



Criminology Needs an Integral Vision

JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE INTEGRAL MODEL¹

Randy L. Martin

This article supports the claim that there is substantial agreement within the discipline that criminology (and criminal justice) is in need of a change in approach. This article maintains that a framework is needed to organize the contributions and partial truths of existing disciplinary knowledge. It is argued that criminology needs an “orienting perspective” or a “meta-theory.” The article proposes that the Integral model provides a functional and apposite framework for addressing these problems. An in-depth, AQAL-based justification for this proposition is provided.

Introduction

The purpose of this article is twofold: to establish that there is substantial agreement within the discipline that criminology (and criminal justice) is in need of a change in approach; and to provide a set of justifications for the appropriateness and utility of adopting the Integral model to address this need.

One need look no further than the literature already reviewed to find more than ample indications of a widely held perception that change is needed. There is also support for a more Integral model. This support is not limited to a select few works but can be gleaned from a broad range of sources, even those in which the surface message appears diametrically opposed to some of the tenets of Integral Theory.

Does Criminology Need a New Model?

Over the years many criminological scholars have claimed that the discipline is in need of a new direction, model or paradigm. One of the strongest voices for a new vision for criminology has been Frank Williams. In his 1984 article, “The Demise of the Criminological Imagination,”



Williams first raised his call for a more imaginative approach in criminology, and over the ensuing years, he has elaborated his ideas and strengthened this plea.²

Yakovlev identifies serious and limiting “epistemological problems” in criminology.³ These are problems that strike at the very heart of the discipline because they relate to the rules employed for finding facts, their criteria of selection, and the methods for analyzing them. More specifically, Yakovlev criticizes the discipline for relying exclusively on “the mechanical manipulation of material objects” in its search for solutions to social problems. He refers to this process as “reification,” which he says has led to extreme reductionism and incomplete understanding.⁴

Pavarini notes that the limit of our current theories and methods “forces us to misinterpret.”⁵ He also calls for a new way of looking at things (which he characterizes as “defining a new artificial horizon”). Others, like Braithwaite, see the discipline as failing miserably thus far, which seem to be an indictment of the “business as usual” approach.⁶

Acknowledging the general need for change in the discipline, Freda Adler, in her 1995 American Society of Criminology (ASC) Presidential Address, outlined a new and expansive vision for the criminology of the future. The call for change went out yet again in the 1998 ASC Presidential Address, when Margaret Zahn encouraged her colleagues to pursue “alternative conceptions of crime and justice problems.”⁷ These calls for transformation are consistent and recurrent themes among members of the academy. The extent to which such calls have actually been heeded is ultimately unclear.

Along a similar vein, many in the discipline have advocated a more interdisciplinary approach. One could presume that this is in reaction to something akin to Yakovlev’s and Williams’s concerns with reductionism and narrowness and derives from a fear that the discipline, with its limited vision, has set artificial and deleterious constraints for itself. Cressey urged that



“criminological ideas must be borrowed” from other disciplines, saying that “if this borrowing does not occur, any ‘innovative’ generalizations are likely to be either crackpot notions about what demons are doing these days or mere punitive political philosophies espoused in some bygone age.”⁸ Jeffery, while in less melodramatic prose than Cressey, has consistently and strongly argued that for criminology to remain viable, it must be highly interdisciplinary and open to “outside” ideas, concepts, and variables.⁹ Reiss concurs, stating that criminologists should draw on different disciplines and sciences, not just for specific concepts and variables, but also for “the core structure of their explanatory theories.”¹⁰ Osgood, in a fairly ironic little twist for a criminologist, encourages his colleagues to “make a regular practice of academic thievery” by borrowing ideas from whatever disciplines we can.¹¹

Ten years ago, in an article exploring a transpersonal model for criminology, I made the observation that it was “time for criminology and criminal justice to shed their egoic attachments, to grow and mature.”¹² Since then, myself and a few others have continued to not only advocate for a change in how we think about crime and justice but also specifically call for a more integral model in criminology. In the article, “Criminology and The Eye of the Spirit,” Gibbs and his co-authors offer two important messages:

- the current view of crime and justice “is imbalanced or skewed toward focusing on exterior aspects,” with interior components getting the “short shrift”;
- “there are levels of awareness of understanding beyond those reflected in our contemporary models and there are methods that make these advanced levels accessible.”¹³



In fleshing out these two messages, Gibbs and his co-authors provide an excellent overview of some of the key issues in criminology and criminal justice and the potential utility of Integral Theory for addressing them.

Focusing on a more specific theoretical expression of these same themes, I used Wilber's Integral Theory as a model for reconceptualizing anomie in terms of spiritual alienation. The fundamental points were basically the same as those offered by Gibbs and his co-authors.¹⁴ We note that our traditional theories have proposed a world in which the "apex" of development is often equated with what others (e.g., Graves,¹⁵ Kegan,¹⁶ and Loevinger¹⁷) have identified as more egocentric levels of development. This narrow perspective not only fails to recognize transpersonal development but often stifles it. "From the social science perspective, focusing exclusively on the Right-Hand quadrants has done and will do little to aid us in understanding this process and its varied outcomes. We have created a flatland of disenchantment."¹⁸

Why a New Model?

Criminology does not need yet another specific "theory of crime or criminality"; there certainly is no shortage of such theories. It also is not a matter of choosing between existing theories; the prevailing antagonistic, competitive approach to theory development has netted us very little in the way of depth understanding.¹⁹ Rather, what is required is an organizational framework for sorting existing knowledge and placing it within the context of the partial truths thus far identified. We need what Williams referred to as an "orienting perspective" or a "meta-theory," which, simply put, is an alternative perspective from which to view reality.²⁰

Williams is not the only one to conceptualize the necessity for change in the discipline as a meta-theoretical change. In his biting critique of postmodernist criminology, Morrison discusses the need for a new "social metaphysic."²¹ From his description, he seems to be writing about something quite similar to Williams's notion of meta-theory.



Support for a new meta-theory can also be gleaned from rather unlikely quarters. McCord and Gottfredson are two scholars who tend strongly toward what I would characterize as traditional, empirical approaches to criminology. However, McCord concluded that “new metatheories” would prove more useful than “simple theories,” and Gottfredson noted that the first characteristic of an “adequate theory” is a “basic metasystem.”²² Although, their ideas of what a meta-theory would look like are probably somewhat different from Williams’s, Morrison’s, Gibbs’s, Wilber’s, and certainly mine, I believe that the basic underlying premise is the same: criminology and criminological theory should be moving toward a more overarching, orienting framework. We should not continue blindly down the path of dogmatic empiricism, which is the path toward ever increasing specificity and reductionism. We need an alternative worldview or meta-theory that provides the possibility for both horizontal and vertical development of thought and values. In other words, we need a meta-theory that recognizes the important and essential differences between increasing breadth of knowledge and increasing depth of understanding and that fully includes both in its developmental model.

