

TheCrimAcademy_48_Campbell

📅 Thu, 6/23 9:11AM ⌚ 1:04:41

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

people, state, mass incarceration, prison population, prison, crime, new jersey, talking, policy, legislation, proposed, reform, political, bigger, corrections, piece, legislature, paper, reforms, bills

SPEAKERS

Michael Campbell, Jenn Tostlebe, Jose Sanchez



Jose Sanchez 00:14

Hey everyone. Welcome back to the criminology Academy podcast where we are criminally academic. My name is Jose Sanchez.



Jenn Tostlebe 00:20

My name is Jenn Tostlebe.



Jose Sanchez 00:22

And today we have Professor Michael Campbell on the podcast to talk with us about qualitative research methods and state level research on law and policy.




Jenn Tostlebe 00:30

Michael Campbell is an associate professor in the Department of sociology and criminology at the University of Denver. His research employs mixed research methods to examine the social, historical, and political forces that shape law and policy, especially those associated with mass incarceration. Along with Matt Vogle and Josh Williams, he won the American Society of Criminology outstanding article award in 2017 for his article "Historical contingencies and the evolving importance of race, violent crime, and region in explaining mass incarceration in the United States." His current research funded by the National Science Foundation, the Koch Foundation, and the Russell Sage Foundation includes a collaborative project that examines state level criminal justice reforms that affect correctional populations and mass incarceration. The goal is to compare reforms across state contexts since 2000 to better understand how state and national forces have shaped policy reform efforts in the United States. Thank you so much for joining us, Mike.

 Michael Campbell 01:31

Thanks for having me.

 Jose Sanchez 01:33

So just a brief overview of what this episode is going to look like. So we're gonna start off with some broad and general questions about incarceration and policy, just to kind of lay some groundwork, then we're gonna talk about a paper that was coauthored by Mike. And then finally, we're going to touch on a broader project that this paper is a part of. So with that being said, Jenn, take it away.

 Jenn Tostlebe 02:00

Thanks, Jose. Okay, so one of the topics, Mike, that your research is focused on is mass incarceration. And so to kind of lay the groundwork of what this looks like, from a policy perspective, let's start before mass incarceration actually occurred. So somewhere around 1960s/1970s. What did criminal justice policy look like around that time?

 Michael Campbell 02:23

Well, I guess one of the ways that I always try to explain this is that there's a lot of change and continuity. When we talk about policies in the United States. Sometimes the idea that the entire approach to corrections or criminal justice in the United States suddenly transformed itself overnight, in the 70s, and sent us on this path toward mass incarceration. It's really overstated. If you look at what was going on in different states, across the country in different regions, it's impossible to talk about criminal justice policies in general and correctional policy specifically without talking about how different they are across regions, and how different they are across different states. And if you look at what was going on in the 1960s and 70s, when you look at state prison systems, for example, or correctional systems, more largely, every single state in the south at some point was under federal control over the decrepit and brutal conditions in their prisons. And if you look then when we talk about, you're asking about the start of mass incarceration, and the truth about that is that it's very complicated. In southern states, mass incarceration really began in the 1960s, as the Civil Rights Movement was gaining steam, state prison populations in those states were all growing. And they continue to grow across the region throughout the mid to late 1960s. And rates were declining and a lot of the rest of the country. And in some places like California, there were discussions that prisons don't work, prisons are a failure, we've seen the end of the prison. And the reality of it was that, you know, that was the view among some criminologists and certain reformers. The reality of it was that the people who were most interested in the types of policies and approaches to corrections and criminal justice, that were interested in a very harsh approach that would lead us to mass incarceration, they remained very politically powerful. And they had a lot to talk about in terms of rising violent crime in the 1960s and 70s. And so the landscape was complex, but this idea that everything changed suddenly and completely is really not right. You know, there were always places where repeat and serious offenders went to prison for a long time in the United States. The difference was that back then, you know, there were realistic opportunities for parole, which was still an option in essentially every state. And there were still judges that had

considerable amount of discretion, to limit the types of sentences that prosecutors could pursue, and the types of charges that would commit more people to prison were much more difficult to execute. So the landscape was different. But there were even then very clear strands of a very harsh and punitive view of how to respond to crime of how criminal justice should operate. Of course, that had always disproportionately targeted people of color, marginalized groups that were poor people that didn't graduate from high school. So there's a lot of similarities from those earlier periods to later. But obviously, things changed significantly by the time we get to 1970s and 80s. And, you know, a serious investment and prison expansion and some serious legal changes that come with it really changed the landscape.



Jenn Tostlebe 05:24


Yeah. So I mean, that era moving into mass incarceration, we talk about it a lot as like the "Get tough" movement. And so when you're talking about regions, then if the south kind of always had more of this, like, get tough focus, when we move into the 1970s 1980s, would you say that pretty much every region has started to adopt this "Get tough" idea?




Michael Campbell 05:47

Yeah, I would agree. So essentially, you know, if you look at the state trajectories, in terms of their prison populations, and also the legal changes that contributed to, you know, the types of changes in drug laws, for example, or extending sentences for things like burglary, essentially, the rest of the country follows the South, right. And part of that has to do you know, the South became increasingly politically powerful. And you know, the Sunbelt population grew dramatically from 1960 to 1980. So Southern States became key political players from California, to Texas, Arizona became more important, and obviously, Florida. These state's populations grew dramatically. And as they did, they really retained correctional and criminal justice systems that looked a lot like the old days in those states. And in the old days in those states, those systems were brutal. You know, there's plenty of good movies from the 50s and 60s about what types of, you know, correctional systems you had, you know, you think a Cool Hand Luke, for example. And that's just kind of the white version, imagine the black version of that prison, you can imagine what that would have been like. So I would say that, you know, the rest of the country kind of followed and became more like the South in terms of criminal justice policy. That didn't happen overnight, there were places and regions that really, you know, weren't as keen to make those shifts. But it's not to say that northern states like New York that passed the harsh Rockefeller drug laws in the early 1970s, they were game, there were always strands of their politics that were favorable to these kinds of policies, you know, those states were never particularly tolerant of violent criminals or drug users. And I would say that rising crime across the country, you know, and urban unrest, and those kinds of problems really fed the political flames that helped create a perfect environment, to really make it hard for people, you know, to make a stand against this and say, Yeah, but let's talk about the roots of crime. Right, the things that people are starting talking about today, you know, what other types of approaches can we incorporate into, you know, a strategy for public safety. At the time, people were very politically receptive to really cracking down. And that essentially became a political force that was very difficult, especially for people to withstand. Democrats in the South had complete political control of most southern states. And they backed and advanced the penalties that I'm talking about. You know, Southern, they often call them Dixiecrats were always harsh on crime, right? They were part of the Democratic Party, of


course, they migrated to the Republican Party over the next 20 years in this period. But the reality of it is, you know, the nation's history didn't start in 1960 and 70, right, there's a long history. And there's plenty of blame to go around by region, and ultimately, all the regions essentially succumb to this kind of political pressure to really amplify the most punitive approaches. And sadly, you know, approaches that we knew then and know now really aren't that effective at improving public safety, right, like doubling the prison size when it was small, made sense, because you were getting more very violent, serious criminals. But even by the time we get to the mid and late 1980s, you're starting to lock up a lot more very low level criminals at great cost. And so, you know, there wasn't a lot of resistance to this, you know, they did it in Massachusetts, just like they did it in Alabama, but just to different magnitudes.

