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Introduction:
Any scholar who makes a lasting contribution to the African crisis would be recognized in the history of intellectual accomplishments as having made a unique contribution to the world. This is part of the reason why I am passionate about addressing the African condition, not simply because I am an African scholar. Surprisingly, criminologists have routinely buried their heads in the snow of Europe and North America with hardly any serious attempt to understand the hieroglyphics of African reality except when they perceive threats to European comforts in the form of human trafficking, terrorism, piracy, dictatorships or the drugs trade. What is wrong with Africa is that no other people went through what Africans went through in modern history and survived to tell the tale against the odds of enduring imperialist arrogance. This journal is open to all contributors who seriously attempt to address the African crises of authoritarianism whether the authors are of African descent or not.

For clarity, this paper is not advocating something separate to be called African criminology or Bantu criminology for only Africans, rather the paper is challenging all criminologists to learn from the peculiar history of Africa in order to advance their discipline. There is enough reason to avoid adopting Eurocentrism as the only viable paradigm in criminology but also to explore Afrocentricity in the search for answers to the apparently insoluble threat of violence around the world but with particular emphasis on the African crisis.

We will be mistaken if we think that what is contained in this journal is only relevant to Africa but even if it were so, why do we not restrict Lombroso to Italian criminology and Durkheim to French sociology the way we try to tie African intellectuals down geographically? There is no such thing as African criminology except by that we mean criminology that seeks to serve the interests of the majority
Elsewhere, I defined criminology as a technology designed for the control of others (Agozino, 2003). In this editorial I will elaborate on this definition by emphasizing that the discipline and its disciples tend to be obsessed with social control-freak domination over others in otherwise democratizing global communities. This crisis of authoritarianism, I argue, plagues the discipline by forcing criminologists to obsess with the question of how to advance social control over and above any other concerns. Criminology is better established and is booming today in the former colonial centers that claim to be more democratic while the former colonized locations almost completely shy away from institutionalizing the imperialist reason inherent in criminological discourse even while enthusiastically importing or retaining the control-freak fetishes of modernism to enhance the exercise of internal colonialism and neocolonialism. Sumner (1982) critiqued the tendency in theories of modernization such as that of Clifford (1974) for recommending harsh penalties for the poor and leniency for corrupt elites and that of Clinard and Abott (1973) for recommending the apartheid policies of population control for the rest of Africa. Cohen (1986) made a similar critique on the work of Crummey (1985) while being more sympathetic to the social history of Brillion (1985).

This editorial will conclude by calling for the accelerated democratization and decolonization of criminology away from the empire of punitiveness and towards greater freedom and love for responsible adults. People of African descent have felt the brunt of the criminological repressive technology more than most and should be at the forefront of efforts to decolonize and democratize the discipline to transform it into a tool for liberation if at all possible. This journal, AJCJS, might very well be making such contributions in modest ways.

The paper builds on the conclusion in my book, Counter-Colonial Criminology: a Critique of Imperialist Reason, that imperialism is the basic form of all criminality since every criminal act implies the violation of the spaces of others and attempts to colonize the spaces of the other and
yet imperialism has the tendency to pose as the moral policeman of the world. My equation of imperialism with criminality means that the rapist, the pickpocket, the robber, the murderer, the arsonist, the bank fraudster, the dictator, all share the qualities of the criminal state that commits violence against the people: the abuse of power—physical, fiscal and or farcical. That book was given the honor of being the subject of a roundtable discussion at an ASC meeting and then this journal featured a roundtable of five amazing reviews on the book. In this paper, I will be responding to some of the more than a dozen reviews that the book has attracted since its publication.

The paper will devote a section to the puzzle of why Africa gave to world civilization, the philosophy of nonviolence (Gandhi, 1993, reports that he learned non-violence from the Zulu) while Africa has been apparently doomed to perpetual violence for more than half a millennium since its contact with modernist Europe. I will hypothesize that the root cause of the crisis facing Africa is the unprecedented demolition job that Europeans embarked upon since their contact with African civilization, a pattern that has been sustained and continued in alliance with those that Fanon (1963) called the phantom bourgeoisie in present day Africa. In the midst of the analysis of the chaos, the paper will highlight the creative and critical thinking possibilities even in criminology that could help to turn things around in Africa and offer deep lessons to the rest of the world.

