

Criminology as Epistemic Necropolitics¹

I argue in this essay that from 1492 to the present, the Global North has used theories of “crime,” its causation and control, as part of a three-pronged epistemic necropolitical attack on the Global South. I suggest that the emergence of critical criminology and its more recent offshoots, given their dependence on the present or hypothetical war making and coercive state, are themselves a part of the problem. I suggest criminology is a Trojan Horse that brings epistemic toxic waste and destruction in the guise of deterministic theories on crime and its control. Like their Inquisitorial predecessors, I suggest criminology and criminologists are clerical dangers that ought to be avoided by the Global South. Alternatively, I point to scholars that have revolted against the criminological plantation to found sovereign epistemic worldviews and communities that resist the epistemic imperialism of the Global North.

KEYWORDS: colonialism and imperialism, criminology, epistemic transfer, epistemic violence, Inquisition

Let us waste no time in sterile litanies and nauseating mimicry. Leave this Europe behind where they are never tired of talking of Man, yet murder men everywhere they find them, at the corner of every one of their own streets, in all the corners of the globe.

Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of this Earth*

[I]t is a sign that something has gone badly wrong with public life when we have to look to criminology to provide recipes for social peace or political order.

David Nelken, *The Futures of Criminology*

The fact that so much of what passes for Australasian criminology is tethered firmly to the government teat (whether in a direct contractual relationship, or the fact that it fails to ask critical questions of the institutions of social control) belies the oft-made claim by its adherents to being objective in either a political or epistemological sense of the term. It is no such thing: it is very much a political animal, one that preys on the bodies (physically, theoretically and epistemologically-speaking) of Indigenous peoples. It gorges on the *wairua*, the very essence of Indigenous peoples and their culture, in the name of 'science', self-aggrandisement, and financial procurement on behalf of the academic institutions to which Australasian criminologists belong.

Juan Marcellus Tauri, "The Master's Tools
will never Dismantle the Master's House"

CRIMINOLOGY AS EPISTEMIC NECROPOLITICS: BEWARE CRIMINOLOGISTS BEARING GIFTS

The title of this essay draws on Achille Mbembe's (2003) concept of "necropolitics" to make an argument that criminology thrives on and produces death. It will be shown that criminology is a seed from the rotten fruit of Europe's so-called Enlightenment, but also that it had a prior life onward from the Inquisition of the fourteenth century and fifteenth century colonialism. Using indigenous Rastafari prose, leading thinker in the decolonizing criminology movement that began in Jamaica, Biko Agozino (2004) calls criminology "the gangster philosophy of [the] enlightenment" (quoted in Oriola 2006; see also Bierne 1993; Cohen 2007). In the midst of colossal misery imposed by bourgeois Western Europe, it entered the world as a rational science for pain delivery to more effective mass exploitation under the guise of equal protection under law (Brickey 1989; Christie 1981; Foucault 1979; Lynch 2000²). It was and remains an epistemological weapon to aid the coercive apparatus with ideologies to justify control of the indigenous peoples, the enslaved, the mass of working peoples, and women (Agozino 2010; Bosworth and Flavin 2007; Brown 2001; Bull 2004; Cain 2000; Christie 2004; Cohen 1982; Covington 1995; Deckert 2016; Hulsman 1986; Kalunta-Crumpton 2004; Kitossa 2020; 2014; Mann 1993; Shelden 2008; Smart 1990; Staples 1975; Tauri 2018).

Criminology's Holy Grail, its supposed *modus vivendi*—determining the causes and prognosticating on the deterrence and prevention of crime—is shrouded in mystical claptrap worthy of the best fourteenth century Inquisitors.³ As noted by many an infidel and heretic to the faith (Cohen 2007; Foucault 1980; Muncie 2000; Pepinsky 1982; Pavarini 1994; Ruggiero 1992; Smart 1990), it is a wonder that criminology's practitioners are not eternally shamed and their vacuous enterprise not consigned to history's epistemological dustbin as is alchemy. But, any mode of thought with such a zombie quality of endurance because it is useful to the state is worthy of consideration and most certainly resistance. This rings true all the more because as corporations and states race to expropriate what is left of our dying world from the depredations of capitalist Europe and now neoliberalism the Global South is increasingly the target of criminology's epistemic predation that aims to wring the last drop of life that remains. In this context, drawing on Carlos Alberto Elbert's (2004) sobering review of criminology and the scattering

of critical criminology to the winds of neoliberalism, the question is what remains of even critical criminology when there is nothing left, save mass genocide of the “useless eaters” who cannot even eat and a global regime of corporate and state mass barbarism? In the face of desperation, the wretched in the Global South, as much as the dispossessed in the Global North, must be on guard against criminologists bearing gifts; if not, they will be sorely disappointed by a feckless intellectual class that either promises more than it can deliver or that makes good on delivering them into the waiting arms of the state’s net-widening mesh, its prisons or its jackboot guardians.

My viewpoint rests on a broad contemporary and historical survey of the criminological literature and one at that which gives short shrift to what some would regard as the great epistemic gap between the three major currents in criminology: consensus (conservative), pluralist (liberal), and radical (critical criminology and left realist). For all their sophistry, to the extent that the determination and prevention/deterrence of crime is the centripetal force of all criminologies, a focus on the internal logic of criminologies toward moralism, scientism, and tethering to the state (even the hypothetical communist one) indicates we are dealing with the narcissism of petty differences. This will not, of course, satisfy criminological purists of whatever stripe, who will no doubt leap to the aid of their school of thought and condemn me as a blunt, no nothing, barbarian. Be that as it may, all believers condemn the heretics who damn them! And all heretics must be sure to avoid framing their heresy in the language of the dominant orthodoxy.

Relevant to epistemology as it concerns the “Global South” and “Global North” as geo-spatial realities, I follow Samir Amin (1992) and Tom Lewis and Sandra Sousa (2015–2016) who show that this nomenclature is as much euphemistic as it is a geographic reality. The terms are euphemistic in the sense that they obfuscate that the “core” is composed of the US as the world’s hegemon with subordinate hegemonic powers, the European Community and Japan. These cultural and political configurations constitute the dominant core of the world capitalist regime. Though confronted by the rising power of China, the world is organized between core and peripheral and semiperipheral zones integrated into the world capitalism. In reality dominative power of all forms flow from the core, including Japan, through Western satellites such as Australia, Israel, New Zealand/Aotearoa, thereby constituting important sites for the articulation

of the core capitalist hegemonic influence in the Global South. The Global South then is by no means a coherent whole, though it is constituted by those regions of the world whose incorporation into the world capitalist system is conducive to the economic and political interests of core Western countries and Japan. But within this global constellation of power as noted by Lewis and Sousa (2015–2016) the flow of knowledge is multiplicative. Knowledge at once flows from the core to the peripheries even as knowledge is expropriated in the reverse to be repackaged and resold to the “Third and Fourth Worlds.” Specifically, my concern in this essay is the asymmetrical relationship of social control epistemologies (i.e., in the form of criminology) that yolk the periphery (i.e., the Global South) to the metropole (i.e., the Global North) in the world system of capitalism to the periphery.⁴ I trace the origins of criminology beyond the European Enlightenment to an earlier phase of epistemic and material imperialism, the Inquisition. The point is to show that criminology’s metaphysics of crime’s causes are a fiction with the aim of legitimizing social control and persuading adjustment to maladjusted conditions.

With that overarching viewpoint established, I aim to provide a breathless review of criminology’s three-pronged attack on the Global South as necessary stage-setting to laying out the phenomenological grounds for my resistance. Specifically, using criminologists own words, I demystify the scientific pretensions of all criminologies, noting that its imperative is the soul-breaking of “criminals” and ultimately genocide for the unreconstructed. This is a logic consistent with the Enlightenment foundation of criminology as knowledge for the power of social engineering. Finally, I alert readers of the Global South to other indigenous and non-indigenous marronist⁵ scholars who, as heretics and infidels to the faith of criminology, have liberated themselves and resisted the cognitive and epistemic imperialism of discourses that situate crime as a “problem” in need of solution(s). Spiritual descendants of the Filipino Hukbalahap (Blum 1986, 37–43), the Kenyan Mau Mau (Elkins 2005), and others like them who struggled for humanity are scholars who have “emancipated themselves from the mental slavery”⁶ of the criminological plantation to found maroon⁷ communities of intellectual sovereignty. Their reliance is not on current or hypothetical state definitions of reality (i.e., law) nor on moralizing metaphoricalizations of the state’s vocabulary (i.e., crime) but on redefining violence and establishing harm and injury as metrics in relation to cherished and unfulfilled social values.