 Jose Sanchez 08:56

It's always a little interesting seeing, especially, like states that you have, like this reputation of being super blue, super liberal, super progressive. But when you kind of look under the hood, the engine seems to not be that much different across the board.

 Michael Campbell 09:12

Yes, California, right?

 Michael Campbell 09:14

California is one of the best examples. My dissertation focused on trying to understand how Texas could be viewed as a super conservative state if politics are so important. And California became all democratic and all liberal, and yet at the same time, California out imprisoned Texas by a mile in the 1980s, you know, and so, if you look at what California did you know that they were dragged to the Supreme Court kicking and screaming to reduce their prison population because people were dying left and right from inadequate medical care. So, you know, it's easy to kind of do this blue state/red state kind of dichotomy. The reality of it is, you know, this kind of mindset and that's part of what I'll talk about today is that this you know, many scholars call it like the carceral ethos, really came to permeate the way that most states and if not all states thought, you know about the way they were going to approach corrections, which became partly, you know, entwined with the overall response to crime. And that was kind of a militaristic, harsh, you know, old school response that really didn't even you know, incorporate any acknowledgement of the roots of crime that criminologists had spent a lot of time trying to explain.



Jenn Tostlebe 09:14

I was just gonna say that.

 Michael Campbell 09:36

So and we'll get into some of the meat of your paper a little later, but as I was reading through it, and so during your front end, or the setup of your paper, there was this one line that I found

it, and so during your front end, or the setup of your paper, there was this one line that I found interesting, where you mentioned that scholars have argued that mass incarceration transcends policy and practice, and instead, it is, instead of just being strictly like a crime control policy, you describe it as a and I'm quoting directly from your paper, "a way of thinking and a system of subordination." Could you elaborate more on what you meant by this?

M

Michael Campbell 11:02

Yeah, so in terms of a way of thinking, when you take a policy, like the mass imprisonment of so many people, and many of them, you know, obviously, when we're talking about so many people in prison, you know, it's a myth that most of these people are low level drug offenders, right? Most half of people are in state prisons for violent crimes. But the reality of it is there's very little consideration of where that violence is coming from, and why violence is so prevalent in certain communities and why it persists in those communities. And it persisted through mass incarceration. And part of what happens and happened as I see it, is that as the states and as decision makers became increasingly committed to this mindset of, this is just our response. And we're seeing calls for the same thing again. Today the Wall Street Journal has a call to just add more police in Chicago to stop gun violence. I feel like you know, and a lot of other scholars have noted that this whole mindset of caging people being the proper, and ultimately, the only appropriate response came to permeate the views of parole where parole officers were no longer viewed as people that help you find housing and get a job; of the nature of probation, which became about, you know, urine tests to look for dirty drops from failed drug tests that lead to even more penalties and more fines. And so part of that kind of expansion of the size and the reach of the correctional system and the way that it imposes especially and disproportionately on certain people, it's hard to ignore that this came to permeate so much of governance. At one time in California in 1983, I think, in one of my papers, I know that, at one point 38% of all legislation under consideration had to do with crime. In a state the size of California with the problems that that state had as its economy was expanding as population was, the focus on crime was so overwhelming among the state government.

M

Michael Campbell 13:01

I like to you know, sometimes note that, you know, if we were to imagine that these people that we're putting in prison were, for example, our troubled uncle who has a drug problem and gets in fights with people and steals things to support his drug habit, we probably would never be all that comfortable with throwing that troubled uncle into prison for five to eight years, because, you know, he was high, had drugs, and burglarized, you know, somebody's garage or whatever. But during this period, essentially, corrections became increasingly linked to a view of this kind of "other" type of criminal. And that criminal wasn't the troubled uncle, this was some scary dangerous person lurking around the corner. And I don't think that you can sleep well at night with mass incarceration, unless you have a view of American society that that dangerous other is lurking around the corner, and the only real way to control them as they have police ready to aggressively pounce on them, and put them in prison and throw away the key. So when I talk about a system, and we talk about how these things permeate, you know, these are things it's not hard to imagine how this is also a part of policing, right? Like this is part of the militaristic mindset of a war. And, you know, if you're gonna fight a war on crime and a war on drugs, you don't use half measures in warfare. You know, you pull out your heaviest guns, and you know, you start battling day after day. And I think the message to law enforcement was clear that that was, you know, this is an acceptable approach. I think corrections administrators, you know,

when they got the green light to expand their facilities, you know, I think that's partly rooted in this idea that a lot of the people we were sending to prison really weren't redeemable and so it was okay to do what we did in the 80s and 90s. And continue to do today, quite honestly.



Jenn Tostlebe 14:43

Okay, so talking about mass incarceration, we kind of hit this high point in the prison system population in 2008. Right, if I'm remembering that right, I think that was like the high point.



Michael Campbell 14:54

Mhm.



Jenn Tostlebe 14:55

And now we're starting to see kind of this dialogue of entering a new era. era of mass decarceration. So releasing a lot of people from correctional facilities. And so when did we start to see this kind of change in discussion? And does it actually correspond to what's occurring?



Michael Campbell 15:15

Well, the answer is, we've been having mass decarceration every year for 20 some years because we simply put so many people in prison that some of them have to come out. Right? So if you think about the average prison term that a person spends, it's depending on the state three to four years in prison, a lot of times people get consumed with this number of you know, that hovered at the peak around 2 million people in Americas prisons today, right, excluding jails, or whatever it may be. A bigger and more important number to talk about is the churn of people who are rather than that snapshot of a given moment. Imagine the 10s of millions of people that have churned through these prisons over this period. And by churning I mean that there are new people coming in. And there are always people coming out, right. 95% Of all people leave prison. I don't know if that's still true, because of some of the prison lengths that have actually been imposed and life without parole. But at one point, it was around that statistic. So if you think about that, you can't have mass incarceration without mass decarceration.



