

JJoseph4REVIEW

Sun, 12/19 12:11PM 53:17

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

corruption, organized crime, people, chicago, paper, crime, individual, network, politicians, power, measures, talk, corrupt, important, specifically, centrality, prohibition, dissertation, state, actors

SPEAKERS

Jenn Tostlebe, Jared Joseph, Jose Sanchez



Jose Sanchez 00:14

Welcome back to the criminology Academy where we are criminally academic. My name is Jose Sanchez,



Jenn Tostlebe 00:19

and my name is Jen Tostlebe.



Jose Sanchez 00:22

And today we have doctoral candidate Jared Joseph on the podcast to talk with us about corruption and organized crime.



Jenn Tostlebe 00:28

Jared Joseph is a doctoral candidate in Sociology at the University of California Davis, with designated emphasis in computational social science. He is a first generation student and received his bachelor's degree in psychology and Japanese before transitioning to sociology for his doctoral work. He uses governmental data and computational methods to research abuses of power. His dissertation focuses on public harm by government officials at the local, state and national level and he received the American Sociological Association's dissertation research improvement grant for this work. Thank you so much for joining us Jared.




Jared Joseph 01:07


Thank you for having me.

 Jose Sanchez 01:08

So, a brief overview of what this episode is going to look like. First, we're going to ask some questions about the history of corruption, mainly in Chicago, then we're going to talk a little bit about organized crime, and then again, situate it in Chicago. And the reason for that is because our final topic is a paper that our guest wrote that is situated in Chicago, and talks about corruption and organized crime, and a little bit of network analysis, which our episode with Martin, which we learned, we've kept butchering his name. Sorry, Martin. His episode touched a lot on network analysis. And so with that being said, Jenn, why don't you take us away?

 Jenn Tostlebe 01:52


Okay, so we always start our podcasts with this very broad, definitional question, because we're pretty concerned with definitions, we think they're important. And as with every single time, we've asked this question I'm sure it's difficult to define. But our first question for you, Jared is what is corruption?

 Jared Joseph 02:11

That's very difficult to define. And I don't think there is a single canonical definition that exists in the literature yet. Because you can look at it from a strictly legal definition. There are like 17 specific laws that if you break it, you're guilty of corruption. But I think that's not how the most people think about it. Corruption is inherently relational to what is ordinary and not corrupt. The term is sort of very morally charged, when people think of a corrupt politician, I don't think they're thinking of, you know, they broke that specific law, it's a feeling that they have violated the trust that has been placed into them. And I think people are pretty good at picking up on those sorts of things. I think people are good at telling when things aren't fair. So when I think about corruption, I typically take a public harm perspective, like, are these individuals using their power to harm the public or benefit themselves? Personally, I think that's a common thread through all of the definitions that you'll see is that they're using power vested in them by some other entity to enrich themselves personally. So, when I think of corruption, that is the sort of defining characteristic I think about.

 Jenn Tostlebe 03:30

So most of what we're talking about involves state actors. So how in Why do state actors engage in corruption?

 Jared Joseph 03:37

The why is always difficult. That's the whole field of criminology. But the the sort of broad answer is The corruption is the mechanism by which people can convert their power into profit. Corruption is the way that they can take this thing that they have for a temporary amount of time, they're the office they hold the prestige associated with it, and convert it into something lasting for themselves. So that seems to be why corruption and we'll get into organized crime later go hand in hand.

J Jose Sanchez 04:15

So many people they know, like the large scale, like the widely reported political wrongdoings that involve corruption. One example was California Representative Bill Cunningham, who had to resign after it came to light that he was accepting bribes from defense companies. However, crimes of corruption seem to occur every day even like on a smaller scale. Can you give us some examples of what your more common or not as widely reported, crime of corruption would look like?

J Jared Joseph 04:49

Yeah, corruption happens all the time. They're, they're sort of the the grift and oiling of hands that make many things work. It happens whenever a government official picks one contract over another for a building or some service because he got a nicer gift basket from one of them, you know, lobbying on the federal level, it specifically says in the legal code that lobbying should not affect the voting behavior of our representatives. But studies show over and over that it does. But you know, going back to our our fuzzy definition of corruption, is that corruption? Can we prove that the lobbying expenditure influence their votes? It's remarkably difficult. My current work my dissertation, asset forfeiture is a large portion of it. So, one of my favorite stories to tell is in Georgia, there was a sheriff who used asset forfeiture funds police agencies received from seizing money and objects from things they think is associated with a crime. They use those funds to buy the share of a high performance muscle car that he drove to and from work, again, is that corruption? I don't know. But those sorts of things happened.

J Jose Sanchez 06:01

Sounds nice though.

J Jared Joseph 06:02

It was a nice car.



