THE CRITICAL CRIMINOLOGIST: SPOTLIGHT
Message from the DCCSJ Board

“Ours is not the struggle of one day, one week, or one year. Ours is not the struggle of one judicial appointment or presidential term. Ours is the struggle of a lifetime, or maybe even many lifetimes, and each one of us in every generation must do their part.”

John Lewis

DCCSJ Members,

With a holiday break on the near horizon, we send this letter from the Executive Board with gratitude that each of you have put in your efforts in ‘surviving’ what is 2020 and for continuing the incredible, timely work we stand for as a Division. We sincerely hope that each of you will find inspiration in the highlights included in this edition of the newsletter as we continue the fight towards change. It has been a year of immense loss and great change, as our daily lives have radically changed. The demonstrations of resilience and persistence in the pursuit of justice and work towards eradicating systems of oppression and inequality are necessary, continued labor we must engage in at every level. Undoubtedly, the theme of this edition highlights the importance of and appreciation of necessary activism and engagement in all that we do across a variety of spaces today.

Foremost, it is imperative we acknowledge the exceptional dedication of our Communications Team, Cassandra Boyer and Alexa Bejinariu, who have worked tirelessly and with great insight on presenting the important work of our membership. Their care, organization, and continued vision for representing the Division are paramount to the success of this newsletter.

Our Awards Committees had an exceptional set of nominations this year, as they dedicated time and careful, thoughtful consideration under extraordinary circumstances for each and every nomination. Though the pool for nominations were loaded with excellent scholarship and activism, the committees finalized their decisions for excellent awardees that the Division can be proud of as we celebrate the work and dedication accomplished among our membership. It is important to note that the volunteer service to such committee work, including Awards Committees, is a tireless labor that keeps us going and can be incredibly rewarding to those participating (please join us for future opportunities!).

Lastly, we missed everyone at the annual meeting for ASC, especially missing our opportunity to get together for the DCCSJ Social & Awards Ceremony. Though it is in line with the many
ways we have not been able to gather “in person” this year, it is an especially difficult time to feel such a void after missing an annual conference meeting that often rejuvenates and invigorates our research and engagement. We acknowledge that this is difficult for many of us and simply provide sentiments that the feelings are mutual – we missed it and missed all of you!

In a time of uncertainty, a few things show themselves as solid or certain; the members in this Division are committed to change! Our members are inspirational as they have engaged in important work that contributes to the social changes and resistance among us today. It is our membership’s daily work that provides hope amidst times when resignation is tempting when faced with such exhaustion.

Thank you all for your resilience and persistence.

Sincerely,
Executive Board of the DCCSJ
Donna L. Selman, Ph.D.
Jayne Mooney, Ph.D.
Lindsey Upton, Ph.D.
Luis Fernandez, Ph.D.
Ashley Farmer, Ph.D.
Shelly Clevenger, Ph.D.
Dear Members of the DCCSJ,

First and foremost, we want to thank our contributors who carved out time from their busy schedules to make this newsletter what it is. We know that during the pandemic and the shift to online teaching, academics in general have had an extraordinary amount of strain placed on their time. Somewhat counterintuitively, demands for productivity seem to have increased. And yet, despite these pressures, Drs. Andrea S. Boyles, Calvin John Smiley, Alex Vitale, Jennifer Otiz, Sean K. Wilson, and master’s student Nicholas Walrath answered our calls to contribute to a newsletter focused on the conversation around defunding the police and abolitionism. Thank you for your time and commitment to the Division!

Dr. Andrea S. Boyles, author of *You Can’t Stop the Revolution: Community Disorder and Social Ties in Post-Ferguson America* (2019), kicks off the newsletter for the “Critical Criminologist Spotlight.” Dr. Boyles describes her work as an ethnographer and activist in her spotlight.

Next, Dr. Calvin John Smiley and co-editor of *Prisoner Reentry in the 21st Century: Critical Perspectives of Coming Home* (Routledge, 2020) is featured in the “Critical Issue Spotlight.” Dr. Smiley critiques police reform and discusses the merits of abolitionism.

Dr. Alex Vitale, author of *The End of Policing* (2013), is featured in the “Critical Book Spotlight.” After witnessing the criminalization of the poor in San Francisco beginning in the early 1990s and becoming informed about critical literature on mass incarceration while living in New York City, Dr. Vitale penned *The End of Policing.*

Dr. Jennifer Ortiz’s “Critical Teaching Spotlight” is a must-read for educators looking to reach students from conservative backgrounds. Her most recent publications include *The Invisible Enclosure: How Community Supervision Inhibits Successful Reentry* (2020) and a book chapter entitled “Perpetual Punishment: One Man’s Journey Post-Incarceration” in Drs. Middlemass and Smiley (Eds.) *Prisoner Reentry in the 21st Century: Critical Perspectives of Returning Home* (2020).
Dr. Sean K. Wilson is featured in the “Critical Activism Spotlight.” He defines what he means by “Academic Karen” and directs critical criminologists to act as allies for BIPOC students and scholars. Dr. Wilson recently published a chapter entitled “Failures of Reintegration and the Return to Prison” in *Black Males and the Criminal Justice System* (2019).

Last, Master’s student Nicholas Walrath is featured in the “Graduate Student Spotlight.” His research focuses on policing and surveillance. Walrath discusses his upcoming work with Travis Linnemann from Kansas State University in this spotlight.

This issue concludes by highlighting the recipients of the 2020 DCCSJ Awards. Calls for Papers (CFPs) and the “What we are Reading” section are also included here.

Our next issue is scheduled to be released in May 2021. If you would like to be a featured contributor or would like to nominate an organization or individual for the DCCSJ newsletter who you think would be a good fit, please email me at boyerc1@unlv.nevada.edu or my colleague Alexa at bejinari@unlv.nevada.edu.

Thank you and best wishes!

*Cassandra Boyer & Alexa Bejinariu*
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Critical Criminologist Spotlight: Dr. Andrea S. Boyles

Dr. Andrea S. Boyles is the author of University of California Press books, You Can’t Stop the Revolution: Community Disorder and Social Ties in Post-Ferguson America (2019) and Race, Place, and Suburban Policing: Too Close for Comfort (2015). She is a critical feminist, race scholar, whose scholarship and public work account for social inequality and (in)justice thematic to Black citizen-police interactions; neighborhood disorder and disadvantage; community development and engagement; and resilience and collective action.

Dr. Boyles has previously taught within the Missouri prison system, served in various capacities in academia, as well as, worked with corporations such as American Airlines and organizations like NOBLE (National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives), on matters pertaining to race and discrimination. She has also served as a delegate to the United Nations (UN) Commission on the Status of Women (CSW63) and presently, as member and Secretary of Council for Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS).

Dr. Boyles is a native of St. Louis, Missouri. She holds a B.A. in English and M.A. in Sociology from Lincoln University of Missouri, and a Ph.D. in Sociology from Kansas State University with concentrations in Gender and Criminology. She is currently visiting as an Associate Professor of Sociology and Africana Studies at Tulane University.

Please tell us about yourself and what you are currently working on.

I am a community-engaged scholar. My heart is in the street with “the people,” who are often disadvantageously fighting for humanity. These are Black folks who are working in the trenches, seeking a fair chance at life and the quality thereof, daily. I spend time with them, participating and observing as many “build community” without salaries, grant funding, accolades or pretense. My engagement has been pre- and post-academia and regardless of police brutality and civil unrest. This matters to me—the witnessing and evidencing of Black people organizing. This has been them doing so despite disorder and disorganization characterizations about them and the places where they live.