Michael Campbell 16:16

But it doesn't mean that the size and scope of state prison systems have declined significantly. They have in some states they've grown in others. You can look at states like Indiana, their incarceration rate in the Midwest has continued to go up. Others have stayed steadily high. Georgia is a good example in the south, a state that's politics have changed somewhat, but it's just now talking about taking \$600 million of COVID funds to build a new prison, because that's what COVID money was designated for somehow. So mass incarceration, if you're talking about a dramatic shrinking of the overall size of the American prison population is not happening. I think the decline from 2008 over the next five to 10 years or something like four to 6%. We're

talking about something that grew by 500% from 1970 on. So if we're talking about mass incarceration, the answer is no, on one hand, in that there's still an awful lot of people in prison relative to our own history, and relative to similar nations. But the reality of it is there are always, every day in the United States, 1000s of people leaving state prisons. So decarceration is happening every day and must because we simply couldn't build enough cages to put everyone in prison indefinitely the way that it seemed like we were trying to do in the 80s and 90s.

M

Michael Campbell 17:30

So I would say the focus on churn would be a way to think about it, and that states like Massachusetts, New Jersey, they have made significant reductions in the size of their prison population by about a third. But if you want to turn around and look at some of the other states, they reduced them some during the great recession, but they then plateaued after minor reductions that were probably just driven by fiscal necessity. And then, you know, they went back to their high levels and sustaining those high levels as soon as it was, you know, financially possible. So, yeah, people are leaving, a lot of people are leaving prison, there are fewer people than there used to be. But I think if you'd asked a lot of experts if we had a massive recession, like we had in 2008 and 09, and that states are going to be forced to deal with major cutters in their budgets, how much would you predict state prison populations would decline? They might have guessed 15 20%, because they were so over incarcerated, and the real rate ended up decline was about four to 6%. So we're not seeing mass decarceration. We're not living in an era of mass incarceration unless someone can show me some statistics I have not yet seen.



Jenn Tostlebe 18:37

I was wondering if that was going to be your answer because I've continuously seen this term pop up. And I've seen, you know, similar to the statistics that you just said and so I was wondering, from your perspective, as someone who looks at this, like what you actually thought.

M

Michael Campbell 18:54

Well, I mean, I just left Missouri and you know, Missouri they actually did have meaningful reductions, but their reductions still land them at like the 15th highest state in the country, I think they had an eight or 10% decline in their prison population. But it starts at such a high number that that decline then leveled off, and it's still exceptionally high compared to the rest of the world, you know, triple quadruple any other country on Earth.

J

Jose Sanchez 19:18

So when we talk about politicians, we often hear people criticize them for taking a quote unquote, tough on crime stance, insofar that politicians that don't take the stance are often sort of seen as, they call it, that they're taking a weak on crime stance. And so that's how their

opponents would package that. And so we were wondering, is tough on crime, still the default for politicians, especially since Bill Clinton's election, or are we starting to see a shift away from this tough on crime discourse?

M

Michael Campbell 19:56

Part of this depends on what level of a politician you're talking about, and it depends on where you're talking about, right. So, you know, we did see a brief period here where we were seeing the election of prosecutors that were willing to prosecute police and who were saying they weren't going to prosecute drug crimes. We didn't see a lot of Governor's campaign on saying I'm really going to take on mass incarceration. But we did see some campaign that said that they would embrace some policies that might have an impact on it. That was new. That hadn't happened. But needless to say, the Trump administration, and then the pandemic and the much higher rates of homicide that came with it, and the rising gun violence that has followed the pandemic, those things have really altered the kind of political rhetoric in significant ways. You know, Donald Trump ran on a very aggressive, very old school law and order anti immigrant campaign and was very successful. And so were many other Republicans that embraced what he had to say. But they weren't successful everywhere, obviously, you know, the country is still remains very polarized on some pretty key issues, if not most issues. Crime is one of the most polarizing issues, right? If you look more at the city level, in many cities in the country, though, where, you know, crime is a very real persistent social issue that we have to deal with in cities where, you know, violence is higher than it is in many other parts of the country. But so is homelessness, right? Here in Denver, for example, you know, we have such problems right now, with homelessness and addiction, that it's impossible to talk about one without talking about the other. You know, we're facing fentanyl and opioid overdoses at record levels that people keep pointing to for good reason. You know, this is a tragedy. But right now, we're seeing our legislature here in Colorado, that's been very progressive in criminal justice reform, we're seeing them talking about, you know, making very low levels of fentanyl, a felony, which it's understandable to hate fentanyl, and what it does, because it's destructive. That's undeniable. But the problem here, I think that for many people, is that we haven't learned the lesson of history that more criminalization, that you know, putting this in the felony category, and essentially weaponizing the criminal justice system even more, it didn't work to stop heroin, it didn't stop cocaine, it didn't stop meth, it didn't stop weed, and it's not going to stop fentanyl. But this is kind of the de facto political response. And I would say then, that, you know, it's very difficult to resist this, when you look at what's happening with these drug deaths and overdoses. And when you go to downtown Denver, and you see the level of homelessness, people do not want that kind of disorder going on in their communities. And part of the problem is there has been a lack of imagination in this country in talking and thinking about public safety. You know, when people with problems of drug addiction, get the right kinds of services to stay off of the streets and off of drugs, more than less, we're all safer when that person is also safer, that works a lot better. And unfortunately, we, you know, Americans are like other people politically, you know, we kind of go back to our default, right, like, more police violence means we need more police, right, higher crime, we need more prisons and longer sentences. It's a simple, intuitive response that also just doesn't work. It's like spanking your children, you can beat your children and they'll become terrified of you, but it won't necessarily make them stop doing the things they're doing. And it definitely doesn't in the long term lead to better outcomes. And I feel like you know, as Americans, we just keep beating our children here. And it's not to infantilize, you know, the people who are engaged in criminal activity, many of these people have dealt with serious trauma, that mental health issues, but I feel like it's kind of the

same simple mindset of, you know, sitting in a chair and saying, I know how to solve that problem. And it's politically easy to swallow. And we're definitely not beyond that. I don't see us being beyond that anytime soon.



Jenn Tostlebe 23:50

And it's in line with, public opinion. I can't tell you how many people I've talked to who are moving and buying houses. And the number one concern is, you know, the level of crime in the neighborhood. And so it ties all together.



