https://www.crimejusticejournal.com/ *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*
Volume 12 (4) 2023 https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.3223

Rosa del Olmo Prize
Introductory Essay

David Goyes
University of Oslo, Norway
Nigel South
University of Essex, United Kingdom
John Scott
Queensland University of Technology, Australia
Tracy Creagh
Queensland University of Technology, Australia

Abstract

Academic prizes have three problems: they feed an individualist ethos, perpetuate the idea of the 'marketplace of ideas' as a fair and even playing field, and build a stereotype of white, Western men as the ultimate knowledge creators. However, prizes can also challenge stereotypes and help democratise knowledge creation by enlarging the visibility of communitarian knowledge creation beyond Western scripts and outside hegemonic masculinities. The *International Journal for Crime, Justice, and Social Democracy*, committed to cognitive justice, knowledge democratisation, and encouraging voices on the periphery to partake in global academic debate, established the *Rosa del Olmo Prize*. Seeking to challenge criminological stereotypes about who can create knowledge that contributes to the development of criminology, the Journal honours Venezuelan criminologist Rosa del Olmo (1937-2000) through this award. Rosa symbolises critical, feminist, decolonial criminology working to advance social justice.

Keywords: Rosa del Olmo; decolonial criminology; social justice; Southern Criminology

Western Dominance in Criminology and its Prizes

'Let's abolish academic prizes', invites associate professor of history Michael J. Kramer (2020). 'They feed an individualist ethos in a time when the fantasy of the self-reliant individual, isolated from all community, support and connection, is doing more damage than good both within and beyond academia', writes Kramer. That higher education rewards individualism is unsurprising. Academia builds on a Western culture that 'calls for heroes to solve problems instead of seeking communal, structural transformations' (Goyes 2019: 106). Prizes not only further individualism but also reproduce a neoliberal logic that increasingly pervades academia (Lund, 2015). Academic awards are designed to encourage growth in knowledge generation and are deemed functional for economic growth (Borjas and Doran, 2015). But believing that prize winning relies on sole merits equates to falling into the assumption that the 'so-called free market competition (the cheesy "marketplace of ideas") doesn't rely most of the time on a crooked playing field of favouritism or bias' (Kramer 2020: para. 18). In this way awards may be political projects that can further the careers of individuals who are nominated, nominate, judge or vote. They may also support the groups or institutions in which they are grounded and the networks of power that perpetuate them. Awards do not challenge a hierarchised and competitive academia but tend to reinforce the prevalent neo-liberal ethos in western higher education institutions. Paradoxically, after receiving an award, winners' productivity declines (Borjas and Doran2015). Therefore, Kramer

(2020) invites us to stop privileging the few—through individualistic academic prizes— and instead cultivate the many, through actions that nourish inclusive, collective intellectual activity.

Criminology partakes in the individualist and neo-liberal logic from which academic prizes derive. As Sandberg and Ibarra (2021: 1) write, 'Criminology has long celebrated the lone hero researcher. Doing and writing up research in solitude has been the key to academic success and institutional promotions.' By selecting a 'crowned prince'—our use of gender is deliberate—academic prizes may send batches of scholars the message that they have not worked hard enough, their work is not good enough, or they are not good enough. Highlighting the merits of individual efforts risks losing the benefits of collective work: elevated creativity, productivity, well-being (Sword 2023), and social justice.

Academic prizes can be dangerous not only due to the individualistic ethos and the neoliberal logic that inform them—and that they perpetuate—but also because they are biased and skewed in different ways. The harms they create reproduce the unfair structures of society at large. Gender is the first dimension of inequality in academic awards. Krause and Gehmlich (2022) ask, 'Does the persistent lack of female recipients of academic awards have to surprise us if few scientific prizes and medals are named after women?' They analysed 300 major academic prizes and found that less than 10% of them are named after women. The few academic accolades that carry the name of female scholars were instituted after 2020. Unsurprisingly, women comprise less than 15% of prize recipients. The stereotypes academic prizes create through the names they carry and the scholars they honour, argue Krause and Gehmlich, lead committees to neglect the contributions of those who deviate from the image of 'the ideal' scholar.

