what is needed is an alternative public space in penal policy, for example through grass-roots movements and public meetings. Mauer, while acknowledging the presence of useful analyses of crime trends and sentencing practice in some of the print media, highlights the fact that on television, local news means the nation: 'continues to be flooded with a relentless assault of nightly crime stories, regardless of whether crime is rising or falling' (p. 11). This is compounded by TV drama shows, according to Mauer, whose images: 'rather than the more sober editorial one might read in the morning paper, are what linger in the mind as policymakers enact legislation and citizens consider which candidate will have the most impact on crime' (p. 12). This has, in his view, made the job of reformers far more difficult, and means that they now need to

include broader constituencies, for example: 'education leaders concerned about the diversion of funding to prisons, religious leaders raising moral concerns, and family members in communities heavily impacted by incarceration' (p. 13).

The need for penal reform has never been greater. The US, with two million people incarcerated, now imprisons a higher proportion of its population than any other country in the world. Imprisonment is already used so extensively that commentators in *Mass Imprisonment* such as Downes believe that it has reduced the official unemployment figures by 30 to 40%, feeding into the myth of the American dream. The situation is particularly severe for African Americans, who are bearing the brunt of America's institutionalised racism and penal myopia. Anyone wanting to begin to understand the racial dimension to imprisonment in the US should read Loic Wacquant's chapter and reflect on his conclusion that: 'lower-class African Americans now dwell, not in a society with prisons as their white compatriots do, but in the first genuine prison society of history' (p. 107). Since 1989, African Americans have made up a majority of people walking through prison gates each year and one in three black men aged 20 to 29 years is currently in prison or under penal supervision. Staggeringly, there are more black women locked up in the US than the total prison population of any western European country. The exclusion of many black Americans is not just social and physical, but also political. As Wacquant observes, because so many states ban prisoners and people on probation from voting, quite apart from the 14 states which disenfranchise ex-prisoners, one black man in seven nationwide is banned from voting and seven states permanently deny the vote to more than one-quarter of their black male residents.

In his introduction to *Mass Imprisonment*, David Garland remarks that the rise of imprisonment: 'is an unprecedented event in the history of the USA and, more generally, in the history of liberal democracy' (p. 1). However, the scale of imprisonment is such that it is questionable whether the US should still be regarded as a liberal democracy. With over two million people in prison, millions more under some form of correctional supervision, one in three young black men in prison or under penal supervision, around four million adults excluded from the ballot box, widespread use of detention without trial in the wake of September 11th and the death penalty still in use, modern America appears neither liberal nor democratic. How long before the supposed land of the free becomes the land of the three million prisoners?

*Policy Officer,
Prison Reform Trust.*

JOE LEVENSON

Illusion of Order: The False Promise of Broken Windows Policing B.E. Harcourt. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press (2001) 294pp. £23.95pb

Harcourt's essay makes a significant contribution to the 'broken windows' debate. Three bricks are eloquently thrown: first, an empirical critique that reminds us, not only of the lack of evidence in favour of broken windows theory, but also of the grounds for believing it is probably incorrect; second, a theoretical critique that effectively challenges notions of disorder and order, and calls for a much more reflexive treatment of social meaning than that employed within the order-maintenance tradition; finally the author offers a rhetorical critique that links the popularity of the approach to the successful transformation of 'offensive conduct into harmful conduct' (p. 183) by its proponents.

The book begins with a helpful introduction to the wide span of order-maintenance

ideas, from law and order preoccupations with innate evil and moral relativism, to New Chicago School social norm theorising. Broken windows theory is located within this pane, its connections and differences etched. The three critiques are then delivered and the work is completed with two chapters dedicated to an alternative way of thinking about, and researching, punishment and criminal justice. Here Harcourt examines 'how the policing and punishment practices that we adopt may shape us as contemporary subjects' (p. 216). Inevitably, such new windows serve to tempt those who love the sound of breaking glass, and, mindful, the author offers brief replies to two likely criticisms: first, to the charge that 'meaning' lacks sufficient objectivity to be studied, he argues that we should seek rigour in ways other than those adopted within 'hard' science – he suggests triangulation, integration of research methods, analytical reflection and reflexivity; and second, Harcourt responds to the point that public policy making must proceed (even) on the basis of less than perfect evidence by putting the converse view; that the need for, and nature of policy making cannot be allowed to inhibit social research.