Michael Campbell 24:05

Yeah. And, you know, it's hard when you're a person in that circumstance to say, well, I'm going to be tolerant. Well, they really are going to be tolerant. I lived in St. Louis, we had carjackings, gunshots out the window, gunfight in the alley, and I'm not tolerant of violence and crime. I'm not. You know, I don't like crime policies that I don't think are effective, like the ones that often are a part of mass incarceration. But nobody, you know, in their right mind thinks that a bunch of crime is fine. Criminals don't want to live in bad neighborhoods, you know? You survey people that are in prison for homicide, they don't want their kids growing up in neighborhoods that have a lot of crime. So, you know, I think that's universal for good or simple reasons. You know, how you turn that into policy is another very difficult question. And especially in a place where housing values have just skyrocketed, like here in Colorado in Denver, Boulder, the whole metro area. You know, it's understandable that people have been displaced because it's almost impossible to even afford a home here unless you've got an awful lot of income or wealth for both.



Jose Sanchez 25:09

Okay, well, I think this sets us up nicely to get it into your paper. And so, the paper that we're gonna be talking about today was authored by Mike and his colleagues, Heather Schoenfeld, and Paige Vaughn. It's titled "Same old song and dance: An analysis of legislative activity in a period of Penal Reform." And it was published in *Punishment and Society* in 2020. The study draws from all proposed and passed bills in three legislative sessions in New Jersey between 2001 and 2013 to better understand state level reform and provide a complete look at the continuity and change in penal logics in New Jersey.



Jose Sanchez 25:47

Okay, Mike, so we're gonna hit you with a question that we hit everybody with when we get into this section, and that is, what was the motivation behind writing this paper?



Michael Campbell 25:57

Well, that's the right question to ask when you're talking about papers, because, you know, the fact that maybe you stumbled across some data that you thought a bunch of criminologists would want to read is a bad motivation for a paper.

would want to read is a bad motivation for a paper.

M

Michael Campbell 26:10

This paper was motivated by a broader study, trying to understand what was going on at the state level during this period, essentially responding to your earlier question about, you know, are things really changing in the United States as they pertain to mass incarceration and the carceral ethos that undergirds it. And so we designed a broader study, that's a case study of six different states, and New Jersey, we paired the states within the same region. So New Jersey is our state that's paired with Pennsylvania and New Jersey, we study because New Jersey's incarceration rate declined by 38% from about 2003 to whenever we design the study, which I think was in, say, 2016, or something like that. And so we were like, Okay, here's a state that if you know, the country is going to get better at not putting so many people in prison at great costs. Well, here's an example. So let's study New Jersey and see what they did. And one of the things we want to study is obviously, they must have passed a bunch of legislation that gradually rolled back mass incarceration, and explains this big downward tick in the state's prison population, right? Like, we were just like, we have to go see, what did they do? Maybe this is a model, maybe, you know, maybe these people figured out a set of paths that were politically acceptable, that might serve as examples for other states. And so we started analyzing and you know, the state, and this was very difficult methodologically, but looking through all the legislation that's going through the state legislatures is a really big challenge. You know, they propose and they enact or don't enact. And these bills are very difficult to trace. And so we spent a lot of time just getting familiar with what was actually going on. And you can't do it for every legislative session. It's just too time consuming. We didn't have the power to do that. And I don't know that it would have paid off to do so. We thought about it and realized that three time periods across a bigger chunk of time, anything more fine tuned than that most people aren't really going to be that interested in anyway. People really care about bigger trends here, not the minutia of New Jersey lawmaking. So we picked three time periods kind of beginning, middle beginning, you know, kind of just after the big recession, and then further down the line, I think, was of 2013, maybe, which were all available data at the time.

M

Michael Campbell 28:34

And we just wanted to understand what did the New Jersey legislature do to drive down this prison population? And well, we were wrong. As it turns out, the legislature didn't do hardly anything to dry down the state prison population. And it was a big lesson for us and that we had always attributed, and for good reason, right, like, you cannot have mass incarceration without state legislatures passing and enacting huge budgets that fund prison expansion, prison operations, right? You cannot have these things exist without the state doing that. But it turns out that as a state like New Jersey has reduced its reliance on imprisonment, the legislature essentially was the last one to the table, not the first one to the table. And so for us, that was a very surprising result in that we had thought the legislative branch would be leading. We know governors are reluctant to do these things because they are often politically ambitious. These are high profile things, they get all the blame if things go south. But we thought a little bit more low key operations in the legislature would really be kind of the quiet driver of these changes. And as the title suggests, same old song and dance, as it turns out, you know, we didn't find what we thought we were going to find. We were looking for 20 or 30 different pieces of enacted legislation that reduced a little bit of drug crimes here or had a diversionary program there, or, you know, provide a new parole opportunity for somebody

who's 50 or over here, those were not the things that led to that big decline in New Jersey's prison population. And that was a surprise to us. And we, you know, that was what we kept looking for, we kept thinking we were just missing it.

M

Michael Campbell 30:15

And we kept digging and digging, and the digging is what led to this massive amount of coded legislative pieces. Because we kept thinking, well, we must be missing, you know, we must be missing something, we've got to make sure we're being thorough, because you can never get everything that comes out of a state legislature. Obviously, there's a massive amount of stuff that goes on. But this was essentially the product of really taking the microscope to or I guess a magnifying glass to one state that seemed like it should be a prime example of reform, driving down prison populations. And taking it and getting it closer and closer and closer until you're finally like, well, you know, this is not the reason that things changed in New Jersey, at least not the main reason they put it that.



Jenn Tostlebe 31:04

Okay. All right. So to get in a little bit more into the nitty gritty, you just gave a fantastic overview of the paper. For this, you not only though looked at, bills that passed, like actual legislation that went into action, but you also included the proposed legislation? And so why did you decide to take this approach and do you think that was a fruitful way to go about this analysis?

