Takeaway thoughts on:


**What this book does**
1. It defines WCC.
2. It makes a strong case that WCC is widespread if not ubiquitous at the highest levels in American business.
3. It points out the harms resulting from these crimes.
4. It suggests interpersonal dynamics which continue the culture (intergenerational cultural transmission dynamics).
5. It integrates sociological stratification dynamics with both the difficulties of regulating/punishing WCCs and in getting white collar criminals to be seen as serious criminals.

**What remains to be worked out**
1. *Figuring out the dependent variable and where to get the data.* How much law violation is there, where, when, of what type, done by whom, and with what resulting harm? The “dark figure of crime” issue here seems almost impossible to resolve (Biderman & Reiss, 1967). Yes, we can build models based on court data (Weisburd, Wheeler, Waring, & Bode, 1991). But the case Sutherland is making is that these will be hopelessly deficient.

2. **Theoretical framework needed: Apply here.** Because the legal environment (which specific laws apply and how are they enforced), and dynamics involving offending, regulating, punishing, economics, organizational culture and individual differences are all relevant, all connect in complicated ways, and shift over time, we need an **integrated** theory that captures all this. For organizational culture, read Diane Vaughan (Vaughan, 1996, 1998, 1999). For more on temporal shifts, read Abolafia (1996) about Polanyi cycles. To learn more about current ineffective regulation see Yeager’s (1987, 1991) work on water regulation. For more on or pernicious relationships between offenders and regulators, read about Enron or the 2008 meltdown (McLean & Elkind, 2004; McLean & Nocera, 2010).

Theories that criminology has applied here just don’t get us very far. Simpson (2002) has tried to get deterrence to work. Also thinking along deterrence lines, policy makers worried about under-punished environmental crimes have argued mightily that increasing the penalties and making those penalties more clearly criminal – involving longer prison time – would help ratchet up the seriousness of these crimes in the minds of offenders, the public and regulators (Celebrezze, Muchnicki, Marous, & Jenkins-Smith, 1990). But Sutherland tells us this is not relevant and qualitative work on enforcement says this framework misses the boat completely (Hawkins, 1984, 2003).

The lack of an integrated theory afflicts other areas of criminology as well (Wikstrom, 2006). So WCC is not worse off here than the rest of criminology. *But it will never get the data needed to develop and test comprehensive theoretical frameworks.* In this sense it is worse off.

**What someone needs to do**
Given these irresolvable data problems on the outcome side and the predictor side, and the need for a temporally dynamic, multilevel model, the only thing that might work would be agent based simulation models (Berk, 2008; Elizabeth R. Groff, 2007a, 2007b; E.R. Groff, 2008; Elizabeth R. Groff & Mazerolle, 2008). If you are interested in WCC, you should definitely learn about these. Dr. Groff offers a course.
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