A second dimension of bias in academic awards is nationality. The Stockholm Prize in Criminology—deemed by many as the most prestigious award in the discipline—professes recognising contributions that improve 'knowledge on causes of crime on an individual and structural level' (Stockholm University 2023). Thirty-three of its recipients are North American or European; the remaining two are Latin American. Similar trends exist in other prestigious prizes. The Radzinowicz Prize, bestowed by *The British Journal of Criminology* to the article that 'most contributes to knowledge of criminal justice issues and the development of criminology' (The British Journal of Criminology, n.d.), has chosen twenty-one winners since 2007. Fifteen are European scholars, three from Australia or New Zealand, two from Asia, and one from the US. One more example is the Joan Petersilia Prize, which the American Society of Criminology gives annually 'for the peer-reviewed article that makes the most outstanding contribution to research in criminology' (American Society of Criminology, n.d.). Of its 32 recipients, 31 are North Americans.

Our concern is not only with the nationality of the criminologists extolled by academic awards—although where we are socialised shapes how we see things. We worry about how praising almost exclusively scholars from the West creates a 'monoculture of the mind' (Shiva 1993) and reinforces Orientalism (Said 1978) and culturism (Harari 2011). When recipients are mainly chosen from the same pool of eligible candidates, the world forms an idea of who the ultimate knowledge producers are. The winners of the prizes mentioned above have all undoubtably made valuable contributions to criminology, but winners come from a handful of countries. This fuels the idea that valuable criminology comes from the minds of Western scholars only. As Aas (2012: 6, now Franko) wrote, 'the seemingly context-free nature of western social theory and its assumptions about the universality of its knowledge production', which gives continuity to existing asymmetries of knowledge, is reinforced by 'the immense production of books, journal articles and conferences'—and we may add, prizes—'dedicated to US [and European] realities.'

Celebrating Contributions Beyond Western Scripts

When academic prizes perpetuate all these harmful logics, why institute a new prize awarded to an individual article? Through a prize that inverts and challenges harmful ideologies within academia, we can defy at least three dogmas: that knowledge creation is a feat of isolated individuals, that the so-called marketplace of ideas is an even and fair field, and that Western scholars are the ultimate knowledge creators. Regarding individualism, the realisation must be that challenges on the path to *justice and social democracy*—to which this Journal endeavours to contribute—'have deep cultural and structural roots that only collective action can transform' (Goyes 2023a: 187). The Rosa del Olmo Prize, celebrating contributions that develop criminology beyond Western scripts, focuses on analyses that capture the structural roots of social injustices and how paths towards justice must be marked by collective action. To underscore the collaborative nature of knowledge production, recipients are invited to write 'reflective "acknowledgement" stories about those who made the research possible' as Kramer (2020) proposed. You will find below the acknowledgement story of the first Rosa del Olmo Prize recipient.

Second, the Rosa del Olmo Prize challenges an uneven playing field by establishing a committee composed of scholars from diverse genders and regions of the world who are aware of discrimination and bias in academia. They evaluate academic texts

not based on 'conformity' to Western standards but on contributions to diversity of thought and understanding, accompanied by high-quality reasoning and presentation.

The *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy* chose Rosa del Olmo as a symbol to challenge 'global' stereotypes about who the ultimate knowledge creators are. Many criminological awards use Western men (also a few Western women) as emblems for academic excellence. As described below, Rosa symbolises the epistemological potency of intellectuals beyond the West and their ability to contribute to criminological theory. Remembering the knowledge that exists but has been forgotten or erased is a way to decolonise academia, democratise knowledge, and forward cognitive justice. Rosa del Olmo challenged cognitive dependency in her work—and this award continues her endeavour. On various occasions, del Olmo denounced how the knowledge produced by some groups is ignored just for coming from non-European perspectives. She also condemned the outright exclusion of critical insights made by the Southern thinkers. With the Rosa del Olmo Prize, we challenge the idea of Western scholars as ultimate knowledge creators, enlarge the visibility of non-European perspectives, and set Southern scholars back on the table of global criminological dialogues.

