

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Van Hellemont, Elke and Densley, James (2021) If crime is not the problem, crime fighting is no solution: policing gang violence in the age of abolition. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 13 (2/3). pp. 136-147. ISSN 1759-6599.

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JACPR-12-2020-0561>

Link to record in KAR

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/90854/>

Document Version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>



**If Crime Is Not the Problem, Crime Fighting is No Solution:
Policing Gang Violence in the Age of Abolition**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research</i>
Manuscript ID	JACPR-12-2020-0561.R2
Manuscript Type:	Brief Review
Keywords:	Gangs, Violence, Policing, Databases, Eurogang, Critical

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

MANUSCRIPT DETAILS

: If Crime Is Not the Problem, Crime Fighting is No Solution: Policing Gang Violence in the Age of Abolition

Keywords: Gangs, Violence, Policing, Databases, Eurogang, Critical

:_PURPOSE_(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data available.

DESIGN/METHODOLOGY/APPROACH(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data available._FINDINGS_(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data

available._RESEARCH_LIMITATIONS/IMPLICATIONS_(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data

available._PRACTICAL_IMPLICATIONS_(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data

available._SOCIAL_IMPLICATIONS_(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data

available._ORIGINALITY/VALUE_(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data available.

If Crime Is Not the Problem, Crime Fighting is No Solution:

Policing Gang Violence in the Age of Abolition

Abstract

In their 1999 classic, *Crime is Not the Problem*, Zimring and Hawkins changed the way criminologists thought about crime and violence simply by forcing us to distinguish between them. In so doing, they advanced an agenda for a more effective response to the real ‘crime’ problem in America—violence. In this short commentary, we apply this logic to gang research and responses. We argue police fall short in responding to ‘gangs’ because researchers and policymakers have defined them in terms of criminal behaviour writ large, not the problem that really needs policing—the precise social and spatial dynamics of gang violence. We stand on the shoulders of others who have stated violence trumps gangs when it comes to policy and practice, to provide a conceptual review of the literature that captures mainstream and critical perspectives on gangs and offers both sides some common ground to start from as they contemplate ‘policing’ gangs with or without police.

Keywords: Gangs; Violence; Policing; Eurogang definition; Databases

‘The gang’ is one of the most contested concepts in social science (Fraser 2015; Curry 2015; Reid and Valasik 2020; Klein and Maxson 2006; Pyrooz and Densley 2018b). Leaving the ontological, epistemological, and methodological concerns of the Ivory Tower aside for this special issue on policing gangs, the interests of criminologists and police converge around the fiercest debated issue in gang research: the role of crime in gangs and gangs in crime (see Curry 2015). This debate centres around whether gangs should be understood as primarily criminal groups, whether ‘the gang’ is to blame for the crime and violence of its members (Pyrooz et al. 2016), and what feature of collective crime and violence designates ‘gangness’ (Klein and Maxson 2006).

At time of writing, the police response to the ‘gang crime’ construct has sparked civil unrest in cities across the globe and led some commentators to forecast the ‘end of policing’ entirely (Vitale 2018). From London to Los Angeles, there have been calls to eliminate gang

1
2
3 databases built on police intelligence data on the grounds that the criteria used to document
4
5 gangs and gang members are invalid (Densley and Pyrooz 2020; Pyrooz and Densley 2018a).
6
7 Abolitionists envision replacing traditional law enforcement tools and tactics with a strong
8
9 social safety net, creating a society in which the police are largely unnecessary because basic
10
11 human needs like a living wage, safe affordable housing, and access to mental healthcare are
12
13 universal (Gimbel and Muhammad 2019).
14
15

16
17 Conventional gang policing methods are controversial and there is no doubt that
18
19 social services and anti-poverty measures could reduce the appeal of gangs and therefore the
20
21 need to police them at all. However, opponents to police abolition fear a rise in crime and see
22
23 the idea as a threat to public safety; not least because inadequate policing is already a risk
24
25 factor for gang violence (Densley and Stevens 2015).
26
27

28
29 This short commentary strikes at the root of this problem. We argue police fall short
30
31 in responding to ‘gangs’ because researchers and policymakers have defined gangs in terms
32
33 of criminal behaviour *writ large*, not the precise social and spatial dynamics of what needs
34
35 policing—gang violence. We argue that by shifting the focus from crime to violence,
36
37 researchers can develop an evidence base the police can actually use, and policymakers can
38
39 stop validating practices that are not developed from the evidence from the start.
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Criminalising the Gang**

46
47 Many critical and cultural criminologists (e.g., Hallsworth 2013) blame the academy
48
49 for criminalising the ‘playgroups’ we now call ‘gangs’ (Thrasher 1927), beginning in the
50
51 1970’s when cooperation between research universities and state agencies interested in
52
53 juvenile delinquency began in earnest (Katz and Jackson-Jacobs 2004). Once state agencies
54
55 funded academic gang research, gang studies morphed into an academic-state conglomerate
56
57 that compromised the political impartiality of gang research, they argue (Hallsworth and
58
59
60

1
2
3 Brotherton 2011). A ‘criminologists’ gang’ was swiftly constructed, which Katz and Jackson-
4
5 Jacobs (2004) argued was an academic conceptualisation less representative of the
6
7 phenomena as it exists in reality, and more aligned with the crime-control interests of the
8
9 police and other sponsors of gang research.
10
11