This has also been my life’s story in many respects. There were many instances, even in childhood, where I shared struggle and tears with people in my community. Contrarily, I recall “good times” as well – instances filled with laughter and hope. These are my memories. And it has been through those recollections and persisting ongoing exchanges through and beyond civil unrest, overlapping insider statuses, intimate awareness, and continued interactions with these mostly Black citizens that I am continuously humbled and committed to social justice work. In the words of an organizer/activist in one of my projects, my work and its many components are my “revolutionary tasks” for the sake of community and the broader society.
My life’s experiences drive my interests and work in the academy. I have been in academic settings full-time since the age of two (preschool). Thus, I learned early the power of connecting education and community engagement. It is in this vein that I also imagined myself as a writer and scholar on social issues that desperately plague the Black community, and others broadly. Hence, the reason my first college degree was a B.A. in English. I purposed to carve out space in the literature and otherwise as a theorist and author, accounting for the plight of my people, well before entering college. The mission is the same. I am living my dream. As a professor and researcher, I am still centering community engagement and education across curriculum, presentations, publications, and programs.

In sum, I continue to work at the intersection of race, place, and social justice. Through a series of networks and public engagement, I am still critically accounting for community disorder in post-Ferguson America. This translates into my ongoing assessment of the persisting and overt use of racial threat and white spatial imagination for (re)constructing “law and order” in the recent political climate especially.

**How does your research expand our understanding in the field of critical criminology?**

My research expands our understanding in the field of critical criminology by affording contemporary, evidence-based work as resistance, in the following:

1. by challenging age-old assumptions and ideas of race and place at the intersection of policing, disorder, and criminality widely urban as poor, Black, and dangerous; suburban as affluent, white, and safe;

2. by challenging white and patriarchal canons, theories, and/or general framing that colonize, erase, minimize, or co-opt race and intellectual approaches and space—therefore, fetishizing Blackness & Black experiences, while simultaneously directly/indirectly delegitimizing Black thoughts & scholarship—as if sole or lone intellectual proprietors of criminological thought and work in and across communities, Black and places of color especially.

3. by challenging the over-reliance and deference to traditional thoughts and approaches when accounting for human behaviors and the roles of institutions (e.g., their policies and practices) at the risk of social detachment and an unwillingness to evolve and revolutionize the discipline.

More directly, my work directly engages the Black community and the broader public through ethnography and scholar-activism. I offer a Black reconceptualization and post-Ferguson framework—as a Black woman sociologist and critical criminologist, leading early on-the-ground accounts, and findings for one of the most transformative, longest sustained periods and exhaustively covered phenomenon(s) in twenty-first century America (e.g., Ferguson, Black resistance, suburban uprising). This has mattered for capturing real-time responses, critical context, and nuance particularly in the heat of Black citizen-state clashes.

*More directly, my work directly engages the Black community and the broader public through ethnography and scholar-activism.*
Tell us a little bit about your mentors and perhaps why you find mentorship important?

I have several mentors. Ones who have been very influential and supportive of me. Their advice and time spent significantly advanced my education and career trajectory in diverse ways. I am continuously grateful. I have also had the honor of mentoring others similarly. I take this role and responsibility personally. For me, it has always been about paying it forward and selflessly assisting others in fully realizing and maximizing opportunities. This has meant different things, for different people. I have worked with students and faculty alike—who at different junctures of life—have needed a sounding board, guidance, and so forth. Everyone’s story and goals are not the same. Regardless, mentorship should be individualized, safe space for growing; that is developing and evolving. All things that still matter to me, personally, especially in a world where intersectional marginalization is persisting. Consequently, my general rule of thumb is to steer clear of assumptions and judgement and instead, inspire and encourage through humanness, truth, and example.

Consequently, my general rule of thumb is to steer clear of assumptions and judgement and instead, inspire and encourage through humanness, truth, and example.

What accomplishment are you most proud of and why?

I have been blessed with accomplishing many things. I am humbled by thoughts of them. But if I had to pick something specifically and more recently, I am especially proud of my research and publishing agenda; the fact that I published two UC Press books within a four-year span. I managed to stay the course in doing so while working at a small liberal arts college, where all hands were needed on deck. Yet I was often in civil unrest, as an administrator, teaching two courses per semester (except summers), conducting research with a little seed funding, and navigating a rigorous writing schedule. Let’s just say, I sacrificed a lot of sleep. I do not recommend this, but I did it for years across two projects. I kept a change of clothes in my car and office, routinely racing between Ground Zero and campus. This was all-the-while collecting, juggling, and coding fieldnotes, in-depth interviews, focus groups, classes, and supervising alone. I had several research assistants, who for relatively short periods of time transcribed mostly. Otherwise, I was my own research team, and I am thankful for grace and good health in the process. I am also appreciative of times, when I could escape a bit (rare)—instances where folks at my University, in my division, department, and so forth, respected my commitment to the work in the streets, stepped in, and covered for me. I persisted and felt the prayers of many. I thank God for the strength, and ultimately both projects and books as accomplishments. I am also grateful for the many Black participants and others directly/indirectly captured in them.
Critical Issue Spotlight: Dr. Calvin John Smiley

Dr. Calvin John Smiley, PhD, is an Assistant Professor in the Sociology Department at Hunter College-City University of New York (CUNY). His expertise is broadly defined around the areas of social justice, inequality, and race. More specifically, he has done research and published on issues of mass incarceration, reentry, and other aspects of the criminal justice system. He is the co-editor of Prisoner Reentry in the 21st Century: Critical Perspectives of Coming Home (Routledge, 2020), which uses a critical approach to demonstrate how many issues surrounding reentry do not merely intersect but are in fact reinforcing and interdependent. He is currently working on a monograph that explores how individuals returning to society navigate and negotiate the reentry process. In addition, he is developing a research study on digital spaces and reentry. For more information, please visit: www.cjsmiley.com

Reform is Never Enough: Embracing the Defund and Abolition Movement

In October 2020, Los Angeles Police stopped luxury shoe designer, Salehe Bembury, for the benign issue of jaywalking on Rodeo Drive. Documented on police body cameras, Bembury, who is Black, is visibly uneasy and verbally expresses his nervousness during this interaction, not fully comprehending why he has been detained and subject to police search. The officer requests Bembury’s identification and repeatedly asks if he has any weapons on him. During the search, the officer comments on Bembury’s shoes saying, “Don’t want to mess up those shoes, those are pretty nice.” Here, the police officer subliminally conveys the true meaning of the stop. The shoes, which ironically Bembury designed, were perceived to be too nice for a Black man to wear, highlighting how racial profiling persists. In this context, Bembury was perceived to be “out-of-place” or as sociologist Elijah Anderson discusses, occupying, “white space,” areas historically designed exclusively for white people. Therefore, Black occupation raises suspicion within white supremacy.

While Bembury was released with his life, identification, and property, this idea of “existing while Black” is not new but pervasive. Earlier this year, in Louisville, Kentucky, Breonna Taylor was not as fortunate. During a police raid at her apartment based on bad information, Taylor was shot and killed. Louisville SWAT body camera footage shows officers entering her home and not administrating any

---

lifesaving services. When it is discovered that she is deceased, an officer is heard saying twice, “She’s done.” Highlighting the callous indifference and disregard of Black life by law enforcement.

Months later and only after national pressure did the Kentucky Attorney General bring this case to the grand jury, which declined to charge any of the three initial officers with her death and only charged one officer with ‘wanton endangerment.’ More recently, it has been revealed that the Attorney General did not present or explain homicide offenses to the grand jury, indicating his subversive intentions of not actually seeking justice for Breonna Taylor.

These cases along with other more recent deaths and shootings of Black Americans such as George Floyd and Jacob Blake, respectively in 2020, have reinvigorated the call for Black Lives Matter. In previous years, advocates have called for police reform, which included the expansion of police body cameras, civilian complaint review boards, and more diversity hiring and bias training. Yet, police continue to kill Black and other Americans with impunity. Amidst a global pandemic, an unstable president, the loss of millions of jobs, and thousands of housing evictions, Americans have begun to embrace a new stance: defund the police. The defund movement calls for reallocation of funding from police to other social services, limiting police interventions, and ultimately abolishing police.

