

OCCD Bulletin

Connecting the Justice System

May 2002

Experiences of Domestic Violence Among Women on Probation or Parole in Lane County, Oregon

Study Overview

Purpose

The primary goal of the study was to investigate the prevalence of experiences of domestic violence among women on probation or parole in Lane County, OR. This data will be used to advocate for better services for women on probation or parole.

General Procedures

In September 2000 Jean Daugherty, Director of Women's Services, Sponsor's Incorporated, approached J. Mark Eddy, Courtenay Paulic, and Rachel Whaley of the Oregon Social Learning Center to collaborate on a research project to investigate the prevalence of domestic violence among women on probation or parole in Lane County, Oregon.

Anonymous, self-administered questionnaires were made available to women on probation or parole at the Main Office and satellite offices. Respondents returned completed questionnaires to a locked box at the main office or via the mail. Steps were taken to ensure that each respondent completed only one questionnaire.

A cover letter attached to the questionnaire solicited women for an in-depth interview. Fifty-seven percent (N=20) met screening criteria and were invited to participate in the in-depth interview; each responded affirmatively to at least one question regarding domestic violence or admitted to committing a crime for or because of a partner. Fourteen women completed the in-depth interview. The approximately 2 hour-long interviews were conducted by Jean Daugherty or Barbara Hurwich and were audio-taped and transcribed. Respondents were paid \$10 for the telephone screening interview and \$25 for the in-depth interview.

Summary of Findings

Of the approximately 486 women on probation or parole, 35% (N=172) completed the one page

questionnaire. As presented in Table 1 [Page 2], the sample closely resembles the population with regard to age and race.

In both the questionnaire and interview samples, women are more likely to have never married or to be divorced or separated than currently married. On average, respondents have approximately two children.

The most common convictions for both samples are for property crimes and drug-related crimes. The majority of respondents meet with their probation officer on a monthly basis.

Our results indicate that the vast majority of women on probation and parole in Lane County have experienced domestic violence by a romantic partner at some point in their lives. Eighty-five percent of the questionnaire sample (146 women out of 172) reported experiencing at least one type of physical domestic violence including pushing, shoving, punching, kicking, choking, hitting, or forced sex. Seventy-three percent experienced at least one violent incident that caused them to feel physical pain the next day.

Our results indicate that there is a connection between women's criminal histories and their relationships with partners. Fifty-six percent reported that they committed at least one crime in an effort to please a partner. Forty-five percent committed a crime to get drugs for a partner and 40% admitted to a crime actually committed by the partner. Nonetheless, only 29% reported that they committed a crime because they

Also in This Issue

About the OCCD	Page 3
Corrections/Clarifications	Page 3
Events Calendar	Page 3
Supreme Court	Page 4
Appeals Court	Page 4
Miscellanea	Page 8
Book Reviews	Page 9

were threatened by a partner. The results of the in-depth interviews suggest that more often the threats were implicit or based on the women’s fear of future incidents of violence rather than explicit commands to commit a crime.

Tables 1 and 2 are reproduced below.

Experiences of Domestic Violence Among Women on Probation or Parole in Lane County, Oregon was a collaboration between: Sponsor’s Incorporated, Jean Daugherty, LCSW, Director of Women’s Services, Barbara Hurwich, MSW Intern; and the Oregon Social Learning Center, J. Mark Eddy, Ph.D, Associate Director, Courtenay Paulic, MA, Project Coordinator, Rachel Bridges Whaley, Ph.D, Senior Analyst.

For more information contact Jean Daugherty, LCSW, Director of Women’s Services, Sponsor’s Inc. at 767 W. 8th Avenue, Eugene, OR 97402 (541-485-6738) or J. Mark Eddy, Research Scientist and Associate

Director, Oregon Social Learning Center, 160 E. 4th Avenue, Eugene, OR 97401 (541-485-2711). Support for this project was provided by grant no. RO1 MH 59127 from National Institute of Mental Health, U.S. Public Health Services.

Researchers!

The OCCD provides the above space to disseminate the results of relevant research to statewide audience. If you do research in the state of Oregon on issues related to adult or juvenile justice, please contact us.

larsencp@pdx.edu

or 503-725-9586

or Oregon Council on Crime and Delinquency
PO Box 9355
Portland, OR 97207-9355

Table 1. Percent of respondents with various experiences of domestic violence in current or past intimate relationships.