12 Eurogang represents a network of over 200 researchers and practitioners interested in
13
14 gangs (Esbensen and Maxson 2018) and is traditionally perceived as both a symptom and
15
16 cause of this process. Eurogang set out to bridge the divide between scholars and
17
18 practitioners, so unsurprisingly its’ yearly workshops are dedicated to dissemination of
19
20 findings about gang crime and the gang’s relationship to a variety of social issues, from
21
22 migration to social media (Decker and Weerman 2005; Esbensen and Maxson 2012; Klein et
23
24 al. 2001; Maxson and Esbensen 2016; Melde and Weerman 2020; van Gemert et al. 2008).
25
26 The Eurogang ‘consensus’ definition that ‘any durable, street-oriented youth group whose
27
28 involvement in illegal activity is part of its group identity’ is a gang (Klein and Maxson 2006:
29
30 4) plays a regulatory role in this international, multidisciplinary, academic-practitioner
31
32 hybrid. This definition leaves room for interpretation, but its operationalisation in the
33
34 Eurogang methods manual (Weerman et al. 2009) limits its application to inherently criminal
35
36 groups, potentially excluding more ‘pro-social’ views of gangs (e.g., Brotherton 2015; Biondi
37
38 and Collins 2016; Tapia 2017).
39
40
41
42
43

44 The focus on ‘illegality’ broadly conceived, instead of specific crime forms, also has
45
46 net-widening consequences. Illegality is itself a social construct that varies across time and
47
48 place and captures a diversity of conduct from public nuisance and status offenses to
49
50 homicide and serious violence. So even when more strictly interpreted through the
51
52 Eurogang’s operationalisation, the definition captures collectives of individuals with
53
54 substantially different patterns of illegal behaviour or a ‘cafeteria style’ of offending (Klein
55
56 1995: 132). It also turns gangs into criminal groups through tautological reasoning, i.e.,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 selecting only those individuals that self-report their involvement in collective illegal activity
4
5 as gang members necessarily leads to groups composed of individuals that do crime and thus
6
7 criminal groups (Curry 2015). That is, a set of individuals form a gang because they
8
9 collectively engage in, approve of, and tolerate each other's illegal behaviour and they
10
11 collectively engage in, approve of, and tolerate each other's illegal behaviour because they
12
13 are gang members.
14
15

16
17 Why should (law enforcement) practitioners care about these issues? First, the
18
19 Eurogang definition is used by 'more policymakers than any other' (Sanders 2019) and
20
21 policymakers are generally not well versed in these debates about net-widening and sampling
22
23 biases (e.g., Aldridge et al. 2012). Overly broad definitions of gangs and gang crime have
24
25 been accused of assisting 'gang talk' (Hallsworth 2013), a highly stigmatising and racialised
26
27 discourse that relies on the gang concept to criminalise Black and minority ethnic people in
28
29 general (Gunter 2017; Smithson et al. 2012b; Williams 2015), and street culture (Ilan 2015),
30
31 urban music (Ilan 2020), and minority resistance (Brotherton 2008; Hagedorn 2008) in
32
33 particular. By ignoring the political dimensions of the gang concept (Fraser and Atkinson
34
35 2014; Hallsworth and Young 2011) a growing number of scholars complain that any broad
36
37 definition like Eurogang, that affords wide interpretation but never outside of the criminal
38
39 realm, gives the political class a conceptual tool to label the labouring classes as dangerous
40
41 classes (Hallsworth and Young 2008, 2011; Ilan 2015) and justify repressive measures
42
43 against them (Zilberg 2011; Brotherton and Barrios 2011; Ward 2013; Flores 2014; Fontes
44
45 2018).
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Ethnographies from the United Kingdom (Densley 2011; Hallsworth 2013; Ilan
53
54 2015), France (Mohammed and Mucchielli 2016), Spain (Feixa and Romaní 2014), the
55
56 United States (Flores 2014; Martinez 2016; Tapia 2017; Durán 2018), and Central America
57
58 (Cruz 2010; Baird and Rodgers 2015), from Guatemala (Levenson 2013; O'Neill 2015;
59
60

1
2
3 Fontes 2018) to Honduras (Wolseth 2011; Rivera 2013), to El Salvador (Zilberg 2011; Ward
4
5 2013), describe how ‘gang talk’ is used as a political windfall for authoritarian politics. For
6
7
8 example, the Trump administration strategically associated Mara Salvatrucha (MS-13) with
9
10 migrant ‘caravans’ moving through Central America (Fontes 2018) and used ‘the gang’ to
11
12 politically construct a ‘Latino crime threat’ in the US (Flores 2014) that resulted in children
13
14 being separated from their parents at the border and increased use of detention and
15
16 deportation to deter migrants and asylum seekers. The Eurogang definition has no direct
17
18 impact on these policies and practices, but critics fear it provides rationale if needed. Not
19
20 ignoring the harmful practices of gangs and gang members, they point to the harms of anti-
21
22 gang zero-tolerance policies and conclude that these might be more damaging to local
23
24 communities than the gangs themselves. That brings us back to the unifying theme of this
25
26 special issue: policing gangs.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Policing the ‘Criminologists’ Gang’**

34
35 Marginalized and racialized urban youth are the overwhelming recipients of the ‘gang
36
37 member’ label (Durán 2013; Phillips 2012) to the extent that there is some debate about
38
39 whether white gangs even qualify as gangs at all (for a discussion, see Reid and Valasik
40
41 2020). For some, the primary function of gang definitions is to legitimise the identification,
42
43 surveillance, and suppression of Black and minority ethnic youth, and to justify enhanced
44
45 prison sentences for them (Brotherton 2015). Repressive police tactics in theory focus on
46
47 targeting criminal gang members, but in practice gang enforcement targets all minority youth
48
49 living in urban settings because police officers overestimate the percentage of street crime
50
51 that is gang-related (Kennedy et al. 1997) and they view urban Black and minority ethnic
52
53 youth as a threat for gang membership (Durán 2013).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 A recent ride-along study (Rios et al. 2020) found officers' general adherence to
4
5 traditional, punitive policing practices like stop-and-frisk was undermining courtesy policing
6
7 efforts designed to improve community trust and legitimacy. The paradox of policing Latino
8
9 gangs, the authors found, was treating suspects with respect ('mano suave'), while continuing
10
11 to reinforce the racial bias at the heart of stop-and-frisk ('mano dura'). These findings echo
12
13 those of Durán (2008, 163), who found that 'Gang units legitimated the social control of
14
15 people beyond involvement in crime to include perceived criminality.' Durán claimed
16
17 specialized gang units, which are a common police adaptation to gangs (Braga 2015; Katz
18
19 and Webb 2006), fabricated intelligence and initiated frequent, unwelcome, even violent
20
21 contact with Mexican American gang youth, thus contributing to the general 'suppression' of
22
23 already marginalized communities, and deeper construction of the gang problem.
24
25
26
27

