

Chapter 1 : Integrating Criminologies

INTEGRATIVE THEORIES, INTEGRATING CRIMINOLOGIES. The following unedited or draft essay by Gregg Barak, "Integrative Theories," was published in the Encyclopedia of Crime & Punishment (Sage,).

Amidst these changes, various original theories prove to be inadequate and limited in their scope in explaining crimes, crime control and criminal behaviors. As a result, therefore, criminologists turned to integrated theories of criminology in attempt to offers a more compelling and a precise explanation to crime. However, the outstanding issue remains to be the effectiveness of the integrated theories approach in explaining causation and prevalence of criminals, crime and informing crime control. Thus, to validate this approach taken by many criminologists, evaluation of its strengths is worth of a study curiosity. In this regard, this paper shall discuss the strengths of integrated theories of crime to evaluate whether they hold a promise as far as criminology is concerned. The development of integrated theories approach is said to have been stimulated by limitations of existing theories in offering explanation of the crime, the notion of criminal careers approach and developmental criminology Vila, played central role in their development. Three approaches in integrating individual theories according to Barak b are: The conceptual approach involves bringing pre-existing theories together and demonstrates they are achieving comparable results. In other words, the approach is intended to blend the elements of individual theories into new theories. The structural approach usually links existing theories in a new format. While the assimilation approach allows union of different theories into large conceptual frameworks without considering the conditional effects and interactive relationships that these theories may have on each other Barak b; Taylor, In attempt to integrate various criminological theories, theorists have combined certain individual theories to create integrated theories of crime and punishment. Examples of theorists that have done good work in integrating theories are Thornberry and Elliott. While low social control tends to increase the likelihood of association with delinquent peers, that in turn promotes the social learning of crime for the affected individual. Integrated theorizing by Thornberry tries to integrate social learning and control theories Stuart and Barak, In his integration, Thornberry argue that low control at the social institutions such as school and home promotes association with delinquent peers, hence may lead to adoption of beliefs favorable to delinquency Vila, ; Stuart and Barak, He also observed that causes of crime have reciprocal effects with each other. In turn, association with delinquent peers reduces attachment to parents as much of time and concentration is given to peers than parents. Strengths of Integrative theories Today our society is in the era of multicultural and postmodern worlds of criminal justice and criminology characterized by post-structuralism, post-feminism, post-Marxism, and post-affirmative action, criminologists from various schools of thought appreciate the value of integrative theories in enhancing our understanding to crime Taylor, This is a far much reaching approach as opposed to traditional theories which divided the society and persons into sociological entities, biological, psychological, cultural Barak, b, p. This on the positive scale was partially correct, while on the negative scale proved to be quite inadequate as they ignore more factors than they consider. Therefore, this implies that most traditional theories have limited range and application. In response to the limited scope and application of the traditional theories, criminologists are turning to integrative theories as a mean of integrating criminologies. However, the outstanding question is validating the rational behind criminologists turning to integrative theories, rather than the popularity gained by these integrative theories among various stakeholders. Therefore, this is a point of contention that shall be closely examined in attempt extract out the usefulness of integrative theories to criminologists that aid approach to gain support and recognition. Integrative theories of crime appeal to criminologists due to its diversification to the extent that the integration allow for a creative plurality of knowledge based frameworks that enhances better understanding of crime and criminals Taylor, This is applauded in both modernist and postmodernist modes of thought in relation to crime explanation. Evidently, it is clear that some integrative theories focus on crime, justice, and social control; others focus on criminal behavior and criminal activity; and others still focus on punishment and crime control Barak, b. Additionally, some of the integrative theories are formalistic comprising of a number of propositional statements from one or two theories within the same

field of study; while others are less formalistic and consist of conceptualizing interactive relations between various levels of human structural relationships, motivation and social organization. Therefore, these special domains engulfed in integrative theories enable criminologists to understand many interpretations accrued to crime causation Pearson and Neil, , p. Strength of integrated theories of crime is that they are easily broken down into a variety of explanations of crime and punishment by use of specific integrated theories. This is in the sense that specific integrative theories usually focus on a single form of criminality like crimes that relate to rape. This is opposed to the general integrated theories which try to make a sensible explanation of crime from a relatively broad range of harmful activities such as structural forms, interpersonal and organizational Pearson and Neil, Furthermore, integration of theories that take into consideration both postmodernism and modernism forms prove to be effective. For instance, postmodernist forms of integration central tenet emphasize the ever-changing voices of plurality bear insight into providing meaning for the local sites of crime such as community, law and justice, since these scenes of crime are constituted by social and harmful personal relationships Barak, b. While on the other hand, the modernist forms of integration its central tenet emphasizes on the centrality of theory in scientific endeavors and in the construction of causal models capable of predicting transgression Pearson and Neil, Application of modernist forms of integration implies that criminologist will have confined themselves to criminality. These approaches offers explanations to crime and punishment by specifically venturing into three models such as micro-macro models that focus on kinds-of-culture, social structure-macro models focus on kinds-of-organization and social process-micro models that focus on kinds-of-people Braithwaite, This can be clearly perceived by illustrations from various examples. First, Quinney in his work of Class, State and Crime provides an integrative theory presented through development and contradictions of capitalism in our society. In this theory, from a political economy of crime and crime control perspective he argues that crime can be best explained from a class-structural perception. In this regard, class and structure in the society interconnects in the sense that crimes of repression and dominations are most likely to be committed by agents of control and capitalists. While the crimes of resistance and accommodation is more likely to be committed by the ordinary and working individuals. Therefore, the social structure of the capitalistic society has an impact on the crime causation due to specific differential opportunities for crime class. Additionally, the theory advocates that deviant behavior of the poor varies in relation to mixed land use, dilapidation, population density, transience, and poverty. This example from Quinney work illustrates the social-structure macro models application to the criminology world. This theory proves to be relevant in aspects of both production and reduction of crime and punishment since it focuses on four dimensions of control of consistency and coercion. This dimensions covered are critical as they have a profound different effects on non-criminal and criminal outcomes whether applied to chronic street criminals, white-collar rule breakers, or exploratory offenders. This integration shows how differential levels of consistency and coercion appear in macro and micro processes of social control involving larger economic and cultural forces in society Colvin, Therefore, this integration geared towards non-coercive society aim at altering and preventing the erratic coercive dynamics in the background and foreground of most criminality, especially in its habitual forms. The integrated theories of crime are more concerned with integration of knowledge rather than theories per se John, This is far much opposed to the traditional singular theories that pursued the cause-and-effect predictions of theoretical integration within, or even between disciplines Braithwaite, For instance, Vila theory of evolutionary ecological encompasses a multiplicity of disciplinary causal factors and bases of knowledge, in the sense that the theory integrates different levels of analysis. Therefore, the knowledge approach in the construction of integrated theories provide a synthesis of both interdisciplinary domain and it is problem-oriented rather than discipline-oriented approach of traditional theories in relation to understanding criminal behavior Vila, , p. Conclusion In conclusion, the paper has examined the strengths of integrated theories of crime and punishment which can be perceived in terms of the ways of seeing integration, integrating bodies of theory, and integrating bodies of knowledge. The paper also supports the integrated theories of crime and crime control because of their cross analysis and incorporation of the basics of the original theories that yields a more precise and compelling crime explanation. The explanations arrived at help modern criminologist to find answers to critical questions in relation to