This is an intriguing book, not so much because of the theoretical frames discussed, more through how they might be applied in future research projects. Nevertheless, subject creation theory got me thinking about how contemporary penal policies, practices and debates shape my own assumptions and predilections. Tough-talk makes me want to say 'care' to the fiercest person imaginable: zero tolerance, to be even more tolerant than is good for me. As a researcher, interested in the notion of 'offender as user of probation service', a counter to the pathologising positivism and risk-talk currently rampant, I guess that I am likely to be angered by the apparent assumption, within both academic and policy discourse, that the idea no longer applies. Some of the anger relates to knowing that, given time and sufficient exposure, I may come to think the same way. For that insight alone, my gratitude is owed to Harcourt's commendable work.

*Senior Lecturer,
Social Work and Social Policy,
Anglia Polytechnic University,
Chelmsford.*

GREG MANTLE

The Japanese Police System Today: A Comparative Study L.C. Parker. New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc (2001) 284pp. \$58.95hb

This book's purpose is, according to the author, to explore the role of the police in community relations in Japan, as seen through the eyes of a psychologist, but substantially its style appears to be based on ethnomethodology, not psychology. Actually, the author has visited Japan twice (firstly 1980/81 and secondly 1999), stayed for a relatively long time, and during these periods he very energetically visited the Kobans and interviewed the policemen and the public, along with meeting his Japanese colleagues and friends, by which means he gained much knowledge, whether academic or not, about the overall situation of Japan. As a result, he offers detailed information about the system and the events happening in this country, but it is fragmentary because of time gaps between the 1980s and the 1990s. He introduces the results of numerous interviews undertaken by himself but his presentation is journalistic, rather than academic, and prolix in style.

These stylistic weaknesses are not confined to the interview material. For instance, the overview of crime in Japan he presents is oversimplified, so I wonder whom his book mainly targets as a reader. If most of the readers are western criminologists it

appears too simple for them, and if they are Japanese, of course, it may be boring, but it may be interesting for the general public. He has also tried to analyse the reasons for the low crime rate in Japan: the homogeneous make-up of Japanese society, the large networks of formal and informal groups, the strict gun control and the high standard of living among all social strata. However, this sort of analysis is far from novel because several books and articles have already discussed these issues.

The main part of this book is based on fieldwork in the area of community policing, as I mentioned above, where the author interviewed numerous policemen and community members at the Kobans, or police boxes. As he acknowledges, most of the low-ranking policemen working in the boxes were reluctant to respond to the questions put, even by foreign academics, because they were afraid of subsequent criticism by higher ranking officers, so most of their responses to the author seem very superficial and diplomatic. Parker should have focused on why their answers were so guarded. This is the key to the enigma of the Japanese police.

In contrast to other prominent studies of the Japanese police system, there is little sharp analysis and commentary included in this book, though it covers plenty of matters not directly related to the Japanese police system itself, such as the interviewee's academic background or graduated university, and digression concerning the correction and probation system in Japan.

Moreover, this book also includes some out-of-date data, based on research carried out in the early 1980s, so it threatens to confuse its readers and lead them to misunderstand the current situation, because the situation in the early 1980s clearly differs from that in the 1990s and the new century. Since the 1990s the Japanese police have faced a rapid increase in crime and delinquency, a low rate of crime clear-up associated with it, and a series of misjudgments of events as well as organisational corruptions, which the general public has strongly criticised and, consequently, has become disaffected about the police. In the 1990s, the public attitude towards the police in Japan dramatically changed for the worse.

The book too often merely eulogises the Japanese police. We can imagine that these eulogies will delight some Japanese readers, as well as the National Police Agency, but we need a more objective analysis. At the end of the day, this book shows not the true image of Japanese police but, cynically, how the American police fail to function as a responsible agency for safety. For most readers, thanks to this book, it is rather easier to understand the defects of the American police system.

Parker concludes that the USA should adopt several systems already adopted by the Japanese police department: a national training system for police officers, and a quasi-national system of promotion, physical training and administration. This conclusion is too simple and its implementation would be unlikely to contribute to improvement of the USA police system.