Jenn Tostlebe 06:03

Sounds like a nice car. Okay, so when we're trying to understand then, like why crimes of corruption are occurring? Or those, you know, more fuzzy questions? Can we understand this type of crime using our traditional theoretical perspectives like social learning theory, social control, self control, so on? Or are there very specific theories devoted specifically toward explaining corruption?


J Jared Joseph 06:32

I think that the traditional theories struggle with corruption and white collar crime, more generally. Sally Simpson has a good *American Sociological Review* article, trying to look at

generally. Sally Simpson has a good American Sociological Review article, trying to look at traditional theories of crime and how they work or don't work with white collar crime. But I think we just have to sort of accept and understand that many of our canonical theories were made with, you know, street crime in mind. They were looking at violent, you know, on the grounds of offenses, which corruption, white collar crime more generally, typically, isn't. There are specific theories that specifically say we work for white collar crime, like self control, but that's never really convinced me because the whole argument of self control is like, well, just the people with the lowest self control commit crimes, but white collar crime and other forms of corruption, they take years, these are large schemes sometimes. And I think it's hard to argue that those people don't have self control. There is some work on personality theories like the dark triad of Machiavellianism narcissism, and psychopathy. But as a sociologist, I find those unsatisfying, because I want to see the systems that allow corruption and these things to persist. The because the systems might be able to be fixed individual psychological characteristics, we're not going to be able to do anything about those really. So, when I'm working on things, I've sort of come to terms that my dissertation sort of tacitly takes a routine activities sort of lens and perspective, because I want to see what we can do to the structures of our governance, how we might be able to alter it to make corruption less feasible, less likely and less possible. That's the sort of orientation I find myself slipping into.

 Jose Sanchez 08:28

Yeah, that's interesting. Yeah, like a routine activity approach. Like, that's very macro. So would you say that that's the right approach for something like this instead of something more at the individual level?

 Jared Joseph 08:42

I think it's, it's what I gravitate to, because I think it's slightly more hopeful. Like, we if, if these things are structural, we may be able to do something about them. If we specifically look for ways to police, like individual people by, you know, increasing punishments or something like that. I, I think we've seen over time that, like, general deterrence doesn't work. For one thing, so like, how I look at it from a structural perspective, just because I want to have some sort of hope that we can do something about it, I suppose.

 Jose Sanchez 09:19

Okay, I can respect that.




Jenn Tostlebe 09:20

Me too. Yeah.

 Jose Sanchez 09:22

So I knew this before. I can't remember where I learned this, but I'm pretty sure a lot of people don't. So you open, you opened your paper by stating that Chicago is the Windy City, not

because of anything weather related, but because of hot wind from politicians. Can you give us a historical rundown of corruption in Chicago?

 Jared Joseph 09:46

So I'm not a historian, but I did read a lot. They eventually got cut from the paper we'll talk about. I can give you two sort of recommendations of good books I read from historians about the history of Chicago, Sam Mitrani wrote a book about the history of the Chicago Police, which I learned from his book was only officially made a thing in 1855, which seems remarkably recent. For some reason, to me, that seems very strange, but that the police in Chicago were born out of an environment of private security in like forces, like you would pay these people to protect your property or to go do the investigations to find things that were stolen or to solve murders. Like you would just pay these people individually. And so while the Chicago Police eventually professionalized over time, that was the environment that it grew out of. I think that's very telling, when you start thinking about corruption as the sort of you know, greasing the wheels sort of things where if you give a little bit of money, maybe things will happen. In terms of the political side, The Mayor's by Paul Green and Melvin Holly, essentially just goes through the mayors of Chicago over time, and all of the ways that they use their discretionary ability to create policy and to selectively enforce policy. So I thought that gave a good overview in terms of the political legal side of how people in power always have some discretion on what they choose to actually actively go after. So, again, can't always label it as corruption but a big player in my book, in my paper was mayor, Big Bill Thompson, who, as part of his campaign platforms, just gets up on stage and says, I'm not enforcing prohibition laws. You know, that's, that's a use of discretion. That is exactly counter to what's on the books, but that's what actually happened. That's the guidance the police followed. So, I think reading about the individual's, sort of policymakers over time and seeing how they use their discretion can give you a good idea of corruption over time, and this sort of attitudes around that discretion and what it was and was not corrupt.

 Jenn Tostlebe 12:00

Yeah, I thought that was interesting. It the like, introduction of your paper that we're going to talk about was I really enjoyed reading it. And I'm sad that you had to cut a bunch of the historical stuff out of it. But it was interesting.

 Jared Joseph 12:12

Yeah. But I'm happy that I still got keep Big Bill Thompson in there, because he was such a character.


 Jenn Tostlebe 12:18

Yeah.

 Jared Joseph 12:20

 Jose Sanchez 12:20

But I have a quick follow up question. Because I'm pretty sure we don't necessarily ask this later on. But what is it about Chicago that makes it such a prime spot? For for this type of work?