understanding the nature of the crime. Why do people perform criminal acts? Is it something in their genes? Is it something in the hand of fate? Or is it something that they learn? Integrative theories therefore, answers these questions to aid criminologists understand the trends of crime prevalence and occurrence in order to better contribute towards crime combating. Thus, focus of integrative theories can be streamlined in to sub categories of theory objectives. These categories of integrative theories objective are: Although integrative paradigm looks strong and holds out the promise, the ways of theorizing and applicability parts of integrative theories vary greatly within the theories. As a consequence, it implies that integrative theories lack viable framework for synthetic work having emerged from study of crime and punishment from other theories. Therefore, more has to be done than desired in relation to achieving measurable results in this field of integrative theorizing. London, Dartmouth Braithwaite, J. An Integrated Theory of Chronic Criminality. Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency, American Journal of Sociology, Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology Crime, Class, and State: New York, David McKay. An Integrative-Constitutive Theory of Crime:

Chapter 2 : Integrative Theories, Integrating Criminologies - Critical Criminology

Integrating Criminologies and its 'post-postmodern' perspective was exciting to receive and stimulating to read. Many others who see the wisdom in multidisciplinary studies will feel the same way, as will those who are bored or in a rut because of what Barak calls 'the sterile backwaters of disciplinary criminology'.

Not only has the study of crime and punishment broadened throughout the behavioral and social sciences, but, increasingly criminologists have adopted perspectives that are no longer grounded in "classical" versus "positivist" views of human nature and social interaction. At worst, these analyses are very inadequate as they typically ignore more factors than they consider. Like theories in general which have diversified in kind and approach, the same has been true of integrative theories, perhaps more so. What makes integrative theories especially appealing is that the diversification of models is liberating to the extent that they allow for a creative plurality of knowledge based frameworks. This is the case, both within and across disciplinary boundaries, as well as within and across modernist and postmodernist modes of thought. At the same time, some integrative theories focus on criminal behavior and criminal activity, others focus on punishment and crime control, still other focus on crime, justice, and social control. Moreover, some integrative theories are formalistic and consist of propositional statements stemming from two or more theories usually within the same discipline; other integrative models or theories are less formalistic and consist of conceptualizing the reciprocal or interactive relations between various levels of human motivation, social organization, and structural relationships. Hence, when one thinks of integrative models one must realize from the beginning that there are many interpretations of what it means to be "doing" integration. Ways of Seeing Integration Just as there are multiple ways of doing theory, or of building simple, one-dimensional models of crime production, there are, even more ways of constructing complex models of criminal behavior or of integrating criminologies. Despite this abstract agreement on the meaning of integration, actual approaches to integration vary significantly. In other words, the ways of seeing or constituting criminological integration differ in both theory and practice. As a consequence, the development of integrative theories and practices has, thus far, "proceeded in a somewhat anomic fashion with no [one] viable framework for synthetic work" having emerged in the study of crime and punishment Tittle, Nevertheless, much of the impetus for integration in criminology, at least early on, beginning in the s, was grounded in the disciplines of psychology or sociology, and occasionally from the perspective of social psychology. For example, the criminological literature on theoretical integration reveals a strong reliance on learning and control theories, a weaker reliance on strain theory, followed closely by subcultural, conflict, and Marxist theories. These sociological biases at work in criminological integration have traditionally marginalized theories and models of biology, evolution, history, gender, communication, economics, and law. In contrast to the more sociologically- and psychologically-based positivist and modern stances toward integration, are the eclectically-based constructivist and postmodern stances toward integration. Both modernist and postmodernist approaches to integrative theories can be broken down further into a variety of explanations of crime and punishment. Moreover, integrative or integrated theories, may be specific or general. Whereas the specific integrated theories have focused on a single form of criminality, such as rape or battering, the general integrated theories have attempted to make sense out of a relatively broad or inclusive range of harmful activities, including interpersonal, organizational, and structural forms. Whether these attempts at integration have been modernist or postmodernist, some have confined themselves to criminality while others have focused more broadly on deviance and non-conformity. Finally, modernist forms of integration emphasize the centrality of theory in scientific endeavors and in the construction of causal models capable of predicting transgression. Postmodernist forms of integration emphasize the ever-changing voices of plurality that provide meaning for the local sites of crime, justice, law, and community as these are constituted by harmful personal and social relationships Barak, a and b; Henry and Milovanovic, Integrating Bodies of Theory Whether discussing various forms of delinquency integration that hook theories together sequentially Cloward and Ohlin, ; Colvin and Pauly, ; Elliott, Huizinga, and Ageton, ; Elliott, Huizinga, and Menard, , of learning or reinforcement

forms of integration that bring theories together by focusing on a central causal process Glaser, ; Akers, ; Pearson and Weiner, , or of macro- and micro-level forms of integration that link theories together by combinations of interdependencies Hagan, ; Kaplan, ; Tatum, , these approaches to integration have engaged in three basic types of positivist integration: The structural integrations can be either "end-to-end" or "side-by-side" integrations. End-to-end conceptualizations, such as those of mainline delinquency integration tend to give no preference to the various components involved and assume some kind of linear effect is in operation, so that different theorists might order the elements in different sequences Elliott, Ageton, and Cantor, ; Johnson, By contrast, side-by-side integrations, provide a firmer basis for the sequencing of theoretical ingredients, in that later outcomes are conditional on earlier outcomes Braithwaite, Conceptual and assimilative integrations assume one of two kinds of abstract causal processes. In the conceptual types of "up-and-down" integration, pre-existing theories are brought together that are saying more or less the same types of things, only at different levels of analysis, or related theories are brought together and blended into new theoretical products. By contrast, the assimilative type of "kitchen sink" integrations employ abstract causal processes that do not consume other theories one way or the other, but rather allow different theories to be united into larger, abstract conceptual frameworks without respect to the interactive relationships and conditional effects that these theories may have on each other. Modernist constructions of integrative theories may also be thought of or described in other related ways. These approaches may be divided up into those that emphasize kinds-of-people social process-micro models , kinds-of-organization social structure-macro models , and kinds-of-culture micro-macro models explanations of crime and punishment. The following represent a few brief examples of each of these types of modernist integration: Wilson and Herrnstein Their theory is an eclectic, social learning-behavioral choice formulation that relies on both positivist determinism and classical free will as it claims various linkages between criminality and hereditary factors, impulsivity, low intelligence, family practices, school experiences, and the effects of mass media on the individual. Krohn bridged together theoretical propositions from the delinquency-enhancing effects of differential association and the delinquency-constraining effects of social bonds, as these interact with social learning and social control. His network theory maintains that the lower the network density in relationship to population density, the weaker the constraints against nonconformity, and the higher rates of delinquency. In Class, State and Crime, Quinney provided a general and integrative theory expressed through the contradictions and development of capitalism. His political economy of crime and crime control articulates a class-structural analysis where two interconnected sets of criminality, the crimes of domination and repression are committed by capitalists and agents of control, and the crimes of accommodation and resistance are committed by workers and ordinary people. This social structure- macro model argues that not only are the differential opportunities for crime class specific, but so too are the accompanying motivations for both crime and punishment. Stark introduced an integrated set of thirty propositions as an approximation of a theory of deviant places. His "kinds-of-place" explanation or ecological theory analyzed the traits of places and groups rather than the traits of individuals. It contends that the deviant behavior of the poor varies in relation to population density, poverty, mixed land use, transience, and dilapidation. In Power, Crime, and Mystification, Box provided a conceptual integration of how corporate crime overcomes environmental uncertainties by illegally reducing or eliminating competition through fraud, bribery, manipulation, price-fixing, and so on. Box employed anomie and strain as the motivational sources behind corporate crime. He argues that "motivational strain" is translated into illegal acts through differential associations and corporate subcultures where elites learn to rationalize and neutralize their infractions with social and moral contracts. This model searches for common vocabulary in which terms from one theory have analogs in other theoretical formulations. The central organizing concept of their model employs a social learning theory of crime, and incorporates micro-social factors, macro-social structural factors, and behavioral consequences or feedback factors. An Integrated Theory of Chronic Criminality. His control balance theory contends that the "amount of control to which people are subject relative to the amount of control they can exercise affects their general probability of committing some deviant acts as well as the probability that they will commit specific types of deviance" Tittle, His socially and psychologically dynamic theory is relevant to both the production and reduction of crime and punishment as it focuses on four