Other Criminologies:
The few criminological perspectives that differ from the social-control-freak fixation of western modernity on how to control others include the rediscovered perspective of criminology as peacemaking which Pepinskey and Quinney (1991) and others are developing mainly from non-western philosophies; the chaos criminology of Young (1992) and others which owe their origin to African Fractals (Eglash, 1996); feminist and critical perspectives (Smart, 1990); the decolonization perspective of Agozino based on the African philosophy of non-violence and aspects of the critical (race-class-gender) and abolitionist perspectives in criminology (Agozino, 1997, 2003). The rest of criminology concentrates on the three pleasures of sadism, surveillance and mastery according to Stephen Pfahl and Avery Gordon (1986).
The critique of biological determinism in criminology was announced a long time ago by W.E.B. Du Bois (1899) who was defending the basic humanism of Africans at a time that white supremacy believed Africans to be sub-human. But conventional criminologists ignored The Philadelphia Negro with all its insights into what was 50 years later identified in the same city of Philadelphia as ‘White Collar Crime’ during the American Society of Criminology Presidential Address by Edwin Sutherland (1985). Furthermore, what came to be known as critical race theory and critical criminology that emerged from the era of the anti-war movement, civil rights movement and global students’ rebellion were already theorized in the pioneering work of Du Bois long before Bonger and others tried to revive classical Marxist orientations that prioritized a critique of capitalism. In addition, according to Gabbidon, Green and Young (2002) and Gabbidon (2007), what came much later to be dubbed racial profiling and excessive minority incarceration in critical criminology was already highlighted one hundred years earlier in the path-breaking work of Du Bois (1899) who focused on the much neglected problems facing people of African descent globally, a tradition that this journal aims to maintain.

This paper will not rehash the history of western criminology. Instead I will concentrate on useful alternative perspectives that could enrich criminology immensely if brought to the attention of the young scholars who are unfortunately being herded in the direction of becoming conventional as the only viable route to employability in crisis-ridden globalized societies. As I pointed out before, while criminology is booming in the western centers of imperialism, it is conspicuous by its absence in the academic institutions of the former colonized terrains not because criminology is too difficult for others to fathom but because the imperialist reason of conventional criminology appears not to motivate enthusiasm for criminology among people who have little or no imperialist wills to power (Agozino, 2003).

Carol Smart (1990) made a similar argument in her essay, ‘Postmodern woman meets atavistic man’ in which she argued that criminology is too limited in its obsession with crime to offer any exciting prospects to feminist scholars
who are more interested in violence against, not by, women
given that women tend to be much less the perpetrators of
violence around the world compared to men. In the post-
colonial situation, decolonization resulted in the
repatriation of the repressive fetishes that were designed for
the control of colonials back to the internal colonies of
inner city locations where neoliberal control-freak
governments try to manage social insecurity by ‘punishing
the poor’ according to Wacquant (2009).

I recognized this process as that of victimization-as-mere
punishment contrary to the assumptions underlying
‘punishment of offenders’ by Garland (1990) or
‘punishment of the poor’ by Wacquant (Agozino, 1997).
Mary Bosworth (2001) makes an observation similar to
mine in her study of the detention of French women in the
past. According to her even though the detained women
were largely sick non-offenders, they were incarcerated as
if they were guilty of some crime. Wacquant also indirectly
corroborates this when he makes an analogy between the
plantation, the prison and the ghetto but without pointing
out that being on a plantation or in the ghetto does not
presuppose a criminal record as is certainly the case with
many innocent people even in prison itself today. Angel-
Ajani (2005) and Sudbury (2005) support my argument
here by advocating the abolition of the use of penal power
to control poor African and Caribbean women who were
being incarcerated in alarming numbers when arrested as
sex workers, drug couriers or domestic servants without
immigration papers in Europe. To avoid the oppressive
incarceration of black women at a rate that would not be
permissible if it were the case that European women were
the ones being incarcerated in African countries at the same
rates, I have argued that sex work and the drugs trade
should be completely decriminalized as they actually are
already in certain jurisdictions. For instance, if drugs were
legal, almost every Jamaican woman in British prisons
would be free, as I pointed out in an earlier editorial in this
journal (Agozino, 2008).