	Questionnaire Sample	Interview Sample
<i>Did any partner ever...</i>		
shout or yell at you	88%	100%
call you names, insult you	89	100
break or destroy things belonging to you	83	100
push, slap, shove, or grab you	85	100
punch, kick, choke, or hit you	79	na
use force to make you have unwanted sex	46	71
cause you to feel physical pain the day after a fight	73	100

Fully 92% of the women in the questionnaire sample experienced at least one of these negative behaviors. Eighty-five percent experienced at least one type of physical domestic violence.

Table 2. Crime and Violent Partners: Percent of respondents who committed crime for or because of their partners.

	Questionnaire Sample			Interview Sample		
	Never	1-2x	3+x	Never	1-2x	3+x
<i>Have you ever...</i>						
committed crime because threatened by partner	72	21	8	29	21	50
committed crime to please partner	44	33	23	21	14	64
committed crime to get drugs for partner	55	18	27	7	21	71
admitted to crime committed by partner	60	32	8	21	57	21
lied to authorities to hide partner’s crime	49	35	16	7	21	71
chosen to go to jail to avoid violence by partner	78	16	5	50	36	14

Seventy-three percent of the questionnaire respondents committed at least one crime or lied about a crime for or because of a partner at least one time.

Corrections and Clarifications

Some editions of the April issue of the OCCD Bulletin were printed without including full attribution for the Oregon Dispute Resolution Commission's report of Juvenile Victim Offender Mediation. The correct text is reproduced here.

Text reproduced here from the "Key Findings" document, available at the Oregon Dispute Resolution Commission website below. In January 1999 ODRC collaborated with the OJD to produce a legislative report on the obstacles to and opportunities for juvenile victim offender mediation on Oregon. The full text of the evaluation can be found at www.odrc.state.or.us Click on "Victim Offend" to access the PDF version.

About the OCCD

The Oregon Council on Crime and Delinquency is a statewide citizens organization dedicated to increasing understanding of the adult and juvenile justice systems and to promoting effective policies and programs for the prevention, treatment, and control of crime and delinquency.

The OCCD is incorporated as a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization under the laws of the State of Oregon.

Membership is available at General and Student rates. A membership application can be found on the back of this newsletter.

Officers and Staff of the OCCD

Board Chair: James Paul Heuser, Ph.D.

*Assistant Professor
Administration of Justice, PSU*

1st Vice-Chair: Brian Renauer, Ph.D.

*Assistant Professor
Administration of Justice, PSU*

2nd Vice-Chair: Don Gibbons, Ph.D.

*Emeritus Professor
Urban Studies and Sociology, PSU*

Treasurer: Linda A. Larsen

At-Large:

Annette Jolin, Ph.D. *Professor and Chair
Administration of Justice, PSU*

Charles Shireman, Ph.D. *Emeritus Professor
University of Chicago*

Tom English, M.A.

*Institute on Violence and
Destructive Behavior, U. of Oregon*

Executive Director: Christopher P. Larsen

Calendar of Events

Calendar of Events

May 10, 2002 (Friday)

8:30am-4pm (8am check-in)

328 Smith Memorial Center, Portland State University
Workshop: Cognitive Behavioral Therapy: Core Skills and Underlying Beliefs

Instructor: Greg Crosby presents the tools and skills of CBT and how to flexibly use them in individual, group, and family settings.

Fees: \$99 Noncredit

6 contact hours

Contact: Marion Sharp (503) 725-4876

sharpml@pdx.edu

CLINICAL SUPERVISION

May 3, 17, 31 + TBA (Fridays)

Supervision I, II, and III

8:30am-4:30pm (8am check-in)

For all three \$299 Noncredit (Credit available) or \$135 each Noncredit.

Instructor: Russell Miars, PhD, associate professor in the Counselor Education program at PSU.

Contact: Marion Sharp (503) 725-4876

sharpml@pdx.edu

May 3 + TBA (Friday)

8:30am-4:30pm (8am check-in)

229 Smith Memorial Center, Portland State Univ.

Workshop: Supervision I: Theory, Process, and Skills of Supervision

May 17 + TBA (Friday)

8:30am-4:30pm (8am check-in)

229 Smith Memorial Center, Portland State Univ.

Workshop: Supervision II: Developmental Foundations, Skills, and Practice

May 31 + TBA (Friday)

8:30am-4:30pm (8am check-in)

290/292 Smith Memorial Center, Portland State Univ.