The *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy* has been a venue to contest individualist, neoliberal, and discriminatory ideologies since 2012 and, therefore, is a suitable home for the Rosa del Olmo Prize. Knowledge is a commodity and knowledge production does not occur in a geo-political vacuum. Indeed, the influence of North Atlantic nations over knowledge production is even greater in higher education than that exerted in trading and financial economies (Marginson 2014). The Journal is committed to cognitive justice (de Sousa Santos 2014) and, as such, aspires to democratise knowledge, bridge global divides and encourage the voices of those on the periphery to publish with the Journal. It recognises that intellectual projects are intimately related to political and cultural struggles for recognition and social and economic justice. This includes scholars from diverse Indigenous and First Nations peoples communities, as well as scholars from the Global North and South committed to cognitive justice. As part of the Journal's commitment to the democratisation of knowledge, authors retain copyright and articles are licenced via Creative Commons to make published articles more readily available and useable. There are no APCs (Article Processing Charges). Authors can submit and publish at no cost. It is not enough to recognise that the social sciences are northerncentric, it is imperative we act to democratise knowledge production.

Rosa del Olmo a Pioneer of Latin American and Southern Criminology

As remembered by Mario Padilla, Professor Rosa del Olmo (1937-2000) was the 'daughter of Catalan exiles who finally settled in Venezuela',and became 'one of the most important exponents of Critical Criminology in Latin America'. She was undoubtedly a pioneer and a 'leading figure in the world of left-wing criminology [and] … critical criminology in Latin America, [a] feminist and inexhaustible social fighter and one of the most well-versed criminologists in the socio-political and economic analysis of drug trafficking' (Padilla: 2016).

del Olmo was contributing to the formation of a Latin American criminology from the 1970s onward, writing in Spanish and also translating texts from English to Spanish (see e.g., Riera 1979). For many in the English-speaking world, a first encounter with some of her work would have been the various papers she published in the journal *Crime and Social Justice* (as it was then called, now *Social Justice*). Notable from this period was her 1975 paper 'Limitations for the Prevention of Violence: The Latin American Reality and Its Criminological Theory', described by Shank and Dod (1987: iii) as a significant paper in the development of 'Latin American Critical Criminology.'

Around a decade later in a special issue of *Crime and Social Justice* dedicated to coverage of 'Latin American Perspectives on Crime and Social Justice', del Olmo published her pathbreaking (1987) article, 'Aerobiology and the war on drugs'. del Olmo's analysis presented a powerful critique of Reagan-era US drug policy which remains insightful and important, noting the range of criminal acts and humanitarian issues that arose but also referring to the threat of *ecocide* that was resulting from what she called *aerobiological warfare*—the use of toxic chemical pesticides and herbicides 'disseminated with the air as a vehicle' (1987: 32). In this classic paper, in the space of just a few lines, del Olmo drew attention to key concepts that would come to underpin a Green Criminology, as well as elements of Southern Criminology such as use of the testimonials of Indigenous leaders, in this case describing the effects of use of drug war herbicides in the Sabana Culebra region of Santa Marta, in northern Colombia:

> My brothers are dying there and what the doctors are doing, … is not sufficient because this is an unknown and deadly epidemic. We believe that it is a poisoning produced by spraying with glyphosate because the symptoms are vomiting of blood, intense headaches, and shivering all over the body until death. (*El Tiempo* 1986)

Some of del Olmo's other wide-ranging contributions are noted in Goyes and South (2017: 176) she also published two book length critiques of drug policy and controls (del Olmo 1990, 1992).

Like many disciplines, criminology frequently suffers from a form of intellectual amnesia, forgetting or overlooking past contributors and insights (Goyes and South 2017; Young 1979). This is certainly a shame and in some cases it is shameful. Revisiting del Olmo's work (South 2023) reminds us that we should always try to ensure that we acknowledge earlier pioneers—particularly if they have not been a part of the usual transatlantic literature reviews. Hence, for all the 'newness' of a 'southern criminology' (Carrington, Hogg and Sozzo 2016) we really should remember how much significant work had already been done setting out a southern critical perspective. In the following section we draw upon an in-depth interview with del Olmo, published just over 30 years ago, carried out by Maeve McMahon and Gordon West (1992), which reveals much about the influences that shaped del Olmo's work and about the state of Latin American criminology then—and even 30 years later—to some extent, still today.