*Professor of Criminology,
Takushoku University, Tokyo.*

TADASHI MORIYAMA

Situational Prison Control: Crime Prevention in Correctional Institutions R. Wortley.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2002) 253pp. £45.00hb

The back cover of *Situational Prison Control* states that: 'this book examines the control of problem behaviour in prison from a situational crime prevention perspective . . . following the success of situational crime prevention in community settings'. So, before I have even opened the first page, I am bewildered – what have I missed? When did situational crime control become the answer to all our crime problems?

Despite the flourishing of CCTV within our towns and cities, of car and window locks, of security screens in public buildings, crime, and fear of crime, seem hardly to be affected. In fact, fear of crime – possibly because of these interventions – remains stubbornly high. And then I thought – of course there have been successes in situational crime prevention – it's just that they seem so small, so parochial, so contained. And that is when it strikes me: maybe situational crime prevention within the prison environment makes absolute sense. A setting which is closed and contained may be perfect for situational crime measures.

Situational crime is still something of the new kid on the block within the criminological discipline. Nonetheless situational crime, and theories related to it, have in the past 20 years or so, shifted criminology beyond its traditional boundaries. The criminological discipline, which had been so precise in its claim to be empirical and scientific in its focus upon crime, has had that claim challenged by the very development of situational crime prevention.

Situational crime prevention can be characterised as comprising measures directed at highly specific forms of crime; they involve the management, design or manipulation of the immediate environment in as systematic a way as possible so as to reduce the opportunities for crime and increase the perceived risks of involvement by offenders. These measures have primarily been used in the prevention of offences such as burglary, shoplifting and vandalism. It is an approach which prides itself on being, above all else, rational, calculated and scientific. With the advent of this new approach within criminology, and its subsequent popularity with the police and politicians, the intrinsically political nature of all things 'crime' is made explicit.

Situational Prison Control seeks to move the discourse on situational crime prevention forwards in terms of developing theory; whilst also entrenching the approach within the criminological discipline. Wortley recognises that the interaction between situations and behaviours is more subtle and complex than prevention approaches alone may imply. He is also at pains to show that situational principles have the potential to create a less fortress-like prison environment and that: 'prison reform and prison control may actually go hand in hand' (p. 10). The focus of the book is the dynamic tension between control which is restrictive, and control that seeks to normalise. One approach to control is to 'tighten up', to harden the prison environment and restrict prisoner freedom. The other involves 'loosening off', softening the prison environment and maximising prisoner freedoms. Reinterpreted within a situational perspective some situations within prisons are seen as regulating behaviour by providing opportunities for individuals to behave in a way that will deliver them benefits. Other situations precipitate behaviour by prompting or provoking certain actions.

The book is presented in two parts. The first looks at situational prison control in general. The second analyses specific examples of unwanted prison behaviour and its control from a situational perspective. The starting point for Wortley's analysis is based on the assumptions that a great deal of prison disorder is a function of the characteristics of the prison environment; that the environmental forces acting upon prisoners can both generate misbehaviour and provide the opportunities that allow misbehaviour to occur; prison disorder can be prevented by changing the prison environment in ways that reduce the propensity of prisoners to misbehave and make misbehaviour more difficult to perform; and finally, that prevention attempts that fail to adequately address the environmental factors that both generate and allow misbehaviour are likely to be ineffective and may even increase disorder. These assumptions are formulated into a two-stage model of prison control. The model is tested against the available research (although almost all of the research on which the model is tested had not been conceived with a situational perspective in mind) on

seven specific kinds of prison problems – prisoner-prisoner violence, sexual assaults, prisoner-staff violence, self-harm, drug use, escapes and collective disorder.

Wortley acknowledges that there may be ethical concerns if situational crime prevention were to be systematically applied within prisons although, having asserted that ethical concerns are an issue, he unfortunately does not follow these concerns through in the actual text. When looking at the specifics of controlling behaviour in prison it seems that this is done within a political, human rights and ethical vacuum. So for example, in the chapter on sexual assaults in prison, information is presented from those who believe that consensual homosexual behaviour provides sexual release and should be permitted, whilst other commentators believe that failure to control homosexual behaviour encourages sexual assault. Wortley, somewhat weakly says that: ‘there is insufficient evidence at present to assess which view is correct’ (p. 116). A view which of itself fails to see actions and behaviours, choices, freedom and rights as anything other than about regulation or precipitation.

