

164500

RESEARCH AT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE:

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

Jeremy Travis

Director

National Institute of Justice

at the

1995 Annual Meeting

ACADEMY OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SCIENCES

Boston Park Plaza Hotel

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Thank you, Dr. Latessa, for that gracious introduction. I know that you have played many important roles in ACJS, as past President and in other offices. Your efforts and those of President Harry Allen have helped the ACJS grow in prestige and influence. I understand that this is the largest conference ever held by ACJS, and I am honored to be part of it.

Let me offer my congratulations also to Bob Langworthy, your program chair for this meeting. It's clear from your full and varied schedule that he's done a first-rate job. Since Bob will be joining us at the National Institute of Justice in a very short time, we are delighted that we too will benefit from his talents.

For those of you who may not be familiar with the National Institute of Justice -- NIJ -- our agency was established in 1968 as the research arm of the Department of Justice. Since then, the Institute has supported research, development, and evaluation on a very wide range of criminal justice topics. We recently completed a history of the first 25 years of NIJ, and I hope all of you will have time to stop by our information booth for a copy.

As many of you may know, NIJ staff held a workshop last night to go over the outlines of our Research Plan for 1995-1996. They reviewed where the Institute is headed during this period, and the kinds of creative proposals the Institute hopes to receive from researchers and practitioners in response to the Plan.

This afternoon, I'd like to widen the perspective and look

at the work of the National Institute of Justice in the context of the Federal research role in crime control policy -- first, by sharing my thoughts on the current Crime Bill debate; second, by describing NIJ's evolving research strategy, and third by asking why, as a Nation, we invest so little in crime control research.

As your conference theme reflects, we are at a major juncture -- justice is indeed at a crossroads. Just behind us, in 1994, stands the most recent formulation of the Federal role in crime control policy, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994; in the future, the prospect of new crime control legislation now being considered in Congress; President Clinton has stated his intention to veto any legislation that does not place 100,000 additional police officers on the streets. While this is a time of some uncertainty, I think it is safe to say that crime continues to dominate the national consciousness, and the interest and concern is bi-partisan -- although approaches to dealing with crime differ.

Let me review briefly where we stand at the present moment. Last year's Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act was a bipartisan effort marking a moment in time when we were able to agree on a new partnership for crime control between Federal, State and local governments. The bill authorizes \$30 billion dollars over the next six years, with funding from the savings achieved by downsizing of the federal bureaucracy.

Let me note some of the key features of the '94 Crime Act. I find it helpful to think of its provisions as falling into four categories.

The first category includes those provisions that add new federal crimes, prohibitions, or penalties. For example: possession of handguns by juveniles is outlawed. Certain assault weapons are banned. The federal death penalty is extended to

additional crimes. And the "three strikes" provision requires life imprisonment without parole for federal offenders convicted of a third violent crime or serious drug offense.

In a second category are provisions that strengthen the federal role in providing for public safety, or help local governments to meet certain obligations. For example, the Crime Act provides \$1.2 billion to upgrade the Immigration and Naturalization Service's efforts to secure our borders, and \$1.8 billion to reimburse localities for the costs of incarcerating criminal aliens.

In a third category fall a variety of prevention programs. The law authorizes (but funding has not yet been appropriated for) an array of programs for States and localities to choose from, including anti-gang programs; boys and girls clubs; partnerships between the elderly and law enforcement; academic skills programs; and after-school and summer programs for at-risk youth. In this category, the debate over the programs' value is most heated. For some, these programs have little crime control connection; for others -- including significant numbers of police, prosecutors, and researchers -- their potential impact is greater than the equivalent financial support for another prison cell or police officer. I will not join this debate today.

This afternoon, I'd like to focus on a fourth category -- one that, in my view, begins to distinguish this legislation from earlier federal efforts, as well as from the current proposals before Congress. This category could be defined as crime control innovations -- innovations that focus not on defining new crimes or new penalties, but on new approaches to preventing crime and responding to crime.

For example, the law provides federal funding for 100,000 police officers, a nearly twenty percent increase over the number

already at work in localities around the country. But federal funding in this instance is more than a revenue-sharing scheme to pay their salaries -- it is leverage to raise the effectiveness of the way we police ourselves. These new officers will work in community policing -- not merely reacting to crime after it has been committed, but working in collaboration with the community to identify problems, help resolve conflicts, and prevent crime.