---

Policing does not work. Therefore, the call for police reform is both unimaginative and reductive.

---

Policing does not work. Therefore, the call for police reform is both unimaginative and reductive. One can embrace both abolitionism and public safety, as these are not dueling or competing ideas. Abolitionism, at its core, is guided by the fundamental principles of keeping communities safe. It is a premise that relieves communities of occupation not justice.

---

Abolitionism, at its core, is guided by the fundamental principles of keeping communities safe.

---

The defund movement has been met with conservative voices that attempt to sow moral panic into the public sphere and any divestment from traditional modes of law enforcement is met with reactionary assertions of an apocalyptic future. Despite these false claims, progressives must continue to advance defund and abolitionist movements. Argentine born Cuban revolutionary, Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara said, “The true revolutionary is guided by a great feeling of love.” Abolition is a movement of love, understanding, and knowledge. It is a movement guided by principles to divest from institutions of violence and reinvest in areas that reduce public harms and promote social unity. In the last fifty years, law enforcement has been strongly pushing for more funding for weaponry, military-grade gear, and resistance to any type of oversight. For example, after the Department of Justice found widespread discriminatory practices within Newark, New Jersey’s police department the city established a community complaint review board (CCRB). However, the Newark Police Department and Newark
Police Union have created various obstacles to stymie any type of oversight into officer misconduct.² In essence, it is not a few “bad apples” but a rotten tree.

Abolitionism is not simply a movement of eradication, but a two-fold effort of abolition and replacement. After the American Civil War, the formal institution of slavery ended (abolition) and citizenship was granted (replacement). While policies and customs such as de jure segregation, convict leasing, white terrorism, and other practices continued to perpetuate institutional racism and systemic forms of oppression, the fundamental logic of replacing outdated systems with inclusionary techniques is imperative. This includes re-thinking our positions on justice, collective responses to violence, contextualize and reorient our notions of punishment, and envision a world without traditional prison institutions. This must be the long-term goal for those invested in racial equity, social justice, and principles of non-violence.

The continued racial violence and police killings as well as law enforcement reactions to protest and demands for transparency and justice, highlight that reform is impossible and leaves us only with the option of abolition. This is not an easy or quick task but can be achieved through continued advocacy and movement building. To begin, we must elect officials who are champions of progressive ideals, challenge police unions, continue to push for external police oversight such as CCRBs, utilize independent prosecutors in police-involved shootings, and remove judges, prosecutors, and other law enforcement officials with long track records of unfair practices.

The institution of slavery in the United States was one of the worst conditions of the human experience, yet those enslaved continued to envision a day without chains.

The institution of slavery in the United States was one of the worst conditions of the human experience, yet those enslaved continued to envision a day without chains. The same vision and principles must guide our collective anger and frustration towards this complex system as well as motivate our hope and love for future generations. Reform is nothing more than keeping the same values of violence, retribution, and harsh punishments, with less race, class, and gender disparity. This is simply not enough, should never be accepted, and diminishes the calls for true justice, which is guided by the lived experiences of marginalized populations who continue to feel the over presence of policing, incarceration, and reentry in their communities. Abolition is about love and nothing should motivate change more than that.

---

² Coleman, V. “Newark Council approves police oversight board, union vows to sue.” NJ.com (March 17, 2016; updated Jan 18, 2019). Retrieved at: https://www.nj.com/essex/2016/03/newark_municipal_council_citizen_police_oversight_b.html#:~:text=Newark%20council%20approves%20police%20oversight%20board%2C%20union%20vows%20to%20sue,-Updated%20Jan%202016%26amp;text=NEWARK%20With%20unanimous,of%20the%20city%239;p%20police%20force.
Critical Book Spotlight: Dr. Alex Vitale

Alex S. Vitale is Professor of Sociology and Coordinator of the Policing and Social Justice Project at Brooklyn College and a Visiting Professor at London Southbank University. He has spent the last 30 years writing about policing and consults both police departments and human rights organizations internationally. Prof. Vitale is the author of City of Disorder: How the Quality of Life Campaign Transformed New York Politics and The End of Policing. His academic writings on policing have appeared in Policing and Society, Police Practice and Research, Mobilization, and Contemporary Sociology. He is also a frequent essayist, whose writings have been published in The NY Times, Washington Post, The Guardian, The Nation, Vice News, Fortune, and USA Today. He has also appeared on CNN, MSNBC, CNBC, NPR, PBS, Democracy Now, and The Daily Show with Trevor Noah.

In the early 1990’s I worked at the San Francisco Coalition on Homelessness doing housing policy and advocating for social programs of benefit to homeless people. At that time there was very little discussion of the criminal justice system in urban studies courses. This was considered an independent concern handled by criminology and was disconnected from debates about affordable housing, tax policy, and community economic development initiatives.

This separation between the two became disrupted for me with the growth of police harassment of homeless folks in San Francisco, culminating in a full-scale political backlash in which the chief of police was elected mayor on a platform of criminalizing poverty in 1991, with a copy of Fixing Broken Windows under his arm. This led to widespread abuses in which people were ticketed, harassed, and arrested for sleeping in public, panhandling, and merely taking up space in the center of the city.

In response, I was tasked with working with a committee of legal advocates and service providers to develop strategies to push back against this. We set up an outreach effort called Streetwatch, modeled after Copwatch across the bay in Berkeley. We observed the police writing summons even when there was no legal basis, inappropriately discarding people’s belongings, and engaging in discourteous and threatening behavior that constituted an abuse of authority. In some cases, the police properly followed the law, but the law they were enforcing was constitutionally suspect, such as arresting people for sleeping outside when no shelter space was available for them or criminalizing panhandling. The result, was an effort to sensitize police through training efforts, creating a “know your rights” card for folks being targeted, helping people challenge their arrests and summonses in court, and challenging the constitutionality of specific ordinances. The results of these efforts were at best mixed. While some illegal abuses were diminished, the overall program of harassment and criminalization continued unabated.

It was at this point that it became increasingly clear that a set of legal and procedural interventions were not going to fix this problem. The police were not a rogue force that just needed some training
and legal guidance. They were a highly trained professional force doing exactly what they were being asked to do. The law was merely a guidepost that set some vague limits on what they could get away with if exposed but was easily skirted around in normal circumstances or changed if there was sufficient resistance to its misuse.

What also became clear was that the City of San Francisco had largely given up on the possibility of housing people and was intent, instead, on using police to put a lid on the problem; to relegating people to the darkest recesses of public space so that their impact on the rest of the city was. It was in this way that I realized that there was in fact a deep organic connection between urban development policy and the criminal legal system. The apparatus of policing, under the guise of the “broken windows theory” was enabling the city to continue a set of housing and economic development policies that benefitted real estate and corporate interests. City leaders could continue to plow money into downtown led development schemes that caused the destruction of thousands of low-income housing units as long as the police could manage the impacts of those directly and indirectly forced into homelessness. The city could continue to underfund essential mental health services to allow more tax breaks for the rich as long as police kept a tight rein on those left to roam the streets.

In 1993 I moved to New York and became aware of a growing body of organizing and critical scholarship on mass incarceration. I participated in the Critical Resistance East gathering of 2001 at Columbia and was active in the Drop the Rock campaign to end the draconian Rockefeller Drug Laws. I also began teaching books like Golden Gulag by Ruth Wilson Gilmore, Michelle Alexander’s The New Jim Crow and Donald Braman’s Doing Time on the Outside. On the one hand, I was deeply impressed by the depth of the critique of mass incarceration and its roots in racial oppression and economic exploitation. On the other hand, I was frustrated that there was very little mention of the role of police. It was in this context that I arrived at the deal to write The End of Policing in 2013. One of the challenges for me, was figuring out how to communicate an abolitionist analysis of policing when very few people were talking about or organizing around such an idea.