The presentation of material in terms of theoretical framework followed by practical application should work well. However, as Wortley freely admits, the evidence presented in each of the seven practical chapters: ‘fails to be specific . . . is speculative . . . and lacking’ (p. 98, 114, 208). Despite situational crime prevention’s empirical pretensions therefore, the very empirical basis on which the case for situational crime in prison is based is missing. Moreover, the charts at the end of each chapter which outline promising strategies for controlling the various behaviours analysed are themselves lacking in specificity and do not provide the level of detail one would have anticipated at the outset of the book. Nonetheless, this is not to dismiss *Situational Prison Control* out of hand. It fails as an attempt to apply situational crime prevention approaches to particular examples of behaviour within prisons; but succeeds in making the issue of prison control one of complexity requiring a range of interventions and approaches. Wortley highlights the fact that the prison environment can increase the risk of problems as well as help to reduce it. It may be the case, however, that to really tackle the problems which can be found in prisons, a more radical overhaul of the institution itself is required, and that this is far more than situational crime control measures alone can provide.

Research and Evaluation Manager,
NACRO.

FINOLA FARRANT

Captive Audience: Media, Masculinity and Power in Prisons Y. Jewkes. Cullompton, Devon: Willan (2002) 210pp. £17.99pb

Policing Images: Policing, Communication and Legitimacy R.C. Mawby. Cullompton, Devon: Willan (2002) 214pp. £30.00hb

Two PhD-based books both concerned with the media, crime and criminal justice from the same publisher but both very different. The work of Jewkes on the use that men make of the media – radio and TV – in prison to establish or maintain their identity, manage power relations etc. is – as the blurb calls it – ‘pioneering’. Some evidence can be seen for that in the title. Only an early work could lay claim to the punning title she uses. Mawby’s work on the history and current practice of police use of media is no less pioneering but avoids the available plan (*Arresting Images* might therefore be saved for my unwritten opus on CCTV).

Whilst both deal with the media, it is Jewkes’s book that specifically addresses theories of media, in chapter 1, in parallel with her review of the prison literature – specifically the importance of ‘doing’, ‘killing’ and ‘marking’ time. Particularly

important – given her emphasis on masculinities (derived from Connell and Messerschmidt) – is the tendency in some media theory of seeing TV viewing and radio listening as ‘passive’. Within media theory both right and left have their versions of this. Thus, for the right, the media subverts all that is good – respect for motherhood and *home-made* apple pie – and replaces it with promiscuity and ersatz ‘pop tarts’. Equally, for the left, the media is a ‘narcotic’ (anyone remember the Yippies?) or a tool of capital (for instance, noting Silvio Berlusconi’s control of the Italian State and commercial media respectively as prime minister and owner). To overcome the deficiencies of these ‘hypodermic’ or ‘cultural dope’ models, media theorists have developed the ‘uses and gratifications’ model. This recognises that audiences can be active in ‘reading across the grain’ of media texts. Jewkes uses Bourdieu and Giddens (discussed in chapter 2) to emphasise the interplay of structure and agency in the uses made and the gratifications available to prisoners through various media. Thus the deprivations of imprisonment can be seen to emasculate structurally far more effectively than the castration visited on the couch potato. She notes: ‘like the unemployed, prison inmates are likely to have a far greater degree of attachment to and appreciation of media as a source of entertainment, escapism, identity and opinion reinforcement, social interaction, or simply a means of enduring painfully slow-moving periods of time’ (p. 63). As we can see, watching television or listening to radio has never been so active.

The research was carried out in two Category C prisons with 62 face-to-face interviews and ten further individuals seen in focus groups. Sentences ranged from eleven weeks to life but long-term and life prisoners predominated. Focus groups bring out the social nature of much TV use and are common in media research but the author convincingly argues that individual accounts are more relevant for prison research – finding groups produced consensus. Many of her interviews took on an oral history dimension; for instance, one lifer recalling the first introduction of radios. The methodology chapter is marred by a slight to the work of Genders and Player (p. 81).