In their article, “Criminology, Social Theory, and the Challenge of Our Times,” Garland and Sparks raise a series of pertinent questions about the state of the discipline.²³ They ask whether “criminology’s frameworks of explanation” are adequate to address the changing realities, not only of crime and criminal justice, but of the “expansive hinterland of political, economic and regulatory activity that encircles them.”²⁴ They further state that if the answer to this question is no, then we need to assess what kinds of adjustments need to be made in the questions that we ask and in our methods for answering them. These issues, they say, need to be addressed within a “fully contemporary idiom,” which requires that we take stock of the kinds of diverse intellectual resources from which we can draw. Late modernity poses

...intellectual challenges for criminology that are difficult and sometimes discomfiting but which are ultimately too insistent to ignore. To wish them away,



to carry on regardless, to pursue the conventional agendas of criminological enquiry in the accustomed way, would be to turn away from some of the most important issues that face contemporary social thought and public policy.^{25 26}

Framing the Debate in Integral Terms

The main proposition of this work (and of the book-in-progress from which it is excerpted) is that the Integral model provides a functional and apposite framework for addressing the problems currently facing criminology (and criminal justice). In this section, we will attempt to frame the need for a new model for criminology within the Integral model itself. The problems facing the discipline that were discussed will be connected to the relevant Integral concepts. Some of the themes presented below will be revisited and expanded upon in later excerpts on the application of the Integral model to organizing and analyzing criminological theory/knowledge and on an Integral analysis of criminal justice policy.

Criminology Is Too Scientific/Not Scientific Enough

The Great Flatland

Criminology and its theories have been very one sided. Two main criticisms of criminology include:

- criminology is not scientific enough;
- criminology is too narrow and empirically oriented.

Both positions converge on the same general conclusion that whatever we have been doing is not correct and some modification is needed. Both positions actually point to the same interpretation within the Integral model. Criminological theories have, with very few exceptions, collapsed the Left into the Right, leaving significant gaps in our knowledge and understanding. The “not scientific enough” position maintains that such a collapse is necessary and desirable and should



be pursued with even more gusto and vigor, while the “too scientific” position sees the collapse as limiting and restrictive.

A dominant theme in Wilber’s theory is that most of our attempts (and certainly those that are viewed as mainstream and valid) to explain virtually all aspects of human existence and functioning have been very narrow and constricted.²⁷ Because of our almost exclusive reliance on the “eye of the flesh” (i.e., traditional empiricism), we have focused on what Wilber characterizes as the Right-Hand quadrants and mistakenly concluded that these knowledge and value domains are the whole “truth.” We have collapsed the Left into the Right. The “eye of the flesh” has usurped the roles of the others claiming that only it can see the “truth” and that there is no “truth” beyond what it can see.^{28 29}

Judging from most of the literature relating to the state of criminological theory over the last thirty years, we can conclude that the vast majority of the debate and discussion about theory, both evaluative and formative, falls within this narrow range of the Right-Hand quadrants. Nonetheless, there have been some exceptions, such as Williams’s *Imagining Criminology*.³⁰ In it, Williams provides an innovative and unique assessment of the state of the discipline and makes many valid points about areas of concern. In his critique of “Thought and Ideology” in criminology, Williams includes sections on “The Emphasis on Empiricism,” “Increasing Specialization,” and the needs for “Non-Linear Thinking,” “Expansive Thinking,” and “A New Exemplar.” The points contained within these sections are highly consistent with a model like Integral Theory. The fundamental point that both Wilber and Williams make is that the over-dependence on the traditional scientific approach has led to a severely restricted vision, which translates into incomplete theories, partial truths, inadequate understanding, and ultimately into ineffective and inappropriate (even harmful) policies and practices.

Yakovlev also notes the consequences of this restricted vision with his discussion of the differences between material and social facts. He reminds us that facts are constructed, not just



out of material objects and things but also out of moral prescriptions, norms, legal ideals, values, and perceptions. Social facts have objective manifestations but

...are principally different from mere material facts. They are facts of collective consciousness. They are the ideal essence of social life. To ignore the essential differences between material and social facts is to underestimate the specific nature of the latter.³¹

As noted earlier, Yakovlev warns of the dangers of “reification,” when social processes are treated as if they are material things, with purely objective existence. David Silverman identified “the reification of human institutions” as “one of the traditional weaknesses of sociological analysis.”³² Christie cautioned about this identical issue when he called to our attention that “crime is not a thing. Crime is a concept applicable in certain social situations.”³³ In essence, Yakovlev urges us to remain aware that the material conditions of social life cannot be separated from the processes of social construction. Lacking this awareness fosters the narrow and shallow (i.e., Flatland) worldview that has pervaded criminology.

Williams provides an analysis similar to Yakovlev’s, with his discussion of “the verstehen of social constructs.”³⁴ His point is that, in the social sciences, when we talk about social constructs such as sex and age, we are implying much more than one’s chromosomal makeup and the calendar date of one’s birth. These and other such variables represent a “verstehen of our cultural roles and ideologies.”³⁵ Williams offers the social construct/variable of race as an example of his point, which also fits nicely within the all-quadrant aspect of the Integral model (i.e., all-quadrant). Race:

- is a biological and observable characteristic (UR);



- represents a set of personal experiences and relates to one's self image (UL);
- represents a set of values and beliefs that are held by groups and passed on to individuals (LL);
- is reflected in the functioning of institutions [there are even laws about it] (LR).

Williams says that this “verstehen” is clearly what is intended when we employ such variables, but when we collect data, we treat them as much less. The “substance of criminological reality,” he claims, is “primarily a mathematical, statistical substance” that can be traced all the way back to the 1930s, when we first began to collect social statistics. Compounding the problem, we interpret this limited data as if it actually represented the verstehen. In Integral terminology, we mistake Right-Hand aspects for the whole picture and thus are more likely to make partial interpretations and poor decisions.