Classical African Criminology:

Edward Said (1978; 1993) argued that the concept of
Orientalism was adopted by the West during the colonial
era to identify cultures that were supposedly inferior in
order to justify their subjection to European domination. However, it is not only with reference to the Orient that supremacist European thought is manifest. With reference to European women who were simply different from the patriarchal expectations, the control freaks set out hunting down and burning nine million of the mostly women who were accused of being witches. No other culture comes close to such hysteria of ovary or womb envy or whatever it is that Freud would have liked to blame. Poor European men were subjected to similar repressive control mechanisms out of fear that they would dilute the purity of the dominant race through cross-breeding. Sadly, other dominant groups around the world have since copied this genocidal intolerance to a fault over the centuries.

Leaving the apparent European obsession with social control aside, the Trinidadian scholar-activist, Kasala Kamara (2005), in *A Tribute to African Civilization*, narrates this incredible historical fact that African philosophy conceptualizes national security in terms of the welfare and happiness of the people and not in terms of weapons of mass destruction. For instance, none of the monuments left in ancient Egypt and across the rest of Africa was for the purpose of fortification and militarism! What Akhenaton built as a priority were houses for the workers designed to offer comfort and airy healthy living to maximize the health and happiness of the workers. By contrast, the ancient absolutist regimes of Mesopotamia were described by Lewis Mumford (1961) in *The City in History* in which he recounts the fact that insecurity and terrorization of the people was the main means of maintaining order. Even the schools required functionaries with a whip to maintain order, an office that was unheard of in the Mystery School system of ancient Egypt. Moreover, he admitted that the emergence of the dynasties in ancient Egypt ‘eliminated (the) need for enclosure as (a) means of coercion and control’ (quoted in Kamara, 2005: 80).

By contrast, the very first thing Europeans ever built across Africa and in the Caribbean was always a fort with very phallic cannons stationed to symbolize patriarchal control over others. During the reign of Akhenaton (1370 - 1352 B.C.) there was a nationalist rebellion in the province of Syria which was under the Kingdom of Egypt at the time. The ruler of Egypt was advised to invade the province and
show them who was boss or else his loyal supporters might be overwhelmed by the rebels and other principalities might get the idea that they too could challenge the might of the ruler. The Pharaoh thought about it but instead asked for the princelet of Damascus to be summoned to the palace. He came and was received with kindness in accordance to the ancient African principle of diplomatic immunity, he was feted and told to go home and rule his people autonomously if that was what they wanted. This might seem to be a generous act of humanitarianism on the part of the ruler but he actually avoided putting the lives of his own citizens in harm’s way by waging a war of aggression against a people who wanted to re-assert their independence and right to self-determination. The lessons in the wisdom of ancient Africans here are too obvious to be spelled out.

Modern Africana Criminology

Control-freak criminology was there from the beginning of imperialism when the attempt to pacify the rebellious natives and stabilize foreign domination of finance capital was ‘politely referred to as “the native question” (Mamdani, 1996) to which the answer was a pattern of pacification that has been identified as gun-boat criminology (Onyeozili, 2004; Agozino, 2004). Mahmood Mamdani (1996) recognizes this as the riddle that the best minds of imperialist scholars tried to solve with what Edward Said unforgettable termed the colonial discourse of Orientalism. Mamdani used the example of a former rector of Cambridge University, member of the war cabinet of the allied forces in the second World War, one of the founders of the League of Nations and former Prime Minister of South Africa, Jan Smuts, to illustrate how arrogant imperialists are when they argue that South Africa was an exceptional case whereas it was the same old story of control-freak imperialist arrogance writ large as white supremacy.

African-centered criminology differs from the punitive-minded European criminology because Africans are not seeking punishment for genocidal imperialism since no punishment would ever fit the crime of centuries of genocidal practices. Instead of trying to do something against the offenders, African criminology concentrates on
what is to be done for the victimized in reparation for the wrongs of imperialism. African criminology is not simply the importation of European repressive fetishes to Africa but the efforts to develop original approaches to wrongdoing that privilege the famed African tendency towards non-violence. Since most of the crimes committed against Africa by imperialism are not crimes committed by isolated individuals but were structural wrongs orchestrated institutionally, the focus of African criminology is or should be on what is to be done about the unjust social institutions that have been used to facilitate genocidal policies for centuries. However, African criminology or more exactly, post-colonial criminology, is not exclusively for Africans but for the whole world as one astute commentator on my work recently reminded readers (Oriola, 2006).

