



The Meaning of Integral Criminology and Criminal Justice

John J. Gibbs, Dennis Giever, and Randy L. Martin

This document was produced on the basis of a meeting that took place in March, 2001. There are some revisions reflecting activities and developments that have occurred since that meeting. Our intention is to suggest, in an introductory way, how the Integral approach could be applied to contemporary issues in criminology and criminal justice. We explore issues of the War on Drugs, the death penalty, and juvenile justice as illustrations.¹

Criminology and Criminal Justice as an Academic Discipline

The academic discipline of criminology in the U.S. began as a subfield of sociology. At that time it consisted of sociological inquiry into crime and delinquency. The central focus of criminology was developing and testing theoretical models of criminal and delinquent behavior based on social factors. Criminal justice did not emerge as an academic discipline until the 1960s, when crime became a national priority. Criminal justice is an interdisciplinary field of study that applies theories and methods of inquiry from sociology, psychology, economics, management, geography, operations research, law, and social work, to name a few, to the study of the criminal justice system and its components—law enforcement, courts, and corrections. Criminal justice also inquires into public responses to crime (fear of crime), the geographical distribution of crime (mapping hot spots), crime prevention, the etiology of crime, prediction of individual criminal behavior, and studies of types of offenses and offenders (e.g., white collar, violent, drug, and sexual).

At one time, the distinction between criminology and criminal justice had some meaning to some academics. Criminology was seen as a more traditional and scholarly discipline than criminal justice, then considered an area of professional and applied studies within universities. Today,



the distinction has little meaning from our perspective. We consider criminology and criminal justice a single discipline: criminology/criminal justice.

The Integral Approach

The purpose of applying the Integral model, also known as the all-quadrant, all-level approach (AQAL), to criminology and criminal justice is to obtain a more complete picture of the essential knowledge constituent to issues, problems, and concerns in the area. Our objective is to provide agents of the criminal justice system—government officials, academics, researchers, and the public—with the opportunity to understand how the broad perspective reflected in the Integral approach can be of benefit in exploring, understanding, and solving criminology and criminal justice problems.

The Integral map incorporates knowledge from four separate but mutually influential perspectives called the *four quadrants*. The four quadrants themselves can be simplified into two paths, the Left Hand and the Right Hand. The Left-Hand path represents the interior of experience. The subjective world of the individual is called the Upper-Left quadrant (UL), and it includes those factors that directly affect the individual human being's experience of the world, including thoughts, feelings, sensations, and intentions. It is the interior or subjective meaning of events to the individual. This knowledge is derived from the individual experiences of victims and offenders, as well as police, court, and correctional personnel, to name a few. Obtaining this kind of knowledge requires the ability to enter the world of the individual and come away with authentic and truthful accounts of the content of that interior space.

The collective or intersubjective aspect of the Left-Hand path is called the Lower-Left quadrant. It is a cultural worldspace where group perspectives, norms, traditions, rituals, and rules reside. Perceptively and adroitly entering this space yields knowledge of what is just and appropriate in a particular culture.



The Right-Hand path of the Integral model represents the exterior of all phenomena. The exterior of the individual is called the Upper-Right quadrant (UR) and is primarily the home of objective, observable knowledge. The purpose in collecting and analyzing this data is to generate a valid or accurate description and explanation of individual phenomenon, including behavior and physiological functioning. It also includes any objective measures such as standard personality tests and intelligence tests, or measures of psychological and mental functioning.

The exterior of the collective or interobjective dimension is the Lower-Right quadrant (LR). It contains objective knowledge of the collective or group. Studies focusing on this quadrant indicate how we function as groups, including our social, economic, and government systems and subsystems, such as the criminal justice system and the legal system. Data from this quadrant indicates how components of systems and subsystems fit and function together to accomplish the goals of society and its smaller collectives. The LR contains (inter)objective descriptions and explanations of how our social, economic, and political arrangements operate. Here, questions of efficiency and effectiveness are paramount.