Overcoming this serious predicament, Williams correctly points out, will require that we adopt a “different perspective.” However, I contend that in laying out his model for this new perspective, Williams does not go far enough. He advocates, simply put, that we must include both qualitative and quantitative methods in our paradigm. This recommendation, while it is certainly appropriate in its own right, does not fully address the issues of Left-Hand contributions, especially UL, nor does it adequately incorporate considerations relating to the differences between depth and span.³⁶

Our current vision for criminology is entrenched in the Right-hand path. It comes as no surprise that demographic variables (e.g., age, gender, race, educational level) are so highly correlated with many of our dependent variables (e.g., involvement in certain kinds of criminal activity, likelihood of incarceration, sentence length). While variables such as sex and race certainly do fit



into the UR, they also have correlates in the other three quadrants and at multiple levels. I am sure that we are all aware that it is not literally the pigmentation of a person's skin or their 23rd chromosome pair (UR) that contributes to their involvement with the CJS. It is only by examining the corresponding aspects from the other quadrants that we get the whole story and learn the whole truth. Unfortunately, while we know this, we lose sight of it all too often. This loss of vision is reductionism, the collapse of multiple quadrants or domains of knowledge and values into one. The implications from such a discussion seem to clearly point to the need for a model or framework that can recognize and accommodate the full breadth and depth of personal and social and cultural experiences.

Levels, Depth, and Span: Flatland and the Pre/Trans Fallacy

Reductionism can take at least two forms: 1) whole domains of knowledge can be ignored; and 2) different levels of consciousness within a given domain can be ignored or go unrecognized. Criminology, it would seem, is guilty of both versions. The first type, ignoring whole knowledge domains, was discussed in the preceding section on Flatland. The second kind of reductionism, which will be discussed in this section, relates to several different Integral concepts: 1) the confusion of span and depth; and 2) the inability to solve problems at the same level of development at which they were created.

Confusing Depth and Span

I contend that criminology, much like the rest of the social sciences, has a long-standing and persistent problem with confusing span with depth. With our arrested disciplinary development (which is to a large extent a reflection of the general evolutionary level of societal consciousness) and the accompanying infatuation with the linear, empirical view of reality, we have repeatedly fallen into the Flatland traps of thinking that *more* is the same as better and that interiors are reducible to exteriors/surfaces. That is, we have confused *span* with *depth*.



The current love affair with multiple regression analysis serves as a good illustration of both “spanism” and gross and subtle reductionism. Multiple regression allows us, with an appropriate sample size of course, to add more and more (quantitatively measured) independent variables to our analysis, which tends to improve our ability to make predictions (i.e., accounts for *more* variance) about some other quantifiable behavior. We then equate this process and its outcomes with increased understanding. However, there are several questions that should be raised before we make this interpretive leap. First, the amount of unexplained variance is often still quite high, which means that there is a lot that we apparently do not yet understand. The more standard response to this legitimate concern is that once we get a handle on the other variables that are involved and develop valid quantitative measures of them, then that error will be reduced and we will more fully understand. The problem with this response, however, is that we still are confusing interior depth with increasing exterior span. Second, apparently only in the special world of empirical science are prediction and understanding synonymous. (I actually looked both words up in the dictionary, and in neither definition does the other word even appear!)

When we plug race, age, sex, and income level into our regression equation, we may well find that together they account for a significant amount of the variance for the dependent variable of criminal behavior. Our analysis has told us that younger males, of color, from low income backgrounds are significantly more likely to be involved in officially measured criminal behavior. So, what do we now understand? Does this finding actually constitute “deepened” understanding or is really just a broader surface description? What does this finding mean? Also, there remains the concern that we are still committing reductionism, in that we have failed to recognize that these variables can and do exist at different levels.

My intent in the preceding paragraph is not to be flippant. I am trying to point out that, once we have measured our variables and done the analysis, what we have is a *partial* truth, not the truth. If we want to know why young, poor males of color are more likely to be associated with



officially designated criminal behaviors, we need to gather other information, perform other kinds of analyses, and attend to other validity claims. I do believe that this is in fact what we as criminologists often do, but then we are coerced into trying to force all else that we have considered into the narrow (Flatland) scientific world of “It/s” (Right Hand). When we do not, we are seen as unscientific and our ideas may be brushed off, glossed over, or even ridiculed.

One thing that seems to be eminently certain is that increasing specificity and refining our ability to “measure” ever smaller components of things is not the cure for such deficiencies. Measuring a broader and broader surface area of only the physical world even with greater and greater precision, is not a substitute for accessing information, knowledge, or wisdom from multiple domains, and it certainly cannot provide us with interior depth, experience, and understanding. The only solution is a more inclusive and expanded framework (that is, deeper and broader in a multi-domain sense) for understanding our phenomena. The Integral model provides such a framework. It directly acknowledges the need for accounting for both span and depth, across all four quadrants/domains, to more fully accommodate developmental and evolutionary aspects. It broadens and deepens our field of vision by incorporating the four quadrants and by bringing in levels of consciousness within the quadrants.

Wilber has concluded “each successive level of evolution produces *greater* depth and *less* span.”³⁷ If evolution progresses toward increased depth and decreased span, equating development within our field merely with wider span is heading in the exactly wrong direction. Adding ever more Right-Hand variables to our regression equation is not the path to a more complete (deeper) understanding. Continuing to rely almost exclusively on the exterior quadrants is still reductionism.

If we commit either form of reductionism, then any theory or policy that is generated in the process is regressive, not progressive. In our great desire to be scientific and to generate valid information about the world (indisputably appropriate and noble aspirations), we have “tossed



out depth and interiority, and settled aggressively on exteriors, surfaces, and the great interlocking span—with the ‘good’ of men and women now being how they fit into the span, not how they discovered depth.”³⁸ We are confusing understanding with surface description, significance with size (i.e., *more* variance accounted for is [erroneously] equated with deeper understanding), and we are collapsing whole domains of knowledge into others.

McCord, in outlining the difficulties facing theory verification, notes that none of our many attempts to arrive at “formal criteria for relevance have been successful in admitting only appropriate evidence.”³⁹ At least part of what is being identified is the need for not just a broader set of criteria, but a qualitatively different set (along the lines of Williams’s “new exemplars”), a set of criteria that accommodates depth as well as span.⁴⁰ In his “Reflections on the State of Criminology,” Sir Leon Radzinowicz observed that criminology has reached a point in its development “where there is less need for further expansion and more need for robust consolidation.”⁴¹ I believe that Sir Leon has correctly elucidated part of the problem. The discipline is ready for and in need of consolidation (i.e., the metatheory or orienting perspective discussed above), but we also must recognize that identifying the boundaries of our theoretical span does not speak to issues of depth in understanding. Depth (especially interior depth) has been dramatically under-considered and under-developed in criminology. It is not possible to adequately address depth if we persist with our current worldview and favored injunctions.