Workshop: Supervision III: Legal/Ethical Issues and Relationship Dilemmas

June 17-21, 2002 (Monday-Friday)

9am-5pm

414 Graduate School of Education, Portland State U.

Class: Negotiation and Mediation

Fees: \$695 Noncredit (Grad and Undergrad credit available)

Instructor: Alison Taylor

Instructor: Alison Taylor

This meets the requirements of the basic mediation curriculum as set by the Oregon Dispute Resolution Commission (ODRC).

Contact: Marion Sharp (503) 725-4876
sharpml@pdx.edu.

This calendar of events is a service provided at no charge by the OCCD and is sent to a statewide audience. We are interested in events relating to adult and juvenile justice, whether these be meetings, conferences, or training sessions.

If you would like to have events listed in this newsletter, we may be contacted at:

larsencp@pdx.edu
or 503-725-9586
or Oregon Council on Crime and Delinquency
PO Box 9355
Portland, OR 97207-9355

Oregon Supreme Court

All opinion text cited here is abstracted from Supreme Court opinions or media releases, except for *italicized block quotations*, which are abstracted from Appeals Court opinions.

Supreme Court opinions can be accessed on the web at: www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/supreme.htm

No criminal or juvenile justice opinions as of April 16, 2002.

Oregon Appeals Court

Text is from media reports and opinions of the Oregon Appeals Court.

Appeals Court opinions can be accessed on the web at: www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/appeals.htm

April 10, 2002

State v. Espinosa (Marion) (A106660)

Defendant appeals his convictions on two counts of aggravated murder. Defendant's assignments of error pertain to the admission into evidence of hearsay statements of the two people defendant was with immediately before and after the murders. The state concedes that certain admissions by defendant's companions should not have been admitted into evidence as statements against penal interest under OEC 804(3)(c), but argues that the admission of those statements was harmless. *Held*: The erroneous admission of the disputed statements was not harmless.

admission of the disputed statements was not harmless. Reversed and remanded for a new trial.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A106660.htm>

State v. Riggins (Malheur) (A104512)

Defendant appeals his convictions of burglary and theft. At sentencing, defendant challenged the use of two juvenile adjudications in determining his criminal history score, arguing that those adjudications were constitutionally defective because they were uncounseled. The sentencing court rejected defendant's challenge and calculated his criminal history using the juvenile adjudications. Defendant challenges that ruling on appeal. *Held*: Because the state failed to carry its burden of establishing a valid waiver of counsel in defendant's prior juvenile adjudication, the trial court erred when it relied on that adjudication to enhance defendant's criminal history score. Remanded for resentencing; otherwise affirmed.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A104512.htm>

Kenton v. Board of Parole (Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision) (A115329)

Petitioner seeks judicial review of two orders issued by the Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision, which denied petitioner's re-release and reset a parole release date. *Held*: These orders relate to a parole release date. Consequently, petitioner cannot seek judicial review of those orders under ORS 144.335(3)(1999). Judicial review dismissed.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A115329.htm>

Mastne v. Schiedler (Umatilla) (A114441)

Petitioner appeals from a judgment denying post-conviction relief. Petitioner argues that he should be allowed to seek post-conviction relief, despite the time bar of ORS 138.510(4), because he could not have reasonably made a claim under *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 US 466, 120 S Ct 2348, 147 L Ed 2d 435 (2000), until that case was decided. *Held*: Under *Wallis v. Baldwin*, 152 Or App 295, 954 P2d 192, rev den 327 Or 174 (1998), the escape clause provision of ORS 138.510(3) does not apply to ORS 138.510(4). Petitioner cannot seek post-conviction relief under ORS 138.510(4) because his petition is time barred. Motion for summary affirmance granted.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A114441.htm>

State v. Wilcox (Clatsop) (A110568)

Defendant appeals from a judgment of conviction for harassment of his wife. Defendant argues that the trial court erred in admitting into evidence incriminating hearsay statements made by his wife. The state asserts that the statements were admissible under OEC 803(26). *Held*: The totality of the circumstances imbued the victim's statements with sufficient indicia of reliability, and, given the character of the statements and the circumstances in which they were made, they have particularized guarantees of trustworthiness. Affirmed.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A110568.htm>

State ex rel Juv. Dept. v. Kopp (Multnomah) (A113523)