Image: Rosa del Olmo 1992 (Mexico)
Source: Lina Torres Rivera, sociologist and criminologist, Professor at the University of the Sacred Heart, Puerto Rico (used with permission)

Background

Latin American criminology has traditionally been strongly tied to the teaching of Penal Law and del Olmo's early divergence from this tradition must owe something to her original training which was as a sociologist at the University of Wisconsin, where she met Marshall Clinard. This proved a useful encounter as Clinard was later able to provide her with a reference when she was offered a place at the University of Cambridge on the first graduate diploma course in criminology led by Sir Leon Radzinowicz in the early 1960s. This was something of a step into the unknown as del Olmo says, 'I must confess … that, at the time, I did not know what criminology was about; my studies had been related to anthropology and sociology, but it was an opportunity to go to England' (p. 97). At Cambridge she was also taught by Donald Cressey who described the work of his former teacher, Edwin Sutherland, on *White Collar Crime*, and in the mid-1960s she also met Nils Christie at a conference in Montreal. Both encounters were to be influential.

Returning to Caracas, she worked at the Directorate of Prisons at the Ministry of Justice and also taught a course on 'Social Disorganization' at the School of Sociology in Caracas Universidad Central, drawing on her course at Cambridge, but, 'As time went by, criminology itself did not make much sense to me until I was able to connect the crime problem with social and economic critical theory.' (p. 97). At the time, Latin American criminology was still dominated by European positivist thought, but ideas from Liberation Theology and Liberation Pedagogy had started to influence the minds of a nascent Latin American Liberation Criminology group (Goyes, 2023b). Subsequent influences included Marxism and the Cuban Revolution but also a critical economic analysis of the activities of transnational companies in Latin America, leading her to embark on the first Spanish language translation of Sutherland's *White Collar Crime*. By this time, it is clear that del Olmo could see the potential for a radicalisation of the kind of criminology that had been dominant in Latin America and, as far as she was aware, in the UK and US as well. In the early 1970s she joined the wave of 'new' criminological thinking and critique that was underway, meeting key figures in the US such as Richard Quinney and members of the Berkeley School, making connections with the National Deviancy Conference in the UK, and attending the inaugural meeting of the European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control in Florence in 1973. Del Olmo sought to publicise these new developments within Latin American criminology but, importantly:

> only to inform, and never to copy, European criminological thinking. … I was already assuming the position I maintained through the years regarding the dangers of what I called at the time ideological dependency: stressing … the need to begin the historical reconstruction of criminology in Latin America. (p. 98)

When del Olmo again met Nils Christie at a later meeting of the European Group he encouraged her along these same lines—rather than write her PhD on criminology theory in general she should do what no other scholar had yet done and write on 'The Historical Development of Criminology in Latin America' which became her book *América Latina y su Criminologia* (Latin-America and its Criminology) published in 1981. In a different era, working across various countries and without specialist libraries to work with, the methodology for this project had to be innovative and this is described in her Introduction to the book, 'A History of This History'. Here del Olmo developed the position that copying European criminology would be an example of a form of 'cultural dependency that complemented our economic dependency on industrialised nations.' (p. 100) and also explored how the field of criminology had contributed to the 'internationalisation of social control' and how, as in Argentina, it had become 'very useful to legitimate social control through "science." '

As a reflection on her work at the time, del Olmo suggested that:

> While I was reconstructing the history of criminology in Latin America, I discovered that, from its origins, it was a highly political discipline with social control as its ultimate goal. Often it developed into a discourse to legitimise differences between Whites, Blacks and Indians and thus, was very convenient to classify people and to justify racial discrimination.' (p. 101)

Importantly for her longer legacy and relevant to the prize in her name, she also observed evidence of the coloniality of knowledge whereby 'works written by Latin American specialists … were ignored because they inquired about their own reality with a non-European perspective' (p. 101).

At the level of politics and policy, del Olmo argued that the 'Latin American ruling classes mixed European "juridical science" with North American "techniques of treatment." The end product is that, even today, crime and punishment are defined in the tradition of European Penal Law' (p. 101). While larger networks of critical criminologists have developed in Latin America, the criminology developed by some penal lawyers and psychologists still largely supports foreign and elite social control (Goyes and Sozzo 2023). To address this colonial importation and imposition, del Olmo argued, what was needed was the development of a Latin American Indigenous methodology and also the incorporation of analysis of violations of human rights.