To summarize, the four quadrants are: the Upper-Left quadrant, interior-individual, subjective intentions, being, consciousness, “I”; the Lower-Left quadrant, interior-collective, intersubjective culture, worldview, “We”; the Upper-Right quadrant, exterior-individual, objective behavior, “It”; and the Lower-Right quadrant, exterior-collective, interobjective society, social (economic, political, and production) system, “Its.”

Fully understanding any human action or endeavor requires knowledge from each quadrant, including a comprehension of the mutual influence between quadrants. Gathering and bringing together valid information from all quadrants is one kind of *horizontal* integration.

Within each quadrant there is a nested hierarchy of *levels* (stages or waves), which make up the *vertical* aspect of reality. For example, within the Upper Left, there are levels of individual depth



or consciousness. The spectrum of consciousness, which represents the journey of individuals and the human species from body to mind and beyond, ranges from the universal beginning of infants to comprehension of the All. In between are the stages of interior development that each of us individually undergo. Each of us progresses, as has humankind, from identifying exclusively with our physical and biological self, to identifying with the mind.

The lowest level of the spectrum of consciousness is archaic. Here, humans are little more than physical or biological beings who experience the world through physical and biological needs. Several levels above the archaic level is the rational level. At this stage of consciousness, human reason and abstract thinking emerge. Reason and abstract thought has delivered scientific and medical advances, the accumulation of wealth, a high level of production of goods and services, and many other benefits of modern life. Yet in some cases, individuals have gone beyond the rational mind to even higher stages of consciousness. Under the appropriate conditions, human beings today are capable of progressing from preconventional (egocentric) to conventional (ethnocentric) to postconventional (worldcentric) levels of care and consciousness. As we move up the spectrum, we become decreasingly self-focused.

Each lower stage in the spectrum of consciousness is a necessary condition to move to higher stages. The higher stages depend upon the lower stages, which must be adequately mastered to transcend to the next level. The higher stages transcend but incorporate the lower stages, and each higher stage is more complex than its predecessor. The relationship of the levels or stages is hierarchal. An even better term to describe the relationship among the levels is holarchical. Each stage is a whole in itself, but is part of a greater whole. It is a nested design, rather than a linear, hierarchal progression.

Vertical integration represents a healthy ascension along the spectrum of consciousness, in which higher stages transcend the limitations of lower stages (without repression), while simultaneously



honoring the vital contributions of each lower stage (without regression). In other words, it is a development that is envelopment.

Individuals also develop along various *lines* or streams—also called multiple intelligences. Common examples of lines are cognitive, moral, and emotional. We can trace an individual's progression along each of these lines. For example, at a particular point in time, a person could be at the pre-conventional, conventional, or post-conventional stage of moral development. Individuals do not necessarily progress along lines at the same pace, and development among lines is not inevitably strongly correlated. For example, an individual could be highly developed in the cognitive line (post-rational) but poorly developed in the moral line (pre-conventional). This may not present a problem, but if there are enormous differences in stage development between lines, it can be problematic. This highlights another kind of integration: some balance, correspondence, or congruence in stage development along some lines is beneficial for self and others. Absence of such integration or balance can be destructive. The “evil genius” above, with high cognition and low morals, is an example of such imbalance.

The great benefit of progress on the spectrum of consciousness is that problems that were insolvable at one level can be solved at a higher level. It is like being lost in a cornfield. When you are at ground level, all you see are cornstalks. If you climb a tree that places you above the field, you can easily see the best way out. Your superior vantage point may even show you that, when you were at ground level, you were walking in circles. As Albert Einstein observed, we cannot solve problems at the level at which they were created. Solutions often require the application of a higher perspective. Of course, as we move to higher perspectives or levels, we encounter new problems that we were not aware of at lower stages of consciousness.

There are levels or stages in the other three quadrants that parallel the stages of interior development in the Upper Left, for example technological or cultural development. Another kind of horizontal integration is measured by the correspondence in development among quadrants.



