

Chris Eskridge
Professor of Criminology,
University of Nebraska

Thoughts on the Historic Rift Between Science and Policy (And How to Overcome It)

KEYWORDS: Criminology, Crime Theories, Public Criminologists,
Communication, Public Sentiment, Socio-Political Context,
Interdisciplinary Studies

Introduction

Political officials of every ilk all depend upon and gravitate to political truths for survival. Scientific truths might be absorbed, but only if they are in line with contemporary political winds, and those positions will quickly be abandoned when those winds change. In a somewhat simplistic sense, there are political or public truths, and there are scientific truths. There is some measure of overlap, of course, but political “leaders,” by their very nature, must cling more to the former to stay in office, to maintain their positions of influence and power in the public domain. Some have suggested that politicians operate in information-free zones. I reject that perspective utterly and completely. Political officials (at least the successful ones) are keenly attuned to and actively seek out “information,” but it is political information that they seek, the public/political truths. They continually measure the political winds like a sailor on the high seas. They are on constant lookout for the politically palatable, for the breeze that will transport them to the political promised land.

In contrast, academics generally operate in the inverse, focusing on scientific truths, not politics. However, by ignoring public sentiment, science is often overlooked and left to gather dust, making its impacts moot. Rather than criticize political leaders for focusing on politics instead of analysis and then retreating into our journals and societies, we must recognize that this focus is the nature of their jobs. We need to adjust to this reality to have a pragmatic impact and acknowledge that politicians only listen to the political. In this context, I suggest that our role as criminologists is not only to uncover empirical truths and expand knowledge—as scientific criminologists—but also to become public criminologists. We need to engage in activities that increase the implementation of our work. Otherwise, we will simply enjoy each other's "music" in our secure offices and at our provincial meetings, yielding negligible public impact. Our research must have an applicability component, or it holds little value beyond being read by a select few. We need to don a public criminology hat. Since political criminology often supersedes scientific criminology, we must wear a big hat—in other words, become effective public criminologists. Again, we need to engage in activities that increase public policy implementation of our work.

Public Sector Challenges

How do we become effective public criminologists? How do we move our findings into the mainstream, into the communal marketplace of ideas? Before addressing that topic, we must first identify the landmines. We need to pause and measure the interrelated challenges before drafting strategies.

1. Confirmation Bias – Nearly all of us, scientists as well as politicians, have a strong tendency (particularly as we age) to look for and grasp only that evidence which confirms what we already believe, and to ignore all else. This confirmation bias, I posit, is ubiquitous. It is deep within our genes. I echo the sentiments of Mark Twain, who recognized that individuals occasionally do stumble across the truth, but if not to their liking, will generally pick themselves up and keep going. Leo Tolstoy made the same observation in *War and Peace* (1867):

“Kutuzov knew how readily men are when they desire anything, to manipulate all evidence so as to confirm what they desire, and he knew how readily in that case they let everything of an opposite significance pass unheeded.”

Lippmann (1922) stated the same – “*we do not first see and then define, but we define first and then see.*” If facts don’t match our vision, our beliefs, then they are discarded, and discarded easily. We readily (enthusiastically, cheerfully) grasp that which confirms our beliefs, and we ignore all else, and, all too often, seek to discredit the messengers of those inconvenient and unsettling truths. We all too often mock those who see differently.

When facts conflict with core beliefs, those facts tend to be ignored. Belief brims with confidence, while facts disrupt and force pause and reflection. Those in positions of power typically abound with confidence and have little time (or need in their view) for thought and consideration. As a rule, they “double down” when confronted with troublesome truths, they harden their positions rather than

succumb to reason, and thus become deaf to the new via a purposefully engineered ignorance.

2. Science is proverbially ahead of custom and culture - There is a science-to-culture time lag, a time fissure if you would (ie, the Catholic Church refused to accept the heliocentric nature of the solar system for nearly 200 years after Copernicus and Galileo had empirically documented it). Custom and culture often literally hold science hostage. Science does impact culture and custom, but it has historically been in a time-lagged context. Max Planck (1949) noted nearly a century ago that the implementation of new truths must invariably await the passing of the older generation, or in other words, science advances one death at a time.