That del Olmo was a pioneering criminologist is obvious but she was also an imaginative and innovative one, anticipating green criminological concerns and use of concepts like ecocide (South 2023: 267) but open to ideas later underpinning cultural criminology, looking at analysis of news sources, and also drawing attention to the insights offered by other intellectual and cultural forms such as literature, as a counter to the attempted scientific detachment of so much criminology. Thus, she suggested that:

> our literary authors were able to grasp our social world better than many social scientists who were often too concerned with testing the "scientific hypotheses" suggested by foreign specialists who did not understand our complex societies. … I always said to my students that we need to study some of those works. (p.103)

In all of this, del Olmo was laying foundations for what has become a 'Southern Criminology'. Her advocacy for a Latin American criminology led her to confront the epistemological inequalities that have become familiar in debates today but that she recognised in the 1980s (p. 103), noting how the required language of conference proceedings was English with no translation, and how scholars from Latin America might be denied the opportunity to present papers and be excluded from published proceedings. Evidence of this is chronicled in a devastating but overlooked account of the experiences of del Olmo and Argenis Riera Encinoza (also a Venezuelan criminologist) when they tried to present a paper at the Sixth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and the Treatment of Offenders. The paper itself was eventually published in 1981 in a special issue of *Crime and Social Justice* on 'Law and order in the 1980's: The rise of the Right', but only after this dismaying series of events which the Editors (1981) recount, based on a cover letter that accompanied the article:

> Encinoza explains that when an advance copy of their paper was sent to the United Nations in New York, they received a telephone call to delete their criticisms of Gerhard Mueller's views on crime and its control. When Encinoza and del Olmo refused to change the contents of their paper, Pedro David went to Caracas to persuade them to reconsider. Again, Encinoza and del Olmo refused. Encinoza writes that they were punished for their noncompliance. Their session was not printed in the schedule of meetings; the paper was not translated or reproduced for the Congress; and according to Encinoza, Sergio Garcia Ramirez (of Mexico), a representative of Pedro David, was assigned as chair with instructions to forestall any open discussion on the prospects for an alternative criminology in Latin American countries.

In the interview with del Olmo, the declarations of the Latin American pioneer express a sense of despair about such treatment but also about the slow pace of change within Latin American institutions and criminology. This is particularly notable when

she describes the relative lack of impact of feminism on criminology or society in Latin America in the 1980s: 'I don't know of any criminologist in Latin America who knows what feminist thinking in criminology is. Those who consider themselves critical criminologists don't take gender issues into account' (p. 106). The real assertion of rights by ordinary women—human rights not solely women's rights—and their acquisition of political consciousness arose from groups of mothers seeking 'the disappeared' from the 1960s onward in Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Argentina. In her work based on a visit to Nicaragua, del Olmo also described the central role mothers played in rehabilitation schemes aimed at young people who had been trained as soldiers, some from the age of 12, and 'had been victims of a regime which had no qualms about giving them military training and psychologically conditioning them to implement a brutal system of justice' (del Olmo 1982: 103).

However, it is del Olmo's analysis of the significance of 'drugs in Latin America' as both a symbol and form of economy that is a substantial part of her legacy and remains acute. Drugs, she argued in the interview, had 'become the new excuse for the control of minority populations' (p. 108) and a 'political issue' that had encouraged 'transnational police control', providing 'an excuse to militarise the entire continent'. However, as in later work (1998), del Olmo always highlighted the realities related to drugs, observing in the McMahon and West interview that:

> there seems to be a close resemblance between today's cocaine industry and the beginning of the Industrial Revolution: children and women do the worst jobs and are the most exploited. For example, they are used as pisacocas—the hardest job in the cocaine industry. Coca leaves have to be trampled, as grapes are to make wine, but once the leaves are dried they are mixed with various chemicals which, besides producing wounds in their feet and legs, affect the general health of the children and women workers. (p. 108)

Del Olmo's analysis of the growth of the cocaine 'industry' is worth revisiting: 'We are talking about a transnational industry with similar practices, in my opinion, to any other transnational corporation, except for the fact that the commodities are illegal' (p. 111).