Incongruence or lack of concordance in levels between quadrants can create or intensify problems. For example, when specific technology, such as sophisticated weapons produced by advanced countries using scientific and organizational principles (rational level), find their way into the hands of tribal groups, whose culture and society are operating at the tribal or mythic level, the results can be horrific. When fighting with technology that matches their level of cultural and social development, there is a limit to the damage that can be inflicted upon enemies. But when advanced weapons are introduced to cultures and societies without commensurate development of rules governing inter-group warfare and formal and informal mechanisms for avoiding conflict, potential damage can be devastating. When technology outpaces culture, the technology can be misused, with disastrous consequences.

Reductionism in the Modern World

Rational thought in the areas of science, politics, economics, and organization advanced at a tremendous pace during the European Enlightenment, also known as the Age of Reason. There was an explosion of knowledge by Enlightenment thinkers and authors. A critical mass of the literate public emerged understanding their ideas. The expanded use of rational thought influenced political, social, legal, scientific, and economic revolutions. The constraints imposed by mythic thought—including mercantile economies, science that answered to the Church, and the reign of divine right royalty—were diminished.

After the Industrial Revolution, unprecedented material progress resulted from applied science, while rights and the potential to earn wealth were expanded through political and social revolutions. Advances in the production and distribution of material goods and in our understanding of the material world were the boon of widespread rationality. The bane of the Enlightenment and the industrialized world, however, was an increasing focus on the material world (the Right-Hand path or the sum total of “It/s”). The influence of the nonmaterial world (the Left-Hand path of the “I” and “We”) was diminished and marginalized: we shrunk the



interior world and gave greater importance to the exterior world. The subjective or interior aspects of reality became only important in terms of objective or exterior manifestations.

The product of the scientific-rational worldview is that the modern mind searches for truth only in the exteriors and denies that any truth can be found in our collective or individual interiors. Consequently, our modern world is imbalanced and our knowledge is incomplete. The knowledge that is primarily recognized as important in the modern world is from the Right-Hand path. For all intents and purposes, we live in half the world, the “It/s” being it! In the end, rational thought, a product of interior development, became a casualty of its own success. It produced such tremendous progress in the exterior or objective world that the interior world was overshadowed. Empirical knowledge and material wealth became the measures of all things.

Implications for Law and Criminal Justice

In criminology and criminal justice, as in other areas of our society, the Right half dominates the Left. Arguments often focus on objective indicators of the impact of criminal justice policies, programs, strategies, initiatives, and decisions on individuals and the system. These are in fact the Upper-Right and Lower-Right quadrants. Our laws and criminal justice systems are grounded in rational thought, so our outcomes are examined using empirical methods and systems models. Cost-benefit models and functional fit in a systems context are now the gold standard. Measures like crime rates, victimization, recidivism, arrests, convictions, effects of deterrence, incapacitation, rehabilitation, and prevention; and the costs of operating courts, corrections, and police are now central in arguments about crime control strategies. These measures are undeniably important in examining our legal and criminal justice systems and their effects, but to focus on them exclusively is incomplete. We do not have an Integral approach when central elements or areas of knowledge are underemphasized, discounted, or overlooked.



Concerns about the meaning of law and criminal justice in the interior worlds of individuals and cultures are seldom expressed directly. When real concerns arise about the individual's interior experience of law and criminal justice, as well as the appropriateness of legal decisions and actions by criminal justice agencies for the culture, they are often collapsed to their Right-Hand correlatives (because interior events have exterior manifestations, and vice versa). Of course, there are problems with this. First of all, the interior (UL and LL quadrants) cannot be reduced to the exterior (UR and LR quadrants), despite our attempts to the contrary. To do so not only results in losing knowledge and information from these interior dimensions, but can also result in losing sight of them completely. In its extreme reduction, the language of the interior becomes a dead language; depth and interpretation escape our concerns. The second problem arises when the Left-Hand knowledge is judged in terms of Right-Hand validity claims (empirical truth, UR, and functional fit, LR) rather than the criteria of the Left Hand (authenticity or truthfulness, UL, and justness or appropriateness, LL). Given that Left-Hand knowledge does not fit the validity claims of Right-Hand quadrants, even when we do our best to squeeze it into scientific and system terms, Left-Hand knowledge is left emaciated.