“A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it.”

Kuhn (1962) made much the same argument specifically with respect to science. A scientific paradigm topples, he noted, only when the last of its powerful adherents die. Yes, the time fissure exists even in the “enlightened” scientific community. Why would we expect anything different in the political world? It is no wonder, then, that social scientists’ greatest impact on public policy to date has been realized by teaching the youth. Those youth, in time, take the place of the old as the new rulers and regents and subsequently impact policy, drawing upon that which they learned years ago. That cycle continues ad infinitum. In other words, truth is not victorious per se; its opponents simply die. In this

paradigm, scientists' impact on public policy is an embryonic, bottom-up, time-lagged phenomenon. Indeed, shifts in social policy have historically been realized only in human geologic time, in large part because of this science-to-culture time fissure. My position is that we need to engage in activities that speed this up, that will yield a greater public policy implementation coefficient for our work, now.

3. Deep-Seated Communal Norms – Communal norms are extremely powerful and deep-seated. Science has been historically constrained due to the tap-rooted social, political, religious, and economic factors because scientists have generally ignored and/or failed to adequately account for them. When facts come in conflict with the core beliefs/the norms of the masses/the norms of the powerful, the former are generally ignored. That aggregate confirmation bias has plagued science since the dawn of the Renaissance, when the new began to challenge and disrupt the traditional. New knowledge is indeed disruptive for those entrapped in custom and tradition – yesterday, today, and tomorrow. I again turn to Max Planck - no matter how much you inform, despite the clear and articulate presentation of indisputable facts and figures, of carefully enunciated principles of reason and reason, little if any direct progress can be made if the message strays from the norm. I have long been intrigued by the story of Dr Joseph Goldberger. This Jewish immigrant from the North was sent into the Southern states in 1914 by the U.S. Surgeon General to attack the disease, pellagra. His discovery of the cause and cure for this disease proved socially and politically unacceptable, in large part because the South at the time, in the midst of

the Ku Klux Klan revival, did not appreciate anything coming from a Jewish immigrant from the North – that’s three strikes against him. He had the truth, but no one in that environment wanted to hear it. They were not just ignorant, but purposefully ignorant, replete with confirmation bias.

While scientific discovery rarely leads to directly established policy, in the historical aggregate, there is no question that science has had influence, great influence. In reflection, however, it may be that it is not science per se that drives public policy, but more a matter of cumulative social movements. Rennie (1978) makes that exact argument with respect to criminology:

It may be that the history of criminology reflects more about the changing values of the larger society than it does about the changing scientific knowledge of crime.

Interestingly, the crime theories that have been developed over the years have tended to mirror the socio-political thinking of the times. Demonological theory was in fashion when the church was in power. Social Contract theory was in vogue as Western Civilization sought to break away from the church. Classical theory emerged when Kings sought more power. Positivist theory emerged as the middle classes evolved and sought more humane treatment from their kings, their governments. Social Disorganization theory emerged as social reformers sought to improve communities. Radical theory emerged as the U.S. began to critically examine itself in the 1960s, at the end of the age of American naiveté. As the perspectives of the body politic changes, attitudes and ultimately official justice system responses toward crime

change with them, and that change is generally based on and is driven by political mood rather than hard scientific knowledge, which of course is in line with the Planck thesis, per above.

4. The Zeitgeist – There is always a timing issue in the mix, the zeitgeist (Nadare, 2020), which suggests the need to be alert as to when the best time would be to bring new knowledge into the marketplace of ideas. Abraham Lincoln articulated this point in the midst of the American Civil War. “Events are in the saddle,” he wrote, “and they ride mankind.” That is the theme of *War of Peace* (though it took Tolstoy 900 pages to say it vs. Lincoln’s 9 words). There are substantial socio-political forces at work in any present tense, and if we fail to account for them and adjust accordingly, we will be ridden off into the sunset by those forces/those events, and our valid, evidence-based message will be completely lost, completely ignored. The road to reform is strewn with the bones of would-be reformers who failed to learn this one fundamental lesson – it’s the timing. I again offer the case of Joseph Goldberger per above. He “stumbled across the truth,” but the timing (among other factors) was not right to bring that truth forward within the environment where he was working.
5. Poor Public Sector Communicators – Scientists are generally poor public sector communicators. We use scientific language, assume a baseline of knowledge, and appeal to people’s heads, not their hearts. We think of ourselves as the guardians of truth, and once we have spewed out those empirically-driven facts, the burden is on our audience to understand us and agree (Begley, 2010). Our training is to provide information, detailed