dimensions of control--or degrees of coercion and consistency--that have had profoundly different effects on criminal and non-criminal outcomes, whether applied to chronic street criminals, exploratory offenders, or white-collar rule breakers. His integration at both the inter-personal and macro-social levels reveals how "differential levels of coercion and consistency appear in micro processes of social control and at the macro level involving larger economic and cultural forces in society" Colvin, Integrating Bodies of Knowledge

Postmodern integrationists are concerned less about theories per se than they are about knowledges. Rather than pursuing the cause-and-effect predictions of theoretical integration within, or even between disciplines, these criminologists are creating explanatory models of crime and crime control that make connections or linkages through and across the entire range of interdisciplinary knowledges Barak, a. Extending Evolutionary Ecological Theory" is consistent with the spirit of integrating criminologies as it incorporates a multiplicity of disciplinary causal factors and bases of knowledge. Vila reconciles or integrates, at one level of analysis, such theories as strain, control, labeling, and learning primarily derived from the disciplines of social psychology, and at another level, he examines over time and across disciplines, the changes that are derived in the "resource-acquisition" and "resource-retention" behaviors of social actors, from parental through early adulthood. Whereas modernist integrations focus on linear causality and multiple causality, postmodernist integrations focus on interactive causality or reciprocal causality and on dialectical causality or codetermination causality. The latter forms of causality not only raise questions about whether modernist theorists have correctly ordered their causal variables, but, more fundamentally, they question whether there is a correct ordering of causal variables in the first place. In fact, certain things may happen simultaneously, while other things may not, and these things or relations may not be constant over time. Some of the synthetic models of integrated knowledges can be classified as "transdisciplinary" or as post-postmodernist integrations that strive to combine principles, facts, and values from both modern empiricism and postmodern reconstructionism. In terms of soft determinist, neopositivist, and post-postmodernist integration, "cause" may refer to the influences and variations that are possible in the context of the multiple interrelations of discourses, ideologies, imaginations, unconsciousnesses, histories, and political economies, all of which are never fully separated from each other Henry and Milovanovic, In any case, these models represent a hybrid of the methods of both modernism and postmodernism, or a third way of seeing integration. A developing means of bridging or integrating knowledges across modernist and postmodernist divides has been established through the use of texts and narratives. As sociologist Richard Harvey Brown It is, instead, a social historical practice where the meaning of words are not taken from things or intentions, but arise from the socially coordinated actions of people. For example, the "life-course" criminology of Sampson and Laub in *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*, and their development or "stepping stone" approach to delinquency and crime is located in the narrative data of life histories and in the social reconstruction of crime. Arrigo has argued that the key to postmodern integration is in the production of nontotalizing analyses and nonglobalizing assessments. His form of integration does not "presume to understand the conditions or the causes of criminal or legal controversies by offering either a homeostatically based integrative model or a rigidly specialized theory" Arrigo, Messerschmidt, in *Crime as Structured Action: Gender, Race, Class, and Crime in the Making* engages in a grounded social constructionism that evolves not only through discourses, but also, more importantly, through the ways in which people actively construct their own identities, masculine and feminine, in relationship to crime and particular social contexts as these are differentiated through time and situation as well as through class, race, gender, and so on. These types of integrative analyses that go beyond postmodernism argue that crimes are recursive productions, routinized activities which are part and parcel of historically- and culturally-specific discourses and structures that have attained a relative stability over time and place. Barak and Henry, for example, in "An Integrative-Constitutive Theory of Crime, Law, and Social Justice," provided an examination of the co-production of crime and consumption and of crime and justice both "criminal" and "social". Their theory "links the study of culture with the study of crime. It is a theory that maintains the diversity of vocabularies through which different people experience violence and different criminal justice organizations exercise their power. It is a theory that integrates each of these points of view into a more complete, more robust regard for law, crime, and deviance" Arrigo, In the

end, this kind of synthesis attempts to bring the intersections of class, race, and gender together with the dynamics of social identity formation and mass communications see also Barak, Flavin, and Leighton, Conclusion Integrative theories or integrating criminological perspectives is not a particularly new endeavor. It dates at least as far back as Merton , Sutherland , and Cohen Throughout this developing period of integration, many criminologists remained skeptical about the merits and potentials of integrative models. Some turned to the "vertical" elaboration of older one-dimensional theories, others abandoned theory altogether in preference for the "horizontal" bits and pieces of knowledge that come from multiple disciplines that study crime and punishment. Nevertheless, by the turn of the 21st century, the integrative paradigm had become the newly emerging paradigm in criminology and penology. As for the future, this integrative paradigm looks strong and holds out the promise that the study of crime and punishment will, sooner than later, become the truly interdisciplinary enterprise that most criminologists have always claimed it to be. A Social Learning Approach. Barak, Gregg and Stuart Henry. Class, Race, Gender, and Crime: Social Realities of Justice in America. Power, Crime, and Mystification. Crime, Shame, and Reintegration. The Culture of the Gang. Colvin, Mark and John Pauly. Crime in Our Changing Society. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. Explaining Delinquency and Drug Use. Henry, Stuart and Dragan Milovanovic. Juvenile Delinquency and Its Origins. Self-Attitudes and Deviant Behavior. Crime as Structured Action: Gender, Race, Class and Crime in the Making. Class, State, and Crime.

Chapter 3 : Radical Criminology - Critical Criminology

A critique of disciplinary criminology and a synthesis of the paradigm of interdisciplinary criminology, this book attempts to bring biology, psychology, sociology, law, economics, feminist studies, media studies, and ethnic studies into a criminological whole.