If a complete picture of any criminology or criminal justice issue is important, we should tap all four quadrants for knowledge. We recognize, of course, that depending on the issue or problem, some quadrants may predominate. The recognition that they are related to the other quadrants, however, is essential to an Integral understanding. The Integral approach can help us recapture the interior dimensions and move toward a more complete view of criminal justice issues and problems. It can increase our awareness and bring interiors out of the shadows for some and back from the dead for others.

Resuscitating the interior-individual dimension is especially important in our society and for our legal and criminal justice systems. The Upper Left is home to consciousness development and transformation. Since problems that resist solution at lower stages of development can only be



solved at higher levels, as key legal and criminal justice personnel ascend the spectrum of consciousness, solutions may emerge for some of the most refractory problems of criminal law and criminal justice. These are problems that have plagued us for decades and have been the focus of furious battles between liberals and conservatives. Although battles have been won by both sides, it is unlikely that either side will decisively win the war in the long-run. The potential for transformation to higher levels of mind or the ability to see these problems from a different and fresh perspective gives us hope.

From the perspective of individual offenders, the interior-individual dimension also is central to reducing crime. If we are to move away from a pure punishment/just desserts model and return to sincere attempts at rehabilitation, interiors must be included in the focus of such efforts.

The requirements for developing novel, workable solutions to the current problems of the criminal law and justice system include:

- a critical mass of influential decision makers and practitioners who will make the transformation to the next level (or those who are already there will start to effectively coordinate)
- a public critical mass that will understand and accept the radical solutions.

These are immense challenges. But there is some hope.

Three Illustrative Issues

The Death Penalty, the War on Drugs, and Juvenile Crime

Criminal law and criminal justice issues represent some of the most basic and central issues in our society. They are about the codification, interpretation, and enforcement of the rules of our society. Together, they determine what is considered wrong and what should be done about it.



Our systems of criminal law and criminal justice are the enabling system or subsystem for the larger system—our social, economic, and political systems.

We will briefly discuss three important criminal law-criminal justice issues in terms of the Left and Right-Hand paths, as well as the four quadrants. Our presentation is merely illustrative. Its purpose is to demonstrate for readers the general importance of an Integral approach, along with the risks of failing to employ that approach.

The War on Drugs

We have been waging a war on drugs in this country for at least twenty years. Setting aside for the moment whether war is an effective strategy for dealing with anything, let's examine some of the arguments that have been supportive and critical of the war.

Our major strategies and policies in the War on Drugs have been:

- vigorous legislation, including increased criminalization
- energetic enforcement of domestic law
- increased use of punishment, especially incarceration
- preventive policies and efforts in stemming the flow of drugs from foreign countries into the U.S. through interdiction and crop destruction programs
- to a lesser extent, we have used drug education and treatment strategies.

Most of the arguments about the War on Drugs are based on Right-Hand concerns. Questions about the measurable effectiveness of strategies and the impact of drug use on individuals, families, and educational, social, and economic systems are typically raised. The empirical assessment of the problem, the consequences of individual and societal drug use, and the effectiveness of control and intervention efforts vary, sometimes depending on Left-Hand issues



that remain partially hidden, lurking as consciousness and cultural worldview concerns. Conservatives present empirical data on increased drug importation and consumption to stress the seriousness of the problem and point to mountains of confiscated drugs and major drug arrests and convictions to support the effectiveness of efforts. Liberals present data on the exorbitant cost of enforcement, interdiction, and crop destruction efforts given their effectiveness. They rail against the cost of incarceration when considering recidivism rates and point to the cost/effectiveness of less punitive individual and social programs.