esoteric information, for a small group of information-driven, like-minded colleagues at our professional meetings and in our journals, and a slightly larger group of students in our classrooms. We place the burden on them to grasp and absorb. If students fail our course, for example, if readers don't understand our articles, so be it. If they don't grasp and absorb, it's their problem that they failed. In public criminology, however, the burden is on us to communicate effectively, or we fail.

As an apologist for my fellow scientists, we advance in our field utilizing scientific communication skills, not public communication skills. When moving into the public criminologist mode, we must do things differently; we must adopt a mass communication orientation. We must touch the body-politic, and we must forsake our professorial fetish with minutiae, droned out in data-stuffed power point presentations. Eschew the details, and focus on moving the crowd emotionally, the entire crowd. Unlike the classroom, if 1/3 of our audience is unmoved as we speak with public criminologist hats on our heads, WE have failed. In contrast to the case of Joseph Goldberger noted above, consider the case of James Brussel, the father of criminal profiling (Cannell, 2017). Even though he obtained a significant degree of public acclaim and recognition in the 1950s case of the Mad Bomber of New York, the general idea of criminal profiling still had to be sold, to the public and the police, and that science had to be sold by a public-sector oriented performer. Brussel knew how to perform, how to reach the crowd, how to sell. He obviously had a handle on the science, but more importantly, he had a showman's touch, and that showman's touch subsequently helped the

science of criminal profiling infiltrate the mainstream. In mass communication, it's about how we make the audience feel, using some milieu of what we say, how we say it, and who says it, which of course changes from audience to audience and from time to time. That requires orientations and skills that differ significantly from our science communication norms. Consider the thoughts of Sharot (2017) on this matter:

In mass communication, it is not what we say or even so much how we say it, but it is how we make the audience feel. Cold, hard facts don't drive change, emotion does, for emotion regularly overcomes reason when it comes to decision-making.

In this same context, we must come to grips with the reciprocal relationship in the public sector between discourse and comprehension – the longer it takes to explain, the less likely it will be understood. This is a hard lesson for the proverbial long-winded professor (such as myself). We could learn much in this mass communication genre from Martin Luther King, Winston Churchill, Franklin Roosevelt, Ronald Reagan, and, dare I say it, yes, Adolph Hitler as well.

6. No Need for Public Communication – There is no pressing direct need for scientists to communicate with the public. Tenure, promotions and professional awards come from publishing in esoteric journals read by a handful of specialists in the (at times quite smug) community of true believers. Consider the thoughts of Jared Diamond (1997) on this matter, paraphrased from a 2012 interview he gave (Carr, 2012):

Every day, we can read of a scientist complaining that the public doesn't understand science. But what it comes down to is that most scientists don't want to do the things that would help the public understand. My professional training was on sodium transport in the gall bladder, and I wrote precise papers about sodium transport in the gall bladder that were read by the world's five other experts on sodium transport in the gall bladder. What we need to do is prepare material that is accessible and entertaining to the general public if we ever want them to understand sodium transport in the gall bladder or any other issue, and to subsequently get the kind of general understanding and support we need.

7. Asymmetric Nature of Science – Science is inevitably asymmetric at the edges, and that uncertainty, which is so inherent to discovery, is hard to sell in the public domain. The new often defies contemporary norms and can only be understood by other esoteric scientists in detailed dissertations. Political truths, on the other hand, mandate simple 21-word sound bites, made for Twitter or Facebook. As emphasized above, scientists are simply not prepared for the latter. We generally lack both the skill and the mindset to communicate outside of our own flock. Advancements in science dictate/mandate that we hone in our scientific communication skills, not our political communication skills, and therein lies the rub – since new knowledge is at the asymmetric edges, it is largely incomprehensible to the scientifically illiterate mass media, and is thus burdened with a hefty incommunicable coefficient.