First, I see abolition as an analysis: that police were created to facilitate regimes of exploitation in the late 18th and early 19th Century: colonialism, slavery, and industrial capitalism. Police exist not to enforce the law or produce public safety, though these can be bi-products at times, but instead to produce a social order by managing the problems that the above regimes of exploitation produce such as what we call “crime” as well as formal and informal resistance to these regimes of exploitation: everything from rowdy working-class pleasures to organized strikes and slave revolts. To the extent that these behaviors interfere with broader projects of exploitation they will be suppressed. It is this analysis that prevents us from making the mistake of thinking that the problems of abusive and racist policing can be fixed with implicit bias training, body cameras, or community policing. What we think of as racist police violence is not an aberration, it is and always has been a central feature of policing.

Second, abolition is a process. Even if we wanted to end the existence of all police tomorrow, there is no actual mechanism for doing so. We live in a society with broad support for a massive system of policing. Any effort to reverse that will take time and must engage in strategic interventions to reduce the scope and power of policing in stages. This is also important because police abolition is also about eliminating regimes of exploitation and building up community resources to address harms in more
just and restorative ways. And, as we succeed in these steps, we begin to dismantle the logic of exploitation backed by repressive policing.

Third, abolition is about a vision of a world in which social cohesion isn’t produced by people with guns or by putting human beings in cages. It is about addressing harms by building up people and communities, not tearing them down. It’s about the hard work of resisting the regimes of exploitation at the heart of American society and global systems of oppression and working out what an alternative might look like as well as the process of getting there. It is not about a teleological science of revolution based on some pre-ordained utopia that need only be reverse engineered. Yes, we need deep study of revolutionary thought and practice, but we also need a deep critique of their limitations and historical failures. A better world is possible, but we have a lot of work to do to get there.

The problem is not police training, police diversity, or police methods. The problem is the dramatic and unprecedented expansion and intensity of policing in the last forty years, a fundamental shift in the role of police in society. The problem is policing itself.

**Alex S. Vitale**

**The End of Policing**
Critical Teaching Spotlight: Dr. Jennifer Ortiz

Jennifer Ortiz is an Assistant Professor of Criminology at Indiana University Southeast. Dr. Ortiz earned her Ph.D. in Criminal Justice from John Jay College of Criminal Justice. Her research interests center on structural violence within the criminal justice system with a focus on reentry post-incarceration. Ortiz’s most recent scholarship has been published in The Prison Journal and Corrections: Policy, Practice, and Research.

Ortiz was born and raised in East New York, Brooklyn to a low-income family with direct criminal justice experiences including the incarceration of many family members. Following her parent’s divorce, at 15 years old Ortiz joined Asociación Ñeta, a street organization that focuses on prisoner’s rights. At the age of 19, Ortiz was wrongfully arrested and found herself facing multiple felony charges. Her direct experiences with street organizations and the justice system served as the catalyst for her career and instilled in her a deep commitment to social justice.

Thus, in addition to her scholarship Ortiz maintains a firm commitment to civil service and community activism. She serves as President of the New Albany, Indiana Human Rights Commission and as an executive board member for Mission Behind Bars and Beyond, a Kentucky based non-profit reentry organization. In recognition of her commitment to community service and activism, the Southern Indiana Business Magazine named Ortiz a 2019 Top 20 under 40 Business Professional and Indiana University awarded her the 2018 Chancellor’s Diversity Award. In 2019, Indiana University recognized Ortiz’s excellence in teaching and research by awarding her a 2019 Trustee’s Teaching Award and the 2019 Distinguished Research Award for Junior Faculty. In 2020, Ortiz was selected to serve as Executive Counselor for the newly established Division of Convict Criminology of the American Society of Criminology, where she advocates for reform including the removal of structural barriers to employment within academia.

Using First-Person Narratives, Self-Disclosure, and Autonomy to help Students become Social Justice Oriented Scholars

When I accepted my current position at Indiana University Southeast, I worried about how I would convince predominately conservative students to abandon the ideologies they learned growing up in conservative households. These ideologies often viewed marginalized groups through a white supremacist lens that attributed their suffering to individual and cultural failings. As a former gang member with a criminal record, I was keenly aware that revealing my past could lead conservative students to dismiss my teachings. The student body I was tasked with educating was vastly different from my New York City students, many of whom had direct negative experiences with the criminal
justice system and thus were often critically inclined. I knew that if I wanted to convince my Midwestern students to become social justice oriented, I needed to speak to them in a language they understood. I knew that many of these students would dismiss my critical perspective as bleeding-heart liberal nonsense. But these students were the future of the criminal justice system, whether I liked it or not, and I needed to get through to them. So, I decided that I needed to appeal to their humanity by putting a face to the carnage caused by our criminal injustice system. It is easy to be dismissive of suffering you learn about in a textbook, but it is far more difficult to ignore suffering that is standing directly in front of you.

"It is easy to be dismissive of suffering you learn about in a textbook, but it is far more difficult to ignore suffering that is standing directly in front of you."

Beginning with my Prison and Street Gangs course (CJUS 300), I incorporated firsthand narratives to illustrate the role of structural violence in the creation of crime. Students entered this course prepared to learn about how gangs are violent, criminal organizations and how police can stop them. I entered the course prepared to show them that gang members were human beings often caught up in structural issues they had no control over. I utilized a half-lecture, half-active learning model; I spent the first half of the semester teaching critical gang theories and studies in an attempt to shift students’ world views, but also to prepare them to take a critical view of gang members in their final assignment. For their final paper, I required students to analyze one of two texts: My Bloody Life by Reymundo Sanchez or Monster by Sanyika Shakur. To help them work towards this paper, we spent seven weeks analyzing both books as a class. I broke students up into small groups and asked them to apply critical gang concepts to the text. I watched as students had very emotional responses to these texts. Many of them could not fathom that 12-year old children joined gangs after experiencing horrific structural and personal violence. Even the most conservative students were deeply troubled by how the boys in these books had little hope of becoming more. This was my first foray into chipping away at their conservative mindsets. Surprisingly, many of these students registered for my Wrongful Convictions course the following semester. I realized that putting a face to the suffering caused by the criminal injustice system had a deeper impact than lectures ever could. I was not quite ready to ‘out’ myself as a former gang member for fear of retaliation from my colleagues, so I continued to rely on first-person narratives.

"I realized that putting a face to the suffering caused by the criminal injustice system had a deeper impact than lectures ever could."

I developed the Wrongful Convictions (CJUS 458) course with humanization as the primary objective. I scoured the internet in search of first-hand narratives and came across the Voices of Witness book series, which presents essays written by individuals who have direct experience with many forms of structural violence. That series included a book titled Surviving Justice: America’s Wrongfully Convicted and Exonerated. That semester I switched my half-lecture, half-active learning model so that every week in the semester featured a lecture on Monday and an essay-analysis on Wednesday.
Students were very receptive to this approach. As they analyzed essays in small groups, they quickly learned how all criminal justice practitioners, including defense attorneys, are complicit in wrongful convictions. Although many of my students desired to enter traditional criminal justice practitioner roles, this book rattled them to the core. I then went a step further and brought a wrongfully convicted person from our local area to speak about his experiences. Although the class meeting is only 75 minutes in length, students remained for nearly two hours listening to his first-hand experience. After class, one of my students who aspires to be a police officer wrote me a lengthy email thanking me for the experience. He told me that he will never be able to forget this man’s face and what police did to him. That email gave me courage to take a more radical step, I told my students about my wrongful arrest at 19 years old. I was someone who plead guilty to misdemeanor offenses to avoid a felony conviction, even though I had not committed a crime. I explained that if I had accepted a felony plea, I would not be their professor today. I was pleasantly surprised at my students’ responses. One student admitted to no longer wanting to be a police officer; she now wanted to work as a defense attorney for the Innocence Project. My student evaluations that semester made it clear how much this experience impacted student with several stating that this course made them question everything they thought about the criminal justice system. Teaching Wrongful Convictions showed me that even conservative students can change their mindsets. While they may not all become prison abolitionists like me, they can move beyond those conservative mindsets engrained in them since childhood. Going forward from this semester I changed all my courses to include first-hand narratives and self-disclosure about the person standing in front of the classroom.