The point is that the Right Hand is considered, for reasons outlined previously in this paper, the *only* forum for arguments about the War on Drugs. Addressing the empirical questions of “does it work” and “does it fit” are the dominant questions for debate in our society. There is no doubt that empirical, objective, or exterior measures of effectiveness are tremendously significant. However, focusing on them exclusively gives a partial, imbalanced, and biased view of the problem. It is not an Integral or complete view. By excluding our awareness of the interior quadrants, we mask concerns that can only be addressed in Left-Hand language. We dilute these concerns by moving them to the Right-Hand path, losing the ability to see them and debate them for what they are. We also restrict our options for influencing effectiveness, a Right-Hand concern, by giving the Left-Hand quadrants the short shrift. Because all four quadrants influence each other, openly dealing with Left-Hand concerns can increase the effectiveness of Right-Hand strategies in the War on Drugs. Addressing consciousness and culture, by way of depth and interpretation, can bring out those interior shadows that lurk behind Right-Hand exteriors, where they can be honestly engaged, without reduction.

The overemphasis on empirical knowledge obscures differences in assumptions and perspectives between, say, liberal and conservative positions, and makes these differences impossible to reconcile. Conservatives tend to see drug use as being caused by personal or cultural failing. Liberals, on the other hand, often see the problem as being caused by exterior factors, such as the



social system's distribution of wealth and economic opportunity. Of course, they are both right. But finding a genuine third way between liberal and conservative requires transcending but including the partial truths of both positions. In other words, an Integral approach is required.

Recognizing the value of both the conservative and liberal view (that is, the contribution of interior and exterior factors) and incorporating them into approaches for dealing with drug use requires that we move beyond the level of consciousness that produced the liberal and conservative positions. The differences defy reconciliation and the problem defies solution at the current level of consciousness that is reflected in our approach to social problems. It is necessary to progress to higher levels of reasoning, to the level at which we can see the value of multiple perspectives, and finally to the level of Integral thinking, where the best of several approaches can be incorporated into our understanding and solutions in a fresh perspective. This level is known by many names, including vision-logic, creative reason, and integrative mind. The first step in moving toward a deeper understanding of social problems and the reconciliation of opposing camps is understanding that the interior is the dimension of human existence where this movement takes place. The second step is finding ways to increase awareness or consciousness to transcend to the level of vision-logic. Success hinges upon our ability to recognize that both perspectives on drug use and policy—conservative and liberal—have valid information to offer if we expand our view to truly explore all-quadrants and all-levels.

Current Juvenile Justice Policy

Concern with juvenile crime, especially violent personal crime, has increased sharply in recent years. The result has been a more punitive and control-oriented approach toward juveniles. Laws sentencing juveniles as adults under certain conditions, zero-tolerance programs in schools, the presence of police officers in school halls, metal detectors to check schoolchildren for weapons, and curfews for teenagers have become increasingly common. Some see it as a war on juveniles, and there is concern that the juvenile justice system is being dismantled and longstanding



policies and programs to prevent and treat juvenile crime are now seen as naïve and misguided. Since 1991, the vast majority of states have passed legislation that reflects a “get tough” approach to the perceived social, educational, legal, and criminal justice problem of youth.

As with the War on Drugs, conservatives and liberals are often at odds about approaches to juvenile offenders. The battleground is primarily, as with drug policy and programs, in the Right Hand quadrant, where observable and measurable events and behaviors take place. The horrible and shocking example of juvenile violence at a school in Columbine, Colorado brought national media attention to school violence. More recently, an episode at a high school in Santee, California has reminded us of the horror of Columbine.

The concern with juvenile crime and violence is cyclical. Liberal rehabilitation and social policies designed to deal with the broader personal, social, and economic problems that are seen as the causes of juvenile offending are followed by conservative “get tough” policies and programs that focus on control and punishment. When the liberal approach is dominant, conservatives emphasize its leniency and rising juvenile crime rates, which are often short-term increases and extrapolations based on a small number of years. When the conservative approach is dominant, liberals are quick to cite increasing rates of incarceration and their long-term effects, often bringing attention to short-run increases in juvenile crime rates during conservative administrations. This, of course, is attributed to punitive conservative measures. As with the War on Crime, the War on Youth finds both liberals and conservatives selecting certain empirical or Right-Hand indicators and interpreting them as either proof for the success or failure of each other’s approaches; sometimes the same data findings are used to champion both causes. Liberals see increased incarceration rates as a sign of failure of conservative policies, because confinement is costly among other reasons. Conservatives see the same objective facts as indicators of success; laws are being enforced, the guilty are being punished, and they are incapacitated while confined.