CRIMINOLOGY'S THREE-PRONGED ATTACK ON THE GLOBAL SOUTH: OUTSIDE AND IN

Criminology's attack on the world, both in the Global North and Global South, corresponds to the rationalizing justifications for the supremacy of post-1492 class rule in Europe and colonial conquest and slavery in the Global South. In the vein of Immanuel Wallerstein's (1974) "World Systems Theory," Edward Said (1993), Samir Amin (1992), Charles Tilley (1985), and Sylvia Federici (2014) give eloquent testimony to the interpenetrating nature of domestic and peripheral pacification techniques of state-sanctioned knowledge. Thus, criminology did not spread from Europe to the periphery; it was as always a dual and mutually reinforcing dynamic (Agozino 2003; Brown 2001; Bull 2004; Tauri 2014) whose center was the state, wherever the state was and whether it was dependent or independent. One may indeed pushback the foundation of criminology beyond the genesis story of "classical criminology" associated with Cesare Beccaria, Jeremy Bentham, Immanuel Kant, and others to the landmark debate of 1550–1551 in Valladolid, Spain. The debate on colonial policy for population use and management centered on theories of the crime of sin within an Aristotelian logic of a Great Chain of Being. The aim of the debate was to resolve the theoretical problem of whether the indigenous Americans were, in the Aristotelian sense, soulless two-footed beasts (i.e., the position of Juan Sepulveda) or whether they were reformable innocents (i.e., Bartolome las Casas) (see Anghie 2007). While the debate was a draw, the Spanish Crown issued protective orders for the indigenous peoples—these were promptly ignored by colonists. Las Casas, the so-called father of human rights, knowing well the economic loss to the empire were the indigenous peoples not to be enslaved, was not pricked in conscience in advocating that Africans should replace them in the mines and the plantations—they after all, he reasoned, did not have souls (Davis 2014, 37). Was this not a case of nascent criminological theory and unidirectional knowledge imposition?

The Valladolid debate took place with the Holy Inquisition and monastic penal Catholic trials and punishments for crime in the background (see Cayley 1998; Lehner 2013).⁸ It was preceded by Pope Innocent VIII's 1484 Papal Bull⁹ and Heinrich Kramer's 1486 *Malleus Maleficarum* (Hammer of Witches) followed by the efflorescence of scientific demonology and the witch hunt tracts such as Jean Bodin's *On the Demon-Mania of Witches* (1580) as well as King James's *Daemonology* (1597). There were even the Salem witch trials

held in 1692 and the Holy Inquisition that reached the Caribbean, Latin America (Trevisan 1986), and the Philippines (Angeles 1980)¹⁰ in the eighteenth century. These events are relevant for two reasons: First, the epistemic force for social engineering and taming the unruly preceded the Enlightenment's transfer of knowledge about crime in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Second, the unidirectional epistemology about crime was underway long before the formal adoption of criminology in Latin America in the mid-1800s, however much it was contested (Salvatore and Aguirre 1996).

This excursus is no simple distraction. The point is to show that capitalism, colonialism, and imperialism had at their heart theories of deviance embedded in relations of dominance that were transmitted from core to periphery and back. By establishing then its embryonic form from the sixteenth century and in its explicit and increasingly elaborated manifestation across the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, speaking of a sharp geographical break in the articulation, dissemination, and production of criminological knowledge is purely artificial. With this cursory rewriting of the history of criminological theory, I move to the second prong of the criminological attack by briefly reviewing the contemporary North-South unidirectional imposition of knowledge.

Geographically close to the US, Latin America is immediately impacted by the exportation of Northern theories of crime and its control, be it conservative, liberal, or radical criminology (del Olmo 1999; De Giorgi 2014; Dod 1986; Dod and Shanks 1986; Riera 1979). While conservative criminologists bask in the glow of borrowed concepts and ideas, a perennial complaint among critical criminologists in Latin America is that Northern theories of crime, particularly biological, labeling, and psychological, are inappropriate for the specificity of the Latin American context. Latin American critical criminologists also complain that UN crime control agencies impose foreign experts who attempt to suppress local expertise (Encinoza and del Olmo 1981). Cognizant of Latin America's incorporation into the world system as dependency and a zone of US imperialism and interventions, critical criminologists focused their attention on impoverishment, the undermining of democracy, militarism, death squads, and the like that violate human rights and exploit the people on behalf of local and transnational capital. Indeed, because of their ties to civil society groups, the 1980s and 1990s were marked by efforts among Latin Americans to establish institutes for critical criminology in Latin America often with the aid and solidarity of North American critical criminologists (Dod 1986).

But even here, for all the insistence on asserting local expertise, the influence of Northerners is palpable be it through graduate supervision or research collaborations (see Dod and Shank 1986).

Signaling the power of criminology's intrinsic reactionary and what Agozino calls its "control freak" behavior, it is astonishing to read in the works of Latin American critical criminologists concepts and terms that are leakages from the conservative and liberal orthodoxy. For example, in addition to exposing the political-economic levers for militarism, capitalist exploitation and corporate and state sponsored violence, Latin American critical criminologists aim to "elaborate alternative strategies for social control in Latin America" (Dod 1986, 63). One also encounters terms and ideas such as: "scientific precision and moral clarity" (Riera 1979, 72); "real crime problems" (75); "rehabilitative crime control" (ibid.); "Crime is the product of historical circumstances and therefore an eradicable social phenomenon" (Encinoza and del Olmo 1981, 64); or finally, the "bleak psycho-social climate [in Latin America] leads to violence and crime" (Elbert 2004, 389). The positivism, the scientism, the determinism is obvious!¹¹ Is the difference between critical criminology and its conservative and liberal siblings not one of petty differences insofar as criminology as a science goes? Could it be otherwise, when approvingly, Carlos Alberto Elbert asserts that among the options for the revival of critical criminology in Latin America, "There's no reason to preclude the study or even adoption of First World Models" (395). Elbert gives no justification for criminology's value and thus no clear reason why scholars in the Global South should not abandon or reject it to begin with. Indeed, with criminology exposed as both a scientific fraud (i.e., it has failed to determine the cause(s) of crime) and complicit with pain delivery, it is probably the only field of scholarship routinely abandoned by scholars since the emergence of critical criminology in the late 1960s.

The third prong of criminology's knowledge transfer attack in the Global South occurs like an autoimmune disease within the Global South itself. Again, "Global South" is in this context an obfuscatory geographical category unless its historical development and contemporary articulations in the world system are considered. Whether from a Marxist viewpoint on contradictions or an anti-colonialist perspective on the historical and contemporary role of comprador elites (Chinweizu 1975), one must be on guard against reifying the North/South divide in ways that dissolve into a series of incompatible oppositions: capitalist/non-capitalist; White/"of color"; oppressor/oppressed and so on.

Indeed, in his outstanding critical and “friendly” overview of the limits and possibilities for both Asian criminology and Southern criminology,¹² Leon Moosavi (2019) shows that class, culture, gender, national, linguistic, and regional cleavages within the Global South, especially in relation to world capitalism, are objective realities that (should) arrest discursive reification of a distal, compartmentalized, and homogenous North and South. An existentialist binary that presupposes uniformity and unity of people and purpose obviates that, for example, Europe’s colonial outposts—Australia, Canada, Israel, New Zealand/Aotearoa, South Africa and the United States—are White-dominated, capitalist, and settler-colonialist geo-cultural and political formations. Particularly, Australia and New Zealand/Aotearoa are key subordinate allies to US imperialism in the Pacific Region. Notable here is Australian complicity in the ecocidal and genocidal unilateral and unprovoked eight-year assault by the US against the Viet Nameese (see Doyle, Grey, and Pierce 2002). Thus, the “Global South” runs the risk of being a conceptual instrument for epistemic violence in its denial of the role that White colonial offshoots have played in colonialism and imperialism (see Moosavi 2019).

Moosavi points out that criminology in the Global South tends to reflect and reproduce prior epistemic valorizations of ideas about crime, indigenous peoples, and race generated from the experience of White, Western, and capitalist dominance. Moosavi (2019) points out that in the Global North, marginalized criminologists have mounted “usurpatory” moves against the “social closure” of the criminological establishment that protect the theoretical and embodied monopoly interests of White, conservative, middle class, and male criminologists. The emergence of African criminology, Arab criminology, black criminology, counter-colonial criminology, feminist criminology, minority criminology, indigenous criminology—all of which are offshoots of critical criminology—are usurpatory, rather than revolutionary, moves against the status quo in criminology. They are usurpatory in the classical Weberian theory of “social closure” because they aim toward “inclusiveness” and “enrichment” of criminological theory and its purported influence on coercive and repressive (note, the two are not the same) public policy. Epistemologically, I suggest this is a dangerous move.¹³

These marginalized scholars aim to bring into the center of the criminological enterprise perspectives, research, viewpoints, and embodied experiences—the absence of which they claim, “impoverishes the discipline.” But how does one treat as an overriding

objective the enrichment of an epistemic enterprise whose *modus vivendi*—the production of conformity, the imposition of pain, the advocacy for “painless” neuro-correction, and ultimately, the genocide of the “unreconstructed”—is a project worth pursuing? Relevant to my concern here about the malignancy of all criminological theorizing and their interlocutors (that is criminologists) is *the* question Moosavi should have asked but does not. This is a matter of some consequence to which I will return.

For now, however, to complete this review, I will itemize the key factors Moosavi identifies concerning knowledge transfer in the recent emergence of Asian Criminology and Southern Criminology.¹⁴ First, Moosavi points out that both criminologies assert the primacy of local knowledges but not without qualification. Asian Criminology develops local capacities by deepening its connections to Northern criminology from which its instrumentalist and positivistic commitments derive. Dependence and semi-peripheral status are here openly accepted. Southern Criminology, on the other hand, claims sovereignty from Northern epistemic tutelage. However, being loaded with the baggage of tropes about crime and criminals inherited from Europe’s Enlightenment to radical criminology of the early 1970s, what theoretical developments it has made of its own accord are not evident. It is largely, therefore, descriptive. In the form of “Criminologies of the Global South” (see Carrington et al. 2019), scholars lament the absence of or limited access to official crime statistics that would enable its adherents to elaborate a comparative criminology. Second, both groups criticize their marginalization and aspire to demonstrate that Global South criminologists are as good as their Northern counterparts. Indeed, suggesting they can contribute to comparative criminology, they assert their privileged ownership to the South’s marginalized and “subaltern subjects” (i.e., the ever-expanding surplus population welling up on all sides in their billions because of neoliberalism’s Pyrrhic victory). Armed with a mixed methodological toolkit and a variety of pop-psychology theories—control theory, learning theory, and life course theory with a sprinkle of “labeling theory”—there is an emerging coterie of Western trained anthropological-post-structural-criminologists from Hong Kong and China eager to overcome the barriers of researching in China (Xu et al. 2013).¹⁵ Moosavi points out that others would contribute much to the rural study of crime because of their greater access to rural populations. One can imagine a global network of criminologists tied to the various UN regional crime control centers, where these latter-day inquisitors can circulate as they did in the Spanish Empire.