She was astute and farsighted in her views about the then growing attention being paid to drugs operations in Medellin and Miami arguing that, 'the whole picture is much more complicated' than many assumed and that 'for reasons that should be explored, the mass media have played an important role in creating a monster image, distorting how the industry really functions and obscuring who profits the most from it' (p. 110-111). This is a point that is today echoed in the recent work of Franko and Goyes (2023). We should see such work as part of del Olmo's legacy—as much as the work she helped to initiate on ' "social harms" such as ecological harm, food fraud, dumping of pharmaceuticals, violations of industrial security mechanisms, and administrative corruption' (p. 112).

For those unfamiliar with the wide range of del Olmo's work, obviously many items are available in Spanish and English via libraries, but some readings of her works can also be accessed with auto-translated English subtitles at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AJIyoIJxHHQ and in 2017 the European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control reprinted her early major article 'Limitations for the Prevention of Violence: The Latin American Reality and its Criminological Theory' in *Justice, Power and Resistance* 1, 1 pp. 80-97 (originally published in *Crime and Social Justice*, 3, Summer, 1975, pp. 21-29).

The Rosa del Olmo Prize

In early 2023 the *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy* editorial team established the Rosa del Olmo Prize to be awarded biennially for the article(s) that, in the editors' opinion and based on the recommendations of a panel of experts, most contributes to innovative thinking in the development of criminology beyond Western scripts. A short list of eligible articles was compiled to include full articles published between July 2021 and July 2023 that best exemplified a review of criminology outside of traditional Global North perspectives (a total of 84 articles). Editors and international editorial board members past and present were excluded from consideration and there was a focus on early career researchers. Judges were selected from the current editorial board and editorial team by Co-Chief Editor Dr David Goyes. The Journal thanks the judges for their perspectives in this valuable initiative:

Dr Moses Ma'alo Faleolo, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
Professor Marília de Nardin Budó, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Brazil
Emeritus Professor Nigel South, University of Essex, United Kingdom

All members of the judging panel were invited to nominate three eligible papers in order of merit and score each out of ten—all three judges scored the winning paper 10/10 and included thoughtful and considered feedback.

The *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy* celebrates the inaugural winner of the Rosa Del Olmo Prize:

Marya Al-Hindi, author of

Criminalising Palestinians: History and Borders in the Construction of the Palestinian Threat

12(2): 36-46. https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.2888.

Judges' comments:

Marília Denardin Budó: The paper brings an outstanding approach to the debate on bordering from the perspective of colonialism in the case of Israel and Palestina. The main argument of this theoretical research is that the border-making process, concretised with the 'security wall' contributes to the deepening of the image of the Arab as threat. The spatial segregation appears as an important symbol to legitimise more and more control and criminalisation to face the 'menacing Arab'. The work is very interesting, as it does not look only to the numbers of criminalisation or control, but to the way in which these can be legitimised by the social construction of risk through colonial tools. Given the political relevance of the topic in the current context, it is very important to highlight the results of this research.

Moses Ma'alo Faleolo: A very powerful and moving exposition and narrative. A critical analysis is apparent, which this is an important aspect of any article especially when it is equitably balanced and proportionally represents both sides of the story, Israel and Arab. The subtitles and various parts tend to present Western, Europe and Israeli treatment of Arabs derogatively, as bullies who pursue a colonialisation agenda to civilise non-whites and convert them into westerners. In a way, the latter ratonalises the reason why colonialists acted the way they did toward Arabs, because they saw their western culture as beneficial to the Arab culture. It is the critical analysis that sets apart articles from each other, underpinning provocative discussion points, and represents the voices of those who are perhaps hidden and invisible or informs those to correct their preconceived ideas or highlight the way humanity treats each other hegemonically, chauvinistically, and insensitively.

Nigel South: Perhaps the more topical of the pieces given the current constitutional developments in Israel and continuing conflict. I think this was also the easiest to read which is not a comment about simplification but about accessibility which is important for an international journal serving many for whom English is not the first language—and, of course, Rosa was a very clear writer.