However, I wish to point out one error in the rave tribute where the review by Oriola states that Agozino strongly believes that “democracy, law and order are in actual fact, ‘organized violence.’” That probably prompted Aina, in a contribution to this issue of this journal, to cite Oriola’s review essay to characterize my advocacy of the right to rebel as ‘what some would call anarchic oppositionalism’. Anyone who is familiar with my work will know that such a view is definitely not mine. It is closer to the view of John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau who advocated opposition to oppressive rule in their theories of social contract, a view that Karl Marx certainly adopted and amplified and a view that is enshrined in the Second Amendment to the US Constitution in the form of the right to bear arms against an oppressive government.

The view that democracy is violence belongs to Nicos Poulantzas, the late Greek Marxist theorist who probably theorized western democracy against a background of its Athenian origins in a slave society with a war-mongering monarchy in a city state where women were denied rights of citizenship. Poulantzas may also have been reflecting on the history of military rule in Greece and Portugal at the time he was writing and against the background of Nazism in Germany and fascism in Italy and Spain in a recent past clouded by Stalinism in Eastern Europe in the face of cold war diplomacy by NATO and the Warsaw Pact. I critiqued the view that democracy is essentially violent and rejected
it in my book, *Counter-Colonial Criminology*. Having been raised in an African traditional democratic culture among the Igbo of Nigeria who still boast that the Igbo know no king because to us, all heads are equal, I cannot hold a view that dismisses democracy as organized violence. On the contrary, I see democracy as the panacea for a victimized society.

**The Decolonization Model in Criminology**

I have argued elsewhere (Agozino, 1997) that punishment operates in an imperialist fashion by colonizing other processes that are alien to the empire of penalty. The colonization process works at the conceptual, institutional and spatial levels of analysis, all with practical consequences for real people. At the conceptual level, I pointed out that when innocent people are being victimized this should not be represented as punishment of offenders, the first four words in the theoretical text of Garland (1990). Rather it should be seen as an instance of penalty trying to colonize the concept of victimization as being congruous with the empire of punishment whereas victimization is clearly other than punishment in everyday discourse but also possibly in criminological discourse. The problem lies in the fact that the discourse of victimization in criminology focuses almost exclusively on individual victims of individual offenders and rarely theorizes the mass victimization by state violence especially when such is expressed in the colonial guise of punitive expeditions.

My study of *Black Women and the Criminal Justice System: Towards the Decolonisation of Victimisation* (Agozino, 1997) revealed to me that running through history from trans Atlantic slavery, to colonialism, internal colonialism and to neo-colonialism, black women have been victimized often not because they were suspects wrongly convicted but because of their proximity to suspected black men. Since criminology focuses imperially on the punishment of offenders, this crucial discovery was neglected because it deals with punishment of the innocent or victimization as mere punishment. I called on criminologists to seek the decolonization of victimization from the expanding conceptual and practical empire of punishment.
A reviewer of my 1997 book quickly identified this perspective as the decolonization model in criminology and I think that he is right (Onwudiwe, 2000). This decolonization model that is strongly influenced by Fanon, serves to fill the gap in knowledge as a basis for policies to help end the colonization of victimization by penalty, the colonization of the social world by economic power and the colonization of internal populations by ruling classes. The decolonization model points out the way forward toward the deepening of democracy as the panacea for ending imperialist arrogance and state violence. The history of the victimization of black women in particular and African people in general from the days of slavery, through colonialism, neocolonialism and internal colonialism goes to illustrate the fact that you do not have to commit a crime in order to come under the control of imperialistic power. Wayne Morrison argues that the reason for the silences on the many genocides of the 20th century could be that, ‘Even academically, to confront genocide is unsettling. Silence becomes understandable since language appears to be unable to do “justice” to the horror and terror of it’ (Morrison, 2004: 77). Yet the silence was not complete since there have been attempts to blame the victimized or to deny the history of genocidal crimes in some quarters (see critiques of slavery apologists by Rodney, 1972; Williams, 1969; and Chenyak, 1968).