28
29 The rise of suppression as the dominant response to gang crime problems started in
30
31 the late 1970s and the 1980s as either a function of growing political conservatism or a
32
33 reaction to increased levels of gang violence (Miller 1975). Purported 'gang members' since
34
35 have been subject to a differential and discriminatory pattern of policing that serves both to
36
37 stereotype whole sections of Black and minority ethnic communities, especially young men,
38
39 as involved or potentially involved in crime. A recent report on policing gangs in New York
40
41 City, for example, found alleged gang members were 'subjected to harassment, intimidation,
42
43 surveillance, and threats' (Trujillo and Vitale (2019, 2), leading the authors to conclude,
44
45 'gang policing replicates the harms of mass incarceration... [it is] racist policing at its worst'
46
47
48
49 (29).
50

51
52 Crime management is a mandate that falls to police, so when gangs are defined as
53
54 inherently criminal, it makes sense that police target gang members. The fact that they
55
56 sometimes do this based on stereotypical or inaccurate depictions of gangs (Esbensen and
57
58 Tusinski 2007) feeds a broader 'legitimacy crisis' facing law enforcement today (Cook
59
60

1
2
3 2015). Part of the problem is police focus on *descriptors* of gangs (Klein and Maxson 2006),
4
5 superficial characteristics like an interest in certain music, colours, jewellery, or clothing, and
6
7 treat them as ‘objective’ indicators of gang membership. In so doing, they confirm existing
8
9 stereotypes about Black and minority ethnic youth (Trujillo and Vitale 2019) and criminalise
10
11 the complex symbolism and performances of gangs and gang members as elaborately detailed
12
13 in ethnographic research (e.g., Garot 2010). Lest we forget that gangs are multi-faceted,
14
15 socially constructed, hybrids of fiction and fact (Van Hellefont and Densley 2019), and gang
16
17 symbolism has been strongly commodified (Hayward and Yar 2006; Ilan 2015) to market
18
19 clothing and music (Ilan 2020; Pinkney and Robinson-Edwards 2018) and sell sensational
20
21 tales of Black and minority ethnic criminality to a mostly White, affluent, suburban youth
22
23 market (McCann 2017).
24
25
26
27

28
29 Scott (2020) found huge variations in methods of gang member identification as
30
31 reported by law enforcement across regions in the United States. Some areas were more
32
33 likely to identify gang members through associations or arrests with known gang members,
34
35 gang symbols, or self-nomination, whereas other regions were more likely to identify gang
36
37 members through a reliable informant. In some jurisdictions, someone first had to commit a
38
39 crime in order to be entered into a police gang database. This makes sense in the context of
40
41 the Eurogang definition—after all, why would someone who hasn’t committed a crime be
42
43 included in a police database? —but makes no sense at all when you study gangs as groups
44
45 (as most gang ethnographies do) instead of aggregating individual data to the group level.
46
47
48

49
50 Research shows there is a difference between *gang member* activity, in which
51
52 individuals in gangs behave as independent agents, and *gang-motivated* activity, in which
53
54 individuals in gangs act as agents of the organization (Sánchez-Jankowski 2003). However,
55
56 only some police agencies require a *gang motive* to be present to classify a crime as ‘gang-
57
58 related’, while others only require *gang membership* to define a crime as a gang crime
59
60

(Maxson and Klein 1996; Valasik and Reid 2021). This relates back to the academic question (e.g., Thornberry et al. 1993), to what extent is the gang responsible for all the criminal behaviour of its members? This question is relevant for law enforcement practitioners because anti-gang policies might not even address the alleged gang crime that is perceived to be the issue. In fact, while the perpetrator is registered as a gang member, their gang status might have nothing to do with their actions.

From Gangs and Gang Crime to Gang Violence—Shifting the Focus

As discussed, where police have traditionally come unstuck in their response to gangs is in their generalisation of gang *member* crime to gang crime, and street culture symbolism to gang symbolism. The contemporary climate around police abolition (Vitale 2018) affords us the rare opportunity to focus squarely on what the gang actually *does* and redirect our efforts from gangs and gang members *per se* to harmful gang behaviours. Instead of starting from the premise that gangs are inherently a problem, we must ask what makes gangs a problem in the first place. The answer is violence (Sullivan 2005). To paraphrase Zimring and Hawkins (1999), *gang crime isn't the problem, but gang violence is*. Gang-motivated violence is the only crime attributable to 'the gang' and it exists with or without the criminologists or the police; that much is clear from nearly 100 years of gang research.

The founding father of gang research (Thrasher 1927) did not see crime as a constitutional feature of gangs, but he did identify *conflict* as the driving force in gang formation. The cycle of gang violence is well-documented (Decker 1996; Moule, Decker, and Pyrooz, 2017) and involves a chain reaction of retaliation until eventually intervention and/or de-escalation results. The cycle of violence is explained by opportunity structures (Hughes and Short 2014), normative influence (Decker and Van Winkle 1996; Densley 2013), status concerns (Miller 1958; Anderson 1999), and collective behaviours (Thrasher 1927; Klein

1
2
3 1971; Pizarro and McGloin 2006)—all components of a ‘group process’ perspective on gang
4
5 violence (McGloin and Collins 2015; Short and Strodbeck 1965). This gang-motivated
6
7 violence is the only form of illegal behaviour that is truly unique to gangs and is so ‘central to
8
9 gang identity and certainly to gang lore’ (Maxson 2015: 529) that it deserves its own gang-
10
11 specific research focus (Katz 1988; Maxson 1999; Maxson et al. 1985; Maxson and Klein
12
13 1996; Mares 2010).