M

Michael Campbell 31:30

Well, it was certainly laborious. Including everything that you could find that you thought was reasonably could be lumped into this category was an awful lot of work and Paige Vaughn did a lot of the RA work on that, and to her credit, you know, helped dig through and that and several other RAs at the University of Missouri, St. Louis, were integral as well. I do think it was fruitful, because part of what we want to know is, what is the realm? What are they doing in these bodies that are generating the laws and the policies that run these states? It's pretty easy to look at laws that are enacted. But what if certain states have, for example, a lot of people pushing reform, but those people can't ever quite get over the hump. But they're out there working hard to do this. And by doing that, maybe they make it to where the, you know, the tone of the way the State operates is a little bit different, because people who are opposed to those things become more receptive to passing just one or two reforms, because they see all of this activity going on. So we wanted to really understand more about the kind of universe of activity associated with criminal justice policies or correctional policies that was going on. You know, you can search, there's plenty of ways to search for enacted legislation that gets all the press. But a lot of times, those things that are enacted are the product of three or four failed efforts in previous legislative sessions. And so for us, we wanted to understand, you know, what's not making the cut? What does get across the finish line? You know, do things fail only to come back and succeed later? Or do they fail only, you know, to be reborn in a different iteration. And if you only look at those things that are passed and become law, you're ignoring, essentially, the biggest part of the whole lawmaking process. And that is the obvious, the vast majority of things never do become law. And so we wanted to understand more about what is

the broader universe of what these legislators are actively doing and talking about and proposing, versus just those things that get mentioned, you know, in the state's biggest newspaper, as you know, some change in policy. I do think it was fruitful, I don't think that it's the sort of thing that needs to be done repeatedly, or over and over. But I think that, you know, some of our findings help show that, you know, there might be times when doing something similar to this would make good sense. Because you have a state that's doing things very differently. You know, what if we have a state like Colorado that's landing a lot of reforms over a five year stretch, maybe only then to kind of rail those back? That might be a different thing to understand, you know, so at the end of the day, it was fruitful. But, again, it kind of depends. I think there's a time and a place to do it. And I think this was the right time and place in our project to do that. But I wouldn't, I wouldn't say that digging this deep into the trees in every case is necessary. It was here.



Jenn Tostlebe 34:26

Yeah, I feel like Jose knows a little bit of the pain of how much labor intensive this is because he's doing I don't even know exactly, but digging into gang legislation right now.



Michael Campbell 34:40

Yeah, I remember you talking about that the last time we spoke.



Jose Sanchez 34:43

Yeah, we've expanded it a little bit to include other stuff like RICO. But yeah, you know, there's off the top of my head I believe there's five states that don't have any gang legislation. But when you dig deeper, it's not necessarily the because it's been forgotten, or because everyone agrees that we shouldn't have legislation. When you dig deeper, like there have been a lot of proposed bills that either the Governor vetoed or that passed through the house but didn't pass through the Senate. In those sorts like people have introduced it, it just hasn't passed for one reason or another.



Michael Campbell 35:22

And those reasons are part of what we were looking at, you know, especially partisan dynamics, like, Are there Republican governors that you know, New Jersey had changes in partisanship, you know, are there Republicans in New Jersey that are just more receptive to reform? We thought they must be, they're Northeastern Republicans, maybe they're more, that's actually not what we found. We found that they were very much opposed to reform, they weren't game with it at all. There were a handful that were more moderate and did go along. But in general, that didn't explain what we were finding. And we, we didn't see a legislature where people were coming in holding up research studies that mass incarceration doesn't work, and saying, you know, given our history of extreme, you know, racial disparities and policing and incarceration, we, you know, we need to really change our sentencing laws in this state. We weren't seeing that.

J

Jose Sanchez 36:13

So I know we're gonna talk about methodology a little on a broader sense when we talk about the bigger project. But we did want to briefly touch on the methods you use for this paper, because they fall under this umbrella of qualitative research. But I think when we say qualitative, a lot of people will assume ethnography or interviews. And so this is a little different, right? And so we wanted to ask you, if you could briefly tell us what this method is, and why you chose this method for this paper?

M

Michael Campbell 36:46


Well, we chose this method, because, you know, the research question that we kind of homed in on that we decided to focus on here was like, What are they doing in the legislature, and by doing we didn't just want to hear about, like what they say they are doing, we wanted to see the actual products of the legislative process themselves. You know, we understand that sometimes legislators just propose bills, because it looks good for them politically and they can say I proposed X or I propose Y. But if they're doing that, they have to do it for a reason, right? It's not easy, you can't just propose an indefinite number of pieces of legislation, I'm assuming, without making your colleagues despise you, right. And so part of what we really want to know is what did they think was important enough, whether it had a realistic chance or not at passing, for them to go through all the trouble to fill out all the paperwork to put this on the docket for the state legislature to consider and to reflect on and to put in the work, because we thought that that was essentially the pudding, right? Like, that's where if they're going to spend the time to work on it, and advance it, and put their name on it, then this is real evidence of what they're prioritizing as legislators. Votes are sometimes not as useful for those things because votes are strategic and political, as the legislation you introduced, of course, there's similarities there, they're all kind of problematic.

M


Michael Campbell 38:07

But we decided to do a content analysis where, you know, we had some tools at our disposal to this state was, you know, very accessible in terms of being able to get to the legislation, there's other states that doing a study like this really wouldn't work, you couldn't have online access to all their legislation that would be as sortable and as manageable. And so we, you know, did a lot of content analysis that we built an online platform that allowed us to essentially incorporate a lot of and organize and manage a lot of this data and put it into a very specific set of coding schemes. So the content analysis was really, you know, the design of let's use the laws and proposed legislation and the bills to assess, you know, what these people have decided to invest their energy in. And then let's develop a coding scheme that can break this down into things where we can make sense of it and say, This must be something they find important enough to propose it, otherwise it wouldn't exist, right? And so, you know, there's a level of energy there the same way that you know, if you want to know what states prioritize, look at their budgets, right. The proofs in the pudding, not the words that people say, Oh, I really care about racial justice. And I really care about these poor communities. And this and that, well, the words that you might get in an interview, combined with, say, media statements that reveal somebody's political approach, combined with the actual activities of the legislature, we're always trying to triangulate these things to try to identify why things are operating the way they are. And this content analysis is really kind of this is one branch of something operating in


a bigger project. But this paper shows that, you know, it can be used to make sense of what's going on in the legislature and what's going on over time, right? We didn't do it just for one session, we were able to show that there are some important things changing once we got our coding scheme refined, we were able to do that in three points in time and kind of show, you know, there are some things changing in New Jersey's legislature based on what they're proposing. And there's some other things that are staying the same.

 Jose Sanchez 40:11


Now I think we can get into the moment that everyone's been waiting for.

 Jenn Tostlebe 40:18

That you've given a sneak peeks already.

 Jose Sanchez 40:20

Yeah, you've already you've kind of given everyone an appetizer. But can you tell us about what were the key findings overall for legislation and regulations regarding incarceration and decreasing prison populations in New Jersey?

 Michael Campbell 40:33

Yeah, so like I said earlier, you know, we had really hoped to find, and we had thought, I mean, I shouldn't say hope to find, we expected to find that the legislature had been active in providing momentum or driving this reduction in the state's prison population. And we were not able to find any kind of landmark shift that really explained what happened. As it turns out, and this is not that surprising, I guess, in that a lot of the changes were more administrative within the Department of Corrections itself and also within the prosecutor's office. So New Jersey is a very different state than other states, in that prosecutors are not elected, they're appointed by the governor and approved and managed by the Attorney General of the state, and essentially the Attorney General of New Jersey did and can distribute directives to prosecutors across the state telling them what to focus on or what not or what the Governor's priorities are, or how to interpret legal changes. And what we found is that a lot of the reduction was the product of those kind of more administrative, behind the scenes, less politicized activities.