 Jared Joseph 12:35

Yeah, there's a lot of criminology done in Chicago, right? I mean, the the history of the Chicago school of being like, one of the places that founded these schools of thought means a lot of on the ground work has always been done in Chicago. And then because you have these rich ethnographies, and those sorts of works, later on, more quantitative people can come in and use those as inspiration. And so I think it is a somewhat of a feedback loop. Chicago has always been one of the places to study crime. And the fact that it is a major metropolitan city in the United States, it's not coastal, so that, you know, it's in the middle of the country. So, it doesn't have the extreme cultural poles of, you know, the east and west coast, I think, also makes it pretty common testing bed for a lot of theory and a lot of research. So, I think those are some of the the bigger reasons in terms of corruption, specifically, at least in my time period, you know, we had major characters, which lead to major news reporting, which lead to now an archive of things that I can look at, for which other cities don't have to the same degree.

 Jose Sanchez 13:47

Yeah, that's interesting.



Jenn Tostlebe 13:49

Right? So we've had a couple of people on the podcast during this fall 2021, kind of talking about white collar and corporate crime. And we like asking the question of how difficult is it to identify and punish these types of crimes? So, when we're specifically thinking about corruption, and I think you've alluded to this a few times, how difficult is it to actually specifically point out and therefore punish individuals engaged in corruption?

 Jared Joseph 14:20

Very difficult. That's one of the key questions in my dissertation is like, what can we do? Corruption prosecutions declined significantly in the past few years for political reasons, mainly, but to to go after political actors and say they are corrupt is difficult for a number of reasons. Mainly because one they control the legal environment. They're setting the rules for themselves and so if someone thinks that something they are going to do might get them in trouble, they can ultimately just change the law to make sure it doesn't happen. But alternatively, when you're going after people you think are being corrupt, you're going after the people with the most sort of social and cultural capital of how the legal system works. You're going after politicians, you're going after lawyers, you're going after public servants. And these are the people that know the legal code best, especially in their area. So, their ability to use the expertise to avoid prosecution, I think is much higher. And it's always, when you go after

someone for corruption, you usually have to prove intent that they were intending to do something. And that's a whole lot harder than looking at security footage. Yes, that person stole this thing. The end. So, I think it's remarkably difficult.



Jenn Tostlebe 15:40

Sounds really, I mean, just the political aspect of it, because we've talked mostly about like corporations within white collar and corporate crime versus the political side of it, which just seems to add a whole nother layer of difficulty in something that's already difficult to police it of course.



Jose Sanchez 15:58

Okay, so let us move a little bit into organized crime and organized crime in Chicago. And so we've had a couple guests, come on already and talk about organized crime Cecilia Meneghini and Martin Bouchard, have both spoken about it on the podcast, but both of them spoke about it outside of the United States in a European context, mainly Italy. Can you briefly tell us how you define organized crime? And then what does this look like, in the US context?



Jared Joseph 16:31

So, my sort of co-author and I take the stance that organized crime definitionally is one concerned with controlling illegal markets, and two, is involved in some sort of corruption. Those are sort of the features that take a crime group and transform them into organized crime. But I want to make it clear that organized crime isn't some monolithic like Cosa Nostra, like country why there's like a cabal of some people in a backroom controlling all of it. That was a legitimate theory for a long time that there was one overruling family that control all organized crime in the country. That's, that's not really the case. It's research from Chambliss, who is a favorite of mine. More recently, Daniel DellaPosta, organized crime is a local clustered affair, which will then reach across and work with other groups sometimes. And so I sort of want to dispel the idea that organized crime is a monolith, it is individual, local hustles most of the time, which, when we look at my paper, we'll sort of see how that can change. And how we're gonna find can evolve into something larger



Jenn Tostlebe 17:46


in the United States. What kind of gave rise to organized crime groups? Was there any one specific thing? Or was it multiple things?




Jared Joseph 17:57

I think, sort of what gives rise to organized crime, it's the potential to make lots of money if you break the law. I can talk about Chicago, specifically in that the reason organized crime became such a huge thing in Chicago in my time period, is because prohibition was enacted. And all of a sudden, there were a lot of people who wanted an illegal good, and would pay money to get

that illegal good. There is just a massive opportunity for profit and so people filled the void. They were organized because they worked with the politicians to make sure they wouldn't get cracked down on, they control the illegal market on alcohol. And they set up massive, like logistic systems to make it happen. Like it was. It wasn't just organized crime definitionally it was crime that was organized. They had, you know, during Prohibition Chicago, there were boats coming over Canada, there are railway cars bringing it from the East Coast, there were you know, agreements on prices, there was distilleries there is processing, there's shipment to buyers, and all that was done because there was a lot of money to be made.