Integration is not new. It informed the groundbreaking work of Merton, Sutherland, and Cohen, but it has become a more positive school over the last twenty years see Messner. The problems [edit] The conceptual difficulty is to retain the utility of the substance while considering form. The rule should be not to integrate unless there is a measurable benefit. Systems theory believes that isomorphism can be identified in all disciplines, and better understanding will result from finding and using that common material in an integrated theory. But there is a danger of reductionism or of creating mere abstraction in a metatheory where concepts are simply grouped within concepts. This arises from the easily generalised hypotheses about what human nature is, why people conform or do not conform, how an individual can be both the cause and consequence of society, and why deviancy is both subjective and diachronic. The temptation is to produce a "General" or "Unified" Theory, bringing all the previously separated strands together, but ignoring the fact that to be separate theories, there must have been methodologically consistent research and analysis. This is also assuming that all theories are partly correct, partly wrong, and none wholly adequate on their own. Since society should be aiming for rationality in its justice and punishment systems, it is important to re-evaluate the concepts of social control, but the intention should be to formulate new research to challenge assumptions e. Discussion [edit] Theories of crime and punishment have become increasingly diverse as the phenomenon of diversity has been studied by the medical, psychological, behavioural, social, economic, and political sciences. One consequence has been the abandonment of bipolar debates, e. The proposition that a complex social phenomenon such as crime and its punishment can be researched using a single philosophical tenet is less acceptable in a postmodern world given that analyses limited in their metamethodology or methodologies are likely to ignore more factors than they consider. It is, instead, a social historical practice where the meaning of words are not taken from things or intentions, but arise from the socially co-ordinated actions of people. But such methodological proposals have met with little approval. For example, the Neo-Classical and Right Realism reliance on social control and social learning theory resists reference to issues of history, gender, economics, and law of interest to Marxist criminology, Feminist school, etc. The methodology of integration may be: This links existing theories, or at least their main components, in a new format. This may involve reconceiving the causal variables or theorising that, under certain conditions, the causal processes of one theory interlock with those of other theories. Braithwaite suggests that "side-by-side integration" provides a more internally consistent sequencing of theoretical ingredients as later outcomes are shown to be conditional on earlier outcomes. This brings pre-existing theories together and demonstrates that they are achieving comparable results, only at different levels of analysis. The intention is to blend the elements into new theories. This allows different theories to be united into large conceptual frameworks without considering the interactive relationships and conditional effects that these theories may have on each other. Modernist integrative theories vary in their scope. Some focus on particular types of behaviour or offenders in social process-micro modelling, e. Wilson and Herrnstein concentrated on predatory street behavior using a social learning-behavioural choice model that relies on both positivist determinism and classical free will as it considers possible links between criminality and heredity, impulsivity, low intelligence, family practices, school experiences, and the effects of mass media on the individual. Other integrationists develop social structure-macro models, e. Quinney articulated a political economy and culture of crime and crime control based class-structural analysis where domination and repression through criminalisation was directed by capitalists and their agents of control. These and other new theories care less about theories per se than about the knowledge they represent, focusing on interactive, reciprocal, dialectical, or codetermination causality, challenging whether there is a correct ordering of causal variables or whether the relations are constant over time. Barak and Henry also link the study of culture with the study of crime, examining the diversity of

vocabularies through which different people experience violence and different criminal justice organisations exercise their power. References[edit] Barak, Gregg. Crime, Shame, and Reintegration. The Culture of the Gang. Theoretical Integration in the Study of Deviance and Crime: Crime as Structured Action: Gender, Race, Class and Crime in the Making. Class, State, and Crime. Toward a General Theory of Deviance. Crime and Human Nature.

Chapter 4 : Integrative criminology - Wikipedia

Some of the content of Integrating Criminologies will be familiar to those who have taught criminology classes before. There is, however, a broader range of topics.

Mentor University of North Carolina Wilmington Radical criminology began to appear on the criminological scene in the 1960s as criminologists began to question traditional criminology in light of political, social, and economic events occurring in the United States. Conflict over racial issues and the Vietnam war resulted in organized opposition to the state, including rioting and other forms of violence. The government, along with researchers and academics, sought ways to respond to and control these movements, which eventually led to rapid expansion of the criminal justice system. Radical criminology may be referred to as Marxist, conflict, or critical criminology. The ideological perspectives defined in the early years of radical criminology continue to serve as a foundation for criminologists interested in anarchist, environmental, feminist, constitutive, cultural, peacemaking, restorative, and other branches of critical criminology. All branches of radical or critical criminology share concepts and principles centered on the distribution of power and ways in which the law protects the interests of the ruling class. While Marx did not specifically discuss crime, his writings focused on law, power, and social and economic control, each of which are important variables to consider in an examination of crime and justice. Radical criminologists argue that the law serves those with the power to translate their interests into public policy. Rather than accepting the premise of law as a product of consensus, radical criminologists define law as a set of rules defined and enforced by the state. Critical scholars argue that our criminal justice system neutralizes potential opposition to the state by targeting the actions of those who are most oppressed. In addition to controlling opposition, these laws often reproduce hierarchies that serve the interests of those in power. Individual blame also diverts attention from structural models of causation and relieves those in power from accepting responsibility. Radicals argue that the discipline of criminology, the general public, and politicians focus on crime in the streets, allowing those in power to commit far greater criminal acts with little fear of retribution. Radical criminologists also examine the processes through which deviance, criminal behavior, and state responses to crime are socially constructed. This examination provides insight into the ways state power is used to define challenges to authority. For example, behaviors that threaten the social, economic, and political order are labeled terrorist as well as criminal. Lynch and Groves, Different responses to criminal acts are facilitated when the state-controlled label of terrorist can be applied. Similarly, the focus on repeat offenders, and long prison terms, has centered on street crime rather than corporate or white-collar crime. This pattern also reinforces the perception that individuals, rather than institutions, are to blame for social problems. In effect, the powerful are able to exert social control on the masses while excluding their own acts and the criminal acts of those who serve powerful interests. Radical criminology also examines the consequences of crime policies that prevent society from questioning the dehumanizing effects of our social institutions. The justice system is used to create a permanent underclass whose options are limited as a result of contact with the justice system. Thousands of men, particularly men of color, are kept out of the job market or trapped in the secondary market as they move through the seemingly endless cycle of crime, prison, and recidivism. At the same time, the justice system creates millions of jobs. Radical criminology has evolved, and earned legitimacy within the wider discipline, due to the inclusion of radically oriented sessions at annual meetings and continued contributions to scholarly publications associated with these organizations. A conflict approach to criminology. John Wiley and Sons. A primer in radical criminology 2nd ed. The origins of radical criminology in the U. Bearing witness to crime and social justice. State University of New York Press.

Chapter 5 : Read About My Books

The following unedited or draft essay by Gregg Barak, "Integrative Theories," was published in the Encyclopedia of Crime & Punishment (Sage,): Over the past couple of decades, theories of crime and punishment have blossomed in their diversity.