14
15
16
17 Gang violence is by far the most harmful feature of gangs to the communities in
18
19 which they reside (Abt 2019). The challenge for researchers and practitioners alike is
20
21 capturing it accurately (Valasik and Reid 2021). Existing studies utilize police data—
22
23 primarily field interrogation cards and gunshot victimizations—to study the cycle of gang
24
25 violence and its spatial and temporal patterns (e.g., Papachristos 2009; Papachristos et al.
26
27 2015; Valasik et al. 2017). However, owing to existing gang constructs, police data are
28
29 imperfect for more granular interpretation of gang-motivated violence; that is, violence that
30
31 truly arises from gang (not gang member) activity and is committed on behalf of the group
32
33 (Rosenfeld, Bray, and Egley 1999; Maxson and Klein 1996; see also Sanders 2019).

34
35
36
37 For example, the violence of organised crime groups tends to be policed separately
38
39 from gang violence, but in practice some gangs evolve and gang members can be embedded
40
41 within organised crime networks (Densley 2014; Densley et al. 2019; McLean and Densley
42
43 2020; Roks and Densley 2020). Gang members also fulfil a number of non-violent and non-
44
45 criminal roles (Fraser and Atkinson 2014), many gang members go out of their way to avoid
46
47 violence (Garot 2010), and a fear of retaliation is often a much more important driver of
48
49 conflict than the will to violence itself (Vandenbogaerde and Van Hellefont 2016).

50
51
52
53 To prevent gang violence, actors need the necessary information and the right status
54
55 to resolve tensions (Sierra-Arévalo and Papachristos 2015). First, in terms of data issues, we
56
57 see a middle ground in the creation of more restrictive gang databases that are less a tool and
58
59
60

1
2
3 more a source of information. As mentioned above, gang violence is an act and it is
4
5 determined more by motive than by its descriptive characteristics (Maxson and Klein 1996).
6

7
8 A gang violence database could be designed around said motive(s), and a court decision by a
9
10 judge could provide checks and balances for inclusion and exclusion criteria. Such an
11
12 endeavour would allow police to collect data on the patterns of gang violence, and police the
13
14 real problem with gangs, without problematising the gang in general.
15

16
17 If social service providers shared all they knew about gangs with police officers in the
18
19 construction of a more accurate gang violence database, there is no doubt a more nuanced
20
21 understanding of gang membership would emerge from police data (Densley and Pyrooz
22
23 2020). However, mere information sharing between police and community partners will
24
25 remain caught in a fundamental dilemma of conflicting aims if policing itself remains
26
27 anchored in a culture of crime-fighting and gang suppression (e.g., Brunson et al. 2015). The
28
29 potential to unduly label individuals who have committed no crime will remain, so too will
30
31 the risk that the database becomes a tool for surveillance, prosecution, and repression,
32
33 criminalising the communities where gang members reside. Including in a database people
34
35 who have never committed any violence, but are at risk of offending or victimisation, *should*
36
37 facilitate humanisation of gang members and move us closer to valuing the experience of
38
39 gangs as laid out in the ‘thick descriptions’ of gang members themselves. Absent broader
40
41 changes in police culture (e.g., Vitale 2018), it is more likely to result in further net-widening
42
43 that is harmful to vulnerable communities.
44
45
46
47
48

49
50 Still, the tension between data collection and intelligence sharing on the one hand, and
51
52 data privacy and protection on the other remains regardless of whether it is the police
53
54 gathering the data or the community. The most effective (and evidence-based) approach to
55
56 community work to combat gang violence involves not just the police, but other agencies
57
58 (e.g., social work, education, etc.). Recidivism rates tend to be lower when the individual is
59
60

1 supported by multi-disciplinary teams during the rehabilitation pathway (Bender et al. 2016),
2
3 and we need this approach to be adopted on the front end before the crimes are committed.
4
5

6
7 Traditionally, police have led and managed these efforts in the context of focused deterrence
8
9 (Braga et al. 2018; Sierra-Arévalo and Papachristos 2015), but there is scope to do more.
10
11

12
13 Police can have a *proactive* role in gang-motivated violence, but it requires a subtle
14
15 shift in emphasis from hard deterrence to soft prevention. Surveys find that traditional police
16
17 gang units are engaged in some form of gang prevention (Langton 2010), but distributing
18
19 literature to schools, parents, and community groups is the most common activity, followed
20
21 by after-school activities and late-night sports programming (Gravel et al. 2013). Police also
22
23 deliver education and training in schools to facilitate gang resistance (Densley et al. 2017;
24
25 Esbensen 2015). However, we are more inspired by police and mental health worker ‘co-
26
27 responder’ models where a specially trained officer and a mental health crisis worker respond
28
29 together to mental health calls for service (for a review, see Puntis et al. 2018). Such models
30
31 draw on the combined expertise of the officer and mental health professional to link people
32
33 with mental illnesses to appropriate services or provide other effective and efficient
34
35 responses. Studies find this leads to a reduction in the use of police custody and improved
36
37 relationships between law enforcement agencies and their local partners and citizens (Puntis
38
39 et al. 2018).
40
41
42
43

44
45 Something similar could occur in response to gang violence whereby police partner
46
47 with social service providers and community-based violence interrupters to de-escalate
48
49 tensions and offer triage services before violence gets out of hand. This would signal a move
50
51 away from militarized, broken-windows policing toward a consent-based policing model that
52
53 encourages and develops a culture based on the minimum use of force, transparent complaint
54
55 handling, community policing and outreach, and procedural and restorative justice (Deuchar
56
57 et al. 2021). Where the community is confident they can call on the police to intervene if
58
59
60

necessary, but also discuss and troubleshoot problems in the community beyond gangs.

