Challenging power structures and inequality in understanding crime.

Avelyn Svingen*

Department of Social Policy, University of Birmingham, UK

Introduction

The study of crime has long been intertwined with issues of power, inequality, and social justice. Traditional criminological theories have often focused on individual characteristics or societal factors without adequately interrogating the underlying power dynamics and structural inequalities that shape criminal behavior and criminal justice responses. This article seeks to challenge dominant narratives and perspectives by examining the role of power structures and inequality in understanding crime. By critically examining how power operates within social systems, we can gain insights into the root causes of crime and develop more effective strategies for prevention, intervention, and social change [1].

Power structures are pervasive within society, shaping relationships, institutions, and systems of governance. These structures determine who holds power, who benefits from it, and who is marginalized or oppressed. Social inequality, including disparities in wealth, resources, and opportunities, is a manifestation of these power structures. Marginalized communities, such as people of color, low-income individuals, and LGBTQ+ populations, often bear the brunt of inequality, experiencing higher rates of poverty, unemployment, and social exclusion [2].

For example, women of color may face unique challenges and vulnerabilities that differ from those experienced by white women or men of color, highlighting the need for nuanced understandings of inequality in crime analysis [3].

Structural violence refers to the systematic ways in which social structures and institutions harm individuals by denying them basic needs, rights, or opportunities. Institutional oppression, including racism, sexism, and homophobia, perpetuates structural violence by reinforcing hierarchies of power and privilege. These forms of oppression manifest in various ways, including discriminatory policing practices, unequal access to education and healthcare, and disparities in the criminal justice system, contributing to cycles of poverty, marginalization, and criminalization [4].

Similarly, individuals with mental illness or substance use disorders are often criminalized for behaviors related to their conditions, rather than receiving appropriate treatment and support. These patterns of criminalization perpetuate cycles of poverty, incarceration, and social exclusion, further entrenching inequality and marginalization [5].

Critical criminologists advocate for structural change, including the redistribution of resources, the dismantling of oppressive systems, and the promotion of restorative justice and community-based alternatives to incarceration. By centering the experiences of marginalized communities and challenging oppressive power structures, critical criminology seeks to create a more just and equitable society for all [6].

Transformative justice approaches focus on addressing harm and healing relationships rather than solely on punishment or retribution. These approaches recognize the interconnectedness of individual and collective well-being and prioritize the needs of survivors and communities affected by crime. Transformative justice seeks to challenge power imbalances, foster accountability, and promote healing and restoration through processes such as mediation, dialogue, and community accountability. By centering the voices and experiences of those most impacted by crime, transformative justice offers a path towards collective liberation and social transformation [7].

Intersectionality theory emphasizes the interconnected nature of social identities and experiences, recognizing that individuals occupy multiple social positions simultaneously. Intersectional analyses reveal how systems of power and privilege intersect along lines of race, class, gender, sexuality, and other axes of identity to produce complex forms of inequality and oppression [8].

Critical criminology offers a framework for analyzing crime and criminal justice through a lens of power, inequality, and social justice. This approach challenges dominant narratives and examines the root causes of crime within broader social, economic, and political contexts [9].

Power structures and inequality play a significant role in the criminalization of poverty and marginalization. People living in poverty or experiencing homelessness are disproportionately targeted and penalized by law enforcement for offenses such as loitering, panhandling, and trespassing [10].

Conclusion

Challenging power structures and inequality is essential for understanding crime and developing effective responses that promote social justice and human dignity. By interrogating the ways in which power operates within society, we can identify the root causes of crime and work towards structural change that addresses underlying inequalities and injustices.

*Correspondence to: Avelyn Svingen, Department of Social Policy, University of Birmingham, UK. E-mail: a.svin@bham.ac.uk

Transformative approaches to justice prioritize healing, accountability, and community empowerment, offering a path towards a more just and equitable future for all members of society. As we continue to challenge dominant narratives and center the voices of marginalized communities, we move closer to realizing a world free from violence, oppression, and injustice.

References

1. Weber J, Kruisbergen EW. Criminal markets: the dark web, money laundering and counterstrategies-An overview of the 10th Research Conference on Organized Crime. Trends Organ. 2019;22(3):346-56.

2. Holt TJ, Lee JR. A crime script model of dark web firearms purchasing. Am J Crim Just. 2023;48(2):509-29.

3. Weber J, Kruisbergen EW. Criminal markets: the dark web, money laundering and counterstrategies-An overview of the 10th Research Conference on Organized Crime. Trends Organ. 2019;22(3):346-56.

4. Martin J. Lost on the Silk Road: Online drug distribution and the 'cryptomarket'. Criminol Crim Justice. 2014;14(3):351-67.

5. Liang BA, Mackey T. Searching for safety: addressing search engine, website, and provider accountability for illicit online drug sales. Am J Law Med. 2009;35(1):125-84.

6. Williams BA, Sudore RL, Greifinger R, et al. Balancing punishment and compassion for seriously ill prisoners. Ann Intern Med. 2011;155(2):122-6.

7. Marks J. Rousseau's discriminating defense of compassion. Am Political Sci Rev. 2007;101(4):727-39.

8. Perez-Bret E, Altisent R, Rocafort J. Definition of compassion in healthcare: a systematic literature review. Int J Palliat Nurs. 2016;22(12):599-606.

9. Moon TW, Hur WM, Ko SH, et al. Bridging corporate social responsibility and compassion at work: Relations to organizational justice and affective organizational commitment. Career Dev Int 2014;19(1):49-72.

10. Van Der Cingel M. Compassion and professional care: exploring the domain. Nurs Philos. 2009;10(2):124-36.