Body Physique and Temperament Factors. Looking for a Molecular Knowledge of Crime. Biopsychological Approaches to Criminal Behavior. Psychoanalytic Views of Criminal Behavior. Antisocial Personality Approaches to Criminal Behavior. Social-Psychological Views of Criminal Behavior. Humanistic-Psychological Approaches to Criminal Behavior. Personality and Interpersonal Development. Why We Have Crime. Contributions from Law and Economics: Postmodernism and the Critique of Rational Law. Why People Commit Crimes. A Discussion of Modernist Integration and Causation. Modernist Constructions of Integrated Theory. A Postmodern Criticism of Integration. A Post - Postmodern Synthesis. Modernist versus Postmodernist Thought: Dueling Paradigms and the Need for Synthesis. The Case for Knowledge Synthesis: Research Forms as Kinds of Knowledge: Toward a Post - Postmodern Synthesis. Constituting Crime and Crime Reduction. Integrating Culture, Media, and Gender Studies: An Interdisciplinary Perspective on Crime Production. Mass Communications and New-World Cybernetics. Change in Late Modernity: Crime and the Culture of Consumption. Variability and the Intersection of Race, Gender, and Class. An Inventory of Criminological Indicators. Integrating Crime and Social Control: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Crime Reduction. The War on Youth and Youth Violence. A Conceptual and Practical Overview. Nonintegrated Modes of Crime Control. Integrated Modes of Crime Reduction.

Chapter 6 : Necessary Facts: Integrating Criminologies

Integrating Criminologies is both a critique of disciplinary criminology and a synthesis of the emerging paradigm of interdisciplinary criminology. The author attempts to bring biology, psychology, sociology, law, economics, feminist studies, media studies, and ethnic studies into an integrated criminological whole.

Observations, reports, and discoveries that are true of necessity because they are perceivable and reasonable, empirical and logical, evidentiary and rational, synthetic and analytic. Truths are objective statements. Monday, June 11, Integrating Criminologies Crime is the sine qua non problem of every society. What a culture regards as harms and how people respond to harm defines them even more than their achievements. No laissez faire criminologist asserts that what we mistakenly were told were harms and crimes are only the benefits of an Invisible Hand of Human Action. Integrative Systems Theory Robinson and Integration Theory Barak attempt to bring order to the many theories of crime. Despite this abstract agreement on the meaning of integration, actual approaches to integration vary significantly. Gregg Barak on his website here. Integration is a formidable task because different hypotheses rest on different assumptions. Criminologists argue past each other because they are expressing different paradigms. Integrative criminology correctly identifies what all harms have in common. It resolves conflicts within the individuals involved, as well as remediating their externally apparent problem, and integrates the actors into their society. Different schools of thought stem from different sets of data. The collection of data has always been driven by theory. Unlike scientists who discover some previously unperceived phenomenon “nebulæ through a telescope; germs via a microscope” criminologists absorb their social contexts long before they learn methods of investigating their own and other cultures at university. From the medieval lecturers to online interactions, academic cultures always range within the collectivist models based on the assumption that only altruism defines ethics because it is identical with morality. Those rest on erroneous epistemologies. Individualism is objectively real: Yet, even the proposed integration criminologies do not take this fact into account. Epistemological integration is the unifying of discrete elements into a single concept. The individual person is the unit of society. Therefore, successful criminology begins with the individual. Most often, crimes are identified when individuals are united by a shared harm. Diagnosed with a terminal illness, you have the right to end your life when you choose. You do not have a political right to do that by jumping from a building. Any individual who chooses such an obviously harmful public display is internally conflicted and lacking integration. Thus, other people via the police power of government have a compelling interest to act. When individuals come into conflict, one of them certainly and all of them likely are internally unintegrated or else the problem would not exist. But not all problems are solvable. Whether a dishonest accountant is genetically cursed, or the product of a broken home, or differentially associated with a criminogenic corporation, or simply chooses to gain at the expense of others may be the bottom line. Whether we can walk away from the harms and accept them as metaphysical facts is the essential problem of criminology.

Chapter 7 : Strengths of Integrated Theories of Criminology Essay Example | Graduateway

A critique of disciplinary criminology and a synthesis of the paradigm of interdisciplinary criminology, this book attempts to bring biology, psychology, sociology, law, economics, feminist studies.

They ran in a range; and as a consequence of our criticism, we exchanged some emails with the author who demanded retractions which we did not publish. We stand by our work "as he stands by his. Overall, the book is important and valuable. It does have its weak points. They do not detract from the major thesis: Symbolic Messengers webpages here Today, we are not always certain about the motives of the people of those distant times. That is the first challenge. Common to both Karl Marx and Ludwig von Mises is the hilarious presumption that coinage evolved from bullion, which evolved from bartering for commodities. Those who do not question this fantasy have not investigated the problem. The earliest records written in cuneiform on clay " which, according to Denise Schmandt-Besserat, evolved from tokens for debt " indicate divinity by placing a star above a person or the name of the person. That seems natural to us who place our Gods in Heaven. Those who identify their goddess with the earth have another narrative. Thus, when coins were issued as bonus payments to mercenaries about BCE, they often carried stars in many forms. Other coins of the same time show a "hairy wart" on the nose of the Lion. Does that symbolize Taurus and Leo? And if so, in what context? And where is the Scorpion? But none of that is in Faintich. His focus is the European Middle Ages. Strong evidence supports the choice. First, we have the coins. In the years between Charlemagne and Columbus, perhaps a thousand issues are known. Many have astronomical symbols. Those events also appear recorded on coins as a common medium of communication. Therefore, it is only desk work to rely on modern astronomical software to run the clock back and look at the sky in medieval England, France, and Germany " and then compare those results to the attested times and places of mintage for coins with astronomical symbols. Faintich builds a strong case. At times, he over-reaches. And with good reason. Brad Wade and I talked this out in the context of the ethics in science. Never does he address the bishops including the bishop of Rome and the archbishop of Canterbury who issued coins. By not examining coins issued by ecclesiastic authorities and by ignoring the actual conflicts of church versus crown, Faintich undermines the theory that pellets, annulets, stars, mullets, crescents, combs and bars were intended as symbols of divine favor for mundane rulers. He offers four criteria that must be met to show that the astronomical events correlate with the intent of the coin. Second, the astronomical symbol must be the first such occurrence for that coin design or a reintroduction of the symbol after a substantial period of time to rule out immobilization of the design. Third, the occurrence of the astronomical event must be established. Fourth, and most difficult to ascertain, historical evidence must be presented that supports the observance and importance of the event. Faintich does this repeatedly for eclipses of the sun and moon, comets, and conjunctions. This book intersects both studies. Correlating celestial events with terrestrial history may be the best path for reconciling the calendars of the past. So, when medieval women and men recorded their lives in diaries, we can too easily misunderstand their statements of time. Comparing their skies with their coins can help us bring everything into alignment. That is just one potential use for this overlooked but significant work.

Chapter 8 : Integrating Criminologies - Gregg Barak - Google Books

Integrating Criminologies Crime is the sine qua non problem of every society. What a culture regards as harms and how people respond to harm defines them even more than their achievements.