Mother failed to appear at a pretrial "best interest" hearing on the state's petition to terminate her parental rights to her daughter. The juvenile court heard the state's evidence and entered a default judgment terminating mother's parental rights. The court also denied mother's motion to set the judgment aside. On appeal of the denial of her motion, mother argued that termination of her parental rights was error, because she did not receive statutorily or constitutionally adequate notice regarding the best interest hearing. *Held*: ORS 419B.524 did not deprive mother of standing to seek to set aside the default termination judgment. Under former ORS 419B.515 and a related rule of civil procedure, the juvenile court was authorized to terminate mother's parental rights at the best interest hearing only if mother received adequate notice of the time and place of, and consequences of failure to appear at, that particular hearing. The summons directing mother to appear at an earlier "show cause" hearing was inadequate for that purpose, as were the court's oral instructions and its written order following the show cause hearing. The best interest hearing also could not properly be considered a continuation of the earlier show cause hearing. Because mother received statutorily inadequate notice of the best interest hearing, the juvenile court lacked authority to terminate her parental rights in her absence at that hearing. Order denying motion to set aside reversed; termination judgment vacated; remanded for further proceedings.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A113523.htm>

Baker v. Johnson (Malheur) (A104219)

PER CURIAM

Plaintiff appeals from the trial court's dismissal of his petition for a writ of habeas corpus. He challenges an order of the Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision deferring his projected parole release date. We conclude that the trial court correctly rejected plaintiff's arguments on the merits of that issue. *Hamel v. Johnson*, 173 Or App 448, 25 P3d 314 (2001).

Plaintiff also asserts that the trial court erred in imposing \$475 in costs for his court-appointed counsel. We reverse the award of costs for court-appointed counsel and remand for reconsideration in light of *Bacote v. Johnson*, 333 Or 28, 35 P3d 1019 (2001).

Award of costs for court-appointed counsel reversed and remanded; otherwise affirmed.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A104219.htm>

Mendacino v. Lampert (Malheur) (A105224)

PER CURIAM

Plaintiff appeals from the trial court's dismissal of his petition for a writ of habeas corpus. He challenges a 1997 order of the Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision deferring his projected parole release date. We conclude that the trial court correctly rejected plaintiff's arguments on the merits of that issue. See generally *Hamel v. Johnson*, 173 Or App 448, 25 P3d 314 (2001); *Weidner v. Armenakis*, 154 Or App 12, 959 P2d 623 (1998), withdrawn by order July 13, 1998, reasoning reaffirmed and readopted in *Merrill v. Johnson*, 155 Or App 295, 964 P2d 284, rev den 328 Or 40 (1998).

Plaintiff also asserts that the trial court erred in imposing \$475 in costs for his court-appointed counsel. We reverse the award of costs for court-appointed counsel and remand for reconsideration in light of *Bacote v. Johnson*, 333 Or 28, 35 P3d 1019 (2001).

Award of costs for court-appointed counsel reversed and remanded; otherwise affirmed.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A105224.htm>

Bowers v. Thompson (Marion) (A99945)

PER CURIAM

Plaintiff seeks review of the dismissal of his

petition for a writ of habeas corpus. Plaintiff initiated this proceeding to challenge a 1996 order of the Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision setting his projected parole release date. Plaintiff's habeas corpus claim concerned only whether the projected parole release date was correct. Plaintiff has since been released on parole. Because the only relief plaintiff sought in this habeas corpus proceeding was parole release, this case has been mooted by his release on parole.

Appeal dismissed.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A99945.htm>

Bowers v. Thompson (Marion) (A100278)

PER CURIAM

Plaintiff seeks review of the dismissal of his petition for a writ of habeas corpus. For the reasons set forth in *Bowers v. Thompson*, 180 Or App ___, ___ P3d

___ (April 10, 2002) (decided this date), which involves the same plaintiff, we conclude that this case is moot.

Appeal dismissed as moot.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A100278.htm>

Myrick v. Armenakis (Marion) (A100198)

PER CURIAM

Plaintiff appeals from the trial court's dismissal of his petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The crimes for which he is incarcerated took place during the time period when the administrative rule discussed in *Peek v. Thompson*, 160 Or App 260, 980 P2d 178, rev dismissed 329 Or 553 (1999), was in effect. We therefore reverse and remand with instructions for the trial court to consider plaintiff's arguments in light of *Peek* and in light of the standard of review enunciated in *Hamel v. Johnson*, 173 Or App 448, 25 P3d 314 (2001).