The decolonization model was explored further in my book, Counter-Colonial Criminology: A Critique of Imperialist Reason (Agozino, 2003). In that book, I argued that criminology is a technology designed for the control of others – initially the principal others were the colonized and the poor in the metropoles while the alterity of women was dealt with mainly through the repressive technologies of patriarchal family institutions constructed and maintained by the state as part of what Nicos Poulantzas recognized as the ideological state apparatuses. I pointed out that it was no coincidence that criminology emerged as a discipline at the height of European colonization of the rest of the world and that even today, criminology is dominated by institutions in the former colonial countries while remaining conspicuously absent in the former colonized territories. David Garland (2002) skips over this important detail as he explains the emergence of British
criminology in terms of the confluence between the governmental and the Lombrosian projects but without a word about the genocidal projects of imperialism and the paradigm shattering movement of decolonization.

Moreover, in the former colonial countries where criminology is old-established, almost all the top criminologists are people of European descent due to the not-by-any-means puzzling exclusion of others from participation in the contest over the control of this powerful technology. I concluded that the insularity of western criminology has contributed to the stunting of the discipline and advocated that it is in the interest of the discipline to open up to other perspectives in order to advance knowledge further.

One lesson that criminology could learn from others is in the form of the heroic struggles against colonialism around the world and the futility of imperialist hubris. One immutable law of history is that no empire is forever. Empires rise and empires fall precisely because empires are undemocratic and so no amount of force, threat, intellectual deceit or bribery with economic power could sustain an empire forever. Sooner or later, the anti-imperialist forces would win what Gramsci (1971) called the war of the trenches conceptually, institutionally and spatially.

My perspective goes along with that of Steven Box (1983) and Hall et al, (1978) who argued convincingly that poverty is less of a cause of crime than power because, as Lord Acton put it, power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. If poverty is the cause of crime, how come rich individuals get away with murder and how come rich countries continue to rape poor countries through the exercise of imperialist power? My conclusion that the rapist and the imperialist invader have something in common has been challenged by a sympathetic reviewer who warns that a characterization of crime as imperialism and imperialism as crime might distort the enormity of imperialist crimes (Capeheart, 2006). This point is well taken because I have no intention of implying that imperialism and forcible rape are identical.

I maintain, however, that what the imperialist and the armed robber share is the abuse of power and that the
solution lies in making power more accountable by deepening decolonization and democratization. Rather than distort the nature of imperialism, this insight should encourage criminologists to devote at least one chapter in their fat textbooks to crimes of imperialism which account for the most robbery, rape, homicide and other forms of state violence around the world but which criminologists conveniently ignore in what Stan Cohen called their culture of silence (Cohen, 1993; see also Schwendinger and Schwendinger, 1977).

Maureen Cain, from whom I have learned so much, reviewed Counter-Colonial Criminology (Cain, 2007) and revisited a debate with me that I had highlighted in my reference to one of her works on the policing of carnival in Trinidad. I could not believe when I read her 1985 paper that police officers would go to dancehalls and watch to see if anyone was wining the waist provocatively for that was subject to an arrest as a form of public indecency or lewdness. Well, I relocated to Trinidad and Tobago to take up Cain’s former post and could not believe my eyes when I read in the papers that two women had been arrested for wining their waists at a concert. Surely, the members of the protective services, as they are called in the country, have better things to do with taxpayer’s money and their time.

Where I would still like to debate with Cain is on the motive for opening fire on East Indian dancers during colonialism. Cain maintains that the police officers were scared when the dancers approached them with their trance-like dance. I maintain that it was not fear but loathing and the arrogant abuse of power of the type that made the Jamaican government to declare war on its own citizens at the behest of a foreign government that was seeking to arrest one single Jamaican citizen. As I suggested in my initial comment on Cain’s insightful cultural criminology, if she had extended her powerful analytical gaze from the politics of calypso music to reggae and resistance, as I did in my Counter-Colonial Criminology chapter on the ‘Policing of Peter Tosh And Reggae Music’, she could have changed her conclusion that a frightened white man at carnival is enough to explain imperialist cold-blooded massacre. She is right as usual that fear, or what Rasta call dread, has something to do with it but I insist that it is not the fear of the poor but the fear of being seen by the
imperialist masters as having lost control that would motivate such bloody authoritarianism. I still glow from the joy of seeing Cain, an influential scholar, deliver such a rave review of my modest book.