And the police title of the Crime Act also authorizes up to 15 percent of the funds-- about \$1 billion over 5 years -- for innovative programs. These include community based crime prevention initiatives; multidisciplinary early intervention teams; training in conflict-resolution, mediation, problem-solving and other skills to defuse tensions and reduce crime; the introduction of new technologies to enhance crime control strategies; and the development of new administrative and managerial systems to facilitate the adoption of community policing. Finally, the 1994 Crime Act creates a federal responsibility to provide technical assistance to police departments around the country.

In short, this law does not merely pay for 100,000 officers; it represents an unprecedented partnership in guiding the development of the police function -- one of society's most critical functions -- toward community policing, toward problem-solving policing, toward strategic policing.

Similarly, the Crime Act calls for a federal investment of some \$8 billion, authorized over the next several years, in prison construction -- and also construction of alternative facilities, such as boot camps for nonviolent offenders. Rather than merely pay for more prisons with federal tax dollars, Congress and the President supported a critical innovation in our approach to imprisonment.

The law also advances a multi-disciplinary approach to the problem of domestic violence, by supporting the efforts of police and prosecutors while including grant programs for victims services, rape prevention and education programs, battered women's shelters, and other domestic violence prevention activities. Again, a distinctive and innovative vision of crime control policy emerges from the pages of the statute.

A final example: the law provides \$1 billion over six years to fund drug courts. These dedicated courts provide not just adjudication but also judicial supervision and specialized services, including treatment, to nonviolent drug-abusing offenders. Rather than simply fund treatment -- or simply fund more courts to respond to more drug arrests -- Congress and the President chose to support a creative approach to adjudication that mixes court-supervised coerced abstinence with outpatient treatment, and increasing sanctions for those who do not adhere to the strict, drug-free regimen.

As you are aware, the new Congressional leadership is now proposing a substantial redefinition of the federal role I've just outlined. The House of Representatives has passed its bill. The Senate begins debate on its bills in mid-March. Although they differ in certain respects, these bills would, if they pass, effectively repeal provisions for drug courts, eliminate prevention programs, and convert the community policing title from a discretionary to a public safety block-grant program, without specific ties to the goal of community policing. States or localities would be authorized to spend the money on virtually any programs that enhance public safety.

So my remarks this afternoon about the prospects for federal research on crime control policy take place in a legislative context that is still evolving.

In this environment, it is particularly appropriate that we ask ourselves, what is the proper federal role in crime control policy? It is clear that the public recognizes a need for Federal leadership: a February 1994 poll of Americans showed that 83 percent of respondents believed the federal government could do much more to improve the crime problem.¹ Yet there is a tension between growing federal responsibility -- which is implied in revenue-sharing, the expansion of federal offenses and new federal enforcement functions -- and the realities of our society's response to crime. Notwithstanding increased Federal involvement, crime-fighting remains an activity primarily of states and localities. State and local governments spend more than six times as much on all justice activities in a year as the federal government. They convict almost seventy times as many criminals, and hold nine times as many prison inmates. As one observer has noted, Washington remains a "junior partner" in criminal justice.²

In my view, the public's call for federal leadership -- and the evident bipartisan view that the federal government should spend between \$20 and \$30 billion on crime control over the next five years -- accentuates the need for strong federal support for innovation and research -- to build our knowledge base -- to learn by doing.

The enactment of the 1994 bill gives us a remarkable opportunity to test our ability to learn-by-doing. There are four program areas where the law effectively says: there shall be innovation: community policing, boot camps, drug courts, and violence against women. In each of these four program-areas, NIJ will be conducting program evaluations; the Department of Justice, under the leadership of Janet Reno, will be allocating a percentage of the funds for each program -- up to 5 percent -- to fund these evaluations. For each program area, we will develop a multi-year research and evaluation strategy, beginning with a

strategic planning conference that brings together researchers and practitioners to survey the state of knowledge and propose research topics and strategies appropriate to the Federal programmatic innovation. For each, we will then release a special research and evaluation solicitation. We will not attempt to evaluate every program funded; nor will we focus these funds on large national evaluations. Rather, we will develop evolving research and evaluation strategies that will offer knowledge to guide the implementation of these new programs.