Where the police are not only crime-fighters but problem-solvers, and where information shared is valued even when it is not actionable intelligence.

Concluding Remarks

A recent report by John Jay College Research Advisory Group on Preventing and Reducing Community Violence (2020) identified several evidence-backed strategies for improving public safety without depending on law enforcement, including place-based interventions that help design-out crime (Lasley 1999; Valasik 2018); outreach programs like Cure Violence (see Butts et al. 2015) that rely on people respected in the community, like former gang members and local pastors, to intervene among people who are at risk for violent behaviour, strengthening anti-violence social norms and peer relationships; engagement and support for the people most responsible for community violence—namely young males; and comprehensive and uniform policies that can limit access to the tools of violence, namely firearms. However, it is clear that these measures alone, or even in conjunction with greater public spending on social services, cannot and will not replace a police response to the violence committed by gang members entirely. Community and outreach workers may be the first line actors, but the police will always have a reactive role to play. When community ‘violence interruption’ (Butts et al. 2015) fails and gang violence occurs, for example, we need police to respond in an investigative capacity to bring offenders to justice (Leovy 2015).

For police to regain community trust and legitimacy in this endeavour, a refocus of their efforts on the problem of gang violence versus gangs *per se* would constitute a first valuable step. This is not just a philosophical switch; it is a practical one. It requires law enforcement to resist the temptation to police communities vulnerable to crime through the lens of the ‘criminologist’s gang’ and recognise that practices designed to tackle *gangs* are