Despite these potential contributions to criminology, Moosavi (2019, 266–67) notes some ironies to the claim of distinctiveness. First, Asian Criminology’s adherents often mobilize homogenizing, nationalist, racist, romantic, and Orientalist tropes of (East) Asia, its nations, and peoples. In addition, he points out that Asian Criminology may as well be East Asian criminology. Moosavi observes that its center of operations is principally Taiwan with connecting ties to other spaces for the training of East Asian criminologists: the Global North, Australia, New Zealand/Aotearoa, Japan, and Hong Kong and, to a lesser extent, Taiwan. Yet, it is precisely Asian Criminology’s explicit ideological and practical commitment to deepening its ties to the Global North, Moosavi points out, that makes dubious its claims to distinctiveness. As evidence of this Global North centeredness, Moosavi (2019, 262) notes that “almost half of the contributors [to the *Handbook of Asian Criminology*] are based in Western countries, specifically Australia, the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada, most of whom are not Asian.” This preferencing of whiteness brings other biases into sharp relief, notably its Anglophilism, male dominance, and the ethno-racial predominance of (Han) Chinese and Japanese scholars.

For all its purported possibilities to refresh and renew criminology’s moral and intellectual exhaustion, Southern Criminology too has serious but unacknowledged epistemic cul de sacs. Of significance is its Anglophilism and its center of gravity being Australia and New Zealand/Aotearoa where the Australia and New Zealand Society of Criminology (ANZOC), the Southern Church of criminology, is housed. Moosavi (2019, 263) points out that this regional imbalance is even more skewed given that more than half of the seventy-nine contributors to the *Palgrave Handbook of Criminology in the Global South* are housed in Australian institutions. The recent move toward a “Criminologies of the Global South” (Carrington et al. 2019) bears appearances of correcting this imbalance. It has opened a dialogue between South African, Latin American, Australian, New Zealand, Hong Kong, Japanese, South Korean, and Taiwanese criminologists. Note, the “autonomy” from Northern imperialism leading to economic and political democracy in the Global South is not an agenda item of “Criminologies of the Global South.”

I have thus far suggested that as a knowledge form with serious implications for deepening and extending state repression, criminology has launched a three-pronged attack on the Global South. The first was an external and world spanning transfer of

repressive knowledge and technologies across the Western Imperium from 1492 to the formalization of academic criminology across the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. I suggested the second prong took the form of near and contemporary epistemic transfers over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Finally, I suggested the third prong consists of the internalization and lateralization of Northern methods and theories for the determination of crime and its control.

Given the above historical schematization, there is nothing controversial in stating that all theories of crime and its causation derive from the metropole (Cohen 2007). Furthermore, no criminologist from the Global South—whether authoritarian/administrative or Marxist, indigenous or non-indigenous—can point to any theory of crime specific to their nation's and region's social reality of colonialism and imperialism without also resorting to ideas already produced in the metropole. This fact affirms Boaventura de Sousa Santos's (2014) thesis that the direction of knowledge is not a flow but from the vantage point of validity, a unidirectional imposition against which the Global South greatly struggles to articulate its sovereignty. It may well be that epistemic sovereignty in a deeply entangled world may not be possible save for indigenous peoples—even then, the great danger is that both indigenous and non-indigenous peoples may conceive of indigeneity in the most crude and romantic of ways. This is important for it is an issue of the reverse transfer of knowledge in the form of appropriation, misapplication, and theft from South to North. As shown by Vandana Shiva (2000), the reverse engineering and outright theft and pirating of the indigenous knowledge commons is a core dimension of the world system. More specific to the issue of criminology, Restorative Justice (RJ) is expropriated indigenous knowledge from within both the Global North and South. Juan Tauri (2015; 2013) shows that RJ is fetishized as a commodity of knowledge expertise by Global North and non-indigenous “experts,” while it is used by the colonial state to extend its disruptive reach into the lives of indigenous peoples.

This suggests the specification of my next topic: an explication of how criminologists are carriers of epistemic toxic waste generated by the Global North. I hope to demonstrate that as a part of the Western knowledge-industrial-complex, criminology is a Trojan Horse that should be shunned by the Global South. I suggest that criminology is the software that complements the hardware of coercion and repression and that criminologists are the coders. If the Global South (without and within) really seeks independence from

the Global North (without and within) and if a new humanity is to be forged after 500 years of colonialism, ecocide, imperialism, and slavery, why should the wretched of the earth not recognize there is nothing but ill to be gained from this bad epistemic exchange (Fanon 1968)? Toward demonstrating how the very essence of criminology's deterministic and fetishization of science conceal its danger, I undertake a more detailed and interpenetrating inquiry into criminology's Enlightenment origin story to expose its Trojan Horse nature.

CAVEAT EMPTOR: "WE ARE NOT BUYING THE SUFFERING YOU ARE SELLING"

George Vold and Thomas Bernard (1985) in their *Theoretical Criminology* expend considerable energy marking out the "scientific" basis for the criminological enterprise. Coming early in the book, their (final) judgment on the capacity and competency of criminology to perform "scientifically" (i.e., to predict, measure, and cure/deter "crime") is remarkably honest. Although, it must be said their surprising honesty had zero effect on their willingness to make good on a road out of the academic plantation. Vold and Bernard (1985, 5) note a bewildering array of competing theories on crime, none of which they claim can be "disproven" since all of these, as "scientific" theories, possess some degree of legitimacy respecting "the basic facts known about crime."

What then is the problem? Quite aside from whether deductive and inductive methods of science can ever apply to determining the objective reality of moral conduct, as though law is natural or made in a vacuum, the focus must be on: (a) the data, (b) obfuscation of the political constitution of crime, and (c) invisibilizing criminological theorists as moral agents embedded in perpetuating relations of domination.

Respecting the data: on one level, the basic facts "known" about crime, the point about which so much theory is devoted, is dubious. Vold and Bernard (1985, 6) breezily assert, "Criminology is blessed (or cursed, depending on one's point of view) with a large number of theories. [But] [t]he extent to which these theories are supported by facts is another question entirely." It is hard to know what to make of this when Vold and Bernard cite scholars critical of criminology's status as a science: "The assurance with which criminologists have advanced opinions regarding the causes of crime is in stark contrast

to the worthlessness of the data upon which those opinions are based” (Michael and Mortimer 1971 quoted in Vold and Bernard 1985, 6). Speaking of the politics behind materializing the idea of race, Stephen Jay Gould (1981, 22) observes that facts do not often trouble belief in “science” for two reasons: “First, some topics are invested with enormous social importance but blessed with very little reliable information. [And] [w]hen the ratio of data to social impact is so low, a history of scientific ideas may be little more than an oblique record of social change . . . Second, many questions are formulated by [social] scientists in such a restricted way that any legitimate answer can only validate a social preference.” If this is an irrefutable judgment on the science of race, is it any less refutable when applied to the science of crime?

What “science” is this that depends, as Vold and Bernard (1985, 6) admit, on the possibility that “the history of changing theories of crime reflects more about changing attitudes and values than it does about the changing state of scientific knowledge”? Alchemy gave way to chemistry, but what definite knowledge about the human condition from the hunt for witches and heretics has given way to the hunt for ‘criminals’ (see Miller 1996; Szasz 2003; 1997)? Since Vold and Bernard (1985) never state the case unambiguously—that crime data is a manifestation of the deeper and historical processes of hegemony relevant to the state as a monopoly holder of the “legitimate” means of compulsion—a stunning admission can be made without any sense of contradiction: “*The failure of criminologists to establish the causes of criminal behavior reflects the fact that there is as yet no adequate theory of human behaviour, either criminal or noncriminal*” (45; emphasis added). Given such an admission, one wonders why Vold and Bernard should spend close to 350 pages promptly dismissing the crux of their observation.

This is not the case with a heretic such as Stanley Cohen (2007) who, with remarkable depth and nuance, achieved over the body of his work the abandonment of even hallowed moralisms like “critical criminology.” But it is probably those whose imaginations were never enslaved by the “bovine humanitarianism”¹⁶ of criminology who provide the best account of criminology’s scientific fraudulence. Milton Burglass (1972, 20) said it as best as any:

Despite nearly 200 years of organized research into the question of crime, no one can today claim validated knowledge of the specific causes of criminal behavior or of a consistently effective means for its prevention.

Every major 19th and 20th century theory of man, his psychology, his sociology, or his biology seems to have had its day in one form or another.

In the face of so trenchant an anomaly, why has it not become the dominant “paradigm”? Instead of dying a natural death, criminology proliferates into a laughable and ever more bewildering array of half-baked ideas—green criminology, identity criminology, convict criminology, narrative criminology, survivor criminology, prison criminology, process criminology, ghost criminology, disability criminology, visual criminology, postmodern criminology, cultural criminology, LGBTQ criminology, criminology of science and so on.¹⁷ With a criminology for just about everything under the sun, all that is missing is a criminology of criminology!