As with the War on Crime, the War on Youth between conservative and liberal forces is fought primarily in Right-Hand arena. Left-Hand issues and arguments do emerge, but they are not as often directly engaged as those of the Right. Examples of Left-Hand issues are whether it is just to treat juveniles as adults (a cultural values or LL-quadrant concern), and whether juveniles are at a level of cognitive and moral development (an UL-quadrant issue) where they can be held criminally responsible for their acts to the same extent as adults.

The cyclical nature of the American concern and response to juvenile justice issues sometimes reflects Left-Hand concerns that get masked by focusing on the Right. Periodic alarm over juvenile crime is a form of what Stanley Cohen called moral panic:

societies appear to be subject, every now and then to periods of moral panic. A condition, episode, person or group of persons emerges to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests; its nature is presented in stylized and stereotypical fashion by the mass media; the moral barricades are manned by editors, bishops, politicians and other right-thinking peoples; socially accredited experts pronounce their diagnoses and solutions; ways of coping are evolved....²

Moral panics are the product of the Lower-Left quadrant, or cultural worldspace. Youth, by the very nature of their development, challenge cultural values. Periodically there is a backlash from the dominant (adult) culture. The actions of youth are then interpreted at the collective level as more than normal youthful rebellion. They are seen as a challenge to all that is good and right in our culture. The boundaries of decency and stability must be reestablished by taking decisive action. Actions take place in the Right-Hand path. We identify and punish those who represent the most obvious threats (UR quadrant), and we adjust our system of criminal law and criminal justice (LR quadrant) to identify and punish those who are perceived as obvious threats. We assume that our current juvenile justice system is not equipped to handle these dangers, so we pass legislation to ensure certain juveniles are punished as adults.



The benefits of the systematic use of the all-quadrant, all-level framework are that we are more likely to become aware of how our values figure into the definition of a problem and to understand the impact they have on our actions. A more complete and Integral view of the problem or issue may yield more sensible solutions.

The main concerns in dealing with juvenile crime are both horizontal and vertical. Knowledge from all four quadrants must be brought to bear on the issue, and the knowledge from each quadrant must be systematically examined and properly interpreted using techniques and validity criteria relevant to the particular quadrant. The vertical dimension comes into play because it will take continued development to discover a deeper, wider “third way” between liberal and conservative approaches, one that generously includes the valid claims of both.

The Death Penalty

Death penalty debates generally follow the pattern outlined above for the War on Drugs and juvenile crime. There are some differences, however. The death penalty is an issue that is most vehemently debated by conservatives and liberals, yet it is the issue, more than any other, where adversaries draw knowledge from all four quadrants to fashion their attacks against opponents. Left-Hand concerns like the morality of putting someone to death and just desserts versus compassion are frequently debated. This is encouraging. But here, too, it is Right-Hand arguments that carry the most power in debates. Left-Hand arguments are of secondary importance: they are the second line of defense for combatants when opponents break through their Right-Hand argument, such as deterrence, incapacitation, and the probability of mistake.

Current Developments

While perhaps not widely known, interest in more Integral approaches is growing in the areas of law and criminal justice. Currently, those using the Integral model or planning to use it focus mainly on the four quadrants. Projects that are planned and in various stages of development



and/or completion use the approach (1) to expand the knowledge considered in the analysis of criminology and criminal justice issues, and (2) to organize current theory, research, and policy as a way of taking stock of the disciplines.

Randy Martin has a text in progress that explores the application of the Integral approach to criminology and criminal justice as well as a manuscript under review with SUNY Press representing a broader application of the Integral approach to the social sciences.

Kate Hanrahan, a member of the Criminology Department of Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP), has been awarded a sabbatical for the 2004-2005 academic year to conduct a study of the level of individual interior development and self-reported criminal behavior among university students.