8. Ever-Changing Nature of Scientific Fact – Taking point #7 further, new scientific facts, those that live on the asymmetric edges, are constantly challenged not just by the body politic but even by scientists as new methods, new procedures, new data, and new instruments come to the forefront and grow the knowledge base. Imagine practicing medicine today with the instruments and knowledge base of 1950. Astronomy, physics, engineering, biology, chemistry, rocket science, and space travel – even Harvard University professors’ lecture notes from 1950 are quintessentially antiquated. It is not a sin to shed the old and embrace new knowledge, to change your mind in science. It generally is in the public sector, and that is a landmine when trying to turn science into policy and practice.
9. Lack of Empirical Evidence - Science, and particularly the social sciences, lacks hard evidence at times. The fact that scientific criminology, in particular, has had little hard evidence to contribute over the years has allowed the political component to seep in and amass a more prominent role. As Stephen Jay Gould (1980) noted, *“some topics are invested with enormous social importance but blessed with very little reliable information.”* Criminology clearly falls into that category.

Impacting the Public Arena

With those as our challenges, how do we now respond? What needs to be done to enhance the present-tense impact of science in the policy arena? What do we need to do to become more effective public criminologists? Of course, we need to continue

to teach the young (as per the Planck paradigm), for our students will indeed become the rulers and regents in time and then affect change based on the truths absorbed by their malleable young minds a generation earlier. But what do we need to become more effective public criminologists now? How do we impact the scientifically deaf now, and particularly the purposefully deaf? Baker (1905) once wrote of the good citizens of Springfield, Ohio, that they sat on the sidelines during a public lynching a century ago, with their hands in their pockets and no convictions in their souls. We cannot do that, we cannot just sit on the sidelines as social and political lynching's take place now, but we also cannot just sit there and merely yell. We will be drowned in the onslaught, in the fervor of the moment. We need to move strategically, with understanding, with skill, and with resources focused on the task at hand.

I posit that changing public views is literally akin to rupturing a covalent bond. It rarely happens, but when it does, it requires strategic understanding and planning, prodigious skill, and a great amount of carefully directed energy and focused resources. Again, we cannot simply sit in the stands and yell out "Kill the Umpire" when we are mad and want change. It might make us feel good, but it is of no pragmatic value. The runner is still safe, it's still strike three, and the game goes on. We need to be strategic in our understanding and planning, and subsequently move with skill, with focus, dexterity and proficiency, if we wish to realize fundamental change. So again, how should we proceed? How can we win hearts and minds? What needs to be done for science to have a greater impact in the policy arena? I posit three generalities, a needed long-run orientation, five general strategies, and nine operational-level proposals that professional societies should embrace.

Three generalities:

1. Pervasive Persistent Presence – Elliot Currie has noted that a new truth will never survive unless it is actively and assertively promoted. We need to tell our story again, and again, and again. Assert with certitude and certainty. As any marketing guru would emphasize, you run that ad over and over and over and over, display that label, parade that brand about wherever and whenever you can. That which is promoted loud enough and long enough becomes the truth (sidenote – regardless of its validity). I offer the quintessential model, Coca-Cola. If we wish to be as successful as Coca-Cola in marketing our message (and we do), we need to emulate Coke’s model of pervasive, omnipresent presence and marketing persistence.
2. Reduce our Scope – Given the pragmatic limits of time and effort, perhaps we should not take a shotgun approach, but rather a more focused one, a sniper model. Pick just a couple of issues out of your top ten list, with a pragmatic focus on the zeitgeist (as articulated above), and stick to them indefinitely, until change comes. We cannot change everything, but we can, with the finite resources at our disposal, challenge the most putrid.

It’s the Timing – We need to be alert as to when the best time would be to bring results forward, to be attuned to the zeitgeist, and seek to bring about change when the timing is right. But we must also do what we can to make that timing right and engage in activities that create an environment where truths can be aired and implemented. This suggests the need for both long-run and short-run stratagems.