Reversed and remanded.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A100198.htm>

April 3, 2002

State v. Gotchall (Multnomah) (A108861)

PER CURIAM

Defendant appeals from a conviction for possession of a controlled substance and for supplying contraband. In her first assignment of error, defendant argues that the trial court erred in denying her motion to suppress. We

affirm the trial court's ruling on the motion. *State v. Amaya*, 176 Or App 35, 29 P3d 1177 (2001).

In her second assignment of error, defendant argues that the trial court erred by denying her motion for a judgment of acquittal on two counts of supplying contraband. In the first count, defendant was charged with introducing contraband into a correctional facility. See ORS 162.185(1)(a). Following *State v. Tippetts*, 180 Or App 350, ___ P3d __ (2002), we reverse her conviction on that count. In the second count, defendant was charged with possessing contraband while being confined to a correctional facility. See ORS 162.185(1)(b). Although subsection (1)(b) prohibits different conduct than subsection (1)(a), the state does not argue that, in this case, that difference demands a different result from the one that we reach under subsection (1)(a). If defendant did not voluntarily introduce contraband into the correctional facility, we do not see how, on these facts, she could voluntarily possess that contraband once she was confined in the facility. Accordingly, we also reverse the second count.

Reversed as to both counts of supplying contraband; otherwise affirmed.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A108861.htm>

State v. Reed (Washington) (A108052)

PER CURIAM

Reversed as to supplying contraband; otherwise affirmed. *State v. Tippetts*, 180 Or App 350, ___ P3d __ (2002).

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A108052.htm>

March 27, 2002

State v. Watson (Washington) (A110244)

Defendant was convicted of criminal conspiracy, ORS 161.450, and escape in the second degree, ORS 164.215, based on her conduct relating to an inmate's escape from the Washington County Jail. She appealed, arguing that the trial court erred in denying her mid-trial motion to appoint different trial counsel and in entering separate convictions and sentences. *Held*: The trial court did not err in denying defendant's motion to appoint new counsel. As to the separate convictions and sentences, under ORS 161.465(1), conspiracy is a continuing course of conduct that terminates when the crime or crimes that are its object

are completed. Under ORS 161.485(3), a person cannot be convicted on the basis of the same course of conduct of both the actual commission of an offense and conspiracy to commit that offense. Here, defendant's actions in conspiring to effect the inmate's escape continued from the time of her telephone conversation with the inmate regarding the escape until the escape was completed. The same course of conduct therefore provided the basis for both the conspiracy and the escape charges. The trial court erred in entering separate convictions and imposing separate sentences for those two crimes. Judgment of conviction for conspiracy vacated; conviction for escape in the second degree affirmed; remanded for resentencing.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A110244.htm>

State v. Early (Marion) (A105784)

Defendant was indicted for and convicted of felony driving while suspended or revoked. He did not demur to or otherwise challenge the sufficiency of the indictment or move for a judgment of acquittal. On appeal, relying in part on *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 US 466, 120 S Ct 2348, 147 L Ed 2d 435 (2000), he argued that the indictment failed to state facts sufficient to allege his crime. *Held*: Under ORS 811.175 (1997) and ORS 811.182 (1997), the crime of driving while suspended or revoked was either an infraction, a Class A misdemeanor, or a Class C felony, depending on the circumstances that gave rise to the predicate suspension or revocation. Consistently with the required functions of indictments and with *Apprendi*, the indictment in this case, which was captioned "Driving While Suspended - Felony" and which alleged that defendant "feloniously" drove while revoked, was sufficient to put defendant on notice that he was charged with a felony offense. Thus, unlike the defendant in *Apprendi*, defendant was not, in effect, indicted for one class of offense and convicted and punished for a greater offense. Nor does *Apprendi* require that an indictment for driving while suspended or revoked allege the particular underlying circumstance that gave rise to the defendant's predicate suspension or revocation. At most, defendant's challenge to the indictment on that basis amounts to a challenge that the indictment is not sufficiently definite and certain, which is a challenge that defendant cannot raise for the first time on appeal. Affirmed.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A105784.htm>

State v. Tippetts (Washington) (A108893)