In this way, the nation will be able to learn from experimentation at the local level. We can learn about what techniques are most effective in community policing, not just put the officers onto the streets. We can learn about whether boot camps can divert beginners from criminal careers, rather than just using them to relieve overcrowded prisons. We can learn about effective combinations of sanctions and services in drug courts, not just add a new segment to the court system. We can learn about how best to intervene in and prevent family violence, not just fund battered women's shelters.

Socrates thought the unexamined life was not worth living.³ I believe fervently that the unevaluated federal innovation is not worth funding. I believe we should be accountable to the country, and the Congress, to learn from what we do, to spread that knowledge through the field, to identify failures and avoid replicating them, to advance the field so that it can promote more effective policy-making -- and to develop the knowledge base so that we can intelligently design the next set of innovations. If the federal government merely funds programs without evaluating them, some value may well be transmitted, but significant value is also lost. The federal government can also buy with that money what state and local governments don't have

the scale or scope to buy -- knowledge that can be shared, knowledge that can be adapted to local needs, knowledge that can help us multiply successful programs.

This approach to evaluative research -- to learning while doing -- reflects my own personal experience. Twenty years ago during the height of the LEAA era, I was working at the Vera Institute of Justice. We were implementing two LEAA grants, one to establish a pretrial services agency that would experiment with different innovations in judicial decisions regarding bail, and one to determine whether services provided to prosecution witnesses would improve their participation in court proceedings. In both cases, Vera received simultaneous federal grants to support the programmatic innovation and the evaluative research.

Those were rich experiences. We always knew that our demonstration program would yield lessons for the development of criminal justice policy in other jurisdictions. We always knew we were testing an hypothesis. In one particularly memorable episode, we succeeded by failure; the research showed that the expenditure of a million dollars to provide supportive services to victims and witnesses did not increase their willingness to come to court. Yet we rebounded from this early disappointment to conduct the first survey of witness attitudes, to develop a victim advocacy program, and to conduct a highly successful experiment in the mediation of felony cases. We learned that the "customers" of the criminal justice system were voting with their feet, and didn't like the dispositions that the traditional courts had to offer.

I cite these experiences to support the observation that neither of these experiments would ever have been funded by the City of New York -- and even if they had, they certainly would not have included substantial research components in the program plan. In designing the NIJ evaluative research strategy over the

next three months, we will be seeking out similar opportunities to learn at the grass-roots level, to work closely with innovators, to spread the successes, failures and lessons learned to other jurisdictions. We will be able to do this because the federal support for innovation and research are so closely intertwined.

Of course, the research agenda of NIJ extends beyond the evaluation of specific initiatives in the 1994 Crime Act. I won't discuss our new Research Plan in detail here since copies of it have been made available at this conference. Let me just emphasize that it reflects both continuity and change. First, we have reaffirmed our commitment to the six long-range research goals that have guided NIJ's work for the past several years -- to develop knowledge that will:

- ♦reduce violent crime;
- ♦reduce drug and alcohol-related crime;
- ♦improve crime prevention;
- ♦improve law enforcement and criminal justice; and
- ♦develop new technologies

We have made several important changes. First, NIJ is committed under this Plan to investigator-defined research, leaving to you and your counterparts the important responsibility for recommending specific topics and strategies. And we have placed even greater emphasis on partnerships -- with other Federal research agencies and with the program offices of the Department of Justice -- encouraging the field to pursue interdisciplinary proposals and collaborative funding.

Organizationally, we have merged research and evaluation into one office. And in reviewing the Institute's portfolio of prior and ongoing research, I have identified three areas of concentration for us to build on. Those three areas are: violence, especially juvenile handgun violence; sentencing and

punishment policy; and the relationship between drugs and crime. I would like to briefly describe our approach to these areas.

Juvenile violence is a serious complex of problems; and as young people become a proportionately larger part of the population, the problems of juvenile violence are likely to intensify in coming years.⁴ NIJ is sponsoring model research and demonstration programs to reduce gun-related violence in three cities: Atlanta, St. Louis, and Boston. Joining with NIJ as a partner in this enterprise is the Centers for Disease Control, which has embarked on the project as part of its assessment of violence as a public health problem. These three local programs will attempt to break the link between young people and guns through various types of intervention. Through other research projects, we are learning more about gun trafficking, gun availability to juveniles, and the impact of targeted police enforcement in areas of high gun crimes. We are also supporting the development of new technology for detecting concealed weapons and today awarded three grants to inaugurate a new program in this area.