A Long-Run Orientation

In the long-run, we need to continue to grow and develop criminology as a field of study. We do this by continuing with our interdisciplinary focus, by adhering to a cross-national perspective, embracing a ubiquitous orientation (developing and growing criminology/justice education programs in colleges and universities throughout the world), facilitating high levels of connectivity/networking, and maintaining our evidence-based focus. An integral, synergistic aspect of this plan, is to simultaneously grow and develop professional societies of criminology around the globe. These efforts must be undertaken in tandem to achieve the needed ends as they symbiotically build on each other.

In addition to obviously enhancing the body of knowledge, there are three other major positive communal impacts of such a thrust:

1. Enhance Public Understanding and Awareness - These programs will educate large numbers of student-citizens as to the proper role of justice officials and who will, in part because of their educational exposure, subsequently hold justice officials more accountable, and demand transparency and a high standard of performance from those officials. In this context, former U.S. Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis once noted that the most important political office in a democracy was that of private citizen, and in discharging that office, there was no place for the mere spectator. Criminology/justice education programs contribute to that end.
2. Enhance the Preparation of Individuals who Enter the Field – Justice education programs will graduate thousands of individuals who will subsequently pursue

careers in the justice arena, and who will then have the academic background to be able to respond more professionally to the heightened public demand for justice and equity.

3. Enhance Town and Gown Interactions – Justice officials will be able to turn to local criminology students and faculty to, together as a team, examine local problems, and undertake research efforts to help identify responses and solutions to those challenges. This “Town and Gown” dynamic has the potential to enhance the translational coefficient (turning science into practice), and to, of course, further grow the body of knowledge, to the benefit of both (the science and the practice).

Five general strategies:

1. Contact the “Soft” Junior Legislators – Just as we focus on the young in our classrooms with their still malleable minds, we need to focus our efforts on the junior legislators, those who have yet to be polluted by politics, those who are still somewhat idealistic and elastic, and still somewhat open to new ideas and perspectives. There is no way we will ever change the minds of senior political elites up front. They have risen to power clinging to the beliefs that they have (confirmation bias), and they are not about to change those beliefs until... the political winds of public sentiment begin to shift. Besides that, we don’t have the money that it takes to buy senior legislators at either the state or the federal levels. Start with the junior legislators, instigate a groundswell movement, and the senior legislators will catch on in time.

2. Contact Public Officials at Home, Personally – We need to amass support for issues at home, in the home districts of our state and federal representatives, for that is where their electoral heart lies. All politics is local (to steal from former American Congressman Tip O’Neal). If we really want to get into this business and make an impact, then we need to begin a coordinated effort to ask faculty members to make an appointment with the political officials from their home districts and visit with them in their home districts (and particularly the more junior legislators, as noted above). Don’t visit them in D.C., nor even in their respective state capitals, but in their home districts. In a similar vein, personally visit with the local practitioners to impact policy at that local level.
3. Use Creditable Spokespersons – As any sophomore marketing student will note, flinging out facts and details into the maddening crowd will do nothing unless that information is being articulated by someone whom the audience trusts and respects. Watch virtually any TV ad and note the celebrity spokespersons and the body-perfect models. Consider yet again the case of Joseph Goldberger as noted above. As a northern, immigrant Jew, he was an invalid spokesman in the turn-of-the-century South. He had no credibility in the sphere where he was attempting to communicate. We need to find those who used to be on the dark side and saw the light, so to speak, who will now sing our song. The credibility of the speaker in the world of public criminology is more important than the message. We need to find publicly credible spokespersons for our message if we expect it to be heard.
4. Tailor the Message to “Match and Catch” Specific Audiences – As Sharot (2017) has noted, in mass

communication, it is not what we say or even so much how we say it, but it is how we make the audience feel. Cold, hard facts don't drive change; emotion does, and you reach that emotional component in different ways with different audiences.