When the police arrested defendant, he had a small amount of marijuana in his pants pocket. The police took defendant to the county jail and found the marijuana on him once he was there. Defendant was found guilty of supplying contraband because he introduced the marijuana into the jail. On appeal, defendant argues that the trial court should have granted his motion for a judgment of acquittal. He reasons that he did not voluntarily introduce the marijuana into the jail. *Held*: ORS 161.095(1) requires a voluntary act as a predicate to criminal liability, i.e., it requires some evidence that the defendant had the ability to choose to take a particular action. In this case, there is no evidence from which a reasonable juror could find that defendant had such a choice. Moreover, defendant's earlier voluntary act of possession of drugs cannot provide the basis for criminal liability; on the facts of this case, the introduction of the drugs into the jail was not a reasonably foreseeable consequence of possessing them. Conviction for supplying contraband reversed; otherwise affirmed.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A108893.htm>

State ex rel Juv. Dept. v. Cruz (Washington) (A110181)

PER CURIAM

Youth appeals an order finding him to be within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court for committing acts that, if done by an adult, would constitute the offenses of resisting arrest and giving false information to a police officer for a citation. We write only to address youth's third assignment of error, which challenges the sufficiency of the evidence pertaining to the false information charge. The state concedes that it did not prove that youth knew that the officer was requesting youth to provide identifying information for purposes of issuing him a citation, which is an element of the offense. ORS 162.385(1); *State v. Jaha*, 118 Or App 496, 501, 848 P2d 622 (1993). On de novo review of the record, we agree and accept the state's concession.

Reversed as to trial court's finding of jurisdiction based on an act that, if committed by an adult, would constitute the crime of giving false information to a police officer for a citation and remanded for entry of

amended order of commitment; otherwise affirmed.

Web:

<http://www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/A110181.htm>

Miscellanea

OCCD Web Page

If you are looking for information about crime and delinquency in Oregon or on the national level, the OCCD web page has a large array of links to local, county, state, federal, and research sites.

The OCCD web page can be accessed at:
<http://homepage.mac.com/larsencp/OCCD.html>

New Federal Publications

Print copies of the following documents, where available, can be ordered from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS):

<http://www.ncjrs.org/>

<http://www.puborder.ncjrs.org/>

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

"Short- and Long-Term Consequences of Adolescent Victimization" (16 pp.) (NCJ 191210)
<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs/violvict.html#191210>

"Hybrid and Other Modern Gangs" (8 pp.) (NCJ 189916)
<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs/gang.html#189916>

"2000 Report to Congress: Title V Community Prevention Grants Program" (56 pp.) (NCJ 190635)
<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs/delinq.html#190635>

"Law Enforcement and Juvenile Crime" (32 pp.) (NCJ 191031)
<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs/general.html#191031>

"Highlights of the 2000 National Youth Gang Survey" (2 pp.) (FS200204)
<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs/fact.html#fs200204>

Bureau of Justice Statistics

"Civil Justice Survey of State Courts, 1992 and 1996, CD-ROM" (NCJ 189035) Contains data sets, documentation codebooks, SAS and SPSS setup files from Civil Justice Survey of State Courts, 1992 and 1996, and copies of reports produced from these data.

\$10.25 for U.S. buyers and \$US 23.75 for buyers from Canada and other countries.

Place orders at: <http://puborder.ncjrs.org/>

"Characteristics of Drivers Stopped by Police, 1999" (20 pp.) (NCJ 191548)

<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/cdsp99.htm>

Office of Domestic Preparedness

The Office for Domestic Preparedness (ODP) has released a group of Fact Sheets that provide information about trainings, exercises, equipment grants, and technical assistance programs. ODP is responsible for enhancing the capacity and preparedness of State and local jurisdictions to respond to incidents of domestic terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction. (OJP)

Access fact sheets at:

<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/odp/library/bulletins.htm>

Office for Victims of Crime

"State Crime Victim Compensation and Assistance Grant Programs" (7 pp.) (FS 000280)

<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ovc/publications/factshts/companassist/welcome.html>

New OVC Help Series Brochures.

Each brochure is designed to aid victim service providers in their efforts to assist crime victims. The OVC Help Series addresses eight categories of crime victimization homicide, sexual assault, stalking, drunk driving, domestic violence, robbery, assault, and child abuse.

Only available electronically at:

http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ovc/publications/infores/help_series/welcome.html

More Web Resources

The National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) publishes an electronic newsletter, JUSTINFO, which lists recent federal publications and information about conferences and grant opportunities.