The uses of media by inmates revealed shared something with those of the wider audience but often with an added piquancy: thus Dave needs his Black Sabbath CDs and Bill his cricket but lifer, Neil, flicks over the News: ‘seeing it all on TV would make it even worse’ (p. 91). While one gained comfort for his closeted homosexuality in watching *Queer as Folk* others watched children’s TV with a parental care.

It is ironic that ‘reality TV’ usually features situations recognisable as incarceration yet these shows are not discussed here – though the success of *Big Brother* may have arisen after her fieldwork finished. Younger and short-term prisoners were less ambivalent about the media, seeing it as a way of keeping up with the outside. Different media were also valued differently with many respondents seeing radio listening as stimulating and fearing to become couch potatoes. Such a fear of TV led one prisoner to resist the fitting of the TV that came as part of his enhanced status. Whilst many prisoners used media to support established identities others become ‘born-again’ *Guardian* or Radio 4 fans.

Though not usually a fan of tables, some would have helped here – for instance, were the 14 respondents who named Charlie Dimmock as a favourite presenter enough to secure her top spot? Such summarising might have allowed more space for discussion. For example, Jewkes notes – and possibly correctly – the political in the personalisation of cells (newspapers and magazines obvious resources here) by Afro-Caribbean inmates (p. 93). She does so in just one paragraph which casually equates the boxer Mohammed Ali with Malcolm X and Martin Luther King as a political icon. So, whilst there are some sweeping generalisations like this that one may want unpacked, the book can be recommended for criminology and specialist media readers.

Where Jewkes is largely looking at the reception of media by audiences, Mawby examines the extent to which the media is shaped by the police or, indeed the extent to which the image created of the police *is* the police. Clearly an ideological reading of the police as reflection or refraction of class, race or gender power has always hinted at this. In using the term 'image work' he recognises that some effort is expended even if he does not quite see it in terms of 'the' struggle (no Gramsci or Althusser). Mawby tackles some of the theory (Habermas) but mostly offers a history of police image work and a closely observed case study of South Yorkshire Police. Thus the first two chapters are given over to setting out the four phases he identifies in the history of police image work: 1829 to 1919 (informal but evident in the choice of uniform and force orders); 1919 to 1972 (starting from the formation of the Met's Press Bureau and including the 'golden age' of PC Dixon); 1972 to 1987 (the appointment of Robert Mark and the art of 'winning by appearing to lose') and finally from 1987 (increased professionalism and Imbert's change of force to service and the appointment of Wolff Olins as corporate identity consultants).

His research was both quantitative (questionnaires) and qualitative (interviews and varieties of 'hanging around') and took in the formal work of civilian and press officers as well as the image work involved in routine policing. Recent history was also important to the police and the communities they serve – the Miner's Strike and Hillsborough disaster. He concludes that: 'image work can enhance police legitimacy by contributing to police accountability through transparency and open communications' but also is: 'deployed as a means of coping with illegitimacy, legitimacy deficit and delegitimation' (p. 194). To counter this he recommends the embedding of: 'image work in democratic processes, aligning communications activities with systems of accountability' (p. 196) – documentary film-makers-in-residence or more in-cell and custody suite CCTV? Whilst criminologically informed, the book may be of greater use to public service management and public relations professionals and to those who teach them.

What joins these books and, perhaps, the others on crime and media now starting to appear is downplayed in Jewkes and strangely absent from Mawby. Whilst he mentions *Police*, *Camera Action*, *Crimewatch UK* merits no mention. Jewkes mentions both in the same discussion to note their popularity amongst prisoners as a resource for sustaining a masculine identity. Along with the many fictional cop shows, *Crimewatch* is the key representation on TV of *both* police and offenders. That is, whilst both of these books recognise the mediated nature of the relationship between crime, criminal justice, individuals and society the depth to which this now permeates culture requires a move beyond communications or media theory and an engagement with a wider cultural studies agenda.

Senior Lecturer in Sociology and Media Arts,
St Mary's College,
Strawberry Hill, a College of the University of Surrey.

NIC GROOMBRIDGE