I taught Corrections (CJUS 303) the following semester and I utilized another text from the Voices of Witness series titled Six by Ten: Stories from Solitary. I only assigned four essays from this text because of time restraints. However, three weeks into the semester, students asked to read more essays. I was truly surprised that students wanted more reading materials. So, I let students vote on the essays they wanted to read, and this became my first experiment with student autonomy as a pedagogical approach. As an undergraduate, I was accustomed to the faculty member always being in control of the classroom, so I developed the misguided belief that students should not have a voice in how courses are structured. However, I found that when given the opportunity, students will generally surprise you. In the fall 2020 semester, I decided to incorporate autonomy into one of the most difficult courses to teach in my department: Race, Gender, and Inequality in the CJ System.

I taught Corrections (CJUS 303) the following semester and I utilized another text from the Voices of Witness series titled Six by Ten: Stories from Solitary. I only assigned four essays from this text because of time restraints. However, three weeks into the semester, students asked to read more essays. I was truly surprised that students wanted more reading materials. So, I let students vote on the essays they wanted to read, and this became my first experiment with student autonomy as a pedagogical approach. As an undergraduate, I was accustomed to the faculty member always being in control of the classroom, so I developed the misguided belief that students should not have a voice in how courses are structured. However, I found that when given the opportunity, students will generally surprise you. In the fall 2020 semester, I decided to incorporate autonomy into one of the most difficult courses to teach in my department: Race, Gender, and Inequality in the CJ System.

I found that when given the opportunity, students will generally surprise you.
In my Race, Gender, and Inequality in the CJ System (CJUS 335) course, I knew I was going to be teaching difficult content in the middle of a global pandemic on a campus that is located 10- minutes from Louisville, Kentucky, the epicenter of protests against racialized police brutality. I implemented autonomy on the first day of class by allowing students to develop the ground rules or discussion in our course. I was truly amazed at how students vocalized the need to respect individual experiences, acknowledge triggers, and maintain civil discourse. I informed students that they should feel empowered to come to class with topics or questions for conversation that were relevant to them and that hopefully connected to the course content for that week. I wanted this classroom to be the space where they could ask the uncomfortable questions. My students took that charge seriously. On the second day of class, we discussed why they, predominately white students, were uncomfortable even talking about race. We engaged in a lively discussion about privilege, generational teachings, the surrounding politics of the area, and the long history of racial atrocities that have occurred in the Louisville Metro area. Although some students entered the course apprehensive, I watched them grow comfortable speaking in that second-class meeting. The rules they established on day one kept them from becoming defensive or angry. When we reached the portion of the course that directly addresses race and policing, the class was able to discuss why even the thought of racialized policing made them uncomfortable. Many students viewed police as guardians who protected people because that was largely their first-hand experiences. I shared with them my experiences being groped by a police officer at 15- years old and I could see how deeply troubled they were by that story. I took self-disclosure a step further by assigning a chapter I co-authored with my husband about his dehumanizing and racialized experiences with police and the courts. Some of my students admitted to crying as they read the piece. I then brought my husband to class so students could speak to him directly. I watched as students asked him what they could do to make a change so others would not suffer as he did. My husband, a non-academic, led the class in a discussion about the need for oversight, humanizing our views of the incarcerated population, and even the idea of prison abolition.

The combination of student autonomy, first-person narratives, and self-disclosure has allowed for the development of rich conversations about racism, sexism, classism, ableism, and homophobia, which is no small feat in the middle of conservative America. This pedagogical approach empowers students and makes them more receptive to facts that counter their conservative views. While students may forget key terms and theories they learned in my classes, I know that the first-hand narratives and my self-disclosures will remain with them long after they leave my classroom. And while I cannot predict how this will affect my students’ approaches to justice post-graduation, I find hope in the words of one student who said in class, “Everything I’ve been told my whole life is a lie”. As the world continues to fall apart around us, my students give me hope that maybe we, the educators, can change the world one student at a time.

The combination of student autonomy, first-person narratives, and self-disclosure has allowed for the development of rich conversations about racism, sexism, classism, ableism, and homophobia, which is no small feat in the middle of conservative America.
Critical Activism Spotlight: Dr. Sean K. Wilson

Dr. Sean K. Wilson is an Assistant Professor in the Sociology and Criminal Justice Department at William Paterson University. As a community-based scholar, Dr. Wilson's research seeks to foreground the voices and lived experiences of the oppressed and marginalized. Dr. Wilson's research interests include reentry, critical policing, critical criminology, critical gang studies, and race and justice. Dr. Wilson sits on the boards of several community organizations that are committed to social justice.

Activism in Academic Spaces: A Call to Action

Critical criminology can be used as a tool to transform criminology, the administration of justice, and institutions of higher education. In the era of Black Lives Matter, where many institutions of higher education are attempting to address institutional racism, and lack of racial and ethnic representation in curriculum, some scholars and activists believe that we are finally beginning to see the democratization of the production of knowledge. Institutions of higher education around the nation have begun to attempt to diversify their faculty, staff, student body, and administration. However, many of these newly found commitments to diversity and inclusion seem hollow and symbolic to many scholars of color in the academy. As a self-described activist-scholar, I question the sincerity of such commitments to diversity and inclusion by institutions that have historically shunned inclusion. For example, as an unapologetically radical Black critical criminologist, I have faced discrimination and retaliation from some White senior colleagues who claim to be progressive activists. In my recently published op-ed on CrimComm.net titled “Surviving Academic Karens While Black” (op-ed can be accessed here: https://www.crimcomm.net/post/surviving-academic-karens-while-black), I spoke about my own and other’s experiences navigating departments and institutions with Academic Karens.”

An Academic Karen is a self-described liberal White woman who poses as a progressive ally committed to social justice in public, while subjecting Black junior faculty members to racial terrorism behind closed doors. This op-ed was received well by the public and it started a much-needed conversation about what true allyship looks like in practice. Junior scholars of color are often advised by others to not use their voices to call out injustice while untenured, but to wait until they are tenured to speak out against inequality in the academy and society. In my opinion, waiting for tenure to speak truth to power can be a futile practice for critical criminologists. Activism in the social sciences is needed nowadays, especially considering the reality that many students of color pursue degrees in the social sciences. Academic programs have been spaces of structural violence for many students of color. I can recall having several conversations with students of color at ASC, where they shared with me their horror stories navigating academic programs that see them as racial tokens who should be happy to have access to predominately White spaces. Their humanity and contributions to the body of knowledge are not always appreciated or respected. As a result, many academic spaces subject students of color to constant racial abuse. Students of color rarely have the power or ability to challenge or hold
racist departments and institutions accountable, and they often suffer alone in silence. Unfortunately, scholars of color often find these same exclusionary and oppressive tactics when they complete their programs and enter the field as faculty members. Thus, we all must work hard to transform oppressive disciplines and institutions for the betterment of society.