Christie sees the over-socialization of Master’s and Ph.D. students as a contributing factor to these problems in criminology.⁴² He maintains that this over-socialization in the “narrow empirical worldview” creates an inordinate focus on the (re)acquisition of old knowledge, at the expense of insight. In other words, he accuses us of socializing our developing scholars to believe that more of the same is the ultimate solution. The accumulation of more knowledge at the same level does not equate to deeper understanding; it is simply more knowledge at the same level. More is not different or new. “It is not natural—it is unhealthy—for the academic and the



intellectual (sociologist, criminologist) to continue strictly in the rational mode of speculative and dualistic thought as he or she matures, although this is the approved and rewarded form for the *modern* [italics added] academic.”⁴³ To continue along such lines is not to move progressively but retrogressively.

Another set of issues that can be associated with the confusion of span and depth is the heavy investment in and reliance on theory competition for progress within the field.⁴⁴ The reliance on theory competition as a strategy for advancing understanding leads to what Williams referred to as “the necessity of reinterpretation,” which is the need for every new perspective to demonstrate that it is superior to the old ones.⁴⁵ The simplest way to accomplish this is to “reconstruct a negative version of the old theory using the perspective and language of the new one.”⁴⁶ This kind of competition is generated because the competing theories are all operating at the same basic level, but the theorists confuse span with depth. In other words, theorists hurry to prove that their theory is the best or most complete explanation (that is, it offers the most depth of understanding), without realizing that none of these theories can provide more interior depth. Since they actually all exist on the same level, they contribute only to the span.

Without an overarching framework or orienting perspective that recognizes and accommodates both issues of span and depth, this useless and counterproductive competition will likely continue. At the risk of making an overly crude analogy, the current state of affairs in criminological theory might be likened to a bunch of children in a sandbox. Each wants the toys of the others and a major conflict ensues. Adding either more toys or more kids will certainly not lessen nor resolve the conflict. Only someone at a higher level of development can help resolve the problem. They can offer a new perspective and a depth of understanding. It takes someone at a higher level of development to introduce the higher order concept of sharing (i.e., to recognize the legitimacy of the various perspectives involved) and help devise a plan so that all can play harmoniously in the same sandbox.



Although considerably more evidence of offering span in the place of depth can be gleaned from the rather numerous sources cited in the “Criminology Needs to Be More Scientific” section, I conclude that a call for still *more of the same* to address problems is partly indicative of a failure to recognize the differences between exterior span and interior depth. It also indicates an overly simplistic or inadequately complex conceptualization of the problems facing criminology and the CJS.

The issues relating to span and depth will be revisited in a future publication. For now, we can say that because of the general levels of consciousness that typify our society and because of the worldviews and accompanying methods that accompany them, it has been difficult for criminologists to recognize the essential difference between span and depth, in all four quadrants. Our prevailing models, or meta-paradigms, cannot accommodate such a difference. Until we adopt a model that is more suited to addressing this important developmental/evolutionary distinction, our theories and our practices will continue to fall short.

The Pre/Trans Fallacy

The latter parts of the preceding section bring up another concern relating to levels of consciousness and development. Wilber, Beck, Cowan, and others have recognized that problems cannot be solved at the same level at which they have been created.⁴⁷ This general observation has serious implications for the current state of both criminological theory and criminal justice policy. The discussion above illustrates what happens when a discipline has not yet evolved to the next level of consciousness or to the next worldview. It is, to some extent, the old “can’t see the forest for the trees” adage. If we blindly follow only one trail through the forest, all we can ever see are the trees that border it. To see the forest, we must find a different trail that leads to a higher vantage point, a vantage point from which we can see where we have been but also where we might go.



In terms of criminal justice policy, we could start by asking the same question as Elias: why does “society persists in pursuing predictably ineffective crime policies?”⁴⁸ His answer is supportive of the Integral claim that problems cannot be solved at the level at which they have been created. Elias (as have numerous others) characterizes traditional crime control policy as a “war model.” This type of thinking or worldview is representative of what Spiral Dynamics calls Power Gods/Egocentric and Mythic Order levels (or Graves’s 3rd and 4th Subsistence levels).⁴⁹ According to Integral Theory, unless the problems currently facing the CJS are all indicative of even lower levels of development (Archaic-Instinctual/1st Subsistence and Magical-Animistic/2nd Subsistence), there is no way that Power God or Mythic Order level solutions, at least by themselves, will suffice. Within the model, higher levels, such as Scientific Achievement (Multiplistic) and Sensitive Self (Relativistic) could potentially provide viable and effective solutions. There are, however, factors that can work against such resolution. If the higher levels are not functioning healthily but are pathologically manifested, then, rather than a resolution, we find a new (possibly more insidious) problem.⁵⁰

Thinking more specifically of our crime control and law enforcement policies and practices, the ever-expanding criminalization of behaviors and excessive reliance on harsher and harsher punishments can be seen as manifestations of (possibly pathological) Power Gods and Mythic Order thinking. The Scientific-Rational vision, offers limited assistance to the problems generated by such approaches. The Pluralistic (Sensitive Self) view can effectively point out the problems with the current system and with the Scientific-Rational solutions, but especially since it is often pathologically manifested (i.e., extreme deconstructionism), it offers little more than a call for the dismantling of the institutions of power.

Another pitfall in attempts to change the system is that proffered solutions often reflect the adoption of a pre/trans fallacy. An earlier, less evolved worldview and the accompanying strategies are adopted but are confused with a more highly developed approach. The classic



example relating to criminal justice policy is the “get tough on crime” orientation that has been so predominant during the last two decades. This approach is touted as a return to higher values and morals, when in fact it is a regression to earlier, less complex classical views on the sources of crime and the value and utility of punishment: belief in the appropriateness of “an eye for an eye.” This situation led Morrison to conclude that our current orientation/worldview has created an advantaged social class who are “morally unskilled to possess such advantages and turn to perversity to demand criminal justice strategies of control and discipline of others.”⁵¹ Freud offered similar views on our (in)ability to appropriately and justly apply punishment in *Civilization and Its Discontents* (1930) and *Totem and Taboo* (1950).^{52 53}

A more detailed critical analysis of the current state of criminal justice policy and discussions of potential Integral explanations and solutions is offered in a future publication. The point for now is that the Integral model provides a legitimate and functional framework for examining what have apparently become intractable issues and for pursuing viable solutions.