But if criminology has failed to establish the causes of crime, what accounts for its proliferation? Another question is: if criminology’s *modus vivendi* is to establish as scientifically as possible the means to correct, deter, rehabilitate, and prevent crime, do not all these criminologies ultimately align with the state’s criterion for the maintenance of order, the law?

Considering Vold and Bernard’s (1985) stunning admission, it is important to consider Robert Martinson’s exhaustive 1974 study of the effectiveness of the whole gamut of measures (i.e., psycho-surgery, chemical castration, psycho-therapy, etc.) for what this says about the commitments of criminologists to state-sponsored violence. After determining that no known method of punishment could prevent “crime” and worse, that some methods of prevention actually contributed to “criminality,” Martinson (1974, 50) was left to conclude:

Since we have almost no idea of the deterrent functions that our present system performs or that future strategies might be made to perform, it is possible that there is indeed something that works—that to some extent is working right now in front of our noses, and that might be made to work better—something that deters rather than cures, something that does not so much reform convicted offenders as prevent criminal behavior in the first place.

In my opinion, critics missed the fundamental substance of Martinson’s question “what works” and misconstrued it as his implying “nothing

works.” Rather, if as I show below with Enrico Ferri that the “final solution” for unreformable “criminals” is death, I suggest that what Martinson was getting at was the uncomfortable recognition that genocide is all that remains when the ministrations of latter-day Inquisitors fail to produce the desired effect—conformity.¹⁸ He simply could not state the obvious.

What I argue here is that by the very nature of the enterprise of criminology, at the heart of every criminologist is a little bit of a Cesare Lombroso and his students, Enrico Ferri and Raffaele Garafalo. As noted by Vold and Bernard (1985), the basic premise of Lombrosian or positivist criminology is the proposition that people engage in crime because they are genetically, psychologically, or socially predisposed to doing so. Vold and Bernard (1985) list Ferri’s four-fold classificatory schema of criminals as insane, congenital, periodic, and passion-inflamed. They go on to itemize an even more inclusive range of theoretical factors that enabled Ferri, like in the Holy Inquisition, to find the Devil wherever he looked: “(1) physical (race, climate, geographic location, seasonal effects, etc.), (2) anthropological (age, sex, organic and psychological conditions, etc.), and (3) social (density of population, customs, religion, organization of government, economic and industrial conditions, etc.)” (Vold and Bernard 1985, 41).

The solution proposed for so pervasive a “problem” as “crime” is a rigorous regime of therapy, mutilating psychosurgery, or homicide. For the recalcitrant who, contradictorily, willfully refuses to be reformed, there are two options: a) enforced reparations as compensation (i.e., hard labor) and b) partial elimination through selective and indeterminate incapacitation (i.e., warehousing in asylums or prisons) and transportation. But what of so-called atavists or the criminally unreconstructed against whom all efforts at “rehabilitation” and “cure” fail? For Ferri, there is only one option: “death for those whose acts grow out of a ‘permanent psychologic anomaly which renders the subject forever incapable of social life’” (Vold and Bernard 1985, 44). By all accounts, that Ferri, a sensitive and caring man who objected to punishment because it was cruel, flirted with fascism is not simply a quirk of personality. I suggest he did so because authoritarianism is a necessary condition of the commitment to the belief that law, order, and the state establish the principle criterion for a meaningful existence. Totalitarianism, I suggest, runs through criminology, however much the unreflexive stance in criminology gives criminologists an entirely different conception of their mission.

Could this inherent tendency toward authoritarianism explain why criminology persists as an appendage of the state?

One part of the explanation for the zombie-like persistence of criminology's expansion is that it serves the interests of the state. Indeed, the works of critical criminologists and criminological heretics least likely to have exposure in the Global South are precisely those that might raise questions about the state and of criminology itself. While the body of such work is scarce, they evince a symmetry with radical political theorists of the state and war making such as Charles Tilly (1985) and Michael Howard (1976). What these non-criminological texts reveal is that the modern state is, by its own definition, an ongoing criminal enterprise. And, indeed, one which encourages crime-as-business and state racketeering as protecting the "free world" while criminalizing everything else that challenges the interests of state and economic elites. The "decline" of feudalism, though not a universal social relation in sixteenth century Europe, was part of a general process in the congealing of absolute authority in its contest against competing secular powers as well as the Church. The monopolization of force, either by the conquest of the nobles, tearing down their castles and crushing their armies to establish a unity of command that would cow and herd subject-citizens into accepting absolute authority as their protector from internal and foreign depredations, laid the basis for the modern state. But complicity with the bourgeoisie to access capital, the imposition of protection tribute in the form of taxes and the emergence of nationalism to provide human cannon fodder to dominate other states, to possess markets, and to control the tap routes of trade intensified the logic for internal pacification and external war making.

Therein lay the imprimatur for piracy and brigandage as states quietly employed then, as they do now, a vast range of unsavory characters to do their "dirty" work. It is called plausible deniability—death squads in Latin America; the Contras of Nicaragua; Duterte's death squads in the Philippines; narco-paramilitaries in Mexico; narco-militaries in Latin America and Afghanistan; Nazi scientists and butchers like Klaus Barbie, and Mohammad Bin Salman to say nothing of countless assassinations, coups, and proxy wars (see Cockburn and St. Claire 2012; Feinstein 2012; Paley 2014; van Schendel and Abraham 2005).¹⁹ Designed for war, to secure the interests of the warrior caste and basically to secure zones of profitability and control for the corporate class, elite Western states face the problems of having to manage social instability arising from

unemployment and decreased taxes due to capital flight or mobility seeking higher rents abroad, off-shoring of production, deskilling and technification of the economy. These dynamics necessitate more and intensively militarized police, prisons, and patriotic war-jingoisms that when all else fails unify the state's duopoly of violence—crushing internal opposition while expanding imperialism in the “race for what is left” of our denuded planet. It is this racketeering organization that, in monopolizing force internally and externally, also monopolizes ideology about crime. Herein enters the criminologist as an Inquisitor to distribute more finely grained rationalizations for pain and suffering.

On empirical grounds, the contradictions, complexity, delusions, duplicity, slights of hand, and paradoxes inherent in state formations present us with a thin sliver of reality from which to manufacture explanatory theories of human conduct. Within the narrow parameters of state ideology, which is to say “crime,” not only criminology's incapacity but its complicity becomes manifest. For example, Michael Hudson argues that in the half decade prior to Richard Nixon delinking the US dollar from the gold standard the US Congress freely welcomed money from all manner of gangsters, drug dealers, and dictators to ease its liquidity crisis (Peries and Hudson 2016). This is not ancient news: the drug money of \$300 to \$500 billion floating around the world annually is routinely laundered by the world's major banks (Leopold et al. 2020; Syal 2009). Indeed, the US bank-inspired financial collapse of 2008, and even before this, saw HSBC, Wachovia, and other banks welcome a flood of drug money, often from their Central and South American operations, from often US allied and trained “narcos” (Arsenault 2010; Paley 2014), to ensure their own “liquidity” (Farrell 1997; Vulliamy 2012, 2011). This is to say nothing of the shadowy and interlinked world of clandestine agencies, arms dealers, illicit drug barons, human traffickers, the corporate class, and economic and political elites engaged in massive fraud, murder, mayhem, and the undermining of democracy within countries and the world over (Barak 1991; Chambliss, Michalowski, and Kramer 2010; Feinstein 2012; Mercille 2009; Naylor 1999; Kwitny 1987; Paley 2014; Webb 1998). These facts prove that a) “crime” at the highest level is a state-protected racket and b) that “criminal networks” and the informal economy are captured by the state and corporations to maximize control, power, and profits.²⁰

Criminologists obfuscate the political constitution of “crime” on one hand because it pays (in the form of esteem, tenured professorships, grants, and fat consultant contracts). But more

importantly, the theorist is invisibilized as a moral agent embedded in relations of domination. I am not suggesting that criminologists are dupes or that they are willfully complicit—though it is obvious from Vold and Bernard that some are. The situation is far more sinister: it takes work to self-censor and self-delude. On this point, though speaking of social “science” more broadly, which is all the more pertinent to criminology, Abraham and van Schendel (2005, 5) note:

The contemporary social sciences are ill equipped to make sense of transnational flows due to their symbiotic history with the modern state and its interests. Most social science is expressly and unconsciously bound by state boundaries, [and] categories that are produced within institutionally sanctioned academic specializations.

Of all social scientists, criminologists cannot countenance the unity of the mutual dependence between domestic pacification through the monopoly of force and external war making—for them the two are separate. This is because of all disciplines in the social “science” criminology is the only one whose discourse and substantive concerns is defined by the state. Funding, reputation, and access to the halls of power tend to have a corrupting influence, thereby increasing the cost of “thinking outside the conceptual and material grasp of the modern state” (van Schendel and Abraham 2005, 10). If criminologists could only admit the truth that “[b]oth law and crime emerge from historical and ongoing struggles over legitimacy, in the course of which powerful groups succeed in delegitimizing and criminalizing certain practices” (7), they might lose their chains and gain the world.

CONCLUSION

Criminology has brought about as much good into the world as the Holy Roman and Spanish Inquisitions. And, if the historical record indicts its antecedents for their terrible work in the colonies and metropole alike, the “natives” of the Global South have sound reason to repudiate their modern reincarnation—criminology. That criminology perpetrates the hoax of being science is one thing. That criminologists, all of them, are wedded to the state and enlarging its dominion is another. And that criminology as a science of both painful and “painless” reconstruction, with genocide as its last stage,

has caused unimaginable harm to indigenous peoples, those of African descent, the poor, the dispossessed, and “surplus” is yet another.