To subscribe to this newsletter go to:

<http://puborder.ncjrs.org/register/>

The NCJRS main site provides access to both publications and an abstract database of research:

<http://www.ncjrs.org/>

The Bibliography Project

Are you a researcher who has conducted research in the state of Oregon related to the adult or juvenile justice systems? We would like to know about your research, so that we may begin to construct a bibliography of such research. The bibliography will be posted on our website and will be freely available for searches by all who are interested. We hope that such a resource will help academics, students, researchers, practitioners, and the public find out what has been studied in the state.

Please email us at larsencp@pdx.edu or write to us for further details.

Book Review

Drug War Heresies: Learning from Other Vices, Times, and Places

Robert J. MacCoun and Peter Reuter
Cambridge University Press
August 2001, 496p., 26 line diagrams, 22 tables
ISBN: 0-521-57263-0, 0-521-79997-X (paper)
\$75.00 (hardback), \$25.00 (paper)

This book by MacCoun, a distinguished psychologist, and Reuter, an eminent economist, was first published in 2001 as one of the RAND studies in policy analysis. It qualifies as the definitive work on "the drug problem" in the United States and as a "must read" for persons who would strive to comprehend the multifaceted nature of drug use and public policy questions about what to do about it. Because of space limitations in this newsletter, I can do little more than report that the book provides a broad-ranging and empirically-grounded, multidisciplinary and nonpartisan discussion of the drug problem and policy approaches to the control of it in the United States.

The authors' focus is more catholic than that which is encountered in many popular discussions of drugs in that they attend not only cocaine, opiates, marijuana, and amphetamines, but also to alcohol and cigarettes. Also, they comment not only upon historical experiences in America with these "vices," but also with gambling and prostitution and efforts to control the latter. They also examine responses to drugs in a number of other countries, including Italian experiences with "depenalization," that is, policies which reduce the attention to drug problems by the authorities, e.g., police disattention to low-level drug users; along with maintenance programs in England, in which heroin users are provided with controlled but

regularized dosages of heroin. They clear away a good bit of the mythology surrounding these efforts in other nations, including the frequently-encountered claim that the authorities in Netherlands promote an "anything goes" posture which leaves citizens free to indulge in any or all drugs of their choice.

Regarding drug policy choices, MacCoun and Reuter note that views vary widely in the United States and elsewhere: one end of the continuum being represented by those who strongly favor the status quo of criminalization of heroin, opiates, cocaine, and marijuana, along with zero tolerance and severe penalties for offenders, and on the other pole, exponents of extreme liberalization, in which, like tobacco and alcohol, all other drugs would be legalized and readily available to all who desire to use them.

A central point made by these authors is that there is no single, "ideal" response to drugs and drug use, rather, there are "tradeoffs" that go with all of the regimes or policies that might be chosen. For example, incarceration of large numbers of occasional users of marijuana would eat up funds that might otherwise be used to support other, important social goals. Moreover, the viability of various specific policies that might be adopted to address drug problems is heavily affected by the perspectives of politicians and members of the general public, as well as by the scientific evidence about drug use. For example, while compelling arguments can be made for nearly complete decriminalization of marijuana use, there is little likelihood that proposals to that effect are going to be enacted.

MacCoun and Reuter's analysis ends on a relatively pessimistic note, in that they assert that, as far as complete prevention of drug use and abuse in America is concerned, "it is doubtful that a complete 'solution' exists." At the same time, they contend that it may be possible to move in the direction of less intrusive, divisive, and expensive policies, as for example, drastic reduction in the number of low-level drug users being sentenced to lengthy imprisonment or the depenalization of marijuana use (but not blanket legalization of all marijuana-related activities").

Those who read and reflect upon the contents of this book may not agree with all of the conclusions of the authors, but there is little doubt that all of them will be considerably wiser for the experience.

DG (seaviewu@aol.com)

OCCD
PO Box 9355
Portland, OR 97207-9355

Name: _____

Title: (Mr., Mrs., Ms., Dr.) _____ Occupation: _____

Permanent Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ ZIP: _____

Mailing Address: _____
(if different)

City: _____ State: _____ ZIP: _____

Phone: _____ Email: _____

Membership Category:

General \$35.00

Student \$20.00

Enrolled at: _____

Issues of interest: _____

Membership dues alone do not cover the OCCD's operating expenses.
The OCCD is a 501(c)3 organization, and contributions are tax-deductible.

Donation: _____

Total Remittance: _____

Oregon Council on Crime and Delinquency
P.O. Box 9355
Portland, OR 97207-9355