 Michael Campbell 41:40

And the reality of what we saw, you know, the title is no accident, same old song and dance question mark, is a lot of what we continue to see was that legislators, despite, you know, a lot of evidence that the criminal justice system is not the best place to manage a lot of elements of social life. And, you know, social structure, continued to propose bills for very harsh sentences for people that abused their cats, for people who leave gaps in fences where dogs can get out, that they should maybe go to prison for that. They propose that on the anniversary of the day you killed someone that you have to spend every one of those days in solitary confinement,

and that you, you know, very, very harsh reminders of the worst thing that this person had ever done. And so we found that there was essentially a steady stream of proposed bills that remained very harsh, and essentially, many of them also essentially duplicated, you know, saying something is illegal and saying, Oh, and you can't do it near a synagogue or a church. Well, you already couldn't. But now you're the defender of this great, you know, sanctified place that you can take this to your constituents and say, here's what I'm doing.

M

Michael Campbell 42:50

And so for us, you know, we interpreted a lot of this as really political theater that was going on. These proposed bills, we wouldn't have seen that without looking at the proposed bills, that it's clear that you know, our political system and our lawmaking system, reward people for engaging in this kind of theater. And on the one hand, you might say, hey, that's politics, right? This has gone on forever. Look at ancient Rome, you know, nothing new under the sun here. But that's not true. Because what happens then if you look at the tone, and you look at kind of the culture of what's being said, thought, and talked about within the legislative chambers, when you constantly have people proposing and encouraging and advocating for using criminal justice responses to all kinds of behaviors as like the primary initial or essentially politically rewarding way to signify that you think that this is how this problem should be dealt with, you're essentially perpetuating the same mindset that got us where we're at when it comes to mass incarceration, right? If you want to improve the care of animals, rather than charging people with crimes and putting them in jail, you know, it may be better to require people to have a license to have an animal that they have to demonstrate that they can care for the animal or whatever it may be. But what we found was that there were just so much of the same kinds of perpetuation of this mindset that the criminal justice system's punitive and aggressive response to wrongdoings was the best way to deal with myriad social problems. And that we found was very counter to what we'd hoped to find.

M

Michael Campbell 44:29

So when people talk about mass decarceration, the only way you're really going to have mass decarceration is if the majority of politicians in a state, including the president of the Senate, the governor, the people that have the power to stop legislation from moving forward, sit down and really say to themselves, you know, we have just put way too many people in prison and we really have to think about a better way of responding to crime because this isn't working and it costs too much money, and it actually has criminogenic effects, has obviously devastating effects on certain communities, on individuals, people with mental health issues, doesn't solve addiction makes addiction worse. That was what we were hoping to see. Kind of a rethinking of that ethos. We didn't find that, you know, we found some nibbling around the edges. And it doesn't mean there weren't people there that might have been thinking about it. But it didn't mean that they wanted it to be on the record as their primary legislative proposal for that session. And that didn't change that much through the last time period in our study, and we thought it would. 2001, you know, incarceration rates are still going up and a lot of the country, but we picked 2001, because then we have 9/11, and you know, the tone about crime kind of started to change a little bit where people were talking more about terrorism. And yet, we didn't see that.

 M

Michael Campbell 45:46

We did see a lot more regulation of oh, well, anyone released from prison who had committed this act can't live in these areas, and they can't live in these areas, they have to register for this kind of an offense list. They're not allowed to be work in this field or this field or that field. So we continue to see the all the same sorts of mindsets of what had got us in this mess in the first place. Not some kind of rethinking that had the capacity to really unsettle the foundation of mass incarceration. What we saw instead was nibbling around the edges, and making a New Jersey some meaningful cuts for very low level offenders, while sustaining and even increasing penalties for more serious offenders. You know, as you can see, in the paper, there were, you know, increases and penalties for sex offenders, for gun offenders, for violent offenders. And we saw the focus here on the non non nons, you know, the non violent, non sexual, you know, non repeat offense, you know, the people who were essentially at the lowest level of offending who probably never should have been considered for prison, in the first place. We see legislation and changes to parole that are getting a lot of those people that probably shouldn't have been in prison at that point anyway, out, which is good is certainly better than continuing to incarcerate people that makes no sense to little sense to keep them in. But we didn't hear some, you know, fundamental rethinking of New Jersey's approach to crime, and to the use of the criminal justice system, and to corrections. New Jersey was certainly more progressive than a lot of other states, definitely more thoughtful, incorporate a lot of academic work through, you know, Rutgers University records, but at the end of the day, the legislative toand retained a lot of similarities. The difference was, by the time we get to the end, the people proposing the more punitive things, their bills just weren't going as far they were less likely to have success, they were still trying to do it. They just weren't getting across the finish line. And there were more bills that were being proposed that had the chance to be decarcerated, right, to reduce the prison population. So at least it's in the realm of possibilities because you can't enact something, if no one ever even proposed it.

 M

Michael Campbell 47:26

A positive direction, hopefully.

 M

Michael Campbell 47:58

Right. One would hope. If you're at least hearing someone discuss a bill, and this was part of what we were talking about, if you're hearing people every time and you're a legislator that maybe doesn't know a lot about corrections, but you're hearing these bills being proposed, where these people are presenting evidence that this doesn't work, it costs too much, it doesn't improve public safety. If you hear this enough times, you might actually think about it a little more seriously. But if no one ever says those things, why would you?



Jenn Tostlebe 48:22

So thinking about this, and how these findings and what you're, you know, the same old song and dance coming from what seems like a more progressive state in certain aspects? What kind of implications does this have for research? And then, you know, more apparently, policy and practice?

M

Michael Campbell 48:42

Well, I guess I would say that I would hope that it might make policymakers and especially, you know, when you talk about interviews, we've interviewed many, many people over 20 some people in New Jersey as another component of this project. So we aren't just doing content analysis, we've spoken to people. And I would say that one thing would be like, you know, the primary legislative aides that work with legislators to talk that they would maybe read a very brief version of this paper, and maybe think to themselves, you know, even though we don't think it'll get past this session, let's try to get this bill out there that might help set a different tone about the way that people in here in the Senate or in the assembly are talking about our approach to sentencing for X type of crime or Y type of crime, it may not pass this time, and it may not even be our horse that wins the race. But if we change the tone of the discussion, then maybe it takes three, four, or five legislative sessions, but maybe taking that longer term strategy of changing the way the things that people are talking about and the way they're talking about them might have long term value.