One would not gather from the account criminology gives of itself that it is a necropolitical enterprise, which like Western imperialism and world capitalism is necropolitical in form and content. Yet, at the center of the world’s hegemon stands the American Society of Criminology, proudly proclaiming its intention to imperialize the Global South with its toxic waste. Redolent of Pope Innocent VIII, Gary LaFree (2007), past president of the American Society of Criminology (ASC), strikes a pontifical and proselytizing posture despite the intellectual and moral exhaustion of orthodox criminology. From its ascending clerical heights, the ASC presidency and the rank and file of the various “Orders” within the Church of Criminology are modern Ignatius of Loyolas and his army of Jesuits. Militant spiritual intellects of law and order, the ASC’s criminologists are charged by their vicar, the ASC president, to “expand . . . criminology’s domain” (LaFree 2007, 1). These latter-day Jesuits are armed with knowledge of the “scientific study of crime and justice . . . [derived from their experience] . . . working in democratic regimes” (ibid.). Their proselytizing mission would see them offering “research and education [which] can better nurture democratic, nonauthoritarian societies” in the twenty-first century (1, 4). LaFree imagines Western criminologists, especially in the US, as moral innocents “with a vested interest in supporting the democratic non-authoritarian societies” (1).

One can hardly take LaFree seriously when the world’s leading hegemon, home to the CIA, a plutocratic establishment and a warmongering Pentagon responsible for undermining democracy around the world, routinely installs, arms and protects dictators, and overthrows or starves popular democratic regimes in the Global South (Blum 1986; Pearce 1982). In the face of the US having the highest murder rate of all OECD partners, it teeters on the brink of all-out chaos because of government endorsed bands of armed white supremacists (i.e., “domestic terrorists”) and is now rocked by protests over murderous police forces that hardly differ from the death squads of dictators around the world. There ought to be howls of laughter when LaFree (2007, 3) claims that it is “clear that crime is directly linked to the strength of democratic institutions.” Such a statement should stand as an indictment of US-style “democracy” and serve to expose the complicity of criminologists with its tyranny. Be that as it may, the Global South is clearly in the crosshairs of Western criminology. There is now a veritable gold rush by Western

criminologists to consult with governments, teach in universities, sell books, and hock theories to support the already existing importation of Western military and police hardware and ideas that supports authoritarian regimes and comprador elites.

The abolition of capitalism and imperialism is as much the *sine qua non* for economic and political democracy and the very life of the planet, as is the abolition of criminology a necessary condition for the abolition of state and bourgeois tyranny. There are hopeful signs that there are heretics and infidels, veritable intellectual maroons who have “emancipated themselves from mental slavery.” They are indigenous and non-indigenous scholars in the interpenetrating spatial geographies of the Global North and Global South. Juan Tauri (2018) a poetic and potent Mauri indigenous scholar is a key marronist figure who is now well-past any hope of dismantling the master’s house with his tools. Tauri’s work with Chris Cuneen (2016) in Australia is breaking away from the criminological plantation. Antje Deckert (2016, 2014), a pākehā scholar in New Zealand/Aotearoa, has taken a lead role exposing the inherent anti-indigenous bias of administrative criminology. Together with Tauri, she broke with ANZOC to found in 2019 the journal *Decolonization of Criminology and Justice – Tuwhera*. The journal is a veritable Palmares²¹ for a cross-section of theoretically rigorous works in critical criminology, anti-criminology, and social harms.

Biko Agozino’s *Counter-Colonial Reason* (2003) has had a transformative impact in helping critical scholars deepen the impressions in the sand left by Stanley Cohen. His stewardship of the *African Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies* has played a key role in exposing the outstanding researches of African and indigenous scholars. The journal has also aided interregional knowledge exchanges across and within the Global North and the Global South. Agozino et al.’s *The Routledge Handbook of Africana Criminologies* (2021) is a vitally important collection of African-centered scholarship. Centered on existential African indigenous philosophies it moves into and beyond critical criminology. In addition, a number of former critical criminologists, finding the contradictions, evasions, and reversals of critical criminology too much to bear have struck out to formalize the study of social harms (Hillyard et al. 2004; Dorling et al. 2008). Finally, Battle et al.’s forthcoming *Abolish Criminology* is an essential text that uses an epistemology of abolitionism to critique and deconstruct criminology’s dominant theories and schools of thought. The essence of that work is to imagine possibilities for justice and human connection that break the myth that the state rather than

intentional communities is required to solve problems. To this end, the volume does what so few works in criminology do: it exposes the deleterious effects of criminology's theories on life and public policy.

As these scholars forge ahead to develop social theory beyond criminology, the interpenetrating communities of the Global North and Global South should continually be on guard against criminologists. As Nils Christie (2004, 116) observes, criminologists are "technicians of pain delivery. . . [and] they have an extraordinary potential for being dangerous people." Oh, people of the Global South, verily I say unto thee, beware of criminologists bearing "gifts."

NOTES

- 1 This essay is in memoriam of Dr. Stanley Cohen, the most articulate voice for anti-criminology. I would also like to express my gratitude to the confidential reviewers for their thoughtful and helpful remarks as well as the journal's copy editor for her work.
- 2 See note 11 respecting Lynch and Michalowski (2006) and Reiman and Leighton (2017) endorsing the myth that crime is a "problem." It may be inferred that these scholars contradict themselves, but following Stephen Brickey (1989), I suggest that at the heart of critical criminology is a "splendid contradiction."
- 3 I argue throughout this essay that criminology's real antecedent is the deterministic theories of the Holy Roman and Spanish Inquisitions and the subsequent witch hunt hysteria rather than the so-called classical criminology attributed to Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham. Be it the Inquisition's fictionalization in Umberto Eco's *The Name of the Rose* (2006) or scholarly histories of the Inquisition (Angeles 1980; Szasz 1997), it can be shown that save milieu and rhetoric, there is little to distinguish the sacred determinations of the Inquisitors from the "scientific" determinism of criminologists.
- 4 From a World Systems approach, it is imperative to understand that with empire, knowledge is a circuit instantiated by the metropole—its prime mover and sustainer. The periphery is in this way not only the locus for capital accumulation and the absorber of waste (epistemic and material), it is also an incubator and testing ground for consumption, theories, practices and products (e.g., drugs, toxic waste, and vaccines) that return to the metropole as profit, safe products, and refined practices of repression. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, finger printing, mug shots, and surveillance technologies were pioneered in the peripheries of the British empire in India and the US empire in the Philippines (Brown 2001i; McCoy 2009). All of this with the effect and intent to intensify domestic and peripheral repression as techniques to manage the contradictions arising from the growth of monopoly capitalism. Today, iris scans, heat rays, sound cannons, and intensive surveillance technologies pioneered and perfected in the periphery through global wars of empire return to the core with a vengeance to

intensify subordination (see McCoy 2009). An argument I make in this essay is that, with the aid of criminology, genocide is all that remains however slow moving it is with the growth of favelas, slums, and “refugee” camps (i.e., concentration camps).

- 5 For a definition of a “marronist” scholar, please see note 7.
- 6 This is an allusion to Bob Marley’s “Redemption Song.” I thank my colleague Antje Deckert for alerting me to the connection to anti-criminology.
- 7 In adjectival form, the word maroon is an Anglicization of the Spanish “*cimarron*” for “wild animal.” The term originates with the Spanish who released cattle, goats, and pigs onto Caribbean islands as part of the “New World” settler colonial project after Columbus’s first voyage. The term was subsequently applied to enslaved Africans across the Caribbean and Latin America who broke away from the plantations of the Spanish and other slaving colonial powers to found their own communities. The Spanish referred to these revolutionaries as “Wild Negroes” or maroons (see Craton 1982; Hart 2002).
- 8 It is well beyond the scope of this essay, but the following remarks are relevant to debunking criminology’s favored origin story that it all began with Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham in the eighteenth century. Emperor Constantine, in making Christianity the state religion of the Roman Empire, gave coercive authority to the Church’s compulsive demand for conformity. This led to the revolutionary transformation from sin to crime and the vigorous search for heresy and its causes. Thus, from the fourth century CE, there was an explosion of criminal trials coinciding with the development of a bureaucracy to rationalize and administer legal codification and punitive sanctions (Cayley 1998). The monastic community, most notably the Benedictines, worked out from the sixth century a fine-grained 72-point code of conduct, of which 29 were related to discipline and its penal code (Mumford 1967). The *parens patriae* state followed in the eleventh century (Kittrie 1974) with the Holy Inquisition following not long after in the thirteenth century (Cayley 1998). This culminated in the Spanish Inquisition, Isabella and Ferdinand’s 1478 machinery for legal, racial, religious, and political puritanism that encircled the globe. There is much warrant to claim that criminologists, as much as psychiatrists (Szasz 1997), are a logical extension of the Inquisition. Indeed, the formal abolition of the Spanish Inquisition in 1833, the very year Britain formally abolished the slave trade, occurred at precisely the moment criminologists such as Adolphe Quetelet and André-Michel Guerry were formulating the essentials of criminological theory. Finally, by no means is it to suggest a direct line of continuity for the search for the determinations of crime and its remedy from antiquity to the present, but Thorsten Sellin (1976) notes that in the fourth century BCE Athens there was lively debate among philosophers as to the causes and remedy for crime.
- 9 Declaring total and global war on heresy (i.e., crime), Pope Innocent VIII’s Bull reads in part: “We . . . decree and enjoin that the aforesaid Inquisitors be empowered to proceed to the just correction, imprisonment, and punishment of any persons, without let or hindrance, in every way as if the provinces, townships, dioceses, districts, territories, yes, even

the persons and their crimes in this kind were named and particularly designated in Our letters . . ." (cited in Szasz 1997, 7).

