From the Editor

Ronen Shamir's article in this issue analyzes the treatment of the Bedouin population in modern Israel. Shamir investigates the way Israeli law conceptualizes the desert and its indigenous nomadic inhabitants and in turn how this conceptualization allows and justifies the particular treatment the Israeli state has given the Bedouins. Shamir's story of Israel and the Bedouins holds many lessons for us as we consider the various ways in which gender, race, class, and ethnicity have been structured within various legal systems and consequently how human diversity has been managed legally.

In his article, Richard Leo considers one of the consequences of *Miranda* warnings that are now standard practice in U.S. police procedures. His observation studies of police interrogation reveal techniques that have arisen in police practice associated with the fact that, contrary to their self-interests, many criminal suspects actually do make incriminating statements during interrogation following arrest. Leo finds it useful to liken some of the behavior he observed to that which is common in many confidence games.

Pamela Brandwein's article examines the constructed nature of legal history by examining two histories of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Her focus on the competing ways of relating documentary evidence and meaning or intention raises fundamental questions about how we interpret the past and assess alternative accounts of it. Her consideration of the relation between historiography and epistemology challenges other sociolegal scholars to explore the sociology of legal representation more thoroughly in their work.

Debra Emmelman revisits the topic of plea bargaining, which received a great deal of attention from sociolegal scholars in the 1960s and 1970s. Her ethnographic data both confirms many of the general insights developed in previous research and provides the basis for understanding plea bargaining as a dynamic series of negotiations occurring throughout the litigation process rather than as a discrete or isolated event.

Britt, Kleck, and Bordua's article reanalyzes a previously published evaluation of the effect of the 1976 District of Columbia gun law. They argue that the interrupted time series design underlying the evaluation by McDowall, Loftin, and Wiersma ought to have been applied differently and that doing so would have resulted in substantially different conclusions. The policy implications of these findings go far beyond academic considerations

Law & Society Review, Volume 30, Number 2 (1996)
© 1996 by The Law and Society Association. All rights reserved.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023921600030279 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and raise critical issues for applied sociolegal scholarship. In a lively exchange following the article, Britt et al.'s critique is assessed by the authors of the original research. Britt and his colleagues provide a brief rejoinder.

In a Research Note, John Fliter reports on his examination of state expenditures for corrections following court orders requiring the state to rectify conditions in state prisons. His finding that judicial influence on state budgets declined during the 1980s as courts narrowed the scope of prison reforms, raises questions about the efficacy of litigation for addressing meaningful social change.

—William M. O'Barr

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023921600030279 Published online by Cambridge University Press