Criminology Is Too Tied to Criminal Justice

The other major problem with the discipline that was identified is that criminology is too closely associated with criminal justice. This concern obviously is linked to the discussions above relating to solving problems and the pre/trans fallacy, but there are other issues that fall under this heading as well. Given that the general levels of consciousness in a society are reflected in its institutions and given the functions and nature of the CJS, it is likely that the system represents a combination of Power Gods and Mythic Order worldviews, tinged with Scientific-Rationalism. Criminology’s close ties with the CJS may enhance adherence to lower levels of thinking within the discipline. As the CJS is a primary consumer of criminological knowledge and information, there is some pressure to provide information at the level of the consumer. It also is possible to envision the CJS as a co-dependent partner with scholars and researchers in the pathological manifestation of the Scientific-Rational level thinking. Whatever the specific



scenario, the essential issue in such a situation becomes providing healthy, level-specific models and solutions (Wilber's Prime Directive) versus pathological ones.⁵⁴

Broad Applicability and Praxis

Another sound justification for the appropriateness of Integral Theory as a meta-theoretical model for criminology is its broad applicability. Integral Theory is firmly grounded in an expansive knowledge base about human existence and functioning. As can be readily determined from virtually any of his works, Wilber has reviewed, absorbed, and integrated an extensive array of literature, across a diverse assortment of disciplines.⁵⁵ Consequently, the theory is not only strongly supported with solid evidence; it is also comprehensive and multi-faceted, which enhances its range of applicability. This utility clearly has been recognized, since Wilber's Integral Theory has been adopted as a model in a wide variety of disciplines.

The subtitle of the book *A Theory of Everything is An Integral Vision for Business, Politics, Science, and Spirituality*. In the book, Wilber provides descriptions of integral versions of politics, governance, education, business, medicine, ecology, and consciousness studies.⁵⁶ The model has been used as a framework for critically evaluating the past performance of UNICEF and the United Nations, and a diverse range of political and business leaders have demonstrated strong interest in the model. Integral Theory has also been employed as a model in a substantial number of academic disciplines. Scholars in business, psychology, political science, medicine, the arts, law, education, and ecology all have found the Integral Theory to be an efficacious model, and the list of applications continues to expand. Wilber himself has published a thorough and inclusive view of an Integral Psychology.⁵⁷ Additional support for the diversity and extensiveness of the model's application can be found on Frank Visser's website, <http://www.integralworld.net>, under "Integral Initiatives," which displays a listing of activities and projects from all over the world that have adopted the Integral model.



Another aspect of Integral Theory that makes it a good fit for criminology is that, given its holistic and inclusive nature, it not only addresses theory but it also serves as a call and framework for praxis, or “right action.”⁵⁸ Evidence of this can be found in the applications noted above (i.e., the UNICEF and U.N. evaluations and the adoption of the Integral model by fields with strong application components like psychology and medicine). In addition, and possibly most compelling, is Wilber’s founding of Integral Institute.

The Institute consists of branches from all of the disciplines listed above and has the following as its mission:

Integral Institute is a nonprofit organization dedicated to the integration of body, mind, soul, and spirit in self, culture, and nature. This integral vision attempts to honor and integrate the largest amount of research from the greatest number of disciplines—including the natural sciences (physics, chemistry, biology, neurology, ecology), art, ethics, religion, psychology, politics, business, sociology, and spirituality. Integral Institute is dedicated to the proposition that piecemeal approaches to the world’s problems—war, hunger, disease, famine, over-population, housing, technology, education—not only no longer help but often compound the problem, and they need to be replaced by approaches that are more comprehensive, holistic, systematic, encompassing—and integral.⁵⁹

More information about Integral Institute can be found at www.integralinstitute.org.

Conclusion

As many philosophers and social scholars have reminded us, the world in which we live today is not the same world of our grandparents or even of our parents. The world today is clearly different from the world that spawned the development of modernity and now even postmodernism. As is said, “time waits for no one,” and criminological theory and criminal



justice policy are certainly no exception to the rule. From the multiple and varied calls for change in the discipline, it is clear that at least some criminologists recognize this reality. The real issue becomes what type of vision we will adopt for the present and future. Obviously, the point of this article is to propose a more integral vision.

The state of criminological knowledge has been characterized as reflecting only a small portion of reality, and “that ‘small portion’ is the largest problem.”⁶⁰ The knowledge base also has been characterized as fragmented, which is a reflection of wider processes of fragmentation in the academy and other social institutions, indicative of the dissociation of the value spheres.⁶¹ To pull back together the shreds of the discipline into a more coherent whole will require a model that acknowledges the integral nature of existence and reality.

Our descriptions of events and phenomena determine which theories will find support and the evidence that is gathered, yet there are many potentially accurate descriptions for any phenomena. The dilemma that has arisen within our current worldview is that only some of these descriptions are considered viable, since only some are found to be “helpful in identifying causal relationships.”⁶² Herein lies a core problem: we discard large amounts of knowledge because we have adopted narrow and artificial criteria for “truth” (that is, we have adopted one kind of validity claim to the exclusion of others). The worldview that has fostered this constriction of knowledge (i.e., the collapse of the Left into the Right) has *invariably* contributed to the generation of incomplete truths and the fragmentation of knowledge. If this myopic vision is maintained, we will continue to be afflicted by the problem of partial truths and shallow understanding. We will continue to promote unhealthy development or fail to promote healthy development across the levels of the spiral of consciousness and we will suffer the consequences of the resultant pathology. To overcome this predicament will require a radical shift in our vision of the world, how it works, and our place in it.



I agree whole-heartedly with Garland and Sparks that “the disinvention of criminology” is not appropriate, necessary, or functional. But, I also agree with their contention that “defending the disciplinary identity of criminology against incursions from ‘elsewhere’ is now as unfeasible as it is undesirable.”⁶³ What is being proposed here is certainly not dis-invention, but rather re-invention, at the next level of development. Wilber describes the developmental process as being one of both inclusion and transcendence.⁶⁴ We need not abandon the knowledge and injunctions that we have so far developed, but instead include these within a new and qualitatively different vision of the world, ideally an Integral vision. John Braithwaite said that we are going to have to think beyond the current boundaries of the discipline.⁶⁵ Criminology has to recognize the need to “constantly reconstitute itself.” If the current upper limits of consciousness are reflected in Scientific Achievement and Sensitive Self levels, then to get beyond these boundaries will require the jump to Second Tier (Kegan’s Fifth Order of Consciousness⁶⁶; Loevinger’s Integrated Self⁶⁷; Graves’ 2nd Being⁶⁸).

As should be evident from the information presented thus far, considerable support for what I am proposing can be gleaned from Frank Williams’s book *Imagining Criminology*.⁶⁹ Early in the book, Williams proposes that the field needs a new or at least refocused exemplar. His specific treatment of this issue is somewhat different than the Integral view of appropriate exemplars/injunctions, but his conclusion about such a need is based on the same kinds of observations that I have offered and on the same kinds of general issues that Wilber addresses in his work.