1
2
3 not necessarily effective in tackling *gang violence*. In fact, they may inadvertently contribute
4
5 to violence if they increase gang cohesiveness (Klein 1971) or validate the gang's claim that
6
7 it provides community protection when government is absent (Leovy 2015; Sobel and Osoba
8
9 2009; Venkatesh 2000). Leaving the gang-lens aside and tackling the issues that
10
11 neighbourhoods and communities struggle with most requires a policing that is embedded
12
13 within these neighbourhoods and communities and appreciates even some pro-social
14
15 understandings of gangs. In the end, if crime is not the problem, crimefighting is not the
16
17 solution. Community-based policing is, and if done right it could transform our understanding
18
19 of gangs within and beyond the walls of policing.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Abt T (2019), *Bleeding Out*, New York: Basic Books.
- Aldridge, J., Medina-Ariz, J., & Ralphs, R. (2012). Counting Gangs: Conceptual and Validity Problems with the Eurogang Definition. In F.-A. Esbensen & C. L. Maxson (Eds.), *Youth Gangs in International Perspective*, New York: Springer: pp. 35-51.
- Anderson, E. (1999), *Code of the Street*, New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Bender, K., Cobbina, J., and McGarrell, E. (2016). "Reentry Programming for High-Risk Offenders: Insights from Participants", *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, vol 60, pp. 1479–1508.
- Biondi, K., & Collins, J. F. (2016). *Sharing This Walk*. NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Braga, A. (2015), "Police gang units and effective gang violence reduction", Decker SH and Pyrooz DC (eds) *The Handbook of Gangs*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley. Pp. 309–27.
- Braga, A., Weisburd, D, and Turchan, B. (2018), "Focused deterrence strategies and crime control", *Criminology and Public Policy*, vol. 17, pp. 205–250.
- Brotherton, D. (2008), "Beyond Social Reproduction: Bringing Resistance back in Gang Theory", *Theoretical Criminology*, vol. 12, pp 55-77.
- Brotherton, D. C. (2015), *Youth street gangs: A critical appraisal*, New York: Routledge.
- Brotherton, D., & Barrios, L. (2004), *The Almighty Latin King and Queen Nation*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- 1
2
3 Brotherton, D. and Barrios, L. (2011), *Banished to the Homeland: Dominican Deportees and*
4
5 *Their Stories of Exile*. New York: Columbia University Press.
6
7
8
9 Brunson, R., Braga, A., Hureau, D., and Pegram, K. (2015). “We Trust You, but Not That
10
11 Much: Examining Police–Black Clergy Partnerships to Reduce Youth Violence”,
12
13 *Justice Quarterly*, vol. 32, pp. 1006–1036.
14
15
16 Butts, J., Roman, C., Bostwick, L., and Porter, J. (2015), “Cure violence: A public health
17
18 model to reduce gun violence”, *Annual Review of Public Health*, vol. 36, pp. 39-53.
19
20
21 Cook, P. (2015), “Will the current crisis in police legitimacy increase crime? research offers a
22
23 way forward”, *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, vol. 16.
24
25
26 Cruz, M. J. (2010), Central American maras: from youth street gangs to transnational
27
28 protection rackets. *Global Crime*, vol. 11, pp. 379-398.
29
30
31
32 Curry, G. D. (2015), “The logic of defining gangs revisited”, S. H. Decker and D. C. Pyrooz
33
34 (Eds.), *The Handbook of Gangs*, Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley. pp. 7–27.
35
36
37 Curry G.D., Decker, S.H. and Pyrooz, D.C. (2014), *Confronting Gangs* (3rd ed), New York:
38
39 Oxford University Press.
40
41
42 Decker, S. H. (1996), “Collective and normative features of gang violence”, *Justice*
43
44 *Quarterly*, vol. 13, pp. 245–64.
45
46
47 Decker, S. H. and Weerman, F. W. (Eds.), (2005), *European Street Gangs and Troublesome*
48
49 *Youth Groups*, Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
50
51
52 Decker, S. H., and Van Winkle, B. (1996), *Life in the Gang*, Cambridge: Cambridge
53
54 University Press.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Densley, J. (2011), "Ganging up on gangs: Why the gang intervention industry needs an
4 intervention", *British Journal of Forensic Practice*, vol. 13, pp. 12–23.
5
6
7
8 Densley, J. (2013), *How Gangs Work*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
9
10
11 Densley, J. (2014), "It's gang life, but not as we know it: the evolution of gang business",
12 *Crime & Delinquency*, vol. 60, pp. 517–546.
13
14
15
16 Densley, J., Adler, J., Zhu, L., and Lambine, M. (2017), "Growing against Gangs and
17 Violence: Findings from a Process and Outcome Evaluation", *Psychology of Violence*,
18 vol. 7, pp. 242–52.
19
20
21
22
23
24 Densley, J., McLean, R., Deuchar, R., & Harding, S. (2019), "Progression from cafeteria to à
25 la carte offending: Scottish organised crime narratives", *Howard Journal of Crime
26 and Justice*, vol. 58, pp. 161–179.
27
28
29
30
31
32 Densley, J. and Pyrooz, D. (2020), "The Matrix in context: taking stock of police gang
33 databases in London and beyond", *Youth Justice*, vol. 20, pp. 11–30.
34
35
36
37 Densley, J. and Stevens, A. (2015), "'We'll show you gang': the subterranean structuration of
38 gang life in London", *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, vol. 15, pp. 102–120.
39
40
41
42
43 Deuchar, R., Crichlow, V., and Fallik, S. (2021). *Police–Community Relations in Times of
44 Crisis*, Bristol: Bristol University Press.
45
46
47
48 Downes, D. and P. Rock. (2011), *Understanding Deviance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
49
50
51 Durán, R. (2013), *Gang Life in Two Cities*, New York: Columbia University Press.
52
53
54 Durán, R. (2018). *The Gang Paradox*, New York: Columbia University Press.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Esbensen, F.-A. (2015), "The Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.)
4 Program: An Evaluator's Perspective," Decker SH and Pyrooz DC (eds) *The*
5
6 *Handbook of Gangs*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley. Pp. 369–91.
7
8
9
10 Esbensen, F.-A. and Maxson, C. (Eds.), (2012), *Youth Gangs in International Perspective*,
11
12 New York: Springer.
13
14
15 Esbensen, F.-A. and Maxson, C. (2018). The Eurogang Program of Research. *Oxford*
16
17 *Research Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice*.
18
19 <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264079.013.421>.
20
21
22
23 Esbensen, F.-A., and K. Tusinski. (2007), "Youth gangs in the print media", *Criminal Justice*
24
25 *and Popular Culture*, vol. 14, pp. 21–38.
26
27
28 Feixa, C., & Romani, O. (2014). "From Local Gangs to Global Tribes: The Latin Kings and
29
30 Queens Nation in Catalonia." In D. Buckingham, S. Bragg, & M. J. Kehily (Eds.),
31
32 *Youth Cultures in the Age of Global Media*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK: pp. 88-
33
34 103.
35
36
37
38 Flores, E. (2014), *God's Gangs*. New York: NYU Press.
39
40
41 Fontes, A. W. (2018). *Mortal Doubt*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
42
43
44 Fraser, A. and Atkinson, C. (2014), "Making up gangs: Looping, labeling and the new
45
46 politics of intelligence-led policing", *Youth Justice*, vol. 14, pp. 154–170.
47
48
49 Garot, R. (2010), *Who You Claim*, New York: NYU Press.
50
51
52 Gimbel, V. N. and C. Muhammad (2019), "Are police obsolete? Breaking cycles of violence
53
54 through abolition democracy", *Cardozo Law Review*, vol. 40, pp. 1543.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Gravel, J., Bouchard, M. Descormiers, K., Wong, J., and Morselli, C. (2013), “Keeping
4 Promises: A Systematic Review and a New Classification of Gang Control
5 Strategies”, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, vol. 41, pp. 228–242.
6
7
8
9
10 Gunter, A. (2017), *Race, Gangs and Youth Violence*, Bristol: Policy Press.
11
12
13 Hagedorn, J. (2008). *A World of Gangs*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota press.
14
15
16 Hallsworth, S. (2013), *The Gang and Beyond*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
17
18
19 Hallsworth, S. and Brotherton, D. (2011), *Urban Disorder and Gangs: A Critique and a
20 Warning*, London: Runnymede.
21
22
23
24
25 Hallsworth, S. and Young, T. (2008), “Gang talk and gang talkers: a critique”, *Crime, Media
26 and Culture*, vol. 4, pp. 175–195.
27
28
29
30 Hallsworth, S. and Young, T. (2011), “On gangs and race: A rejoinder to Joseph and Gunter”,
31 I. Joseph and A. Gunter (Eds), *What’s a ‘Gang’ and What’s Race Got to Do with It?*
32 London: Runnymede.
33
34
35
36
37
38 Hayward, K., & Yar, M. (2006). The 'chav' Phenomenon: Consumption, Media and the
39 Construction of a new Underclass. *Crime, Media, Culture*, vol. 2, pp. 9-28.
40
41
42 doi:10.1177/1741659006061708
43
44
45 Hughes, L. and Short, J. (2014) ‘Partying, Cruising, and Hanging in the Streets: Gangs,
46 Routine Activities, and Delinquency and Violence in Chicago, 1959–1962.’ *Journal
47 of Quantitative Criminology*, vol 30, pp. 415–451.
48
49
50
51
52
53 Ilan, J. (2015). *Understanding Street Culture*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
54
55
56 Ilan, J. (2020). Digital street culture decoded. Why criminalizing drill music is street illiterate
57 and counterproductive. *The British Journal of Criminology*. doi:10.1093/bjc/azz086.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 John Jay College Research Advisory Group on Preventing and Reducing Community
4
5 Violence (2020), *Reducing Violence Without Police: A Review of Research Evidence*,
6
7 New York: Research and Evaluation Center, John Jay College of Criminal Justice,
8
9 City University of New York.
10
11
12
13 Katz, C. and Webb, V. (2006), *Policing Gangs in America*, Cambridge: Cambridge
14
15 University Press.
16
17
18 Katz, J. (1988), *Seductions of Crime: Moral and Sensual Attractions of Doing Evil*. New
19
20 York: Basic Books.
21
22
23 Katz, J., & Jackson-Jacobs, C. (2004). 'The Criminologists' Gang' In C. Sumner (Ed.),
24
25 *Blackwell Companion to Criminology*. London: Blackwell.
26
27
28 Kennedy, D., A. Braga, and A. Piehl. (1997), "The (un)known universe: Mapping gangs and
29
30 gang violence in Boston", D. Weisburd and J.T. McEwen (Eds.) *Crime Mapping and*
31
32 *Crime Prevention*. Criminal Justice Press, pp. 219–62.
33
34
35 Klein, M. W. (1971), *Street Gangs and Street Workers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
36
37
38 Klein M. W. (1995), *The American Street Gang*. New York: Oxford University Press.
39
40
41 Klein, M. W. and Maxson, C. L. (2006), *Street Gang Patterns and Policies*. New York:
42
43 Oxford University Press.
44
45
46 Klein, M. W., Kerner, H. J., Maxson, C. L., and Weitekamp, E. G. M. (Eds.), (2001), *The*
47
48 *Eurogang Paradox*, Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Kluwer Press.
49
50
51 Langton, L. (2010). *Gang Units in Large Local Law Enforcement Agencies, 2007*,
52
53 *Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics*.
54
55
56 Lasley, J. (1999). *'Designing Out' Gang Homicides and Street Assaults: Research in Brief*.
57
58 Washington DC: National Institute of Justice.
59
60
61 Leovy, J. (2015), *Ghettoside*, New York: Spiegel and Grau.