- 10 Quite apart from the novelty of Angeles's research, which focuses on the Philippines, he demonstrates the circulation of records and knowledges of social control from the centers of Inquisitorial power (i.e., Spain and Mexico) to the periphery, the Philippines and South America. This demonstrates that then as now knowledges of social control were fundamental to empire and flowed from the center to the periphery, but this knowledge was also reabsorbed into the core.
- 11 In fairness to my Latin American colleagues, I want to be clear that they are not unique among critical criminologists in what appears to be a lexical slip into the determinism, positivism, and science of pain delivery. Leading scholars of critical criminology and left realism in North America and the UK routinely and without any sense of irony write about the "crime problem" and the "sources of crime" (see Lynch and Michalowski 2006; Reiman and Leighton 2017). At another level, such terms signify that positivism and governmentality are "baked" into critical criminology and left realism alike and is neither able to conceal their paternalism of the poor. For example, Reiman and Leighton (2017, 16; emphasis added) write: "One troubling aspect of ["get tough" and "drug war"] policies is that the money used to fund the imprisonment boom has been taken from *crime prevention*, welfare, education, and public health for the poor, thereby weakening programs that *reduce crime* in the long run." Formulating the issue of epistemology and social control in these terms demonstrates that "even heretics remain bound by traditional thought in formulating their heresies" (Gunnar Myrdal cited in Frank 1984). Since they imagine themselves as heretics to the faith, critical criminologists do not fancy themselves as authoritarians because their "side" is not in control of the state. Historically, however, whenever "heretics" take over the state they prove themselves more doctrinaire, repressive, and committed to expanding the bureaucratic basis for social engineering than the bourgeois regimes they replace (Ellul 1972; Scott 1985, 1998). The point? Critical criminologists have the potential to be dangerous no less than their conservative counterparts. We can only be thankful their "side" has not yet won out in securing them the means to make the world "crime free" (see Cohen 2007, esp. chap. 2).
- 12 Moosavi (2019) notes that criminology in Africa and Asia is largely found in countries and regions that are capitalistic, industrialized, and Westernized (i.e., Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Hong Kong, Japan, New Zealand/Aotearoa, Taiwan, and South Africa). My online and admittedly Anglocentric research into the history and state of criminology in the Philippines confirms his assertion that criminology is "underdeveloped" in the Philippines, among other countries. Moosavi's solution to this "problem," one with which I hardly agree with, is that "Asian and Southern criminologists are already attempting to support peripheral criminologists and this should be applauded and further developed" (2019, 266). On the contrary, I think it a healthy sign of epistemic autonomy that criminology is "underdeveloped" in parts of the Global South. A search of ten major universities in the Philippines returned no results for criminology departments or foci on "deviance": University of the Philippines System; Ateneo de Manila University; University of the Philippines, Los Baños; Aquinas University of Legazpi; De La Salle

University; University of the Philippines, Diliman; MSU-Iligan Institute of Technology; University of Santo Tomas; University of the East; University of San Carlos (EntireTest 2019). My environmental scan turned up one utilitarian article on “delinquency” (see Shoemaker 1994) and one scholarly paper that documents the feasibility of a Master of Science in Criminal Justice with Specialization in Criminology at the University of Northern Philippines (Pariñas and Bestre 2015). It can hardly be doubted that the criminological theory this program will rely on will be the tired instrumentalism that has seen criminologists in the West either abandon criminology altogether or dig in their heels (because it pays) to deepen their complicity with state racketeering (see Brickey 1989).

- 13 Carol Smart (1990) has argued for a feminist criminology on the grounds that serve to enrich criminology and impoverish feminism. Not enough of these “usurpatory” criminologists understand her argument.
- 14 Moosavi’s (2019) friendly and rigorous critique of “new” criminological epistemologies in the Global South did not include Carrington et al.’s (2019) “Criminologies of the Global South” for obvious reasons of chronological unavailability. According to its interlocutors, the move to “Southernize critical criminology” (ibid.) aims to facilitate intra-regional collaboration or dialogue between critical criminologists and to open dialogue with conservative and liberal criminologists. This new criminology elaborates, merges, and refines Asian Criminology, founded by Jianhong Liu (2009, 2016, 2017), and Southern Criminology, founded by Kerry Carrington and Russell Hogg (2017). Apart from this being yet another tedious and tendentious nomenclature adding to the already overstocked encyclopedia of criminologies in the world, one cannot rule the egoistic imperative of academics in the humanities and social disciplines to coin terms and phrases to secure the place in posterity. For all the talk of “conversation,” it is instructive that Carrington et al. (2019) avoid citing and engaging with Moosavi’s “friendly” criticism first published in 2018. If Moosavi’s paper was available to Carrington et al. perhaps it was not received in the spirit of friendship Moosavi intended.
- 15 I am not suggesting that such criminologists are dangerous because they are reluctant anthropologists (see Tauri 2018). I think their unreflexive eagerness and possibly youthful exuberance makes them far more dangerous.
- 16 I derive this pithy term from Robert Ratner’s (1985) brilliant critique of criminology’s social history in Canada until 1985.
- 17 Some such “criminologies” were presented at the 2019 American Society for Criminology (see https://convention2.allacademic.com/one/asc/asc19/index.php?cmd=Online+Program+Load+Focus+program_focus=program_calendar&PHPSESSID=92jle8t3nakauljln01u3lh00). I wish to thank my colleague Antje Deckert for bring this to my attention.
- 18 The narrative that death is the cure for crime, especially illicit narcotics trafficking, ought not come as a surprise to Filipinos. Their current president has launched a genocidal campaign against the poor under the guise of the so-called war on drugs (Evangelista 2019; Fung, Fancisco, and Alejo 2018; Sanchez 2018).

- 19** To elaborate the unity of war making and domestic pacification, Alfred McCoy (2009, 14) demonstrated in the Philippine context that:

The continuing influence of U.S. colonial policing was clearly manifest by the late 1990s when master of the criminal netherworld became a prerequisite for an effective Filipino president. Just as patronage machines once dominated Philippine elections in the middle decades of the twentieth century, so the nexus of police, crime, and covert operations now shapes the character of Philippine electoral politics. The police powers created under U. S. colonial rule have thus become a central facet of the modern Philippine state in the half century since independence.

- 20** Global capitalism is a Ponzi scheme that in part rests on Western states ceding what economists call “fiat currency” to a cartel of the private banking establishment. Jacques Ellul (1972) notes that in the West there is a fundamental contradiction between political democracy (i.e., juridical equality) and economic democracy, whose denial ensures political democracy is a cruel illusion. Samir Amin goes further. He argues that world capitalism, which is to say economic totalitarianism, produces deep antagonism within both the West and the peripheral zones of the “Third and Fourth Worlds,” which the former has captured for expropriating raw materials and to which it sells its finished products. In the latter peripheries of global capitalism, where global polarization produces dependency, “the political norm of vicious dictatorship (whether military or not), [which is] broadly amenable to the expansion of world capital . . . [undermines any real prospect of] . . . democracy” (1992, 60). It may be thought that China is a shining beacon on the hill of socialism, but Hart-Landsberg and Burkett (2004) demonstrate that state capitalism and its dependencies reproduce precisely the same dynamics of exploitation and oppression one finds within capitalist regimes and their comprador satellites. Only rarely do critical criminologists address legalized lawlessness of this sort as a coherent whole of world capitalism without resorting to the trite moral opprobrium of “crime.”
- 21** This is the name of one of the earliest maroon communities founded by revolutionary enslaved Africans in seventeenth century Brazil.

REFERENCES

- Agozino, Biko. 2003. *Counter-Colonial Criminology: A Critique of Imperialist Reason*. London: Pluto Press.
- . 2004. “Imperialism, Crime and Criminology: Towards the Decolonisation of Criminology.” *Crime, Law and Social Change* 41: 343–58.
- . 2010. “Editorial: What is Criminology? A Control-Freak Discipline!” *African Journal of Criminology & Justice Studies* 4(1): i–xx. https://www.umes.edu/uploadedFiles/_WEBSITES/AJCJS/Content/agozino%20editorial%20ajcjs%204.pdf.