Two themes that permeate Williams’s work are that, in criminology, we have relied on oversimplified views of reality and restricted methods for gathering data. His general solution to the problems facing the discipline is the adoption of a new meta-theory or orienting perspective. This meta-theory, he says, must reflect:

- an appreciation of real-world complexity;



- an interdisciplinary approach;
- “the encouragement of nonlinear, nonproximate conceptions of causality”;
- an understanding of and appreciation for the role of subjectivity in individual behavior.⁷⁰

I agree that these components are essential and strongly contend that Integral Theory provides an excellent model for accommodating such factors.

Integral Theory also provides a framework that has been adopted in other, quite diverse disciplines for pursuing an expanded worldview or vision, the kind of vision outlined by Freda Adler in her 1995 ASC Presidential Address.⁷¹ If an important aim of the social sciences, as Zygmunt Bauman has claimed, is to develop “responsible speech” about the phenomena that are our foci, then we must be cognizant of the system of language that we employ, and we are obliged to give careful and continued consideration to the vantage point from which we speak.⁷² Integral Theory is a functional and appropriate model for the world in the new millennium, and it provides a responsible, just, and caring language for talking about important social and behavioral issues.

Garland and Sparks nicely summarize the need for an Integral model with their description of criminology:

Criminology is not just a creature of the academy. It is located in other social and institutional settings.... It is located in (i) the world of the academy—of social science and scholarly discourse, (ii) the world of government—of crime control and criminal justice, and (iii) the world of culture—including mass mediated popular culture and political discourse.... If we look beyond the immediate data of crime and punishment to the processes that underpin them—to routines of



social life and social control, the circulation of goods and persons, the organization of families and households, the spatial ecology of cities, the character of work and labour markets, the power of state authorities—it becomes apparent that criminology’s subject matter is centrally implicated in the major transformations of our time.⁷³

If such a description of the discipline is accurate, and I believe it is, it becomes eminently clear that business as usual cannot begin to do justice to the criminological enterprise, nor for that matter can it really *do justice*. Criminology and criminal justice, first and foremost, are human endeavors; they are carried out by people, are about people, are for people, and have huge impacts on people. What is required is a model that is sufficiently complex and encompassing to accommodate the diverse array of factors, structures, and processes that interweave to form the fiber of criminology; a model that can place this complex array of variables and concepts within the larger physical, social, and spiritual worlds that coalesce to form the Kosmos.

The days of reductionism and isolation have passed. It is time for an all-embracing vision of the world in which we live. In his discussion of the shift in physics toward metaphysics and theology, Pepinsky attributes the movement not to individuals burning out and dropping out of science but to the desire “to rise above paradigmatic debate to address issues of paradigm choice.”⁷⁴ However, recognizing such choice requires transcendent thinking.

More generally speaking, science needs criticism. We as scientists need to be reminded that a mind trained in objective science can, over the years, become “cold, dry, uncaring, always atomized, cutting, analyzing,” and it is possible that such a mind may begin to lose “the capacity for empathy, compassion, love.”⁷⁵ If we are to transcend the confines of the materialistic, atomistic, and dualistic illusions that have come to characterize our quest for knowledge, if we are to recognize Spirit, we have to be willing to broaden and deepen our worldview and our



injunctions to accommodate other spheres. Quinney echoed this same concern, specifically in reference to criminology, when he said that the presumed rationality and objectivity of modern science cannot lead us to a “new criminology.”⁷⁶

If it is true that, as some have proposed, we are on the cusp of a world-altering move to the next level of consciousness, an Integral age at the leading edge, then I propose that criminology should be ready to take the leap.⁷⁷ Of course, to take such a dramatic step will not be easy, but we do not have to blaze a completely new trail. There are maps that we can follow. Integral Theory is such a map.



Endnotes

¹ The following article is an excerpt of a work in progress, *An integral vision for criminology and criminal justice*. Please do not cite or reference without permission from the author.

² Williams, *Imagining criminology: An alternative paradigm*, 1999

³ Yakovlev, "Epistemological problems in criminology," 1990

⁴ Yakovlev, "Epistemological problems in criminology," 1990, p. 145

⁵ Pavarini, "Is criminology worth saving?" 1994

⁶ Braithwaite, "The state of criminology: Theoretical decay or renaissance," 1990

⁷ Zahn, "Thoughts on the future of criminology," 1998, p.10

⁸ Cressey, "Criminological theory, social science, and the repression of crime," 1978, p. 175

⁹ Jeffery, "An interdisciplinary theory of criminal behavior," 1989; "Obstacles to the development of research in crime and delinquency," 1993

¹⁰ Reiss, "Whither the craft of criminology?" 1993, p. 506

¹¹ Osgood, "Interdisciplinary integrations: Building criminology by stealing from our friends," 1998, p. 1

¹² Martin, "Transpersonal psychology and criminological theory: Rethinking the paradigm," 1993, p. 25

¹³ Gibbs, Giever & Pober, "Criminology and *The Eye of the Spirit*: An introduction and application of the thoughts of Ken Wilber," 2000, p. 99

¹⁴ Martin, "Anomie, spirituality, and crime," 2000

¹⁵ Graves, "Human nature prepares for momentous leap," 1974

¹⁶ Kegan, *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*, 1998

¹⁷ Loevinger, *Paradigms of personality*, 1987

¹⁸ Martin, "Anomie, spirituality, and crime," 2000, p. 95

¹⁹ For more on this issue, consult Messner, Krohn & Liska, *Theoretical integration in the study of deviance and crime: Problems and prospects*, 1989; Ericson & Carriere, "The fragmentation of criminology," 1994

²⁰ Williams, *Imagining criminology: An alternative paradigm*, 1999

²¹ Morrison, "Criminology, modernity and the 'truth' of the human condition: Reflections on the melancholy of postmodernism," 1994

²² McCord, "Theory, pseudotheory, and metatheory," 1989; Gottfredson, "Criminological theories: The truth as told by Mark Twain," 1989

²³ Garland & Sparks, "Criminology, social theory and the challenge of our times," 2000

²⁴ Garland & Sparks, "Criminology, social theory and the challenge of our times," 2000, p. 189

²⁵ Garland & Sparks, "Criminology, social theory and the challenge of our times," 2000, p. 189

²⁶ A wide range of other sources could certainly be cited as further support for the general claim that a new model is needed in criminology. However, to do so would become redundant, as the fundamental themes that undergird the issue have been addressed.

²⁷ Consult Wilber, *Sex, ecology, spirituality: The spirit of evolution*, 1995 and *The marriage of sense and soul: Integrating science and religion*, 1998 for good coverage of this issue.