Criminology as a discipline has been complicit in maintaining systems of oppression. For example, criminological contributions from scholars of color are often pushed to the margins of the discipline, while contributions from mainstream White scholars are often seen as meaningful contributions to the body of knowledge that must be included in criminology and criminal justice curriculum. There have been calls by many departments and institutions to decolonize curriculum, and several universities have begun hiring diverse faculty members and admitting more students from diverse backgrounds. While these initiatives are commendable and necessary, I am not sure if they will result in longstanding institutional change. What good is hiring another person of color or admitting more students of color, if departments and universities do not fully support or grant students and faculty of color the freedom to be their authentic selves? What happens if a scholar of color is hired by a department that is dominated by Academic Karens? What happens when a scholar or student of color questions a senior White faculty member or administrator about their commitment to diversity and inclusion? These are questions that must be answered before a university or department can believe they have created more inclusive spaces.

Personally, I believe now is the time for scholars of color and White allies to realize the power we have to challenge inequality in the academy and society. We have the power to speak the truth and hold problematic individuals, institutions, and disciplines accountable. We now have the ears and eyes of many people and institutions who in the past did not see or hear us, or even care about our lived experience. Being silent about oppression only allows institutions to maintain systems of oppression. As critical criminologists, it is our duty to hold individuals and institutions accountable, especially those that claim to be committed to social justice. If you see or experience discrimination and exclusion while navigating a department, institution, or discipline, speak up! Gone are the days when the oppressed and marginalized in the academy are expected to tolerate oppression. It is our duty to speak up for what is right. We truly can transform institutions and disciplines if we are not afraid to speak truth to power. Far too long we have been told that we don’t have the power to change oppressive institutions. Those days are long gone. In the words of the prolific activist Assata Shakur, “It is our duty to fight for our freedom. It is our duty to win. We must love each other and support each other. We have nothing to lose but our chains.” Now is the time to speak up!
Critical Graduate Student Spotlight: Nicholas Walrath

Nicholas Walrath is a first-year master's student in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work at Kansas State University (KSU) in Manhattan, Kansas. He holds a B.S. in Political Science from Cal Poly Pomona. His primary research interests focus on a critical theory of police power, with an emphasis on protest policing and the use of less-lethal weapons. Besides reading and studying, he enjoys landscape and architectural photography, playing American Primitive guitar, and watching world cinema.

Email: ntwalrath@ksu.edu

What you are currently working on?

I recently finished a chapter with Travis Linnemann of Kansas State University that challenges the common liberal, or libertarian, understanding of police militarization by situating police as a much older process that has pacified the unruly subjects of capital for centuries from vagabonds to runaway slaves to militant workers and other enemies of bourgeois order. The chapter is part of a broader project tied to my thesis and it references the work of critical police scholars as well as mid-20th century Black radicals as examples of those who have long recognized police power as a violent prerogative that upholds the conditions for capital to accumulate at the expense of communities of color and other surplus populations. Contra right libertarian claims that policing has undergone a fundamental shift to a war/military footing since the advent of the War on Drugs—a degeneration of their original mandate to “protect and serve”—we instead situate police on a much broader historical timeline that underscores the police power as always already intertwined with the war power. The piece is tentatively titled “War, Police and Global Social Order.”

What we aim to highlight is how policing within crowd control contexts such as protests—events that often play out before the prying eyes and scrutiny of the media—seeks to present itself as more “humanitarian” by not killing protesters outright, but instead maiming bodies and minds.

Currently, I am working on a book chapter—also with Travis Linnemann—that will examine protest photos in the aftermath of George Floyd's murder. The theme of this piece revolves around Jasbir
Puar’s notion of the “right to maim” and applies it to US policing’s reliance upon so-called “less-lethal” weapons such as teargas, rubber bullets, and Tasers. What we aim to highlight is how policing within crowd control contexts such as protests—events that often play out before the prying eyes and scrutiny of the media—seeks to present itself as more “humanitarian” by not killing protesters outright, but instead maiming bodies and minds. You could also term this as a process as one of “slow death” given that teargas, or CS gas, has been reported to have particularly damaging, residual effects that have not been adequately reported by mainstream media when covering these uprisings (i.e. miscarriages, eye problems, respiratory damage, increased susceptibility to COVID-19 complications, and so forth).

As we’ve noticed time and again, cops are using weapons like tear gas and kinetic impact projectiles beyond their scope by directly aiming them at demonstrators with traumatic head and bodily injuries resulting as well as many cases of permanent loss of vision. This position US police are taking in protest scenarios between necropolitics and biopolitics—what Puar refers to as “will not let die”—has intriguing, if disturbing, implications as to how police treat any dissent that is critical of their prerogative (and exorbitant budgets), especially during times where the institution is weak in terms of legitimacy. We’re interested in trying to diagnose what this illustrates about the police power and how police pacify protest using means that, while less often immediately fatal, nonetheless manage to inflict lasting physical and psychological trauma upon recipients (versus the average civilian-police encounter where the right to kill is often police’s recourse when they feel threatened).

**Who has influenced your career?**

While several individuals have influenced my academic career, I would have never taken my first step without the mentorship and support from Drs. Helen Taylor Greene, Daniel Georges-Abeyie, and Jason Williams. As an undergraduate student at Texas Southern University, a historically Black college and university (HBCU) in Houston, I had the privilege of being in an academic department with two renowned scholars in the area of race and crime. I was introduced to both Dr. Dan and Dr. Greene through one of their doctoral students at the time, Jason Williams (now Assistant Professor of Justice Studies at Montclair State University). It was through this circle of support that I was introduced not only to Black criminologists, but critical criminology in general. I am forever indebted to these three individuals because I was inquisitive but a handful back in those days!

---

*Rather, violence is ingrained in the very fabric of American civil society as police work is violence work.*

---

Travis Linnemann has been not only a phenomenal mentor during my brief time at Kansas State University but has also had a significant impact upon the development of my conception of police and policing. He has an effective through his writing of estranging the familiar and challenging conventional wisdom, presented in a nuanced yet easy-to-digest manner that I greatly appreciate. His co-authored article with Corina Medley, “Black sites, “dark sides”: War power, police power, and the violence of the (un)known,” is the first piece I can recall reading of his. The piece critically examines the material and metaphorical spaces of the (un)known such as CIA Black Sites and Chicago Police Department’s Homan Square where confessions, especially of Black males, were attained through torture under Chicago police commander Jon Burge. The underlying thesis is that such violence is hardly exceptional, nor can it be relegated to solely happening “over there.” Rather, violence is
_ingrained in the very fabric of American civil society as police work is violence work. Exposing the crimes of “liberal” societies has long been an interest of mine since my undergraduate studies so these types of articles especially resonate with me.

Another influence is critical police scholar Tyler Wall, who teaches at University of Tennessee, Knoxville and who kindly let me interview him back in 2017 for the Socialist Party USA’s magazine, The Socialist. Wall’s writing on drones in particular speaks to the volumetric aspects of police power, a topic that necessitates further study. He argues against treating this technology as a novelty, given that air power has been a form of police power since its advent whether through bombing populations into submission for taxation purposes or simply to instill the fear of (a colonial) god in these subjects. Moreover, Wall situates drones, or unmanned aerial vehicles, within a much longer history of pacification via air power. His contention that such technology should not be fetishized resonates given my prior reading of political theorists like Mark Neocleous, whose “Air power as police power,” situates the drone historically as a contemporary example of aerial policing dating back to the Royal Air Force’s pacification campaign of Iraq in the 1920s.