 Jose Sanchez 19:01

Okay, so when we think about organized crime, all these you know how you see it in pop culture, in movies and TV shows, they'll usually show like this mafia family or this highly organized group. And they'll be talking about how they have Mayor X or governor Z, or the police chief on their payroll, quote, unquote. Does the research support a strong link between a corrupt official and an organized crime group?


 Jared Joseph 19:34

I believe so. My co-author and I believe so too. I said earlier, I think one of the definitional components of organized crime is being involved in some way with state forces, because the power of the state can make organized crime safer to operate. And then, for political actors working with organized crime is the way that they can actually make some money from their power and there are you know, talking about these specific individuals that are always portrayed in media as like, oh, yeah, we got that person in our pocket. I can talk about my paper in this sort of a context that, that happened, like, Al Capone punched a mayor of a city in the face in front of his police force, and nothing happened. There's also another anecdote of money being ladled out by civic workers out of a hotel, in [INAUDIBLE], to corrupt officials. So, yeah, I think corrupt state actors contribute with their power to keep things going and the money in return. So I think, you know, those players are necessary.



Jenn Tostlebe 20:40


Right, so we've talked about your paper for a while now. So let's jump into it and then expand from there. So, the paper that we're talking about for this episode is authored by our guest, Jared Joseph and his colleague, Chris Smith, who's at the University of Toronto. It's called "The ties that bribe corruptions embeddedness in Chicago organized crime". It was published in Criminology this year in 2021. And to provide just a very quick summary of the paper, it examines the embeddedness levels of corrupt politicians and law enforcement within organized crime in Chicago. Mainly, the paper examines how corruption varied in state resources and criminal contexts. And patterns were studied both pre-prohibition, so 1900 to 1919 and then during prohibition from 1920 to 1933, using network analysis, does that provide a decent summary to jump into this? Okay, so our first question, again, one that we ask every single time we do one of these episodes, is what was kind of the impetus behind writing this paper.

 Jared Joseph 21:48


So, we've sort of touched on the corruptions usually seen as a grand affair. And when I started talking with Chris Smith, who is my co-author, and also my, one of my earliest mentors, is that she had this dataset on organized crime in Chicago. And nobody had looked at the political aspect of it. And I saw this and I saw a way to look finally, at a granular level, how corruption operates person to person, we can look at corruption as sort of a verb rather than an adjective of a person. And so I thought that, I saw the opportunity to look at corruption in a very granular way. And so that was what I wanted to do with the paper.

 Jose Sanchez 21:49


Okay, so we're gonna get into this concept of embeddedness, that you talked about. And this is a term that, that Jen and I both use in our work, and you touch on this in your paper, talking about David Pyrooz's work and how he uses embeddedness for gang members. And you mentioned that, well, this term is frequently used, but there's a degree of conceptual and measurement ambiguity that stems from at least two places, right? In the paper, you and your colleague proposed two directions. To clarify the ambiguity of the concept of embeddedness, could you provide us with an overview of what these ambiguities are, and then sort of give us the way that you use embeddedness in your paper.

 Jared Joseph 23:25

So, in embeddedness, was originally used by Polanyi, I think that's how you say his name, to describe how the economy was embedded within history and culture and politics and society. And that's, I don't think that's a controversial thing to think about now. But over time, it sort of became fuzzier as people applied it to their specific use cases. And it sort of came to generally mean people being deeply involved in something. And that's how we initially used it in this paper as well. And then an earlier draft reviewer to stung us on it and said, you know, you're, you're making a big deal about embeddedness. But you just sort of use it to mean this, like, deep involvement, and they and they challenged us to really dig into the concept and sort of address this ambiguity. And so we let our deep sigh and we did and, you know, I think it made the paper better, but I ended up reading every paper in the Journal of Criminology that ever used the term embeddedness. And we think they were, if I remember the number right there 53 of them, since Hagan used it. Maybe.

 Jenn Tostlebe 24:40

That sounds right. I think you include that in your paper. Yeah.

 Jared Joseph 24:44

And so that, uh, and I saw how the concept sort of drifted and changed over time. And so in our paper, we kind of want to recenter it on this idea of embeddedness being the interweaving of social and economic action and sort of taking, again, the idea of someone being embedded from an adjective, again, back to a verb. Because we're doing social network analysis, we can look at the individual people and their relationships to each other and the activities they were involved in. So, we want to recenter embeddedness around economic behavior and provide a

quantifiable way to measure it using social network analysis, which we did with three different metrics of degree centrality, eigenvector centrality, and then the sort of unique one, which was nestedness, which we'll get to.



Jenn Tostlebe 25:37

Yep. Later on. Right. So, you mentioned that there is a symbiotic relationship between organized crime and corruption. Can you talk about this thematic relationship in more detail and why the concept of embeddedness is important when discussing malfeasance or wrongdoing by a public official, white collar crime interest.