We have already made some progress in introducing the all-quadrant, all-level approach on the educational front. Both Randy Martin and Jake Gibbs introduce their graduate and undergraduate students to the work of Ken Wilber. Jake Gibbs was awarded a Contemplative Practice Fellowship by the American Society of Learned Societies (funded by the Nathan Cummings Foundation and the Fetzer Institute, co-sponsored by the Center for Contemplative Mind in Society) to design a course that had among its objectives the introduction of undergraduates to the Integral approach as a way to explore contemporary issues in criminology. This is the second year the course has been offered, and it appears that students understand the approach and its value.

Some of our Ph.D. students have developed a sincere interest in the Integral approach. Currently, there are two Ph.D. students working on dissertations using the Integral approach as a framework for their research. The Integral approach is also being applied to correctional education. Thom Gerhing and Carolyn Eggleston of California State University, San Bernardino are examining correctional education using the four quadrants.



In the area of legal studies, Betsy Lehrfeld and Jim Turner of the law firm of Swankin and Turner have suggested a number of legal projects that could be pursued using the Integral framework. Exploring the relationship between morality and law is one area. Another is to continue the work of the Center for Responsive Law started at Berkley a quarter century ago. One project would be to analyze the evolution of law from earlier forms to responsive law. This project would incorporate both the quadrants and levels of the Integral framework.

Conclusion

The death penalty, the War on Drugs, and juvenile crime are all debated primarily via the Right-Hand path. The Right Hand is the place of action, tangible reality, and behavior. It is not, however, the only reality. Indeed there would not be a Right without a Left. Our mind and values (interior qualities) have tremendous influence on our individual actions and systems (exterior qualities). The Left-Hand path is an integral part of the whole. Diminishing it diminishes us as humans and limits our human potential for growth.

The Integral approach has much relevance to the current debates in law and criminal justice. The Integral framework is a useful and understandable way for policy makers, practitioners, academics, and the public to make sure that they have considered all aspects of problems, to get a complete view. A partial view will yield partial and unsatisfactory responses to crime and justice issues.

Also, we believe that the Integral approach has tremendous potential as a way to organize knowledge in the discipline, generate fruitful research questions, and frame criminal justice policy issues. Recently at IUP we have begun to introduce the next generation of criminal justice practitioners (our undergraduates) and criminology professors and researchers (our Ph.D. students) to the Integral model. When these students graduate and apply the approach to their work as agents in the criminal justice system and teach the approach to others as professors of



criminology and criminal justice, we predict that the adoption of the Integral approach in the field of criminal justice and the academic discipline of criminology/criminal justice will increase exponentially.



Endnotes

¹ Additional work by Randy Martin is in progress on the application of the Integral approach to criminological theory. Those interested in Randy's work on theory should consult his article published in this volume and available from the Integral Criminology Center at Integral Institute.

² Singer, *Recriminalizing delinquency: Violent juvenile crime and juvenile justice reform*, 1996, p. 9



REFERENCES

Singer, Simon (1996). *Recriminalizing delinquency: Violent juvenile crime and juvenile justice reform*. New York: Cambridge.

RANDY L. MARTIN, Ph.D., is a Co-Director of the Integral Criminology Center at Integral Institute. He has been a Professor in the Department of Criminology at Indiana University of Pennsylvania for the past 18 years where he has been developing integral applications for all his courses. He received his M.A. and Ph.D. in social/personality psychology from the University of Nebraska. Randy has been working in higher education for 22 years, initially in the psychology department at a small liberal arts college and then into his current position at IUP. This interdisciplinary perspective has enhanced his interest in and commitment to the Integral model.

JOHN J. GIBBS, Ph.D., is Professor of Criminology at IUP. Jake teaches quantitative methods courses in the Criminology Ph.D. Program and research methods to undergraduate criminology majors.

DENNIS GIEVER, Ph.D., is a professor and chair of the Department of Criminology at Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP). Dennis holds a Ph.D. from Indiana University of Pennsylvania in Criminology and a master's degree in Criminal Justice with a graduate minor in Experimental Statistics from New Mexico State University. He is active in the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, The American Society of Criminology and ASIS International. He has published 19 research articles or book chapters in diverse areas such as juvenile transfers, jails, fear of crime, parental management and self-control, and police pursuits.