1
2
3 Levenson, D. T. (2013). *Adiós Niño*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

4
5 Mares, D. (2010), "Social Disorganization and Gang Homicides in Chicago". *Youth Violence*
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

and *Juvenile Justice*, vol. 8(1), pp. 38-57.

Martinez, C. (2016). *The Neighborhood Has Its Own Rules*, New York: NYU Press.

Maxson, C.L. (1999). "Gang homicide: A review and extension of the literature." In M. D. Smith & M. A. Zahn (Eds.), *Homicide: A sourcebook of social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 239-254.

Maxson, C. L., M. Gordon, and M. W. Klein. (1985), "Differences between gang and nongang homicides", *Criminology* vol. 23, pp. 209–22.

Maxson, C. L. and Klein, M.W. (1996), "Defining gang homicide: An updated look at member and motive approaches. In C. R. Huff (Ed.), *Gangs in America* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McCann, B. J. (2017), *The Mark of Criminality*. University of Alabama Press.

McLean, R. and Densley, J. (2020), *Scotland's Gang Members*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

McGloin, J., and Collins, M. (2015), "Micro-Level Processes of the Gang," Decker, S. H. and Pyrooz, D. C (Eds.), *The Handbook of Gangs*, Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley, pp. 276–93.

Melde, C. and F. Weerman. (Eds.) (2020), *Gangs in the Era of Internet and Social Media*. New York: Springer.

Miller, W. B. (1958), "Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency", *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 14, pp. 5–19.

Miller, W. B. (1975), *Violence by Youth Gangs and Youth Groups as a Crime Problem in Major American Cities*, Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, Law Enforcement

Assistance Administration, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention,
National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Mohammed, M., & Mucchielli, L. (2016), *Les bandes de jeunes: Des " blousons noirs " à nos jours*, Paris: La Découverte.

Moule Jr., R. K., Decker, S. H., and Pyrooz, D. C. (2017), "Technology and conflict: Group processes and collective violence in the Internet era", *Crime, Law and Social Change*, vol. 68, pp. 47–73.

O'Neill, K. L. (2015), *Secure the Soul*. University of California Press.

Papachristos, A.V. (2009), "Murder by structure", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 115, pp. 74–128.

Papachristos, A.V., A. Braga, E. Piza, and L. Grossman. (2015), "The company you keep? the spillover effects of gang membership on individual gunshot victimization in a co-offending network", *Criminology*, vol. 53, pp. 624–49.

Phillips, S. (2012), *Operation Fly Trap*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pinkney, C. and Robinson-Edwards, S. (2018), Gangs, music and the mediatisation of crime: expressions, violations and validations. *Safer Communities*, vol. 17, pp. 103-118.

Pizarro, J. M., and J. McGloin. (2006), "Explaining gang homicides in Newark, New Jersey: Collective behavior or social disorganization", *Journal of Criminal Justice*, vol. 31, pp. 195–207.

Puntis, S., Perfect, D., Kirubarajan, A., Bolton, S., Davies, F., Hayes, A., Harriss, E., and Molodynski, A. (2018), "A systematic review of co-responder models of police mental health 'street' triage", *BMC Psychiatry*, vol. 18, pp. 256.

Pyrooz, D.C. and Densley, J. (2018a), "Is gang activity on the rise? A movement to abolish gang databases makes it hard to tell", *The Conversation*. Available at

<https://theconversation.com/is-gang-activity-on-the-rise-a-movement-to-abolish-gang-databases-makes-it-hard-to-tell-99252> (accessed 1 December 2020),

Pyrooz, D. and Densley, J. (2018b), "On public protest, violence, and street gangs", *Society*, vol. 55, pp. 229–236.

Pyrooz, D. C. and Mitchell, M. (2015), "Little gang and big gang research", S. H. Decker and D. C. Pyrooz (eds.), *The Handbook of Gangs*, Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley. pp. 28–58.