Jared Joseph 26:01

So, I've talked a bit about how I think corruption organized crime go hand in hand. But in these relationships between essentially organized criminals and political figures who have power to exploit, it's the embeddedness happens when they, when there is a long term sort of trusting agreement, that I think it's more or less necessitated for corruption to happen over time, when our assumption is that organized crime can only exist because of the protection from the state that inherently requires a sort of long term orientation by these people and the mutual benefit they get from corruption. And so embeddedness is or to be embedded is the sort of verb of their mixing this economic action and their own social situation. Because there has to be a large degree of trust that is sort of generated by these long term relationships. And without it, you know, most most crimes require trust to, you know, be somewhat profitable in the long term. And we think that organized crime and corruption just takes us to another level of intermixing the different worlds to make it work long term.



Jose Sanchez 27:30

So, kind of try and bring it all together. Can you talk to us more about the overlap of embeddedness corruption and organized crime?



Jared Joseph 27:40

It's an I feel like I've sort of covered this and that the organized crime corruption are symbiotically linked, they exist together. And that embeddedness is the mechanism by which they interface with each other over time, they become embedded, they become intertwined. They become mixed in not only an economic layer, but a social layer and a personal layer, that these relationships between the criminals and the politicians is what makes it work. I provide a few examples in the paper, like, you know, Bill Thompson being the biggest in that there were lines where, you know, no component associates were like, I'm for big bill, hook, line, and sinker and big bills for me hook line and sinker. Big Bill would receive 1,000s of dollars in campaign contributions from Al Capone and Al Capone specifically left one of his vacations early to come back to Chicago to give money to Big Bill to help him win reelection. Like these were long term partners. We can't tell if they were friends, but they definitely, there was an element of trust they work together in their goals and their ends. And I think that provides a good model for understanding how all these forces work together.



Jenn Tostlebe 29:07

Okay, so for your paper, um, you and your co author use this data set that I had never heard about before, but sounds really cool. It's called the Capone database. Can you tell us a little bit more about this data set, and then the unique aspects that your study specifically uses from this data that it doesn't sound like any other study has tapped into.



Jared Joseph 29:29

So, like bone database is the result of my co author advisor Chris Smith, than seven years in various archives. I think she eventually referenced over 5,000 documents, just finding the people and their connections between them during and around prohibition in Chicago. And these include, you know, news reports of X visited Y's house, people co-attending funerals together, being arrested together, going to dinner together. Paying campaign contributions or known bribes, just any instance of known individuals interacting with each other during this time period in Chicago. And so we their social relationships, criminal relationships, legitimate business relationships. And while Chris has done a lot of work on gender in crime using this dataset, she just had a book come out "Syndicate Women: Gender and networks in Chicago organized crime", which is an excellent read, if you at all are interested in this paper, go read that to this paper, "The ties that bribe" was the first look at the political aspect of it. When this all started when I heard Chris present about her work, and she just offhandedly mentioned that they're also politicians and law enforcement officers in there and that she never looked at them. I'm like, what do you mean, you've never looked at them? That's the most interesting thing I can think of. And so I sort of, I jumped on the opportunity to use it.



Jose Sanchez 30:57

So, like I mentioned earlier, we already have an episode that kind of talks a little bit more in depth about network analysis, which is the method that you use. So, we don't want to, sort of get, touch on too in-depth in this episode, but rather, we want to focus more on the analytic strategy and the analysis itself. And so can you tell us briefly what the organized crime network looked like during the pre-prohibition era?



Jared Joseph 31:26

So prior to prohibition, that would be 1900 1919 in our dataset. Organized crime was relatively small and pretty clustered. There were, you know, as I mentioned earlier, localized clusters, sort of individual graphs, grifts, hustles, going on, that involved more police officers and less politicians and then there are bridges between them. Essentially, if I can go on and talk about after, and during Prohibition, yeah, it became much more centralized, it became much more in a way larger, for one things like three or four times larger than pre prohibition, there were just way more people way more connections. And everything was centralized around a few sort of key players, a core group, from which everything else sort of branched off of this hub and spoke sort of structure. And in that, we found that politicians essentially remained important

and law enforcement officers did not. And so it was a market change in terms of the structure overall, but we clued in on the specific actors and their position, and that's where our results eventually came out of as well.



Jenn Tostlebe 32:43

The overall then kind of this network grew, and the power from state actors shifted from police to politicians. Interesting. So did it also was it more like horizontal versus hierarchical before pre prohibition, and then it shifted, or?



Jared Joseph 33:02

Power centralized, it became less of like individual hustles into there was a clear group of most powerful people and that was Capone and his gang. Not everybody involved in the network was necessarily directly reporting to Capone or anything like that. There wasn't like, clear, one boss, but everything was associated with his network. There were very few isolates out about. So yeah.