M

Michael Campbell 49:53

And then secondly, in terms of scholarship, you know, I would say it's important that we not forget that, you know, in many ways, mass incarceration is a political project. It is the investment of enormous amounts of capital and energy. It is a social policy that consumes billions, you know, 10s of billions of dollars a year, I mean, a billion dollars in Colorado alone. And, you know, when we think about that, and we think about the fact that much of this is linked to this kind of political theater, that's successful, you know, you've got to think about talking to voters, why are voters still so receptive to this kind of political theater? Why don't they expect more, you know, from maybe a moderate who would say, you know, we've got plenty of evidence that this won't make us any safer, this will cost us a lot of money, and that, you know, I'd rather us not spend the money right, at the most conservative position, or that maybe we spend the money in different places.

J

Jose Sanchez 50:47

Okay, so I think we can spend the last 5-10 minutes or so talking about the bigger project that this paper is a part of. And so from our email conversations, like I mentioned that paper we talked about today is part of this bigger project that you're collaborating on with Heather Schoenfeld. Can you tell us more about this larger project?

M

Michael Campbell 51:09

Yeah, so we both had done case studies of different states, I had studied California and Texas, and she had studied Florida, and she has a book that came out a couple years ago, it's back here on my shelf somewhere. I heard it all, so I didn't have to read it all. But we had done this kind of work. And we had both had some success and scholars were interested in the ways that these kinds of in depth case studies could really inform theory. And we had some success putting those things together in a piece we published in 2013 in the American Journal of Sociology. And so we decided then to expand this project to a much bigger level, and try to put these things together and put some things to the test for kind of the more contemporary era.

Much of our other earlier work and looked at a more historical kind of view of things. You know, as somebody who studied some history, 2020, it's not even history like that's today, essentially, in terms of historical accounts. And we certainly both were aware that things had started to change. You know, Jenn, as you pointed out at the very beginning, we're in kind of a new era, some people are even saying mass decarceration, I think Heather and I can speak for her and that we would take a much more pessimistic view that, you know, there's been some nibbling around the edges, but the system is still well intact.

M

Michael Campbell 52:18

So we designed a set of match paired case studies. So we're studying New Jersey and Pennsylvania, Florida and Georgia, and Illinois and Michigan. And the goal then is that each of those states, one of those states enacted a pretty big set of reforms or did something serious to address their prison population and the other state didn't. So all these states are regional neighbors, no two states are exactly alike. But if you pick them from the same region, they got more similarities than if you pick Idaho and New York. So we picked states that had some commonalities, knowing we can't fully control for these other things, but to do the best that we could. And then we studied both of those states in depth. So we've interviewed lawmakers, governors, advocates, we've interviewed attorneys general, heads of departments of correction. So we've targeted and interviewed people in all of these different states, we've done extensive work gathering an enormous amount of media data on criminal justice activity in these states from 2000 to 2020. Actually, we've updated that to the present. And the goal is then to look at what's happened in each of these states. And for example, ask ourselves, why is New Jersey doing a, b, and c and Pennsylvania is doing nothing? But then why is it that Pennsylvania by 2012 does decide to do something? And then New Jersey stops doing things when it gets to 2014? And so the benefit of our study then is that we're able to look at paired states from different regions over a 20 year period and compare them and think about why might they be the same? Why might they be different? And we don't even have to compare them right, you could use the data, we have to just examine what went on in a single state and do a deep dive, kind of like we did in this piece.

M

Michael Campbell 53:58

And one of the things that we think is pretty innovative in the piece is that we constructed an online, essentially relational database to manage all of our data. So I think at one point, we had as many as eight or nine RAs working on the project at a given time. I think there's been over 20 to 25 RAs that have worked on it over the last five years. And they're able to simultaneously use the interface to enter data and code data all in one setting. So essentially, that you can take a piece of data and process that all the way through having one RA do that in one setting. And so then, for example, we've got like over 6000 statements from actors that we've extracted from media sources, statements that they've made in the public over this period, about their position relative to criminal justice reform. We also have done interviews with people, targeted people in these places. And so now we're essentially writing up and managing all this and asking ourselves, you know, given that we have these detailed histories of the six states during this, you know, seemingly reform minded era, what drove reform? What stopped reform? What did reform look like in different times in different places? How are the states similar and different? Right? How does the electoral cycle in a state affect the likelihood that it might implement reform? How do changes in partisanship in the legislature affect reform? When

and where are Republican legislators engaged in reform and when and where are they not? So all those kinds of questions are going to be things that we're going to be able to look at moving forward. Now that we've wrapped up data gathering, and we're starting to analyze these things literally tonight.



Jenn Tostlebe 55:31

Yeah, I was going to ask because I think last time we talked to you, which two years ago, I think we decided you were, I believe you were still collecting data. Did you like just recently wrap up with that part? And...yeah?



Michael Campbell 55:43

So, the grant ended, and on August 31 of last year, and we got a COVID. Extension. And we were very fortunate that our RAs were not negatively impacted by COVID, the way that we were, I mean, of course, it impacted them negatively. But in terms of their ability to work on this project, they had already been trained, they actually had more time, not less than they had in the past. And so in some ways, we, you know, we were able to even tick up a little bit in terms of finishing data collection, because our assistants were all fully capable of working even more hours because they were bored at home and wanted to work. And so and make a little money, I guess. And so at the end of the day, they were able to do that. Of course, we've got gaps in our data that we're going in filling in because there's just such a we collected so much, and there's always going to be some things you want to finish up. But that's been a massive endeavor. Bigger than we ever could have dreamed the number and amount of things that we decided to incorporate. But I think it'll be useful. And you know, being an NSF funded project, like our data will be publicly accessible here in a few years after we wrap everything up and we can actually put it in a form that someone can use. So for us, you know, it's been a lot of data collection. And we're really looking forward to really digging into this stuff and being able to write more, because it just seems like data collection was a monster that we weren't fully prepared for how big of a task that was going to be. But we want to do it right. And since we were already in it, we did and we're proud of what we got. But we're we're eager to get to analyzing and writing these things up.



Jenn Tostlebe 57:17

Yeah it sounds like such a cool project, lots of moving parts, when so clearly, we're already seeing some things coming out of the project. But like when could we expect, you know, more things to come?