5. Bring the Policy Makers into our Tribe – Achenbach (2015) speaks to the rift between tribe and truth. Tribe (or our peers), he writes, are the more important ones in our lives. They are the ones to whom we turn for evidence and information, and we actively ignore, even mock, data coming from rival tribes, as valid as it may be. So, how do we bring more of the body politic into our tribe? How do we bring more elites into our tribe? Perhaps we should start inviting junior members of Congress and prominent junior state legislators (Judiciary Committee members in particular) to our professional meetings, and invite them every year (the persistence variable). Get them into our crowd. And we should invite not just those who think like us (then we are just singing to the choir), but invite those who do not. We need to listen to those with whom we disagree and seek to understand them and help them understand us. Our aim should not be to lob rhetorical bombs at them, not to try and dominate, but to seek consensus, agreement, accord, and cooperation. All too often, we isolate ourselves professionally. We tend to interact with relatively like-minded colleagues rather than those with fundamentally opposing viewpoints – we stay within our tribe. So, we should invite not just John Lewis and Jimmy Carter to speak with us at our meetings, but invite the “enemy” into our camp as well and have them speak and participate in our roundtable discussions, and stay for our socials. I believe that we can find many who

will come to our meetings, and with whom we can “reason together.” Bill O’Reilly, Sean Hannity, Tucker Carlson - obviously not. They are fixed in their ways and replete with confirmation bias (as perhaps are many in the scientific community, as well, to be honest). Rather, we need to identify junior, rising public figures and invite them to “break bread” with us, and then to be mutually open to concepts and perspectives.

Related Professional Association Operational-level Activities

I now offer nine of specific, operational level activities that professional associations should embrace to help overcome the public criminology challenges:

1. Encourage members of the association, representing themselves as individuals, to reach out with their research findings to the traditional and social media outlets in a forward-leaning fashion, and urge them to do so regularly (per the Currie dictum).
2. Encourage members of the association to work regularly with their respective institutional public information offices to disseminate their research findings as widely and in as many contexts as possible.
3. Hold workshops at our annual meetings that focus on effective mass communication methodologies such as how to do a media/social media interview, who should do it, what to say and not to say, how to say it.
4. Prepare/sign on to general statements that support research funding as well as evidence-based policy decisions.

5. Bring policy makers, national, state, county, and city, into our tribe and particularly invite them to attend and present at our Annual Meetings.
6. Invite media representatives to attend our Annual Meeting, waiving their registration fees, with the implicit goal of seeing stories appear in print and on the airwaves regarding research presented at the meetings.
7. Set up a press room at the Annual Meeting for representatives of the press to be able to conduct interviews.
8. Utilize traditional and social media outlets more regularly at our end to highlight salient research findings presented at our Annual Meeting and published in our many journals.
9. Make greater use of podcasts, highlighting works that are presented at our meetings and that appear in our journals that have a high translational coefficient (a high research into practice potential).

Conclusions and Challenges

Science's impact on public policy (and more particularly the impact of the social sciences) has generally been time-lagged via the "classroom and wait" model. We have indeed advanced historically one death at a time. The challenge before us as criminologists is to enhance our present-tense public policy impact. As Abraham Lincoln noted in this context so many years ago, public sentiment is everything. I believe that science, communicated clearly, strategically, and pragmatically as per above, can have a more salient and significant present-tense influence on public sentiment and subsequently upon policy than it has in the past. We can overcome the heretofore persistent and

vexing science-to-policy implementation rift, and it will be to the betterment of our world.

ლიტერატურა □ References

1. Achenbach, Joel (March 2015). Why Do Many Reasonable People Doubt Science. *National Geographic's*.
2. Baker, Ray Stannard (February 1905). What is a Lynching. *McClure's Magazine*.
3. Begley, Sharon (2010, March 29). Why Scientists are Losing the Public Relations War. *Newsweek*.
4. Cannell, Michael (2017). *Incendiary*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
5. Carr, David (2012, December 1). The Hemi Q&A: Jared Diamond. *United Hemisphere Magazine*.
6. Diamond, Jared (1997). *Guns, Germs and Steel*. New York: Norton.
7. Gould, Steven Jay (1980). *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: Norton.
8. Kuhn, Thomas (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
9. Lippmann, Walter (1922). *Public Opinion*. NY: Harcourt Brace.
10. Nadare, Maia (2020). *The Media Mill: Political Communication*. Tbilisi: Publishing House Universal.
11. Planck, Max (1949). *Scientific Autobiography and Other Papers*. London: Williams and Norgate.
12. Rennie, Ysabel (1978). *The Search for Criminal Man*. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath.
13. Sharot, Tali (2017). *The Influential Mind*. Boston: Little Brown.
14. Tolstoy, Leo (2008). *War and Peace* (1867). Translated by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky for Penguin Random House.