A second major area of NIJ's research -- fueled by the explosion of the prison population and the poverty of our sentencing options -- is sentencing and punishment policy. Last year our country broke a national record, when the number of people behind prison bars exceeded one million. Average prison time served per violent crime approximately tripled between 1975 and 1989. But violent crime did not decrease.⁵

Although we know that incarceration can make a difference through deterrence and incapacitation, these figures suggest that our punishment policy is inadequate for the problems we confront. As Professor Al Blumstein remarked at a recent conference, our punishment policy has been based on a "prison-centric universe"

-- a "pre-Galileo" model that needs to be reconceived for the real world.

NIJ's research is already exploring a broad range of punishment policies, including: studies of sentencing practices; intermediate sanctions such as boot camps and intensive supervision probation; prosecutorial practices -- recognizing the increasingly critical role of the prosecutor in determining sentencing alternatives; and the relationship between drug treatment and sentencing practices.

We need to do much more. Over the next six months, we will be developing a major new research initiative in this area -- to look at the policymaking process at the legislative level; to develop a collaborative relationship with corrections administrators similar to the excellent relationship we now enjoy with police executives; to examine life in prison and the impact of exponentially expanding incarceration upon families and communities; to explore models of restorative justice and community justice. This is a critical area of policy where knowledge is scarce and unfounded assumptions abound.

Third, NIJ will be expanding its investment in basic and applied research to develop our understanding of the relationship between drugs and crime. We will continue to expand our Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) program, which has been tracking drug use through interviews and urine testing of arrestees in 23 urban areas. This research platform offers us an opportunity to learn about a wide range of drug-related issues, including drug market dynamics, and the procurement and use of guns by drug-using and other offenders. We will also be conducting research on the effectiveness of various police strategies to disrupt drug markets; and exploring the criminal justice system's coercive power to increase the use of effective drug treatment strategies

-- in prisons, through drug courts, in intensive supervision, and on probation and parole.

In the coming years the Institute will be continuing its work on many other projects as well -- international research, policing in emerging democracies, community prosecution, among others. But these three areas of concentration -- and our research programs under the 1994 Crime Act -- will represent our primary investments.

There is one final -- very important issue -- that I would like to reflect on this afternoon. As I mentioned earlier, the Federal research role in criminal justice has been quite limited, especially in comparison to other national policy concerns. Crime and violence, which rank high on the list of public concerns, seem strikingly underrated as topics worthy of research.

In 1989, the National Academy of Sciences conducted a survey to discover how much was being spent by a number of federal agencies (including, for example, the National Science Foundation, the CDC, the National Institute on Mental Health, and NIJ) on research on violence.⁶ They came up with a figure of \$20.2 million, which seems like a lot, says the National Academy, but which amounts to \$3.41 per violent victimization in 1988. Compare that \$3.41-investment-in-research with the estimated costs per violent event, which were: \$54,000 per rape, \$19,000 per robbery, and \$16,500 per aggravated assault.

Another way to make this comparison is to look at how much the nation spends on researching a range of life-threatening circumstances. The National Academy compared how much research money we spend "per year of potential life lost" in four different ways. The federal government spends \$794 per year of potential life lost to cancer. For heart, lung and blood

diseases as a group, the comparison figure is \$441. For AIDS, it is \$697. But for violence, it is \$31.⁷

Perhaps a better analogy for violence research is with other areas of social policy, rather than with medicine. Medical research is seeking a cure; if a massive investment of research funds eventually produces a cure for cancer, the wisdom of that investment will have been confirmed. But there will be no cure for criminal behavior. For this reason and others, research on crime and other issues in the social sciences normally has a harder time proving its value and winning support.

Compare the National Institute on Drug Abuse, which in 1994 had a budget of about \$400 million for research on drug abuse prevention and treatment. Or consider that when the Labor Department wanted to examine the impact of the Job Training and Partnership Act, it was able to allocate about \$19 million. And when the Department of Housing and Urban Development wanted to evaluate housing allowances, it allocated over \$25 million.⁸ By comparison, the basic research budget of the National Institute of Justice has remained fairly constant at \$10 million a year for a decade.

What would be the right funding level for federal crime control research? It would be inappropriate for me to suggest an answer, but I would like to report a number of different recommendations by others.