The 2010 war against poor ghetto dwellers in Jamaica in an attempt to arrest one alleged drug don under pressure from the US has claimed scores of innocent lives that could have been spared had the Jamaican government implemented the recommendations of its own ‘Ganja Commission’ that the herb should be decriminalized. As I pointed out in the conclusion to Counter-Colonial Criminology, the theory of African Fractals could come in handy here to help criminologists to develop a democratization and decolonization praxis for the benefit of the discipline and for the benefit of humanity. There is evidence that Africans tend to think in fractal patterns with emphasis on the interconnectedness of humanity with nature while Europeans tend to think in Cartesian patterns with emphasis on social and natural control (Eglash, 1999). Fractal perspectives have since been introduced to criminology in the form of chaos theory but the advocates rarely pay tribute to the African roots of the orientation (T.R. Young, 1992; Henry and Milovanovic, 1996; Milovanovic, 1997).

**Conclusion:**
State violence has claimed hundreds of millions of lives in Africa and the Diaspora from the days of slavery, through colonialism to the present days of neocolonialism and yet when you open conventional criminology textbooks, there is hardly any mention of state violence. This is unacceptable even from a scientific point of view that seeks to study what Durkheim called social facts *sui generis* for the neglect of such glaring evidence of mass murder around the world reduces much of criminological theory to what I have called social fiction *sui generis* (Agozino, 2003). Come on criminologists, you are capable of making one more effort by going beyond pick pockets and street criminals to see the big picture of the greatest organized crime that there ever was (see Chambliss, 1989), the crimes of imperialism (see also Hochschild, 1998; Nkrumah, 1968; Lenin, 1974; Marx and Engels, 1974; Agozino, 2003; Rodney, 1972; and CLR James, 1980).
The policy implications of this editorial suggest that the repressive criminal laws that colonial authorities imposed on Africa and the Caribbean should be abolished immediately especially when the colonial authorities have since abolished such laws in their own countries. For example, capital punishment was imposed on Africans as colonial law but those European powers that imposed it have since abolished it in their own countries whereas all African and Caribbean countries cling to this barbaric artifact of modernity with the exception of South Africa initiated under Nelson Mandela. Similarly, the law against drugs was a colonial fabrication of morality which should be abandoned as some European and South American countries are doing and instead rely on education and the health system to reduce demand and reduce harm as is the case with the much more harmful but legal products of tobacco and alcohol. The Constitutional Court of South Africa had an opportunity to take the lead in the 1990s when a lawyer who was a Rastaman challenged the illegality of daga or ganja on the ground that it discriminated against his religion but the court turned down his argument. Furthermore, sex work should be legalized so that African and Caribbean countries would be better able to regulate it and prevent more sexually transmitted diseases and sex trafficking the way that Senegal has shown along with the state of Nevada in the US and along the lines of The Netherlands. Abortion should no longer be a crime in Africa and the Caribbean when the colonial authorities that imposed such a law to control the reproductive powers of enslaved Africans have decriminalized it in their own countries to offer their women safer choices.

Furthermore, African and Caribbean countries should follow the example of South Africa and abolish the colonial law that criminalized same-sex relationships given that the Europeans who imposed such patriarchal laws have since ended such discrimination in their own countries. If this is done, then African countries like Malawi with bigger fish to fry in fighting poverty would not indulge in the folly of jailing a gay couple for 14 years in 2010 just for seeking a civil union, thereby exposing their country to international ridicule before the belated pardon from the country’s president. Finally, African and Caribbean countries should abolish the use of prisons for non-violent offenders and
return to our age-old philosophy of non-violence as an effective way to deal with most conflicts in the community especially because many of the European countries that imposed the technology of imprisonment on poor Africans are increasingly resorting to non-custodial sentences today. These policies will help to reduce the endemic violence that imperialism imposed on Africa especially if coupled with reparations for the crimes of slavery and colonialism.