Michael Campbell 57:30

Well, we're actually collaborating with the very first ra who ever worked on the project, who just finished up his postdoc at the University of Michigan's sociology department, Josh Basseches, and we're writing a piece on qualitative methods and the way that doing state level case studies and using qualitative methods to do it is very useful for political social scientists. So we're writing that piece right now. And so that, you know, we've got our outline that's in the

works. So that would probably be the first piece that will go out. And then Heather and I are, this week working on a piece that looks at we've kind of tentatively called kind of proto reforms that started to pop up in the very early periods of between about 2000 and 2005, and seeing like, what initiated those reforms, why were some states receptive to these early pre recession reforms, whenever other states only started to consider reform after their budgets were cratered by the recession. And so that piece, which is going to be more theoretical, and probably take longer to put together, that piece we're hoping to have done by the middle of the summer, and have that out under review. And then we're most likely the first big thing coming out of here, that piece should be big, then the next piece will focus on what was the biggest reform, if any, that each state enacted during our time period? And why did they do that reform versus something else? And how extensive was it? And what were the consequences of each state's biggest move to address incarceration? So that'll be our third piece. And then we plan to wrap all this up into a book with Russell Sage at some point, probably next, that'd be something in the mid to end of next year.



Jenn Tostlebe 59:11

Yeah, I look forward to it. Part of my like comprehensive exams was on the history of mass incarceration and all of that. So it's definitely something I'm interested in. So I'll be looking for those different pieces. Yeah,



Michael Campbell 59:25

Yeah. Well, hopefully we can get them out sooner rather than later. As long as this COVID stays in you know, under wraps a little bit more, we will have a better chance. But like everybody, we were affected. And we both have small children, two small children at home. And so things were really, really challenging there for a while. And it was tough to generate enough energy to take care of them and do this at the same time. So



Jenn Tostlebe 59:48

Things always take longer than you think they're going to.



Michael Campbell 59:51

They do.



Michael Campbell 59:52

I'm still waiting. I've been doing this now for however long. I'm waiting for that one thing we're like, Wow, that really didn't take as long as I thought it would.



Jenn Tostlebe 59:59

Right?



Michael Campbell 1:00:00

Show me that event and I'll be a happy person, but it still hasn't.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:00:04

Maybe it'll be on this project. Who knows?



Michael Campbell 1:00:06

You don't know. Maybe. I would love it. I hope that's the case. You know, maybe boost up my caffeine addiction for about two months.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:00:14

Right?



Jose Sanchez 1:00:16

Well, Mike, those are all the questions that we had for you. Are there any closing comments, anything that we didn't touch on that you'd like to speak on before we wrap up?



Michael Campbell 1:00:25

Yeah, I would say that, you know, I really respect that you all are doing something like this podcast, because I'd say as a scholar who's a little further down the line, one of the most disappointing things about this profession has been the almost total lack of impact that criminology and sociology have had, on the policies that a lot of us study. And I think that's unfortunate, because I think that we can make publicly digestible, powerful arguments. Not everyone is going to want to see the facts or hear the details of your methods. But surely, there's enough people that are smart enough to write and talk in ways that can be accessible to people that don't have or are getting PhDs in our fields. And so I would say that one thing, I'd hope and our project that Heather and I are working on, we see producing a couple of different types of products, one being, of course, the academic currency that we all exchange in in terms of articles and books. But I would say just as importantly, we really hope to have a little bit do a much better job than we've done in the past of plugging our work into the public sphere, where all this work, you know, isn't literally academic, you know, that it becomes a part of the public discussion. And I think, you know, podcasts are one way to do that. But I would encourage you all, as, you know, people coming through graduate school to know that, you know, we've done a terrible job as a profession of getting our work out where people can get it, I hope that the

younger generations of scholars do a far better job than we've done, because it's been an utter failure, as you can see from our current political processes, as they relate to lots of things, criminal justice among them. So keep doing that, I would say.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:02:05

That's part of our goal, so even if we can have a small impact on it, that'd be cool.



Michael Campbell 1:02:10

It's better than none, which that's kind of been the default for a lot of work over the years, barring the random call from a Washington Post reporter asking for a snippet quote. That doesn't change minds.



Jose Sanchez 1:02:21

Right. Well, Mike, thank you so much for being here today. We really enjoyed talking to you. So we've talked about some of the stuff that's in the works with your bigger project, is there anything else you'd like to plug anything else that we should be on the lookout for?



Michael Campbell 1:02:35

Well, I'm just going to bear down and work on that. That's the truth, you know.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:02:38

Sounds like enough.



Michael Campbell 1:02:39


It is enough. And I would say, you know, if there's one thing I have learned over the years, it's that, you know, staying doggedly focused on getting some specific things completed, is one of the ways to be successful as an academic. And my goal right now, is to keep that singular kind of focus on getting these things out, given all the energy we've got in it. So that's my plan. And those you know, when those things come out, I'll be sure to send some stuff over you guys' way and let you know where things are.



Jose Sanchez 1:03:05


Awesome. Sounds great.





 Michael Campbell 1:03:07
I appreciate your interest.


 Jose Sanchez 1:03:08
And where can people find you? Are you on Twitter?


 Michael Campbell 1:03:10
I don't do so much of that stuff. But I do have a website, it's on my email address. It's <https://professormichaelcampbell.com/>, or something like that. You can look it up in the tag here. If you want to link that to this podcast. I do have a Twitter account. But I'm not telling anybody what it is.


 Jenn Tostlebe 1:03:26
Fair enough.

 Michael Campbell 1:03:27
I don't have any interest in engaging in those debates. So that's kind of my plan. But yeah, I think that's on my tag. If you want to take a look at that.

 Jenn Tostlebe 1:03:36
We'll get that added to our website and the podcast link.

 Michael Campbell 1:03:39
Yeah, I'm hoping to maybe rope in a couple speakers to come here to do you at some point over the next year. And if I do, I'll be sure to share that with you folks up at Boulder.

 Jose Sanchez 1:03:48
That'd be great. Yeah. Well, thank you again, Mike.

 Michael Campbell 1:03:53
All right. Nice seeing you both again. Take care.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:03:55

You too. Thanks. Bye.



Michael Campbell 1:03:56

Bye.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:03:57

Hey, thanks for listening!



Jose Sanchez 1:03:59

Don't forget to leave us a review on Apple podcasts or iTunes. Or let us know what you think of the episode by leaving us a comment on our website thecriminologyacademy.com



Jenn Tostlebe 1:04:08

You can also follow us on Twitter, Instagram and Facebook @TheCrimAcademy.



Jose Sanchez 1:04:19

Or email us at thecrimacademy@gmail.com



Jenn Tostlebe 1:04:24

See you next time!