_________________________

_I really cut my teeth in terms of studying police through the lens of surveillance thanks to Hamid Khan who co-founded the Stop LAPD Spying Coalition (SLAPDSC) amidst the ashes of Occupy LA._

_________________________

However, I really cut my teeth in terms of studying police through the lens of surveillance thanks to Hamid Khan who co-founded the Stop LAPD Spying Coalition (SLAPDSC) amidst the ashes of Occupy LA. Stop LAPD Spying is a police and prison abolitionist group based out of the Skid Row area of Los Angeles. Ever since I began volunteering for the Coalition six years ago as a researcher, I’ve felt they had a unique understanding of how things like gentrification are facilitated through policing and how the police function is executed by myriad actors and agencies. For example, their critique of the so-called “Stalker State” is a visual way—presented as a Venn diagram—that emphasizes how the police power is not relegated to uniformed officers—“the” police—but how it overlaps many seemingly-disparate public and private actors in (re)producing the conditions for bourgeois order to be secured. Such actors include the Department of Mental Health, Department of Public Services, Department of Motor Vehicles, and many other institutions and private corporations that collaborate in exchanging information to gauge risk around—as well as to criminalize—certain suspect populations (i.e. public assistance recipients, parolees, those labeled as “Gang members,” etc.). Needless to say, I’ve been very fortunate to have been involved with the Coalition through Hamid Khan and wish to maintain ties with this grassroots collective throughout my studies.
Recipients of the 2020 DCCSJ Awards

Lifetime Achievement Award

Jayne Mooney, Ph.D.
Professor of Sociology
John Jay College of Criminal Justice


Jayne Mooney is an Associate Professor of Sociology (Professor from August 2020) at John Jay College of Criminal Justice and is on the doctoral faculties of women’s studies and sociology at the CUNY Graduate Center, NYC. Her focus of scholarship is on gender and crime, the history of crime and punishment, the sociology of violence, social deviance and critical criminology. She has extensive research experience and has published over thirty papers in books and peer-reviewed journals, together with numerous research monographs and reports. Her funded research has included local victimization surveys, violence against women, the policing of rape and sexual assault, studies of the Irish community in London, stops and frisk, video games and youth, street crime and the history of crime and criminal justice. She developed one of the first large scale surveys of domestic violence in the UK (The North London Domestic Violence Survey), the findings of which continue to inform national and local government policy on domestic violence. Her most recent publications are on the history of crime, e.g. ‘Rikers Island Jail Complex: The Failure of a Model Penitentiary’ (with Jarrod Shanahan), Prison Journal (forthcoming); ‘New York City’s Captive Work Force: Remembering the Prisoners who Built Rikers Island’ (with Jarrod Shanahan), International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice, 2018; ‘A Tale of Two Regicides’ for The European Journal of Criminology, 2014 (this was a special issue to launch the European Society of Criminology’s working group on history), and the book The Theoretical Foundations of Criminological Theory: Place Time and Context (Routledge, 2019), which presents the core theories of criminology as historical and cultural products and theorists as producers of culture, writing in particular historical moments. The Theoretical Foundations is a development of the themes explored in Fifty Key Thinkers in Criminology (jointly edited with K.Hayward and S. Maruna, Routledge, 2011). Jayne is also the author (with Yolanda Ortiz-Rodriguez) of ¿Qué dirán? Making sense of the impact of Latinas’ experiences of intimate partner violence in New York City, and the book Gender, Violence and the Social Order (Palgrave Macmillan, 2000, Palgrave...
reprint, 2011). She is a member of the Howard League for Penal Reform in the UK, SOLON (based at Plymouth University, UK) and the British Society of Criminology’s Historical Network. She is Vice-Chair of the Critical Criminology and Social Justice Division of the American Society of Criminology (having served twice previously as an executive officer) and is currently the Division’s official archivist. She was European book review editor for the journal Critical Criminology. She is a board member of the British Journal of Criminology, International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy and for Current Issues in Criminal Justice. Jayne is a senior editor of the Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice. Recently, she was honored with the appointment of adjunct professor at Queensland University of Technology, Dept. of Law, Brisbane, Australia.

Jayne is originally from the UK, where she held several senior faculty appointments at the University of Kent, Middlesex University, the Open University and Birkbeck College University of London. She worked for a number of years as a Senior Research Fellow at the Centre for Criminology, Middlesex University. In the UK she was an advisor to the Home Office, the London Boroughs of Islington and Hackney and the Metropolitan Police on domestic violence; Women Against Rape, the Zero Tolerance campaign against male violence, Safer Cities, and Holloway Women’s Prison. She also served as policing consultant to the UK Government’s Irish in Britain All-Parliamentary Group and was a consultant to the International Centre: Researching Child Sexual Exploitation, Violence and Trafficking, University of Bedfordshire. She has taken part in several radio debates on violence against women, including BBC Radio 4’s Woman’s Hour. She serves as a member of the Fulbright Awards Screening Committee, Institute of International Education, United States Department of State.

Jayne is currently involved in three research projects: the first is a social history of Rikers Island and the penitentiaries and jails of NYC, the second is on undocumented women, domestic violence and fears of deportation and the third is on historical texts in relation to critical criminology. She is Deputy Director of the Social Change and Transgressive Project, CUNY and a co-director of the Social Anatomy of a Deportation Regime Project (women and deportation) and the Critical Social History Project. She is completing her fourth book Rikers: A Social History of the Other New York City for Temple University Press.

---

**Book of the Year Award**

---

Brendan McQuade, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Criminology
University of Southern Maine

“Pacifying the Homeland: Intelligence Fusion and Mass Supervision”. (2019)
University of California Press.
Use code “17M6662” for a 30% off discount when purchasing through https://www.ucpress.edu/book/9780520299757/pacifying-the-homeland
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About the Author
(taken from the University of Southern Maine’s website at https://usm.maine.edu/criminology/brendan-mcquade-phd):

Brendan McQuade earned his BA at Hampshire College and MA and PhD at Binghamton University (SUNY). He previously taught at DePaul University in the International Studies Department and at SUNY-Cortland in the Sociology/Anthropology Department. His areas of interest are historical sociology, state theory, the critique of security, and social movements.

Critical Criminologist of the Year Award

Judah Schept, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School of Justice Studies
Eastern Kentucky University
Dr. Judah Schept’s Biography (taken from the Eastern Kentucky University School of Justice Studies website at https://justicestudies.eku.edu/people/schept).

Judah Schept, Ph.D., is an Associate Professor in the School of Justice Studies at Eastern Kentucky University. He holds a Ph.D. in Criminal Justice from Indiana University and a BA in Sociology from Vassar College. Judah’s work examines the political economy, historical geography, and cultural politics of the prison industrial complex. He is the author of Progressive Punishment: Job Loss, Jail Growth, and the Neoliberal Politics of Carceral Expansion (New York University Press, 2015). In addition, Judah’s writing can be found in journals such as Radical Criminology, Theoretical Criminology, Punishment and Society, Social Justice, and Crime, Media, Culture, as well as in blogs and opinion pieces for academic and activist websites. Judah’s current research examines the historical, spatial and political relationships between extractive and prison economies in Central Appalachia.

Best Journal Article of the Year Award


Abstract: Lone wolf terrorists, who use bombs, firearms, knives, vehicles, biological weapons, or other means to kill and injure, sometimes inflicting mass casualties, are of increasing concern to governments, police, and security forces in Western countries around the globe. This article seeks to develop a more multi-dimensional framework for understanding these actors and the attacks they perpetrate by bringing the under-examined aspect of gender to the fore. The article contributes to the body of literature on lone wolf terrorism by centering gender as a means of analyzing this phenomenon. In particular, it looks to the current criminological scholarship on lone wolf terrorism, highlighting the lack of a developed gendered analysis. The article challenges misrepresentations of male violence against women in response to and in representations of lone wolf terrorists. It argues that the proliferation of these misunderstandings in policy, practice, and scholarship undermines efforts to understand and combat effectively lone wolf terrorism.

Praxis Award

Brittany P. Battle, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Sociology Department
Wake Forest University

Dr. Battle’s biography (taken from her website at https://www.brittanybattle.com/).