²⁸ Consult Wilber, "Eye to eye: Science and transpersonal psychology," 1980; *Eye to eye: The quest for the new paradigm*, 1983; *The marriage of sense and soul: Integrating science and religion*, 1998.

²⁹ Williams also provides an "orienting perspective" that he refers to as a "critical incident" approach. This perspective is drawn from chaos and self-organized criticality theories. A full critical analysis of chaos theory and its derivatives are beyond the scope of this work, but briefly stated, it seems likely that chaos theory is an insufficient model for addressing the range of problems currently facing criminology/criminological theory.

³⁰ Williams, *Imagining criminology: An alternative paradigm*, 1999

³¹ Yakovlev, "Epistemological problems in criminology," 1990, p. 146

³² Yakovlev, "Epistemological problems in criminology," 1990, p. 147

³³ Cited in Yakovlev, "Epistemological problems in criminology," 1990, p. 74

³⁴ Williams, *Imagining criminology: An alternative paradigm*, 1999

³⁵ Williams, *Imagining criminology: An alternative paradigm*, 1999, p. 87

³⁶ Williams's observations also can be related to discussions about confusing individual and social holons and confusing artifacts with holons.

³⁷ Wilber, *Sex, ecology, spirituality: The spirit of evolution*, 1995, p. 56

³⁸ Wilber, *Sex, ecology, spirituality: The spirit of evolution*, 1995, p. 133



- ³⁹ McCord, "Theory, pseudotheory, and metatheory," 1989, p. 128
- ⁴⁰ Williams, *Imagining criminology: An alternative paradigm*, 1999
- ⁴¹ Radzinowicz, "Reflections on the state of criminology," 1994, p. 100
- ⁴² Christie, "Four blocks against insight: Notes on the over socialization of criminologists," 1997
- ⁴³ Quinney, "The way of peace: On crime, suffering, and service," 1991, p. 6
- ⁴⁴ For a good general discussion of theory competition in criminology, consult Messner, Krohn & Liska, *Theoretical integration in the study of deviance and crime: Problems and prospects*, 1989
- ⁴⁵ Williams, *Imagining criminology: An alternative paradigm*, 1999
- ⁴⁶ Williams, *Imagining criminology: An alternative paradigm*, 1999, p. 57
- ⁴⁷ Wilber, *Sex, ecology, spirituality: The spirit of evolution*, 1995; *A theory of everything: An integral vision for business, politics, science, and spirituality*, 2000; Beck and Cowan, *Spiral dynamics: Mastering values, leadership and change*, 1995; Martin, "Anomie, spirituality, and crime," 2000; Gibbs, Giever & Pober, "Criminology and *The Eye of the Spirit*: An introduction and application of the thoughts of Ken Wilber," 2000
- ⁴⁸ Elias, "Criminologists must promote human rights," 1995, p. 284
- ⁴⁹ Wilber, *The collected works of Ken Wilber* (Vol. 4), 1999; *A theory of everything: An integral vision for business, politics, science, and spirituality*, 2000; Graves, "Human nature prepares for momentous leap," 1974
- ⁵⁰ Wilber, *A theory of everything: An integral vision for business, politics, science, and spirituality*, 2000; "On critics, Integral Institute, my recent writing, and other matters of little consequence: A Shambhala interview with Ken Wilber; Part II," 2001
- ⁵¹ Morrison, "Criminology, modernity and the 'truth' of the human condition: Reflections on the melancholy of postmodernism," 1994, p. 151
- ⁵² Freud, *Civilization and its discontents*, 1930; *Totem and taboo*, 1950
- ⁵³ Freud, *Totem and taboo*, 1950/1913, in discussing the societal need to address transgressions and violations of taboos, said that punishment often provides an opportunity for those who administer it to commit the same outrage as the transgressor, but "under the colour of expiation." Later, in *Civilization and Its Discontents*, 1930, Freud placed the foundations of the penal system on the notion that the same prohibited impulses are present in criminals and the punishing community. Freud recognized one of the sad ironies of human social existence when he observed that, in the hope of preventing brutal violence, society exercises the exclusive right to use violence against its members who deviate. Unfortunately, according to Freud, the law is not capable of grasping the more refined manifestations and cautious applications of human aggressiveness.
- ⁵⁴ I will delve more deeply into the issues relating to the CJS in later excerpts.
- ⁵⁵ Consult, for example, Wilber, *Up from Eden: A transpersonal view of human evolution*, 1986; *Sex, ecology, spirituality: The spirit of evolution*, 1995.
- ⁵⁶ Wilber, *A theory of everything: An integral vision for business, politics, science, and spirituality*, 2000
- ⁵⁷ Wilber, *The collected works of Ken Wilber* (Vol. 4), 1999
- ⁵⁸ Praxis is a concept that has been used in humanistic sociology to express the need for "right action." It also has been strongly associated with the Critical and Radical versions of conflict theory in criminology (consult Platt, "Prospects for a radical criminology in the United States," 1974; Pelfry, *The evolution of criminology*, 1984)
- ⁵⁹ Wilber, "Announcing the formation of Integral Institute," 2002
- ⁶⁰ Williams, *Imagining criminology: An alternative paradigm*, 1999, p. 70
- ⁶¹ Wilber, *Sex, ecology, spirituality: The spirit of evolution*, 1995; *The marriage of sense and soul: Integrating science and religion*, 1998
- ⁶² McCord, "Theory, pseudotheory, and metatheory," 1989, p. 128
- ⁶³ Garland and Sparks, "Criminology, social theory and the challenge of our times," 2000, p. 190
- ⁶⁴ Wilber, *Sex, ecology, spirituality: The spirit of evolution*, 1995
- ⁶⁵ Garland & Sparks, "Criminology, social theory and the challenge of our times," 2000, p. 190
- ⁶⁶ Kegan, *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*, 1998
- ⁶⁷ Loevinger, *Paradigms of personality*, 1987
- ⁶⁸ Graves, "Human nature prepares for momentous leap," 1974
- ⁶⁹ Williams, *Imagining criminology: An alternative paradigm*, 1999
- ⁷⁰ Williams, *Imagining criminology: An alternative paradigm*, 1999, p. 185
- ⁷¹ Consult Wilber, *A theory of everything: An integral vision for business, politics, science, and spirituality*, 2000, for examples.