Pyrooz, D. C., Turanovic, J., Decker, S.H., and Wu, J. (2016), "Taking stock of the relationship between gang membership and offending: A meta-analysis", *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, vol. 43, pp. 365–397.

Reid, S. & Valasik, M. (2020), *Alt-right Gangs*, University of California Press.

Rios, V., Prieto, J., Ibarra (2020), "Mano Suave–Mano Dura: Legitimacy policing and Latino stop-and-frisk", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 85, pp. 58-75.

Rivera, L. (2013). *Territories of Violence*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Roks, R. and Densley, J. (2020), "From brakers to bikers: the evolution of the Dutch Crips 'gang'", *Deviant Behavior* vol. 41, pp. 525–542.

Rodgers, D. and Baird, A. (2015), Understanding gangs in contemporary Latin America. In Decker, S. H., & Pyrooz, D. C. (eds), *Handbook of gangs and gang responses*. New York: Wiley. pp. 478-502.

Rosenfeld, R., T. Bray, and A. Egley. (1999), "Facilitating violence: A comparison of gang-motivated, gang-affiliated, and nongang youth homicides", *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, vol. 15, pp. 495–516.

Sánchez-Jankowski, M. (2003), "Gangs and Social Change", *Theoretical Criminology*, vol. 7, pp. 192–216.

Sanders, B. (2019), *A Dictionary of Gangs*, Oxford: OUP.

- 1
2
3 Scott, D. (2020), "Regional differences in gang member identification methods among law
4 enforcement jurisdictions in the United States". *Policing: An International Journal*.
5
6
7
8 Short, J. F. and Strodtbeck, F. (1965), *Group Process and Gang Delinquency*. Chicago, IL:
9
10 University of Chicago Press.
- 11
12 Sierra-Arévalo, M. and A.V. Papachristos (2015). "Applying Group Audits to Problem-
13 Oriented Policing", in G. Bichler, Gisela and A. Malm (eds.), *Disrupting Criminal*
14
15
16
17
18 *Networks: Network Analysis in Crime Prevention*. Boulder, Co: Lynne Rienner.
- 19
20 Smithson, H., Ralphs, R. and Williams, P. (2012), "Used and abused: The problematic usage
21 of gang terminology in the United Kingdom and its implications for ethnic minority
22 youth", *The British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 53, pp. 113-128.
- 23
24
25
26
27 Sobel, R. and Osoba, B. (2009), "Youth gangs as pseudo-governments: Implications for
28 violent crime", *Southern Economic Journal*, vol. 75, pp. 996-1018.
- 29
30
31
32 Sullivan, M. (2005), "Maybe we shouldn't study 'gangs': does reification obscure youth
33 violence?", *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, vol. 21, pp. 170-90.
- 34
35
36 Tapia, M. (2017), *The Barrio Gangs of San Antonio, 1915-2015*, Texas: TCU Press.
- 37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
- Thrasher, F. M. (1927), *The Gang*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Trujillo, J. and Vitale, A. (2019), "Gang Takedowns in the de Blasio Era: The Dangers of
'Precision Policing,'" Available at: <https://policingandjustice.squarespace.com/gang-policing-report>.
- Valasik, M. (2018), "Gang Violence Predictability: Using Risk Terrain Modeling to study
Gang Homicides and Gang Assaults in East Los Angeles." *Journal of Criminal
Justice* vol. 58, pp. 10-21.

- 1
2
3 Valasik, M., Barton, M. S., Reid, S., & Tita, G. E. (2017), "Barriocide: Investigating the
4
5 Temporal and Spatial Influence of Neighborhood Structural Characteristics on Gang
6
7 and Non-Gang Homicides in East Los Angeles", *Homicide Studies*, 21, 287-311.
8
9
10 Valasik, M, and Reid, S. (2021). "East Side Story: Disaggregating Gang Homicides in East
11
12 Los Angeles", *Social Sciences*, vol. 10, pp. 48
13
14
15
16 Van Gemert, F., Peterson, D., and Lien, I.-L. (2008), *Street Gangs, Migration, and Ethnicity*.
17
18 Devon, UK: Willan.
19
20
21 Vandenberg, E., & Van Hellefont, E. (2016), "Fear and Retaliation: Gang Violence in
22
23 Brussels and Caracas" In C. L. Maxson & F.-A. Esbensen (Eds.), *Gang Transitions*
24
25 *and Transformations in an International Context* Cham: Springer International
26
27 Publishing: pp. 51-63.
28
29
30
31 Van Hellefont, E., and Densley, J. (2019), "Gang glocalization: How the global mediascape
32
33 creates and shapes local gang realities." *Crime, Media, Culture* vol. 15, pp. 169-189.
34
35
36 Venkatesh. S. (2000), *American Project*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
37
38
39 Vitale A (2018), *The End of Policing*, New York: Verso.
40
41
42 Ward, T. W. (2013), *Gangsters Without Borders*, Oxford: OUP.
43
44
45 Weerman, F. M., Maxson, C. L., Esbensen, F., Aldridge, J., Medina, J., and van Gemert, F.
46
47 (2009), *Eurogang Program Manual: Background, Development, and Use of the*
48
49 *Eurogang instruments in Multi-site, Multi-method Comparative Research*. Available
50
51 at from <https://www.umsl.edu/ccj/Eurogang/EurogangManual.pdf>
52
53
54
55 Williams, P. (2015), "Criminalising the Other: challenging the race-gang nexus", *Race and*
56
57 *Class*, vol. 56, pp. 18-35.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Wolseth, J. (2011), *Jesus and the Gang*. University of Arizona Press.
4

5 Zilberg, E. (2011), *Space of Detention*. Duke University Press.
6

7
8 Zimring, F. and G. Hawkins (1999), *Crime is Not the Problem*. New York: Oxford University
9 Press.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60