Jenn Tostlebe 33:30


All right. So you already mentioned that when it comes to that embeddedness measure, there's three different measures that were part of that. And so can you elaborate a little bit on those and then talk about how you incorporated embeddedness into your network analysis to measure this network structural changes in organized or in criminal organizations.




Jared Joseph 33:53

So, we used to pretty common network metrics, which are degree centrality and eigenvector centrality, degree is just the number of connections a person has either connections to them or connections from them. And eigenvector centrality is commonly understood as a measure of popular friends, in that if you have a high eigenvectors and centrality, then you might not be all that central, but you are connected to people who are very central. The third measure was somewhat unique, and that was nestedness. And that came out of a paper by Moody and White. And it essentially measures how deeply an individual is involved in these hierarchical, think onion skinning of tightly bound groups. So if you start with the entire network as one group, and then you sort of cut off the least tightly attached people and that circle shrinks, then it cut off the next band and that shrinks and shrinks and shrinks and shrinks. A person's nestedness is how many of those sort of onion skins down they're involved in. The idea being that if you are in more of these tightly bound groups, you are more embedded in that network because you don't get cut off from the rest of the group as we dig down. So we took all these measures, which are all, you know, somewhat related, but they they capture, as I said, different, different flavors, different nuances of how people can be important in the network. For our project, we took these measures, and we looked at different classes of individuals. So, those were non state actors, just the regular criminals, law enforcement officers, and then politicians. And we compared these groups with each other within time periods. And we sort of showed that these metrics are different for these groups, there is something structurally

different about where these people were positioned in the network, given these measures. And so that's where our network findings really came from. And then we supported it with all the history, we sort of went over earlier. And I did some simulations, which I thought were cool.

 Jose Sanchez 36:08

Yeah, so we've already started touching on some of your findings. Let's dig into them a little bit more. And so, you just briefly talked about them, you focus on four different aspects. And, and we're going to focus on the first three, as we believe that they should provide a good overview of the structural changes in your paper. And so you touched on, you know, so Chicago's organized crime landscape. But we wanted to ask you, if you could sort of talk a little bit more specifically about the distribution of alcoholic beverages in 1922-1933. And how that specifically impacted the change in how organized crime looked in Chicago.

 Jared Joseph 36:58

Yeah, so as I mentioned it centralized it. Organized crime now wasn't just about the brothels, or the gambling dens pre-prohibition, those sort of localized, you know, institutions that, you know, crime groups centered around. Now, there was a central thing, there was the production and sale of alcohol, that massiveness numbers of people could get involved in and were interconnected with each other doing. So, that we argue is why the network grew so large is that there was a massive opportunity for profit, and it was easy for people to sort of join in, and then become connected to this large component of organized crime. Because there were lots of jobs to be done. People could manufacture people can transport, they could distribute, you know, there, there are a ton of jobs that can be filled, and there was a lot of appetite for illegal alcohol. You know, if politicians were up there campaigning, just saying, I will not enforce this law, and people voted for them and that person won, people obviously want this thing, regardless of what the law is. So, there was just lots of opportunity and organized crime filled that void, rather effectively. And so from a network perspective, that's what we saw, it just grew, it grew massively. And the point I was most interested in is how the state actors stayed involved. Talking about prohibition, specifically, I mentioned it that the politicians, despite the network growing massively around them, they remained central in that network, while contrasted law enforcement was essentially pushed out towards the periphery, they never graduated beyond those individual, sort of local hustles. Because they didn't have the sort of resources and power that politicians did is but I theorize they're able to, like alert someone if a raid is coming or, you know, send a police patrol the other direction, compared to politicians who can just say, I'm not enforcing this law. You know, one of those is more useful as organized crime gets bigger and more powerful. This this sort of stance I took.

 Jenn Tostlebe 39:15

Okay, so I think then you just hacked into kind of this embeddedness composition and kind of what you expected to find and what you did find. So, that was kind of the second main part of your findings, I believe. Is there anything you'd like to add regarding like the embeddedness aspect?



J Jared Joseph 39:35

I think it was a pretty good summary of the how we like to have the growth and I like to say it is that corruption climbed the political ladder, along with the profits, like if there is more profits to be made, if organized, crime is more cemented, and Central, then they have needs for different resources, and different political actors can offer those so that's why We think this shift sort of occurred.

J Jose Sanchez 40:02

So, the third part of your assault plots the relationship between the three embeddedness measures by group type one on the three measures of embeddedness. So degree, eigenvector and nestedness, you found that they were interrelated and correlated, but they were unequally distributed on organized crime. Can you tell us how these manifested in your results? And what are these results mean?