- Agozino, Biko, Viviane Saleh-Hanna, Emmanuel Onyeozili, and Nantyatyanbo Dastile, eds. 2021. In-press. *The Routledge Handbook of Africana Criminologies*. London: Routledge.
- Amin, Samir. 1992. *Empire of Chaos*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Angeles, F. Delor. 1980. "The Philippine Inquisition: A Survey." *Philippine Studies* 28(3): 253-83.
- Anghie, Antony. 2007. *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Arsenault, Chris. 2010. "US-Trained Cartel Terrorises Mexico." *Al Jazeera*, November 3. <https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2010/11/03/us-trained-cartel-terrorises-mexico/>.
- Barak, Greg, ed. 1991. *Crimes by the Capitalist State: An Introduction to State Criminality*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Battle, Nishaun T., Michael J. Coyle, Viviane Saleh-Hanna, and Jason M. Williams, eds. Forthcoming. *Abolish Criminology*. New York; London: Routledge.
- Bierne, Piers. 1993. *Inventing Criminology: Essays on the Rise of 'Homo Criminalis'*. New York: State University of New York.
- Blum, William. 1986. *The CIA: A Forgotten History*. London: Zed Books, Ltd.
- Bosworth, Mary, and Jeanne Flavin, eds. 2007. "Race, Control, and Punishment: From Colonialism to the Global War on Crime." In *Race, Gender and Punishment: From Colonialism to the War on Terror*. New Brunswick, NJ; London: Rutgers University Press.
- Brickey, Stephen. 1989. "Criminology as Social Control Science: State Influence on Criminological Research in Canada." *The Journal of Human Justice* 1: 43-62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02619373>.
- Brown, Mark. 2001. "Race, Science and the Construction of Native Criminality in Colonial India." *Theoretical Criminology* 5(3): 345-68. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1362480601005003003>.
- Bull, Simone. 2004. "'The Land of Murder, Cannibalism, and All Kinds of Atrocious Crimes?': Maori and Crime in New Zealand, 1853-1919." *The British Journal of Criminology* 44(4): 496-519. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azh029>.
- Burglass, Milton. 1972. *The Thresholds Program: A Community Based Intervention in Correctional Therapeutics*. Cambridge, Mass: Correctional Solutions, Inc.
- Cain, Maureen. 2000. "Orientalism, Occidentalism and the Sociology of Crime." *British Journal of Criminology* 40(2): 239-60. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/40.2.239>.

- Carrington, Kerry, and Russell Hogg. 2017. "Deconstructing Criminology's Origin Stories." *Asian Journal of Criminology* (12): 181-97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11417-017-9248-7>.
- Carrington, Kerry, Bill Dixon, David Santos Fonseca, David Rodríguez Goyes, Jianhong Liu, and Diego Zysman. 2019. "Criminologies of the Global South: Critical Reflections." *Critical Criminology* 27 (1):163-89.
- Cayley, David. 1998. *The Expanding Prison: The Crisis in Crime and Punishment and the Search for Alternatives*. Toronto: Anansi Press.
- Chambliss, William J., Raymond Michalowski, and Ronald C. Kramer, eds. 2010. *State Crime in the Global Age*. Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Chinweizu. 1975. *The West and the Rest of Us: White Predators, Black Slavers, and the African Elite*. New York: Random House.
- Christie, Nils. 1981. *Limits to Pain: The Role of Punishment in Penal Policy*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock.
- . 2004. *A Suitable Amount of Crime*. London: Routledge.
- Cockburn, Alexander, and Jeffrey St. Clair. 1999. *Whiteout: The CIA, Drugs and the Press*. London: Verso.
- Cohen, Stanley. 1982. "Western Crime Control Models in the Third World: Benign or Malignant?" In *Research in Law, Deviance and Social Control* 4: 85-119.
- Cohen, Stanley. 2007. *Against Criminology*. New Brunswick, NJ; London: Transaction Publishers.
- Covington, Jeannette. 1995. "Racial Classification in Criminology: The Reproduction of Racialized Crime." *Sociological Forum* 10(4): 547-68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02095768>.
- Craton, Michael. 1982. *Testing the Chains: Resistance to Slavery in the British West Indies*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Cunneen, Chris, and Juan M. Tauri. 2016. *Indigenous Criminology*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Davis, David Brion. 2014. *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Emancipation*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Deckert, Antje. 2014. "Neo-colonial Criminology: Quantifying the Silence." *African Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies* 8(1): 39-60.
- . 2016. "Criminologists, Duct Tape, and Indigenous People: Quantifying the Use of Silencing Research Methods." *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice* 40(1): 43-62.
- De Giorgi, Alessandro. 2014. "Reform or Revolution: Thoughts on Liberal and Radical Criminologies." *Social Justice* 40(1/2): 131-32.

- Del Olmo, Rosa. 1999. "The Development of Criminology in Latin America." *Social Justice* 26(2): 19–45.
- Dod, Suzie. 1986. "Report on the Third Annual Latin American Critical Criminology Conference." *Crime and Social Justice* 25: 62–66.
- Dod, Suzie, and Gregory Shank. 1987. "Latin American Critical Criminology Group, Havana." *Crime and Social Justice* 30: 113–17.
- Dorling, Danny, Dave Gordon, Paddy Hillyard, Christina Pantazis, Simon Pemberton, and Steve Tombs. 2008. *Criminal Obsessions: Why Harm Matters more than Crime*. Centre for Crime and Justice Studies (ISTD). School of Law, King's College London.
- Doyle, Jeff, Jeffrey Grey, and Peter Pierce. 2002. *Australia's Vietnam War*. College Station, Texas: Texas A & M University Press.
- Eco, Umberto. 2006. *The Name of the Rose*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Elbert, Carlos Alberto. 2004. "Rebuilding Utopia? Critical Criminology and the Difficult Road of Reconstruction in Latin America." *Crime, Law and Social Change* 41: 385–95. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:CRIS.0000025768.98914.d5>.
- Ellul, Jacques. 1972. *The Political Illusion*. Translated by Konrad Kellen. New York: Vintage Books.
- Elkins, Caroline. 2005. *Britain's Gulag: The Brutal End of Empire in Kenya*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Encinoza, Argenis Riera, and Rosa del Olmo. 1981. "The View from Latin America against Transnational Criminology: A Call for Democratic International Cooperation." *Crime and Social Justice* 15: 61–67.
- EntireTest. 2019. "Top 10 Universities in Philippines 2020." <https://www.entiretest.com/top-10-universities-in-philippines/>.
- Evangelista, Patricia. 2019. "'Some People Need Killing': Murder in Manila Part 1." *Rappler*, June 3. <https://r3.rappler.com/newsbreak/investigative/tondo-vigilante-gang-war-on-drugs-series-part-one>.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1968. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: The Grove Press.
- Farrell, Audrey. 1977. "Addicted to Profit - Capitalism and Drugs." *International Socialism* 77 (December). <http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj77/farrell.htm>
- Federici, Silvia. 2004. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Feinstein, Andrew. 2012. *The Shadow World: Inside the Global Arms Trade*. New York: Penguin Books.

- Foucault, Michel. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.
- . 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. Edited by Colin Gordon. Translated by Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, and Kate Soper. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Frank, André Gunder. 1984. *Critique and Anti-Critique: Essays on Dependence and Reformism*. New York: MacMillan.
- Fung, Jojo M., Manoling Francisco, and Albert E. Alejo 2018. “War on Drugs: The Church’s Resilient Mission of Resistance.” *Social Transformations: Journal of the Global South* 6(1): 55–76.
- Gould, Stephen Jay. 1981. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: Norton.
- Hart, Richard. 2002. *The Slave Who Abolished Slavery: Blacks in Rebellion*. Mona, Jamaica: University of the West Indies Press.
- Hart-Landsberg, Martin, and Paul Burkett. 2004. “China and Socialism: Market Reforms and Class Struggle.” *Monthly Review* 56(3): 7–123.
- Hillyard, Paddy, Christina Pantazis, Steve Tombs, and Dave Gordon, eds. 2004. *Beyond Criminology: Taking Harm Seriously*. London, Pluto Press; Black Point, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.
- Howard, Michael. 1976. *War in European History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hulsman, Louk H.C. 1986. “Critical Criminology and the Concept of Crime.” *Contemporary Crises* 10:63–80. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00728496>.
- Kalunta-Crumpton, Anita. 2004. “Criminology and Orientalism.” In *Pan-African Issues in Crime and Justice*, edited by Anita Kalunta-Crumpton and Biko Agozino. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate.
- Kitossa, Tamari. 2014. “Authoritarian Criminology and the Racial Profiling Debate in Canada: Scientism as Epistemic Violence.” *African Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies* 8(1): 63–88. https://www.umes.edu/uploadedFiles/_WEBSITES/AJCJS/Content/vol8.%20kitossa%20revised.pdf.
- . 2020. “Authoritarian Criminology and Racist Statecraft: Rationalizations for Racial Profiling, Carding and Legibilizing the Herd.” *Decolonization of Criminology and Justice – Tuwhera* 1(2): 5–36. <https://doi.org/10.24135/dcj.v2i1.10>.
- Kittrie, Nicholas N. 1974. *The Right to be Different: Deviance and Enforced Therapy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Kwitny, Jonathan. 1987. *The Crimes of Patriots: A True Tale of Dope, Dirty Money, and the CIA*. London; New York: W. W. Norton and Company.
- LaFree, Gary. 2007. “Expanding Criminology’s Domain: The American Society of Criminology 2006 Presidential Address.” *Criminology* 45 (1): 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2007.00070.x>.