წიგნები მენეჯერებსა და პოლიტიკას შორის
ისტორიულ „ხილვებში“
(რობორტ ბადავლასი იბი)
(ანოტაცია)

საკვანძო სიტყვები: კრიმინოლოგია, დანაშაულის თეორიები, საჯარო კრიმინოლოგები, კომუნიკაცია, საზოგადოებრივი აზრი, სოციალურ-პოლიტიკური კონტექსტი, ინტერდისციპლინური კვლევები

დანაშაულის თეორიები ჩამოყალიბდა და განვითარდა მრავალფეროვან რეალობაში, რომელიც დროის შესაბამისი მონაკვეთის სოციალ-პოლიტიკურ კონტექსტებთანაა დაკავშირებული. ისტორიულ რაკურსს თვალის სწრაფი გადავლევით თუ გავიაზრებთ, შემდეგი სურათი გადაგვეშლება: ყველაფერი დემონოლოგიური თეორიით დაიწყო, რომელიც ეკლესიის სამოქალაქო საზოგადოებაზე უკიდურესი გავლენის დროს მძლავრობდა. ეს პერიოდი ჩაანაცვლა სოციალური კონტრაქტის თეორიამ, რაც ასახავდა საზოგადოების სურვილს, თავი დაეღწია საეკლესიო დიქტატიზმს. ძალაუფლების გადანაწილებას მოჰყვა კლასიკური თეორიის წარმოშობა, რომელსაც საფუძვლად ედო მონარქების კონტროლისკენ სწრაფვა. საშუალო კლასის აღზევებასთან ერთად, პოზიტივისტური თეორია ჩამოყალიბდა, ხოლო სოციალური დეზორგანიზაციის

თეორია საზოგადოების კეთილდღეობის გაზრდას ისახავდა მიზნად. რადიკალური თეორია 1960-იან წლებში შეიქმნა, როდესაც ამერიკული საზოგადოებისთვის კრიტიკული თვითანალიზის ხანა დადგა.

დრო მნიშვნელოვან როლს ასრულებს ახალი იდეების გავრცელებაში. ეს აშკარა იყო ისეთი ისტორიული ფიგურების მოღვაწეობასთან მიმართებაში, როგორებიც არიან 1861-1865 წლებში აშშ-ის მე-16 პრეზიდენტი აბრაამ ლინკოლნი (1809-1865) და ექიმ-ეპიდემიოლოგი ჯოზეფ გოლდბერგერი (1874-1929), ვინც PP ვიტამინის (ნიკოტინის მუავა) ნაკლებობით გამოწვეული კანის დაავადება პელაგრა, იგივე – ლომბარდის ერიტემა შეისწავლა. მათი ცხოვრება და მოღვაწეობა გახაზავს ეფექტური კომუნიკაციის უნარის მნიშვნელობას ცვლილებების განხორციელების მცდელობისას.

თანამედროვე პრობლემა მეცნიერების ასიმეტრიულ ბუნებაში მდგომარეობს, რადგან რთული, ნოვატორული იდეები ხშირად საზოგადოებისთვის მიუწვდომელია, რაც ცოდნის გადაცემის, გავრცელების ციკლს აფერხებს. ამერიკელი მეცნიერისა და ისტორიკოსის, პულიტსერის პრემიის მფლობელი (1998) ჯარედ დაიმონდის (დ. 1937) მაგალითი გახაზავს მეცნიერთა მიერ მათი კვლევითი შრომების იმგვარად წარმოჩენის აუცილებლობას, რომ საინტერესოც იყოს და იოლად გასაგებიც. განსაკუთრებით, კრიმინოლოგიაში, სადაც პოლიტიკური ნარატივები ხშირად ჩრდილავს ემპირიულ მტკიცებულებებს.