Marya Al-Hindi

Marya Al-Hindi is a third year PhD candidate at the University of Edinburgh. Her research has revolved around the intersection of race and criminal justice, with special focus on the Middle East.

Criminalising Palestinians: History and Borders in the Construction of the Palestinian Threat was published in Volume 12, Issue 2 in June 2023. It was part of a special issue *Southern Perspectives on Border Criminology*, guest editors Rimple Mehta (Western Sydney University, Australia) and Ana Aliverti (University of Warwick, UK). This special issue explored the "limits of existing theories for understanding migration governance from a Southern perspective and what the potential for rethinking border controls and their study, such as alternative epistemological and methodological approaches, might engender" (p. i).

Mehta and Aliverti (2023) summarised Al-Hindi's article as follows:

> Marya Al-Hindi examines Israel's nation-state formation as a settler colonial domain, tracing continuities in the exclusion of racialised others in its constitution and contemporary reproduction. Defining Israel in contrast to the Arab 'terrorists', waiting to attack, necessitates a grand, looming settler colonial border and the sequestration of an entire population behind a man-made prison. The justification for this form of border 'control' is made possible by the historic truths established by the West in the colonial era through the characterisation of Arabs as a 'bestial', 'bellicose' group that thrives in conflict situations. The consequence of this characterisation is the global, all-encompassing understanding of the Arab threat. The Israeli 'defence' of its borders is re-imagined from a Southern perspective as an oppressive system of segregation justified by the ways in which Arabs have historically been constructed

Marya explains what has inspired her research to-date:

The stories that my grandparents would tell me about their forcible displacement from Palestine in 1948 was my motivation to study the criminalisation of Arabs. The marginalization of Palestinians in the Occupied Territories and their displacement from it, came with an erasure of Palestinian history and culture. For my grandparents, physical displacement, came with the need to share their stories that account for the destruction and loss of home and identity. In my case, it was clear that there was a gap in scholarly examinations on Israel's discriminate land appropriation policies.

My work in the Anti-Racism Movement in Beirut pointed to the structural aspects of managing unwanted populations and introduced me to scholars such as Biko Agozino, Frantz Fanon and Edward Said, as well as to the critical field of Border Criminology. This field allowed me a platform for more nuanced understandings of the consequences of Israel's settler colonial policies and the criminalisation of Palestinians in the modern Israeli context. My family's consistent support and belief in the pursuit of knowledge also inspired me to pursue a Ph.D.

(Marya Al-Hindi, November 23, 2023)

References

Aas KF (2012) 'The Earth is one but the world is not': Criminological theory and its geopolitical divisions. *Theoretical Criminology* 16(1): 5-20. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480611433433.

American Society of Criminology (n.d.) Joan Petersilia Outstanding Article Award Recipients. https://asc41.org/about-asc/awards/joan-petersilia-outstanding-article-award-recipients/.

Borjas GJ and Doran KB (2015) Prizes and productivity: How winning the fields medal affects scientific output. *The Journal of Human Resources* 50(3): 728-758.

Carrington K, Hogg R and Sozzo M (2016) Southern criminology. *British Journal of Criminology* 56(1): 1–20. http://doi.org10.1093/bjc/azv083.

del Olmo R (1975) Limitations for the prevention of violence: The Latin American reality and its criminological theory. *Crime and Social Justice* 3: 21–29.

del Olmo R (1981) *América Latina y su Criminologia.*

del Olmo R (1982) Remaking justice and rehabilitation in revolutionary Nicaragua. *Crime and Social Justice* 18: 99-104.

del Olmo R (1987) Aerobiology and the war on drugs: A transnational crime. *Crime and Social Justice* 30: 28-44.

del Olmo R (1990) *The hidden face of drugs*. Temis, Bogota

del Olmo R (1992) *Prohibit or domesticate? The politics of drugs in Latin America.* Editorial Nueva Sociedad.

del Olmo R (1998) The ecological impact of illicit drug cultivation and crop eradication programs in Latin America. *Theoretical Criminology* 2(2): 269-278. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480698002002007

de Sousa Santos B (2014) *Epistemologies of the south: Justice against epistemicide.* Routledge.