- Lehner, Ulrich. 2013. *Monastic Prisons and Torture Chambers: Crime and Punishment in Central European Monasteries, 1600-1800*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.
- Lewis, Tom, and Sandra Sousa. 2015-2016. "Knowledge and Politics across the North/South Divide." *International Socialist Review* 99 (Winter): 77-93. <https://isreview.org/issue/99/knowledge-and-politics-across-northsouth-divide>.
- Liu, Jianhong. 2009. "Asian Criminology—Challenges, Opportunities, and Directions." *Asian Journal of Criminology* 4, no. 1 (June): 1-9. DOI 10.1007/s11417-009-9066-7.
- . 2016. "Asian Paradigm Theory and Access to Justice." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 32 (3): 205-24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986216656681>.
- . 2017. "The Asian Criminological Paradigm and How it Links Global North and South: Combining an Extended Conceptual Toolbox from the North with Innovative Asian Contexts." *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy* 6 (1): 73-87.
- Leopold, Jason, Anthony Cormier, John Templon, Tom Warren, Jeremy Singer-Vine, Scott Pham, Richard Holmes, Azeen Ghorayashi, Michael Sallah, Tanya Kozyreva, and Emma Loop. 2020. "The FinCen Files: Dirty Money Pours into the World's Most Powerful Banks." *Buzzfeed News*, September 20. <https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/jasonleopold/fincen-files-financial-scandal-criminal-networks>.
- Lynch, Michael J. 2000. "The Power of Oppression: Understanding Criminology as a Science of Oppression." *Critical Criminology* 9, no. 1-2 (September): 144-53. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02461042>.
- Lynch, Michael J., and Raymond Michalowski. 2006. *Primer in Radical Criminology: Critical Perspectives on Crime, Power and Identity*. Monsey, New York: Criminal Justice Press.
- Marley, Bob. 1980. "Redemption Song." *Uprising*. Tuff Gong/Island Records.
- Mann, Corame Richey. 1993. *Unequal Justice: A Question of Color*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Martinson, Robert. 1974. "What Works? - Questions and Answers About Prison Reform." *Public Interest* 35 (Spring): 22-54.
- Mbembe, Achille. 2003. "Necropolitics." *Public Culture* 15, no. 1 (Winter): 11-40. Translated by Libby Meintjes.
- McCoy, Alfred W. 2009. *Policing America's Empire: The United States, the Philippines, and the Rise of the Surveillance State*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Mercille, Julien. 2009. "Trail of Afghanistan's Drug Money Exposed." *Asia Times*. http://www.atimes.com/atimes/South_Asia/KL16Df01.html (site discontinued).

- Michael, Jerome, and Mortimer Adler. 1971. *Crime, Law and Social Science*. Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith.
- Miller, Richard Lawrence. 1996. *Drug Warriors and Their Prey: From Police Power to Police State*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Moosavi, Leon. 2019. "A Friendly Critique of 'Asian Criminology' and 'Southern Criminology'." *British Journal of Criminology* 59(2): 257-75. doi:10.1093/bjc/azy045.
- Mumford, Lewis. 1967. *The Myth of the Machine: Technics of Human Development*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Muncie, John. 2000. "Decriminalising Criminology." *British Society of Criminology Conference: Selected proceedings*. Vol. 3.
- Myrdal, Gunnar. 1968. *Asian Drama: An Inquiry into the Poverty of Nations*. Vol. 1. London: Allen Lane, the Penguin Press.
- Naylor, Robin T. 1999. *Patriots and Profiteers: On Economic Warfare, Embargo Busting and State-Sponsored Crime*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Nelken, David, ed. 1994. "Introduction." In *The Futures of Criminology*. London: Sage Publications.
- Oriola, Temitope Babatunde. 2006. "Biko Agozino and the Rise of Post-Colonial Criminology." *African Journal of Criminology & Justice Studies* 2, no.1 (June): 104-31.
- Pariñas, Mervic M., and Sina C. Bestre. 2015. "Feasibility Study on the Offering of Master of Science in Criminal Justice with Specialization in Criminology at the University of Northern Philippines." *UNP Research Journal* 24(4): 31-44.
- Pavarini, Massimo. 1994. "Is Criminology Worth Saving?" *The Futures of Criminology*, edited by David Nelken, 43-63. London: Sage Publications.
- Paley, Dawn. 2014. *Drug War Capitalism*. Oakland: AK Press.
- Pearce, Jenny. 1982. *Under the Eagle: U.S. Intervention in Central America and the Caribbean*. Great Britain: Latin American Bureau.
- Pepinsky, Harold E., ed. 1982. "Introduction." In *Rethinking Criminology*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Peries, Sharmini, and Michael Hudson. 2016. "Panama and the Criminalization of the Global Finance System." *Counterpunch*, April 18. <http://www.counterpunch.org/2016/04/18/panama-and-the-criminalization-of-the-global-finance-system/>.
- Ratner, Robert. 1985. "Inside the Liberal Boot: The Criminological Enterprise in Canada." In *The New Criminologies in Canada: Crime, States, and Control*, edited by Thomas Fleming, 145-64. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

- Reiman, Jeffrey, and Paul Leighton. 2017. *The Rich Get Richer and the Poor Get Prison: Ideology, Class and Criminal Justice*. Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson.
- Riera, Argenis. 1979. "Latin American Radical Criminology." *Crime and Social Justice* 11: 71-76.
- Ruggiero, Vincenzo. 1992. "Rethinking Criminology: A Critique." In *Rethinking Criminology: The Realist Debate*, edited by Roger Matthews and Jock Young, 123-41. London: Sage Publications.
- Said, Edward W. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf.
- Salvatore, Ricardo D., and Carlos Aguirre. 1996. *The Birth of the Penitentiary in Latin America: Essays on Criminology, Prison Reform, and Social Control, 1830-1940*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Sanchez, Phoebe Zoe Maria. 2018. "Philippines' Duterte Administration and His 'Anti-Drugs War': Towards a Police State." *Asia-Pacific Research*, December 28, 2018. <https://www.asia-pacificresearch.com/philippines-duterte-administration-and-his-anti-drugs-war-towards-a-police-state/5628448>.
- Santos, Boaventura De Sousa. 2014. *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide*. Boulder, Colo.: Paradigm Publishers.
- Scott, James C. 1998. *Seeing Like A State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition have Failed*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- . 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Sellin, J. Thorsten. 1976. *Slavery and the Penal System*. New York: Elsevier Scientific Publishing Co., Inc.
- Shelden, Randall G. 2008. *Controlling the Dangerous Classes: A History of Criminal Justice in America*. Boston: Pearson Allyn and Bacon.
- Shiva, Vandana. 2000. *Stolen Harvest: The Hijacking of the Global Food Supply*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Shoemaker, Donald J. 1994. "Male-Female Delinquency in the Philippines: A Comparative Analysis." *Youth & Society* 25 (3): 299-329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X94025003001>.
- Smart, Carol. 1990. "Feminist Approaches to Criminology or Postmodern Woman Meets Atavistic Man." *Feminist Perspectives in Criminology*, edited by Loraine Gelsthorpe and Allison Morris, 70-84. Milton Keynes: Open University.
- Staples, Robert. 1975. "White Racism, Black Crime, and American Justice: An Application of the Colonial Model to Explain Crime and Race." *Phylon* 3(1): 14-22.

- Syal, Rajeev. 2009. "Drug Money Saved Banks in Global Crisis, claims UN adviser." *The Guardian*, December 13. <https://www.theguardian.com/global/2009/dec/13/drug-money-banks-saved-un-chief-claims>.
- Szasz, Thomas. 1997. *The Manufacture of Madness: A Comparative Study of the Inquisition and the Mental Health Movement*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- . 2003. *Ceremonial Chemistry: The Ritual Persecution of Drugs, Addicts, and Pushers*. Rev. Ed. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Tauri, Juan Marcellus. 2013. *Globalisation of Crime Control: Restorative Justice and Indigenous Justice*. *The Indigenous Criminologist* (blog). September 10, 2013. <http://juantauri.blogspot.com/2013/09/globalisation-of-crime-control.html>.
- . 2014. "Criminal Justice as a Colonial Project in Contemporary Settler Colonialism." *African Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies* 8(1): 20–37. https://www.umes.edu/uploadedFiles/_WEBSITES/AJCJS/Content/vol8.%20tauri.porou%20revised.pdf.
- . 2015. "Breaking the Criminal Justice-Criminology Nexus, Empowering Indigenous Communities." *The Indigenous Criminologist* (blog). <http://juantauri.blogspot.com/2015/03/breaking-criminal-justice-criminology.html>.
- . 2018. "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House: An Indigenous Critique of Criminology." *Journal of Global Indigeneity* 3(1): 1–18.
- Tilly, Charles. 1985. "War Making and State Making as Organized Crime." *Bringing the State Back In*, edited by Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol, 169–91. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press.
- Trevisan, João Silvério. 1986. *Perverts in Paradise*. London: Alyson Publications.
- van Schendel, Willem, and Itty Abraham, eds. 2005. "Introduction." In *Illicit Flows and Criminal Things: States, Borders, and the Other Side of Globalization*, 1–37. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Vold, George R., and Thomas J. Bernard. 1985. *Theoretical Criminology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vulliamy, Ed. 2011. "How a Big US Bank Laundered Billions from Mexico's Murderous Drug Gangs." *The Guardian*, April 3. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/apr/03/us-bank-mexico-drug-gangs>.
- . 2012. "Western Banks 'Reaping Billions from Colombian Cocaine Trade'." *The Guardian*, June 2. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/jun/02/western-banks-colombian-cocaine-trade>.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.

Webb, Gary. 1998. *Dark Alliance: The CIA, the Contras, and the Crack Cocaine Explosion*. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Xu, Jianhua, Karen Joe Laidler, and Maggy Lee. 2013. "Doing Criminological Ethnography in China: Opportunities and Challenges." *Theoretical Criminology* 17(2): 271-79. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1362480613481798>.

TAMARI KITOSSA, PHD is an Associate Professor of Sociology at Brock University, Canada. His research interests include race and criminalization; racial profiling; criminology and the sociology of knowledge; prison abolition; anti-blackness, racism, and racialization; and interracial unions. He co-edited *African Canadian Leadership: Continuity, Transition, and Transformation* and *Nuances of Blackness in the Canadian Academy* and is editor of the forthcoming book *Appealing Because He is Appalling: Black Masculinities, Colonialism and Erotic Racism*. <tkitossa@brocku.ca>