The National Academy of Sciences has suggested increasing the current level of federal violence research from \$20 million to \$500 million, which is the same as the amount of federal support for cancer research.⁹ Others in the criminal justice field have suggested raising the level to \$1 billion, which would still be a fraction of the \$11 billion designated for health research by NIH.¹⁰

The Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) has recommended that one percent of the proposed funding in the current legislation before Congress be directed toward evaluation research -- that would add another \$20 million for research budgets. By raising this issue, COSSA has performed a valuable service to the field and the nation and I commend them. This approach -- of setting aside a small percentage of the program funding to support research and evaluation -- is quite commonplace in Federal statutes creating education programs, welfare innovations, and health care initiatives. I am pleased to note that the crime legislation that has passed the House of Representatives contains two such provisions -- a 3 percent set-aside, sponsored by Representative Henry Hyde, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to support administrative costs and program evaluations; and a 1 percent set-aside, sponsored by Representative Patricia Schroeder, to support the development of technology. These represent important first steps toward Congressional recognition that every crime control innovation should be evaluated.

Despite these glimmers of hope, we should still ask: Why is so little being done to learn more, and to make better use of what we have learned? The possible explanations for the current situation have been the subject of recent discussion in the research community, and I'd like to quickly review some of the ideas that have been presented.

One deterrent to research that has been cited is skepticism about the utility of research in this field. Often, this skepticism arises from an assumption that crime is intractable, and that research therefore cannot have any real impact on criminal activity. Even if we assume, however, that crime is intractable, there appears to be more determining our behavior than this. The weather is intractable too, but we learn as much as we can about storms and hurricanes to improve our predictive

capacities, and do as much as possible to contain the damage they inflict.

Another explanation for the lack of research into controlling crime and violence is that in this area of domestic policy, perhaps more than in any other, policy-making is driven by unexamined assumptions. In a near-vacuum of actual proven knowledge about what works best, deep-seated convictions about crime, criminals, and the criminal justice system have guided our actions. The idea that crime policy is guided by convictions, rather than knowledge or even experience, is supported by situations in which research findings are available, but are ignored. For example, researchers have shown that with regard to disrupting drug markets, the certainty of punishment of offenders is a more effective deterrent than increasing the severity of punishment.¹¹ Even though these are well established findings accepted by researchers and by many in the criminal justice system, our policies have moved in the opposite direction.¹²

Another example is the "three strikes and you're out" law. An interesting recent study by Rand, conducted by Peter Greenwood, analyzed the impact of California's three strikes law, a very broad law which went into effect in March 1994. Essentially, Greenwood found that the law would indeed have substantial benefits, reducing serious felonies by adults by an estimated 30 percent. (Greenwood says 22% to 34%) But the associated costs would be so high (\$4.5 to \$6.5 billion per year) that, given California's existing budget constraints, funding for California's university system would eventually cease and the state would still be unable to fully implement the new law. Moreover, alternatives to the three strikes law could be devised that would achieve most or all of the benefits at less cost. Greenwood cites as an example of a lower-cost alternative keeping all serious first-time felons in prison for their full terms.¹³

The very nature of research traditions in the field of criminal justice provides yet another explanation for the lack of commitment to research. In criminal justice, the gulf between researchers (in universities) and practitioners (on the streets, in the courts, or in corrections) has been wide and deep. NIJ -- and organizations such as ACJS -- have worked diligently to narrow that gulf, with impressive success, but a great deal remains to be done. The lack of a strong constituency hampers the use of research findings.¹⁴ In the medical field, by contrast, practicing physicians keep abreast of and rely on the knowledge provided by medical researchers.

Another important factor inhibiting research into justice issues focuses on the legal profession -- my profession -- the dominant professional group within the legislatures and the criminal justice system. In the medical world, from the very first year of medical school through residency and general practice, physicians are taught to continually survey and absorb the research literature in order to learn how to do their jobs better. They take it as a matter of professional obligation to keep up to date, and to contribute to medical research themselves. In the legal profession, however, there is no comparable tradition for empirical research.

An additional barrier to the use of research in criminal justice is the sort of "catch-22" that plagues most large bureaucratic systems: some of the officials who know best the practical realities and constraints of implementing innovation are most likely to see it as a threat.¹⁵ In criminal justice, however, that view is changing. Organizations such as the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences have helped to create a new climate of acceptance. Today we are at a point where leading practitioners are more open to change. More managers in the criminal justice system are more highly educated. They have come of age in an era of federally-funded research. And we now have

the capability to generate and disseminate research information throughout the system to build the knowledge base for change.