Dr. Brittany P. Battle is an Assistant Professor in the Sociology Department at Wake Forest University. As an ethnographer, her research interests include social and family policy, courts, carceral logics, social justice, and culture and cognition. She teaches courses on social justice in the social sciences, reimagining the criminal legal system, and courts & criminal procedure. In addition, she is an enthusiastic scholar-activist working with grassroots organizations and has extensive experience working with organizations and agencies to address equity and justice concerns. And she writes a blog on her experiences as a Black woman in academia!

Dr. Battle's scholarship has been funded by the Ford Foundation, American Sociological Association, and Sociologists for Women in Society. She is currently working on a book manuscript (under contract with NYU Press), “They're Stealing My Opportunity to Be a Father:” The Child Support System and State Intervention in the Family, which examines the experiences of parents involved in the child support system using courtroom observations and interviews. The project illuminates the ways that
the child support system functions as a neoliberal construct at the intersection of the welfare and criminal justice systems.

Dr. Battle completed a PhD in Sociology at Rutgers University - New Brunswick in March 2019. She earned an MA in African American Studies from Temple University and a BA in Sociology (Law & Society concentration), Women's Studies, and Black American Studies from the University of Delaware.

Check out Dr. Battle's CV for more on her research and scholarship.

---

**Outstanding Graduate Student Paper Award**

Sarah Pedigo Kulzer, Ph.D. Candidate  
The Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice  
Old Dominion University  
“Triple Threat: Nativism, Homonationalism and Sexual Orientation Asylum in the United States”
Call for Papers (CFPs)

Special Issue on Reclaiming Our Stories: Centering BIWOC Voices & Experiences in the Carceral State

**Guest Editors** | Janet Garcia-Hallett, Kanika Samuels-Wortley, Tri Keah Henry, and Andrea Boyles

**Purpose** | This special issue pays critical attention to systemic forces that impact Black, Indigenous, Women of Color (BIWOC). It intends to honor, respect, and reinforce the visibility of Black, Indigenous, Women of Color not only as victims of carceral systems, but to showcase our presence as experts in this area. In both instances, there continues to be erasure and invisibility that we hope to transform through this special issue. As the leading criminological journal highlighting qualitative work, we seek manuscripts that are solely qualitative in approach and we openly welcome attention to the carceral state both within and outside of the American context.

Possible topics include but are not limited to:
- State violence (e.g., police violence, community violence, interpersonal violence)
- The role and impact of discretion for BIWOC, as criminal justice practitioners and as justice-involved individuals
- Experiences navigating the various stages of carceral systems (e.g., case processing, incarceration, reentry)

**Submission Instructions**
- By December 1, 2020, submit an abstract and cover letter to Dr. Garcia-Hallett at GarciaHallettJ@umkc.edu. In the cover letter, please share how you personally identify with the special issue’s aim to highlight the voices of Black, Indigenous, Women of Color (BIWOC) scholars. (If you learn of the special issue after this deadline but would like to submit a paper, please contact Dr. Garcia-Hallett.)
- By February 1, 2021, selected authors should receive an invitation to submit full-length papers.
- By August 1, 2021, submit the full-length paper. Please follow the instructions on How to Submit and be aware of How we Review. When submitting, you will encounter a text box upon clicking “Request Publication”; in that box, please specify that your paper is for this special issue.

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Garcia-Hallett at GarciaHallettJ@umkc.edu. [https://www.qualitativecriminology.com/special-issue-on-reclaiming-our-stories](https://www.qualitativecriminology.com/special-issue-on-reclaiming-our-stories)
What we are Reading

Exploring Violent Cosmologies From a “Radical Interactionist” Approach

By Adolfo Ceretti & Lorenzo Natali. Published: 06 November 2020.

Abstract

This article advances a theoretical perspective on violent crime, using interviews with male prisoners in Italy who had perpetrated violence. By drawing on Athens’ (1992, 1997, 2007, 2017) “radical interactionism,” we propose the concept of “violent cosmology” in order to counter linear explanations of cause and effect. In an effort to complement narrative criminologists’ contributions, we seek to recognize and understand the dimensions of meaning that are accessed by social actors when they prepare and carry out a violent act, exploring the psycho-social processes that animate violent social experiences from the perspectives of perpetrators. Specifically, we suggest that a “radical interactionist” approach, in dialogue with narrative criminology, can help (1) illuminate the sources of perpetrators’ narratives; (2) explore the interplay between individuals and social structures; and (3) investigate ambiguities in the narratives of violent actors. Finally, we examine how enhancing the reflexivity of violent actors and recognizing the specificity and integrity of their lives and social experiences is a necessary precondition for understanding violent crime.

To access the full article, please visit https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10612-020-09536-y
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Abstract

Welfare reforms have swept across most liberal-democratic nations over recent decades, carried by a deep neoliberal faith in market rationality and an intensive focus on the individual as a key site of disciplinary intervention. These reforms have been accompanied by discourses within which welfare, deviance and crime are interwoven tightly. Australia’s Income Management (IM) policies, which “quarantine” a portion of welfare income as a means of behavioral conditionality, provide an example of welfare policy that has been promoted as a way of reducing crime. In this article, we interrogate these claims. We find little support for the policy logic linking IM and crime, and we demonstrate that there is no clear evidence that IM has reduced crime. Instead, we argue that the overwhelming focus of IM on poor and racialized subjects serves to socially construct crime as a metaphor for justifying the harmful “double punitive regulation” of the state. This sees the state’s left hand (i.e., social functions, including workfare) and right hand (i.e., punitive functions, including prisonfare)
work together to turn poor (and mainly Indigenous) populations into marketized subjects, while punishing those who resist, through a range of governing techniques.

To access the full article, please visit: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10612-020-09532-2
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**Toxic Dispossession: On the Social Impacts of the Aerial Use of Glyphosate by the Sugarcane Agroindustry in Colombia**

By Diana Hurtado & Irene Vélez-Torres: 22 October 2020.

**Abstract**

Over the last five decades, the total area cultivated with sugarcane in Colombia has increased by 280%. The consolidation of the sugarcane agroindustrial cluster has been based on a process of modernization that has included the aerial spraying of more than 783,442 kg of glyphosate since 2001. The resulting increase in productivity for the sugar mills has been accompanied by what we refer to as “toxic dispossession” of ethnic communities in the Alto Cauca region. This article presents a critical examination of modern-day agroindustrial activities, particularly those pertaining to the chemical maturation of sugarcane, and provides evidence for the environmental and social damage that the industry has generated for rural ethnic communities, whose well-being, livelihoods and traditional territories have deteriorated rapidly.

To access the full article, please visit: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10612-020-09531-3
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**“I Can Be Big Sister, Even If You Can’t Be Big Brother:” Spectatorship and Punishment in Anti-trafficking Efforts**

By Corinne Schwarz. Published: 07 October 2020.

**Abstract**

Anti-human trafficking efforts by both state and non-state actors are proliferating across the United States (US). While there is ostensibly some merit in widespread awareness to generate social change, the reality is that the majority of these efforts rely on and support the violence of the carceral state. Using interviews with anti-trafficking stakeholders in the Midwestern US, I argue that anti-trafficking efforts depend on the policing of particular notions of criminality, femininity, sexuality, and victimhood that foster an environment where carceral measures are the only solutions to the exploitation of trafficking. Weaving together key theories from critical trafficking studies (Hill 2016; Kempadoo 2015; Musto 2016; Shih 2016; Srikantiah 2007) and penal spectatorship (Brown 2009), I argue that justice cannot exist in current punishment-centered approaches to ending human trafficking. A more expansive, structurally founded concept of accountability and recourse, not
imprisonment (Davis 2003), is necessary to truly stop human trafficking and to meet the needs of trafficked persons in ethical ways.

To access the full article, please visit: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10612-020-09530-4