El Tiempo (1986, June 29) Indigenas insisten que el glifosato ha causado varias muertes [Indigenous people insist that glyphosate has caused several deaths].

Franko K and Goyes DR (2023). *Victimhood, memory, and consumerism: Profiting from Pablo*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goyes DR (2019) *Southern green criminology. A science to end ecological discrimination*. Bingley: Emerald.

Goyes DR (2023a) Open your eyes: Confronting Indigenous genocide with pedagogy. In V. Canning, G. Martin, & S. Tombs (Eds), *The Emerald international handbook of activist criminology* (pp. 187-197). Leeds: Emerald.

Goyes DR (2023b). Latin American green criminology. *Justice, Power and Resistance* 6(1): 90-107. https://doi.org/10.1332/CDQK2391.

Goyes DR and South N (2017) Green criminology before 'Green Criminology': Amnesia and absences. *Critical Criminology* 25(2): 165-181. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-017-9357-8.

Goyes DR and Sozzo M (2023) Latin American criminologies: Origins, trajectories and pathways. *Justice, Power and Resistance* 6(1): 2-18. https://doi.org/10.1332/VJBP5734.

Harari YN (2011) *Sapiens. A brief history of humankind*. London: Penguin.

Kramer MJ (2020, January 1). Let's abolish academic prizes. *Inside Higher Ed*. https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2020/01/02/how-prizes-do-more-harm-good-academe-opinion.

Krause S and Gehmlich K (2022) Does the persistent lack of female recipients of academic awards have to surprise us if few scientific prizes and medals are named after women? EGU General Assembly 2022, EGU22-2562 https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-egu22-2562.

Lund RWB (2015) *Doing the ideal academic. Gender, excellence and changing academic.* (PhD). Aalto University, Helsinki.

Marginson S (2014) The West's global HE hegemony – Nothing lasts forever. *University World News*, March 28. https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20140326123556985.

McMahon M and West G (1992) Interview with Rosa del Olmo. Universidad Central de Venezuela, Caracas *The Journal of Human Justice* 4(1): 97-116. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02619285.

Mehta R and Aliverti A (2023) Southern perspectives on border criminology. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy* 12(2). i-v. https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.2886.

Padilla MOV (2006).Rosa del Olmo Pérez-Enciso (1937-2000). Pionera de la Criminología Crítica Latinoamericana [Rosa del Olmo Pérez-Enciso (1937-2000). Pioneer of Latin American Critical Criminology. https://m.facebook.com/crimiparateorimaroctvazpa/posts/465368000237381.

Riera A (1979) Latin American radical criminology. *Crime and Social Justice* 11: 71-76

Riera Encinoza A and del Olmo R (1981) The view from Latin America against transnational criminology: A call for democratic international cooperation. *Crime and Social Justice*, 15: 62-67.

Said E (1978) *Orientalism.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Sandberg S and Ibarra Rojas L (2021) A farewell to the lone hero researcher: Team research and writing. *Crime, Law and Social Change*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-021-10006-x.

Shank G and Dod S (1987) Editorials: Overview of the issue. *Crime & Social Justice* 30: i–xxi.

Shiva V (1993) *Monocultures of the mind*. London: Zed Books.

South N (2023) Revisiting Rosa: Eco-bio-genocide, drug wars and southern green criminology. In D. R. Goyes (Ed.), *Green Crime in the Global South. Essays on Southern Green Criminology* (pp. 240-259). Palgrave.

Stockholm University (2023) The Stockholm Prize in Criminology. https://www.su.se/department-of-criminology/about-the-department/about-us/the-stockholm-prize-in-criminology-1.647343?open-collapse-boxes=ccbd-allprizewinners.

Sword H (2023) *Writing with pleasure*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

The British Journal of Criminology. (n.d.). Prize winning articles from The British Journal of Criminology. https://academic.oup.com/bjc/pages/prize_winning_articles#1.

Young J (1979) Left idealism, reformism and beyond: From new criminology to Marxism. In Fine, B, Kinsey, R, Lea, J, Picciotto, S and Young, J (Eds) *Capitalism and the Rule of Law*. London: Hutchinson.