This chapter argues for criminologists contributing and thinking in a new way by returning to and updating the notion of The Challenge of Crime in A Free Society. Interesting in their absence are all the victims of September 11 terrorism from the categories of murder, assault and hate crimes. Excluding victims is not based on uncertainty as to how many deaths occurred: But Ramzi Yousef , one of those ultimately convicted, wanted to kill , His plan was to cause an explosion that would make one tower fall and knock over the other one. If so, then it should show what criminal justice professionals already know – that Sept 11 changed their mission and jobs. The FBI may be opening field offices in Uzbekistan, Afghanistan, Malaysia and Yemen, but rather than also updating this important statistical reference, the FBI clearly thinks that it is better for the UCR and the mindset of all who depend it on it for information, to be firmly grounded in a simpler era not concerned with global terrorism. Adding in all the World Trade Center victims of does add an outlier to crime data, creating difficulties in analyzing issues like the impact of community policing on violent crime. The problems with not conceptualizing terrorism as crime ultimately go beyond consistency or integrity with the UCR, or even the effects on criminology. Acknowledging the tragic events as crime would require more emphasis on criminal procedure and individual rights enshrined by the Constitution. Excluding victims undercuts the growing need to further develop international law and stronger institutions of international justice for a shrinking global village. Three decades of wars on crime and drugs have already eroded many procedural safeguards important to a democratic society, and the war on terrorism has created further shortcuts in the freedoms that the U. Thus, championing democracy in deeds as well as rhetoric is crucial both to preserving the core values of the nation and to U. However, since that time, the U. Disturbingly, the Pew Center found that America has lost much of the goodwill it gained after the attacks of In the face of this dire situation, the question is, Can criminology can be a constructive influence for thinking in cooperative, democratic and new ways? Will the discipline instead follow the UCR in keeping the pre mentality with its implicit repudiation of the rule of law? If criminologists can overcome disciplinary inertia, what could they contribute? This chapter argues that criminology can and should make a contribution to the pressing problem of terrorism and in doing so make long overdue disciplinary changes by becoming more global and as interested in topics like ethnic cleansing as serial killers. However, the criminal justice system has spent three decades fighting wars on crime and drugs – efforts that at best have been marginally successful despite enormous expense, and have increased racial tension because of disproportionate minority involvement with the criminal justice system. The argument is not for a literal rereading of the report, but for criminologists to develop research agendas around the Challenge of Terrorism to the Free Societies of the Global Village. This conception is consistent with statements by the Atomic Scientists and Nobel Laureates; it helps criminology be relevant to the problems of the complex 21st Century global village and will equip students with an understanding of democratic freedoms rather than knee-jerk patriotism. The first section below elaborates on the depth of the current challenge from terrorism, anti-Americanism, and the inadequacies of contemporary criminology. The Challenge of terrorism and from the limits of contemporary criminology Emphasis on the free society is not meant to minimize the threat posed by terrorists or anti-Americanism. Al Qaida has been disrupted, but the string of bombings so far in show it is still a potent force [1]. Even without the war on Iraq, the problems raised by September 11 are formidable. Issues of oil, geo-politics, deeply ambivalent reactions to hegemonic American culture, along with a variety of other factors, play into terrorism; and a failure to understand the root causes of terrorism guarantees its perpetuation. On the eve of the second anniversary of , a video of bin Laden has surfaced, in which his top deputy says the United States has so far experienced "just the first skirmishes" and "the real battle has not started yet. Prepare yourself for the punishment for your crimes" CNN In spite of low interest in information about the world, Americans are willing to back extreme measures to the fight the war on terror: But the inconsistent and partial application of those principles causes tension not only with Arab

nations, but also European allies and thus both inflame the Arab world and make cooperative action with European allies more difficult. Real and imagined grievances surround both U. The possibility of military tribunals handing down death sentences offended many in Europe as well as the Mid East. Camp X-Ray in the Guantanamo Bay legal black hole holds citizens from several European nations, which have expended great effort to ensure access to diplomatic counsel and promises not to seek the death penalty. Success by European nations and the failure of Arab states to achieve the same furthers the perception of double standards and persecution of Muslims. In contrast, the U. America has even executed foreign nationals who had not been notified of the right under the Vienna Convention to contact their embassy for assistance " and one such execution proceeded in violation of a stay ordered by the International Court of Justice Grant More generally, the U. The War on Terror exacerbates existing tensions over capital punishment, which are symbolic of larger skepticism over U. Although criminology can not be responsible for the full range of challenges outlined above, its own shortcomings should be acknowledged before advocating an expansion into new areas. Feagin, in the published version of his American Sociological Association Presidential Address, has a major heading: Michael Tonry concludes that the U. Americans, including criminologists, do not tend to believe that genocide has happened in the U. International Law and human rights are likewise marginalized, largely through the impact of political decisions: This is one of the principle reasons why international human rights law is so little known, or used, by U. Besides understanding this violence, key challenges lay in protecting the freedoms that make the U. If September 11 does not prompt change, then it is difficult to imagine what must happen for criminology to stop being parochial or limited by questionable political decisions defining crime and justiciable issues. Crime and Terrorism in a Free Society Global Village In order to reveal the wealth of criminological issues raised by terrorism, a new organizing framework or paradigm is useful. It should embrace democracy, be global and not replicate the iatrogenic problems of the War on Crime and Drugs [2]. The Commission included four members from the police and prosecution, but no criminal defense attorneys, and still managed to highlight the importance of freedom: However, in reviewing situations going back to Colonial times, former Supreme Court Justice Douglas notes: Short cuts have always been justified on the grounds that the end being worthy, the means of reaching it are not important. Short cuts, however, are dangerous. If they can be taken against one person or group, they can be taken against another. Embracing The Challenge of Crime in A Free Society is thus not a call to reread the report, but to recognize the Commission had a productive guiding framework. Thus, a new conception should return to embracing freedom, be updated to include terrorism and recognize that technology has made the world so interconnected as to give the globe the feel of a village. Although the entire field of criminology need not take up such questions, criminologists should consider using , its anniversaries and related events as time for introspection about whether to devote some of the energy to The Challenge of Terrorism for the Free Societies in the Global Village. For those studying terrorism and related issues, this conception helps to guard against further unnecessary erosions in the democratic freedoms the country is ultimately trying to protect. The Challenge of Terrorism for the Free Societies in the Global Village has several important implications for the subject matter of criminology, including its study of violence, criminal procedure, and international law including human rights. Terrorism builds on the study of violence and hate crimes, which should be supplemented with additional attention to massacres, genocide and mass killings like ethnic cleansing. These topics, in turn, involve greater exposure to human rights and international law, which are also salient topics in their own right in the global village. Interestingly, he notes that in response to the terrorists flying suicide missions with airplanes, one enraged man committed a hate crime by driving his car at high speed into a mosque. The behaviors are not identical but highlight the continuity of new research question from ones firmly within the disciplinary boundaries. Extending current criminological topics like community policing and criminal procedure also open up the discipline to new areas. Again, the two are not identical and shaped by different rules of engagement, but greater attention to international laws like the Geneva Convention and International Humanitarian Law helps illustrate the continuity of the criminological issues. President Bush claims Padilla is not a Prisoner of War or held under the terms of regular criminal procedure " but in either case, the political decision removing Padilla from the criminal justice system does not remove this issue from the scope of criminology. The last