⁷² Bauman, *Thinking sociologically*, 1990, cited in Garland & Sparks, "Criminology, social theory and the challenge of our times," 2000

⁷³ Garland & Sparks, "Criminology, social theory and the challenge of our times," 2000, p. 189

⁷⁴ Pepinsky, *Criminology as peacemaking*, 1991, p. 302

⁷⁵ Skolimowski, "Life entropy and education," 1986, p. 306

⁷⁶ Quinney, "The way of peace: On crime, suffering, and service," 1991

⁷⁷ Wilber, *A theory of everything: An integral vision for business, politics, science, and spirituality*, 2000; Beck & Cowan, *Spiral dynamics: Mastering values, leadership and change*, 1995



REFERENCES

Adler, F. (1996). Our American Society of Criminology, the world, and the state of the art: The American Society of Criminology 1995 presidential address. *Criminology*, 34 (1), 1-8.

Bauman, Z. (1990). *Thinking sociologically*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Beck, Don E. & Cowan, Chris C. (1995). *Spiral dynamics: Mastering values, leadership and change*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Braithwaite, J. (1990). The state of criminology: Theoretical decay or renaissance. In W.S. Laufer & F. Adler (Eds.), *Advances in criminological theory* (Vol. 2, pp. 155-166). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Christie, N. (1997). Four blocks against insight: Notes on the over socialization of criminologists. *Theoretical Criminology*, 1 (1), 13-23.

Cressey, D.R. (1978). Criminological theory, social science, and the repression of crime. *Criminology*, 16 (2), 178-189.

Elias, R. (1995). Criminologists must promote human rights. In R. Boostrom (Ed.), *Enduring issues in criminology* (pp. 284-294). San Diego: Greenhaven Press.

Ericson, R. & Carriere, K. (1994). The fragmentation of criminology. In D. Nelken (Ed.), *The futures of criminology* (pp. 89-109). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Freud, Sigmund (1930). *Civilization and its discontents*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Freud, Sigmund (1950). *Totem and taboo*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company. (Original work published 1913)

Garland, D. & Sparks, R. (2000). Criminology, social theory and the challenge of our times. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 40, 189-204.

Gibbs, J. J.; Giever, D. & Pober, K.A. (2000). Criminology and *The Eye of the Spirit: An introduction and application of the thoughts of Ken Wilber*. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 16 (1), 99-127.



Gottfredson, D.M. (1989). Criminological theories: The truth as told by Mark Twain. In W. S. Laufer & F. Adler (Eds.), *Advances in Criminological Theory* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-16). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Graves, Clare, W. (1974, April). Human nature prepares for momentous leap. *The Futurist*, 72-87.

Jeffery, C. R. (1989). An interdisciplinary theory of criminal behavior. In W. S. Laufer & F. Adler (Eds.), *Advances in criminological theory*, (Vol. 1, pp. 69-87). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Jeffrey, C. R. (1993). Obstacles to the development of research in crime and delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30 (4), 491-497.

Kegan, Robert (1998). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life* (Rev. ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Loevinger, Jane (1987). *Paradigms of personality*. New York: Freeman.

Martin, R. (1993). Transpersonal psychology and criminological theory: Rethinking the paradigm. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 16, 11-30.

Martin, R. (2000). Anomie, spirituality, and crime. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 16 (1), 75-94.

McCord, J. (1989). Theory, pseudotheory, and metatheory. In W. S. Laufer & F. Adler (Eds.), *Advances in criminological theory*, (Vol. 1, pp. 127-145). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Messner, S. F.; Krohn, M. D. & Liska, A. E. (Eds.). (1989). *Theoretical integration in the study of deviance and crime: Problems and prospects*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Morrison, W. (1994). Criminology, modernity and the 'truth' of the human condition: Reflections on the melancholy of postmodernism. In D. Nelken (Ed.), *The futures of criminology* (pp. 134-153). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.



- Osgood, W. D. (1998). Interdisciplinary integrations: Building criminology by stealing from our friends. *Criminology*, 23 (4), 1-4.
- Pavarini, M. (1994). Is criminology worth saving? In D. Nelken (Ed.), *The futures of criminology* (pp. 43-62). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pelfry, W. V. (1984). *The evolution of criminology* (4th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Pepinsky, H. E. (1991). Peacemaking in criminology and criminal justice. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 299-327). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Pepinsky, H. E. & Quinney, R. (Eds.). (1991). *Criminology as peacemaking*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Platt, T. (1974). Prospects for a radical criminology in the United States. *Crime and Social Justice*, 1, 2-10.
- Quinney, R. (1991). The way of peace: On crime, suffering, and service. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 3-13). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Radzonowicz, L. (1994). Reflections on the state of criminology. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 34 (2), 99-104.
- Reiss, A. J., Jr. (1993). Whither the craft of criminology? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30 (4), 505-512.
- Skolimowski, H. (1986). Life, entropy, and education. *American Theosophist*, 74, 305-310.
- Wilber, Ken (1980). Eye to eye: Science and transpersonal psychology. In R. N. Walsh & F. Vaughan (Eds.), *Beyond ego transpersonal dimensions in psychology* (pp. 216-220). Los Angeles: Jeremy P. Tarcher.
- Wilber, Ken (1983). *Eye to eye: The quest for the new paradigm*. New York: Anchor/Doubleday.



- Wilber, Ken (1986). *Up from Eden: A transpersonal view of human evolution*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Wilber, Ken (1995). *Sex, ecology, spirituality: The spirit of evolution*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Wilber, Ken (1998). *The marriage of sense and soul: Integrating science and religion*. New York: Random House.
- Wilber, Ken (1999). *Integral psychology. The collected works of Ken Wilber (Vol. 4)*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Wilber, Ken (2000). *A theory of everything: An integral vision for business, politics, science, and spirituality*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Wilber, Ken (2001). On critics, Integral Institute, my recent writing, and other matters of little consequence: A Shambhala interview with Ken Wilber; Part II. Retrieved September 22, 2003, from http://wilber.shambhala.com/html/interviews/interview1220_2.cfm
- Wilber, Ken (2002). Announcing the formation of Integral Institute. Retrieved September 22, 2003, from http://wilber.shambhala.com/html/books/formation_int_inst.cfm/
- Williams, F. P., III. (1984). The demise of the criminological imagination: A critique of recent criminology. *Justice Quarterly*, 1 (1), 91-106.
- Williams, F. P., III. (1999). *Imagining criminology: An alternative paradigm. Current issues in criminal justice (Vol. 24)*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Yakovlev, A. (1990). Epistemological problems in criminology. In W. S. Laufer & F. Adler (Eds.), *Advances in criminological theory (Vol. 2, pp. 145-153)*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Zahn, M. A. (1999). Thoughts on the future of criminology: The American Society of Criminology, 1998 presidential address. *Criminology*, 37 (1), 1-15.



RANDY L. MARTIN, Ph.D., is Co-Director of the Integral Criminology Center at Integral Insitute. 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 application 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 an Integral model.