J Jared Joseph 40:28

So all of them are, are related, because they're all based on same connections between people, but they do have their own nuances. So, by comparing like the law enforcement against politicians for these measures, they gave us hints to how they were differently positioned, which is the sort of centrality I was mentioning earlier. So, example is for the relationship between eigenvector scores and nestedness. For law enforcement is higher than for politicians and non state actors, like that relationship is stronger. So law enforcement, this helps show that law enforcement clustered in subgroups when organized crime was small and decentralized. But in general, they didn't connect to well connected others, they didn't have that eigenvector. So, their their nestedness was sort of more important than their connection with other people, it for that group for law enforcement, compared to say, politicians who were more connected to more powerful people. So, you can see two different sort of strategies of embeddedness emerging when you look at these when you separate these groups out, and sort of compare their different measures.




Jenn Tostlebe 41:40

Which is interesting. Yeah.


J Jose Sanchez 41:43

Also, I think I said unorganized crime, and I'm pretty sure I meant organized crime. Okay, so another one of your findings, and you've touched on this a little bit, also. And I thought this was interesting, and that came from your scripts was the proportion of corrupt state actors in Chicago. And so they were more proportionately pre-prohibition than during prohibition. And you also mentioned that there were differences between the eras, and what this looked like, and what corruption look like. And so, you know, you've talked about the centrality of the actors and of power. And so just to wrap up, can you give us sort of like a quick, short summary


and tell us more about this finding? And so, because so what I noticed was, the numbers increased, right? But the proportion, shrank. So maybe go into more detail about the centralization of power and why we are seeing this shrinking of proportion.

 Jared Joseph 42:48

So, it was surprising, like, we imagined as organized crime grew, that the number of corrupt state actors would grow with it. That's not really what we saw the the groups change differently, like the network grew from, you know, a few 100 people to nearly 1,000 people in our in after prohibition was enacted in 1920. And so we expected that state actors would, you know, similarly increase with the size of the network, that didn't really happen, especially for politicians, law enforcement, we talked about their centrality sort of became less, they're pushed to the edge. But their numbers also slightly decreased. And, you know, going back to my argument is, I would say that they didn't have the resources that was useful anymore. Politicians on the other hand, despite the network growing such a massive amount, their numbers stay pretty much exactly the same. And their centrality was still significant. So, despite everything else around them becoming bigger, you would expect them to become more diffused, like everything else. They didn't, they remained important, they held their structural position. They, despite not growing in number, were still vitally important. And I think that speaks to the relationship aspect of things, as well as the unique ability of these political politicians, these actors to provide something to the important people in this network. They remained near the decision makers, despite, you know, what we'd expect them to be pushed around like everyone else.

 Jenn Tostlebe 44:32

Like they're the ones that had the power to allow these things to happen without punishment. So they maintained their sensuality. Yeah. Alright. So obviously, most of this research is from, you know, the early 1900s and so thinking about today, you know, what are some of the implications that this study may have both for the academic community theoretically, practically And then also for the general public and policymakers moving forward.

 Jared Joseph 45:04

So, I hope our paper helps emphasize the symbiotic relationship between organized crime and corruption for academics. So if you're ever studying one, I think it's necessary to look at the other to consider it as a central facet of your paper. We show sort of practically how corruption changes in organized crime grows and the different resources that it might look for during different stages of its growth and development, organized crime. And we also have the huge literature review on embeddedness. And I hope someone just wants to look at the paper for that I'd be happy because a ton of work to reconceptualize embeddedness, and really, really recenter it. For policy, I think the implications are somewhat similar to the academic ideas. And that if if you really want to fight organized crime, you also have to fight corruption, you have to look inwards, if you want to make a difference. And as our paper shows, it only gets harder to fight corruption, the longer it goes on, and the more developed, organized crime gets, its sinks

its teeth into systems, and becomes harder and harder to dislodge. So I think for policy, if, if you want to fight corruption, you need to understand at what stage it's at, you need to know where to look. So I hope our paper can provide some sort of insight on how to do that. Yeah.



Jenn Tostlebe 46:34

I mean, there's plenty of corruption, or things that seem like they would be corrupt nowadays. So yeah, it seems really useful and important to understand this, you know, bi directional symbiotic relationship between the tail? Yeah,



Jose Sanchez 46:52

I think it's interesting, you say you need to sort of understand what stage it's at. Because I mean, I should probably should know better, after, you know, being in cream for so long. But I kept thinking you either are corrupt, or you're not. And sort of this idea of, oh, there might be a continuum or stages to this, I think is an interesting way to look at it.



Jared Joseph 47:16

And I hope, like I think network analysis is particularly great for that, because it can take that, that adjective of being corrupt, and turn it into an action that you can study. Like, there are instances of doing corruption, like you accepted the bribe you, you know, sign the contract, despite, you know, other better offers being available. I think, just in general, not just our paper. But I think network analysis is great for this sort of thing for taking states and making them study a bowl instances. So that's one of the reasons I'm a fan of the method.