paragraph hints at the second major set of implications, which have to do with the moral and political stance to the topics. Explicit within *The Challenge of Terrorism* is a concern for democratic freedoms, which in turn is grounded in a conception advanced by Feagin. Witnessing is not just a passive act but also includes the critique, for example of shortcuts in democratic freedoms, violations of international law especially when they undermine the potential for international cooperative action, and U. The previous paragraphs are meant to be more illustrative than definitive about the impact of a new guiding framework. Many of the students will be domestic criminologists or criminal justice practitioners, but criminology can still play a role in preparing them to be citizens of a global village, and hopefully ones who have reverence for democratic freedoms instead of blind patriotism. *The Challenge of Studying Terrorism: Investigating serial killers* tends to be an exercise in abnormal psychology, drawing mostly from individual biography. Understanding terrorism requires confronting the disturbing conclusion that people responsible for mass violence are in many ways normal [3], at least in the sense that people with diagnosable personality disorders tend not to work well in teams or organizations. More problematically, terrorism related to requires an appreciation of intense anti-American sentiments, a topic difficult at the best of times and perilous during the outpouring of patriotism following a crisis. While the mind hunters of serial killers get widespread admiration and respect, those trying to understand anti-American terrorism are frequently derided as unpatriotic or worse. Strong emotions mean the logical argument might be hard to get across, but the author of the book required by the university previous paragraph underscored the larger point: Osama bin Laden came out ahead of President Bush in several countries whose combined population approaches a half billion people see Table 1.

Chapter 9 : Integrating Criminologies : Gregg Barak :

SlugBooks compares all the prices between the biggest used and rental textbook sites so college students can save the most money.

Gostin and Robert Johnson Received: Drawing on alternative criminologies, including constitutive and peacemaking criminologies, as well as the practice of reintegrative shaming, this paper presents a new model of criminal justice that combines aspects of adversarial, restorative, social, and transformative justice frameworks. Young concludes the book by arguing that criminology, for the most part, is still struggling with the same problems it faced over four decades earlier: Arguably, our criminal justice system suffers from similar flaws, which is only logical as it is grounded in and stems from classically based criminological assumptions about law and human nature. For instance, since we have seen the development of both constitutive and peacemaking criminology [3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7], which aim to alter our perceptions of crime, harm, and crime control. There has also been a rise in the number of scholars emphasizing the intersections of race, class, and gender in their theories and policy recommendations [8 , 9 , 10]. Furthermore, in recent years, serious attention has been given to the notion of restorative justice and other alternative or non-traditional dispute resolution models, as manifested in problem-solving courts like drug or family court; such alternative punishment practices bring the criminal justice system closer to achieving the goals of constitutive and peacemaking criminologies. Yet, these innovative frameworks for understanding and analyzing crime, as well as for operationalizing criminal justice, remain on the periphery. This essay strives to bring such peripheral ideas regarding crime and criminality to the forefront in what I consider an exercise in intersectional criminal justice—or a model of the intersection of criminal justice between the individual and society that operates within and across adversarial, restorative, transformative, and social justice frameworks. Prompted, for the most part, by vast financial deficits, the United States has seen a continuous reduction in prisoner populations for the first time in nearly fifty years [11]. Many states such as California, Michigan, and Illinois are altering their mandatory sentencing, truth-in-sentencing, and three-strikes laws or getting rid of them altogether. A number of states have brought back parole [12 , 13]. In fact, even when such acts technically are criminal, white collar criminals experience relatively little sanction when one considers the harms they have caused—a fact that is as true today as it was in [8 , 10 , 15]. Thus throughout the 20th century, American punishment has been characterized by class justice, or the biased application of the law in relation to class, racial justice, or the discriminatory application of the law in relation to race, and gendered justice, or the differential application of the law in relation to gender [8]. Stated simply, this system of justice views criminal wrongs as consisting of three essential components: In theory, this system treats all parties—regardless of race, class, gender, or any other characteristics—equally. A state judge acts as the arbiter of legal rules. Overall, then, adversarial justice is concerned, first and foremost, with assessing blame and punishing the blameworthy. Yet models outside the adversarial justice system, which individualizes harm and reduces it to pieces of legal evidence, do exist. Restorative justice, social justice, and transformative justice are all viable alternatives to adversarial justice. Braithwaite elaborates on this definition, noting that restorative justice emphasizes healing relationships over balancing hurt with hurt, and also places the problem—not the criminal—at the center of the criminal justice system [18]. Overall, restorative justice strives to create a space for offenders to take responsibility for their actions and makes amends with victims when possible, addresses the needs of victims, offenders, and the community, and prevents reoffending through the reintegration of offenders into the community. Thus restorative justice is concerned with harm reduction at the individual and community levels—not blameworthiness and punishment—though it does hold the perpetrator accountable for her actions. Social justice, on the other hand, is concerned with shifting perceptions of harm from the level of the individual to the level of structures and society as a whole [8]. In other words, social justice moves beyond immediate conflicts between offenders and victims, seeking to address the societal roots at the base of such conflicts [8]. Moreover, social justice not only includes harms as legally defined under criminal law, but also includes those harms not defined as crimes, including a whole host of human rights issues such as

exploitation, discrimination, and the ability to migrate. Hence from a social justice perspective, crimes are not personal expressions, but actually manifestations of underlying political, economic, and social relations [8]. It is these relations that social justice seeks to address in order to reduce harm and prevent crime. Drawing on aspects of both restorative and social justice, transformative justice aims to address hierarchy and harm, which it is argued, are facilitated by traditionally repressive disciplinary mechanisms of crime control [19]. In practical terms, this means dealing with the injustice of being victimized, as well as the injustices of inequality [20]. Thus while all three provide alternative models of justice, the differences between restorative justice, social justice, and transformative justice are significant. Under a social justice model, one might link a case of domestic violence to patriarchy or a case of financial fraud to economic inequality, perhaps resulting in demands for a vast adjustment in societal conceptions of gender relations and a redistribution of wealth and power. Finally, a transformative justice model would likely result in a combination of restorative and social justice sanctions, sending the perpetrator of domestic violence to therapy and requiring restitution and community service of the financial fraudster, while also critiquing systems of patriarchy and inequality and asking all those present to take such critiques with them into their daily lives and make change in societal arenas outside the criminal justice system. Thus appropriate criminal justice sanctions must address such harms in a holistic fashion. Ideally, addressing an individual case of domestic violence or financial fraud requires simultaneous intervention at the individual and societal level coupled with intentional critiques and deliberate realignments of gender and economic hierarchies within society. In other words, to thoroughly address crime, one must adopt an intersectional criminal justice sanction that combines aspects of adversarial, restorative, social, and transformative justice. With these four modes of justice in mind, I have chosen two frameworks and one theory of punishment from which to construct such an intersectional system of criminal justice explored below.