In this Issue:

Let me now briefly introduce readers to the contributions in this issue of our journal. The first article by Kamalu, et al, re-visits the theme of racial disparities in incarceration in America and replicates the conclusions in previous articles in this journal that this is the evil fruit of racial discrimination that is wreaking havoc on the African American community, just as this editorial implies above. If it was white Americans who were being incarcerated at the rate that African Americans are experiencing, there would have been a state of emergency to fix this problem. Given that the major cause of the problem is the war on drugs, President Obama should consider applying the lesson from alcohol prohibition and the ending of prohibition in America to prevent otherwise law-abiding youth from being unnecessarily criminalized with the help of control-freak criminology.

Adeyanju and Oriola follow this with a case study of moral panic and racial profiling of African immigrants in Canada who were wrongly labeled as Ebola vectors by the popular media while they were suffering with nothing more serious than malaria. As a consequence, all people of African descent became collectively demonized as threats to Canadian society even if they were not immigrants but citizens born and bred in Canada. The elite discourse in the media reports revealed how prejudiced the leaders of opinion were and not surprisingly, school children quickly mimicked this prejudice to stereotype their classmates of African descent. Their paper suggests that the harm done is not only to the immigrants from Congo who were misdiagnosed with Ebola but to the whole of Canadian society that was subjected to unnecessary fear, contrary to
the common cliché that racism happens but ‘not in Canada’.

Aina follows this article with a review of an isolated attempt to apply the principles of restorative justice to human rights violations in Nigeria rather than rely exclusively on the punitive justice of Western jurisprudence. The paper cautions that unless the recovery of restorative justice by African societies is tied to the issue of the deepening of democracy and the advancement of decolonization, the result would be disillusionment as restorative justice becomes a pretext for impunity while the victimized rarely get anything restored to them in practice.

Mbecke follows with a research note from an on-going doctoral dissertation on the incidence of child abuse, neglect and trafficking in South Africa. The paper cautions against a monocausal approach that isolates one factor, say poverty, as the cause of child abuse and neglect. Rather, the researcher advocates a synthesis of different theoretical approaches in what is called Integrated Modeling Theory (IMT) to attempt to map the incidence of child abuse, child neglect and child trafficking as part of the effort to stamp them out especially given that the FIFA World Cup in South Africa might be seen by some as an opportunity to engage in the exploitation of children.

Complementing the above paper is a paper on democratic policing in South Africa by Pruitt who uses the Afrobarometer database of opinion surveys to analyze public attitudes to policing in the new South Africa. Given the low levels from which democratic South Africa started after apartheid, it is not surprising to read that the police have made major strides in advancing democratic policing in the post-apartheid society. However, Pruitt calls for more legislative changes to be adopted to further advance the democratization of policing in South Africa.

Finally, Ejiogu reviews the book co-edited by his professor, Onwudiwe, on Community Policing: International Patterns and Comparative Perspectives. He observes that the major two patterns internationally is that in industrialized societies, community policing tends to be initiated from a top-down approach by the state while in less industrialized societies, the approach is the opposite bottom-up
introduction from the community. He finds the book to be rich in coverage of diverse perspectives, regions and countries, making it useful for students of comparative policing.
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What Is Criminology? The Discipline of Criminology. Definition of Criminology. The Seductions of Crime. Key Concepts: Crime and Its Definition. What Is Crime? What Shapes Your Views on Crime? What Is Counted as Crime? Criminologists work to try and create knowledge about crime and its control through research and its aim is to gain understanding of crime, its causes, how to prevent crime and how to formulate crime policies. "Criminology can be defined as the systematic study of the nature, extent, cause, and control of law-breaking behaviour" (Lanier and Henry 2004:3). The Seductions of Crime. Why does it appeal? Critical criminology is a theoretical perspective in criminology which focuses on challenging traditional understandings and uncovering false beliefs about crime and criminal justice, often but not exclusively by taking a conflict perspective, such as Marxism, feminism, political economy theory or critical theory. Critical criminology frequently takes a perspective of examining the genesis of crime and nature of 'justice' within the social structure of a class and status inequalities. Law and Criminology as a branch of knowledge is concerned with those particular conduct of human behaviour which are prohibited by society. It is, therefore, a socio-legal study which seeks to discover the causes of criminality and suggests the remedies to reduce crimes. Therefore, it flows that criminology and criminal policy are interdependent and mutually support one another. Thus criminology seeks to study the phenomenon of criminality in its entirety. The problem of crime control essentially involves the need for a study of the forces operating behind the incidence of crime and a variety of co-r