Jose Sanchez 47:54

Yeah, we've definitely come to appreciate it. More, as we've talked to people who've done network analysis.



Jenn Tostlebe 48:02

Limits, like, I didn't really know much about it until this semester, really, when we started all of a sudden, finding all of these people that are doing network analysis, and we've been reading work on it. And yeah, it's cool technique that I'm interested in exploring. We're so



Jose Sanchez 48:20

Yeah, absolutely. Well, those are all the questions that we have for you. But are there any other comments, or closing remarks that you might have something that maybe wish, you were hoping we'd ask you, but we didn't?

 Jared Joseph 48:36

Well, I just want to sort of close and say that corruption is an important issue to study academically, especially in the United States. I think a lot of time when people think about studying corruption, you have these international studies or international comparisons, or, you know, these sorts of things where they think about corruption as a, as something that goes away as countries develop, quote, unquote. And I don't think that's the case. I think corruption just changes shape as time goes on. And I think it's still very much applicable in the United States. One book I read, in preparation for this and interstage and other things is "Smuggler Nation". I can't remember the author's name, but it's a book just all about how the United States was founded by a bunch of smugglers and corrupt individuals. And it's been here ever, ever since the country was started, like the most profitable job in the early colonies was the port inspector. Because they could, you know, ask for something when goods for coming in. So, the thing I want to stress is that, you know, this corruption is not a problem of yesteryear or other places. I think there's plenty of room to study it in the United States. And I think we need to, I think it's important. And so I hope, you know, I can make my paper our paper with was one small contribution to that. Never.

 Jose Sanchez 49:57

Yeah, no, definitely. I mean, you, like you hear like the big news stories that come out, right? So, even that should give you like that's is like the tip of the iceberg. But that should give us a sense that it's not, like it's not dead.



Jenn Tostlebe 50:13

Not going away anytime soon, either.

 Jose Sanchez 50:17

All right. Well, thank you very much. We really enjoyed this discussion. Is there anything you would like to plug anything we should be on the lookout for from you?


 Jared Joseph 50:28

My dissertation will be done eventually.



Jenn Tostlebe 50:33

Or were you on the market this year? Or next year?


 Jared Joseph 50:35

I applied to a academic job. A single one. Okay. And I got an interview, and I'm still waiting to

hear. But I'm looking at government jobs as well. Okay. That's obviously I have a sort of expertise in that area. Yeah. And I have, I've had the opportunity to work in government in the US and the UK. And, I find it very fulfilling.

 Jose Sanchez 50:57

Well, good luck. We hope you end up in a place that you're happy with. And where can people find you? Like, twitter, email, ResearchGate, Google Scholar, that sort of thing.


 Jared Joseph 51:10

I do have a website that I try to keep updated: jnjoseph.com. And I am on Twitter as well, at Epsian. E-P-S-I-A-N. Although I, I don't use that much. I try.



Jenn Tostlebe 51:25

Yeah, I tried to get it. Yeah.

 Jared Joseph 51:29

But do check out my website, because I put up nice interactive graphs of my papers. So, if you want to see the criminal network from Chicago, you can click on it, drag nodes around, see how people are connected to each other.



Jenn Tostlebe 51:43

This is really cool. I spent some time on your website a couple of days ago, just looking around at it.

 Jared Joseph 51:48

And I also put up the full code base that I use to create this paper. And I I'm doing the same for all of my papers, if you want to see how I did this, my paper, you know, the code from data cleaning to creating final plots is all linked on my GitHub. And I think that's important for transparency and reproducibility. So, if you want to see how I did anything, it's all out there.


 Jose Sanchez 52:13


Yeah, that's awesome. Kudos to you.





Jenn Tostlebe 52:15

The way I think it should be moving. So that's great.

 Jose Sanchez 52:18
Definitely.


 Jenn Tostlebe 52:20
All right. Well, thank you again, Jared. It was great talking to you and meeting you. And yeah, be in touch.

 Jose Sanchez 52:26
Right. Yeah.

 Jared Joseph 52:26
Thank you, both of you for taking the time to talk with me. Yeah, yeah. Thank you.

 Jenn Tostlebe 52:32
Hey, thanks for listening.

 Jose Sanchez 52:34
Don't forget to leave us a review on Apple podcasts or iTunes. Or let us know what you think of the episode by leaving us a comment on our website, thecriminologyacademy.com.

 Jenn Tostlebe 52:43
You can also follow us on Twitter, Instagram and Facebook @thecrimacademy. That's T-H-E-C-R-I-M-A-C-A-D-E-M-Y

 Jose Sanchez 52:55
or email us at thecrimacademy@gmail.com. See you next time.