Alternative Criminologies In *Integrating Criminologies*, Gregg Barak asked criminologists to think about the possibility of incorporating differing assumptions, theories, schools, and perspectives from mainstream and alternative criminologies, positivist, and critical criminologies, and from modernist and postmodernist criminologies to create a holistic understanding of crime and crime control [21]. Before delving into the system of intersectional justice proposed here, I will first provide a brief overview of the alternative criminologies it draws upon.

Constitutive Criminology Within constitutive criminology, crime is defined as any harm-producing power relation [7]; this is, by all means, a very radical definition of crime. Conventional understandings of crime typically define crimes as acts legally considered criminal. Even more critical definitions of crime tend towards expansions of the definition of crime as opposed to complete re-workings, such as that provided by Henry and Milovanovic. For instance a number of critical criminologists have pushed for a definition of crime that includes white collar [15], state-corporate [22], environmental [23], and human rights violations [24], which may violate civil or regulatory law, or may even violate international treaties, but which are not defined domestically as criminal offenses. In contrast, within constitutive criminology, crimes are divided into two categories, harms of reduction and harms of repression, which constrain who individuals are and also prevent them from becoming who they want to be [3 , 7]. Ultimately, constitutive criminology is concerned with inverting harmful power relations and reducing harm [7]. As implied above, constitutive criminology exemplifies several of the key aspects of an intersectional criminal justice. First, as with the key goal of restorative and transformative justice, constitutive criminology is primarily concerned with harm reduction. Second, it locates offenders and victims in a structural web of crime producing power relations, reframing individualized harm as aspects of broader social harms. Thus while not explicitly calling for criminal justice sanctions that address crime in a holistic intersectional manner, the work of constitutive criminologists suggests a form of crime control that simultaneously addresses individual harms and social problems. The crux of peacemaking criminology lies in the belief that one cannot and should not respond to violence with violence, something our traditional criminal justice system is often guilty of doing. Instead, the focus is on a de-escalation of violence through the use of conciliation, mediation, and dispute settlement as alternatives to traditional criminal prosecution and sentencing models [6]. Hence, regardless of the fact that a crime is legally considered to be a matter between the state and the defendant, settlement should include all key stakeholders, such as the victim and offender, as well as their family

members, and even community members [5]. All parties should take part in arriving at a solution and this process, as well as the solution, should, above all, operate along the principles of dignity and respect for all [5]. Like constitutive criminology, peacemaking criminology is also grounded in the goal of harm reduction, although harm has been replaced with the term violence. Reintegrative Shaming Reintegrative shaming is perhaps one of the oldest forms of punishment, and is still commonly used today among families and in collective societies [25]. Braithwaite argues that in place of harmful shaming, reintegrative shaming practices aim to strengthen offenders bonds to society and reintegrate them back into the collective [25]. Thus instead of only incorporating degradation ceremonies into punishment—like that of the courtroom ritual, the sentencing ritual, or the ritualized dehumanization one experiences upon entering prison, all of which attach incredible amounts of stigma to the suspect, offender, and convict—reintegrative shaming calls for the incorporation of processes or ceremonies that remove stigma, that de-label the offender or inmate and acknowledge her success as well as her acceptance by society. As evidenced here, reintegrative shaming addresses two of the primary concerns of constitutive and peacemaking criminology: Reintegrative shaming operates on the assumption that traditional criminal justice methods are often counterproductive—inflicting harm upon offenders through psychologically and emotionally violent stigmatization that not only causes distress and social isolation, but also increases the likelihood of subsequent offenses as opposed to reducing it. Thus although not explicit, reintegrative shaming is an ideal component of intersectional criminal justice as it strives to reduce harms produced by the criminal justice system and reintegrate offenders into society through social, community-based sanctions. Taken together, constitutive criminology, peacemaking criminology, and reintegrative shaming offer a harsh critique of current criminal justice practices, effectively linking our criminal justice system to the reproduction—not prevention—of crime in the United States. Each of these approaches to crime and crime control suggests that the way to rid society of harm and violence is not through continued harm and violence, but through holistic, integrative, community-based methods that address the root causes of crime in the individual and society at large. Moreover, they embody many of the principles found in restorative, social, and transformative justice while not being opposed to the accountability principles of adversarial justice. As such, they provide an ideal grounding for the model of intersectional criminal justice proposed here. Intersectional Criminal Justice To re-imagine punishment is no small feat, requiring a flare for the imaginative and a shedding of preconceived notions of crime and crime control. Nevertheless, more than a few criminologists and criminal justice practitioners have been doing just this since the days of Beccaria. Similarly, this exercise in intersectional criminal justice is also a holistic synthesis of existing models of micro and macro justice and crime control at the points at which they meet and overlap. So what might intersectional criminal justice look like in the real world? To begin, a system of intersectional criminal justice would require a reconceptualization of crime, defining it more broadly to include harms outside the traditional legal criminal sphere, while at the same time shedding such victimless crimes as drug use, prostitution, and other morally proscribed illegal acts. Borrowing from Kramer and Michalowski and in accordance with constitutive criminology, crime would be understood as illegal or socially injurious actions that may or may not be linked to harm-producing power relations [22]. By reworking the definition of crime, a swath of formerly harmful yet noncriminal acts would now fall under the jurisdiction of intersectional criminal justice, allowing criminal justice institutions and actors to address broader social justice issues as part and parcel of daily justice activities and sanctions. At the same time, this reconceptualization would free up criminal justice actors from the tedious and costly task of responding to morally proscribed acts like drug use and prostitution. For example, harmful drug use and addiction would be treated as medical issues and be dealt with vis a vis the healthcare system, while prostitution would become sex work and be subject to American labor law. Overall, intersectional criminal justice would work simultaneously to address individualized property and violent crimes within the broader context of poverty, hunger, poor health and holistic physical, emotional, and psychological wellbeing, exploitation, discrimination, and inequality, all of which would be considered criminal in their own right under this proposed system of justice. However, such calls rarely include an integrated response to both individualized and social harms. Such programs would offer transformative punishment to individual offenders, incorporating elements of restitution, reconciliation, rehabilitation, and

deterrence, as well as harm-prevention measures aimed at society as a whole. Furthermore, by bringing offending and non-offending community members together to work towards common goals, sanction-to-solution programs would reduce the stigmatization often attached to offenders without singling out offenders [26 , 27]. Overall, these programs would stress reintegrative shaming with constructive punishments that strengthen offenders bonds to society and reintegrate them back into the collective, uniting them with non-offenders to work towards shared social goals. In short, an intersectional criminal justice system would seek to prevent and reduce harm, sanction offenders, and address the needs of victims and society all at once, thus it is difficult to adequately capture its functioning using a process or flow chart. In fact, intersectional criminal justice is neither linear nor circular. In fact, at any given point in time an individual may be an offender, a victim, a bystander, or all of the above, and it is likely that offenders guilty of individual offenses will also be victims of any number of related—“even somewhat causal”—social harms. Just as some lines on a dreamcatcher never cross the center, some individuals may never cross paths with the core of the criminal justice system, instead only participating in the criminal justice project as a non-offender. Other individuals, just like the lines of a dreamcatcher, may cross through the center repeatedly, offending at multiple points throughout their lives. This allows us to move through our intersectional criminal justice system on one hypothetical path out of many possible paths.