ამგვარი გამოწვევების წინაშე საჯარო კრიმინოლოგებს შეუძლიათ სამი სტრატეგიის გამოყენება საკუთარი გავლენის გასაძლიერებლად. უპირველეს ყოვლისა, მათ წარმატებული მარკეტინგული კამპანიის მსგავსი ყოვლისმომცველი, მუდმივი ქმედებებით ხელი უნდა შეუწყონ მეცნიერულ ჭეშმარიტებათა გავრცელებას. გარდა ამისა, თავიანთი ძალისხმევის ფოკუსირება უნდა სცადონ რამდენიმე კრიტიკულ საკითხზე კონცენტრირებით და „სნაიპერის მოდელი“ გამოიყენონ მდგრადი ცვლილებების განსახორციელებლად. დაბოლოს, თავიანთი დასკვნების წარსადგენად ყოველთვის შეარჩიონ შესაფერისი მომენტი.

კრიმინოლოგიის განვითარებისთვის აუცილებელია ხანგრძლივი მუშაობა ამ სფეროს უკეთ გამოსაყენებლად, რაც მოიცავს ინტერდისციპლინური კვლევების ხელშეწყობასა და ქსელური შესაძლებლობების წახალისებას. ამგვარ ძალისხმევას მნიშვნელოვანი სარგებლობის მოტანა შეუძლია: საზოგადოების ცნობიერების გაძლიერება, მომავალი პროფესიონალების მომზადება მართლმსაჯულების სფეროში კარიერისთვის, აკადემიურ წრეებსა და ადგილობრივი მართლმსაჯულების ორგანოებს შორის თანამშრომლობის ხელშეწყობა.

პოლიტიკაზე საკუთარი გავლენის გასაძლიერებლად, საჯარო კრიმინოლოგებმა საქმეში უნდა ჩართონ ახალგაზრდა კანონმდებლები, რომლებიც უფრო იოლად ემხრობიან და იზიარებენ ახალ იდეებს. საბაზისო მხარდაჭერის მოპოვება გულისხმობს ადგილობრივ ჩინოვნიკებთან მათივე რაიონებში შეხვედრას

მნიშვნელოვანი კავშირების განმტკიცების მიზნით, რაც ძალზე მნიშვნელოვანია პოლიტიკაში. აგრეთვე უნდა იზრუნონ იმაზეც, რომ მეცნიერული დასკვნები სანდო პიროვნებებმა გააფრცვლონ საზოგადოებაში, რათა შეტყობინებები ემოციურად რეზონანსული გამოდგეს სხვადასხვა აუდიტორიასთან ურთიერთობისას.

პროფესიულ შეკრებებზე მრავალფეროვანი პერსპექტივების შეთავაზება ხელს უწყობს თანამშრომლობასა და ურთიერთგაგებას. კვლევის შედეგების მედიისთვის გაზიარებით, საკომუნიკაციო გუნდებთან მჭიდრო თანამშრომლობითა და ეფექტური საკომუნიკაციო სემინარების ჩატარებით, შესაძლებელია საზოგადოებრივი დისკურსის გაძლიერება. სამეცნიერო კვლევის დაფინანსებისკენ მოწოდება და პოლიტიკოსების დისკუსიებში ჩართვა ყოველწლიური შეხვედრებისას კიდევ უფრო გაამყარებს მათ ხელმისაწვდომობას.

საბოლოო ჯამში, ეფექტური კომუნიკაცია და აქტიური მონაწილეობა საჯარო კრიმინოლოგებს საშუალებას მისცემს გავლენა მოახდინონ პოლიტიკაზე, ჩამოაყალიბონ საზოგადოებრივი აზრი, „ხიდი“ გადონ სამეცნიერო კვლევასა და მის პრაქტიკულ გამოყენებას შორის. მხოლოდ ფაქტების წარდგენას არ ვგულისხმობ. მიზნად უნდა დავისახოთ ანგარიშების გაკეთება რეზონანსული მოვლენების თაობაზე, რაც ცვლილებებისთვის განაწყოფს საზოგადოებას და სოციალურ პროგრესს განაპირობებს.