Having explored the problems and prospects of the federal research role, what conclusions do we draw? Let me offer some observations.

First, I would argue that NIJ, despite budgets that have not increased for more than a decade, has made significant contributions to our knowledge about crime and criminal justice. As a result of even a limited investment of federal money, the partnership of NIJ, a capable research community, and a sophisticated practitioner community is poised to take great strides forward. I am proud to be leading this organization.

Second, the public demand for federal action on crime over the past 25 years has created a federal role that is substantial and perhaps irreversible. It is noteworthy, in this era of downsizing of the federal budget, that the new Congressional leadership is proposing to modify but not significantly diminish, the 1994 Act's commitment of \$30 billion to a crime control program.

Third, for me, the distinguishing difference between the 1994 Crime Act and the bills now under consideration is the former's support for innovation and research. Nonetheless, even as that Act is being challenged in the new Congress, I am confident that whatever emerges from the legislative debate will give us opportunities to make progress in developing knowledge about effective crime control strategies.

Fourth, for a variety of reasons deeply rooted in our thinking about crime as a societal problem, we have undervalued research and created a gulf between research, practice and policy.

So how do we respond to both the opportunities and challenges ahead? One important step is to move the community of researchers and the community of practitioners and policymakers closer together. We need to "translate" what research has found into language that practitioners and policymakers can grasp and use. We as researchers can also be sure we make clear the policy implications contained in our findings. And we need to do these things without sacrificing methodological rigor.

We must also seek innovations being carried out right now by practitioners and evaluate them -- to learn by doing, to share that learning, and to replicate model programs throughout the country. We need to continually keep abreast of the new efforts directed by many different disciplines, not just criminal justice, that can be integrated into our efforts to reduce crime.

NIJ intends to do more to encourage these kinds of efforts; for example, by supporting "problem-solving" models that involve both researchers and practitioners, along with community representatives, service providers, and others in tackling crime. At the Federal level, our new partnerships with the program offices in DOJ -- and our colleagues in other Federal research agencies -- are very exciting.

I think that the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, which itself embodies collaborative partnerships between researchers and practitioners, provides fertile ground for nurturing the closer ties we need, so we can finally close that gulf -- and I look forward to working with the members of this Academy in the months and years to come.

Archimedes once said that if he had a lever long enough, he could move the world. I believe that in research and the development of knowledge, we have that lever. We are, I think, and as your program title suggests, at this moment at a

crossroads where there is a unique convergence -- of public concern about crime and violence, commitment to Federal support, and the availability of a sound research base on which to build. Let us seize this moment and use the lever of research, in close partnership with practitioners and policymakers, to move the world toward a more effective -- and more humane -- system of justice.

1. Washington Post/ABC News poll, cited in DiIulio et. al., p. 449.
2. DiIulio et. al., p. 447.
3. Plato, Apology, 38a.
4. Blumstein and Petersilia, p. 480.
5. Albert J. Reiss, Jr. and Jeffrey A. Roth, eds., Understanding and Preventing Violence (Washington, D.C., 1993), p. 292.
6. Altogether, 22 agencies or units of agencies, sponsoring 60 subcategories of violence research, were surveyed. Reiss, Albert J. and Jeffrey A. Roth, eds., Understanding and Preventing Violence, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1993, p. 347.
7. Reiss and Roth, p. 346.
8. Figures from Joan Mullen, Abt Associates, remarks at National Institute of Justice 25th Anniversary Conference, December 12, 1994.
9. Reiss and Roth, p. 346.
10. Blumstein and Petersilia, p. 484.
11. Nagin, Daniel, " General Deterrence: A Review of the Empirical Evidence," in *Deterrence and Incapacitation: Estimating the Effects on Crime Rates*, Alfred Blumstein et al., eds. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press 1978.
12. Blumstein and Petersilia, p. 468.
13. Research Brief, "California's New Three-Strikes Law: Benefits, Costs and Alternatives," Santa Monica, CA.: Rand Corporation, September 1994.
14. Blumstein and Petersilia, p. 470.

15. Marion, Nancy E., *A History of Federal Crime Control Initiatives, 1960-1993*. Wesport, 1995, p. 177.