

forgotten by policy makers in their rush to punish is a valuable contribution. Yet the prescribed solutions also raise some questions, in part stemming from the lack of focus on the larger political and economic contexts in which these policies take shape.

Sullivan suggests that one reason family separation is negative is because it ultimately increases burdens on taxpayers and leads to dependents' unnecessary reliance on social assistance (16, 83). Although he makes important points about the disruptive and negative effects of family separation, this line of argument may ultimately contradict some of his own solutions. Appeals to fiscal responsibility have been used to eviscerate the very types of programs Sullivan rightfully notes are needed to keep families together and to protect children. He proposes a range of policies to mitigate harm to dependents that would all require state investments, including providing financial support for visitation, making chaperones available for children to visit parents (10, 85), employing psychiatrists and social welfare workers to address mental health needs (23), allowing incarcerated parents to work for market-level wages while in prison (95), and broadly giving caregivers "support and resources" (12).

Similarly, the argument that greater family connection and rehabilitation while in prison would lessen the need for state support programs in society more broadly may be shortsighted. Family unity is a worthy goal, but it is not necessarily a substitute for the responsibility of society to address economic, political, and racial inequalities. Many of those outside prison face a similar lack of resources, such as not having access to living wages or affordable housing, that create major impediments to caregiving. This broader inequitable social environment raises the question of whether it will be sufficient to change criminal justice, immigration, and antiterrorism practices alone. It seems likely that the problems related to protecting the children of the accused and detained require policies that extend beyond these domains.

Sullivan acknowledges the social determinants and structural causes of crime, which makes his call for rehabilitation at times an odd choice. Putting forth a rehabilitative ideal risks promoting an individualistic and moralizing view of crime that obscures the role of economic and political context. Arguments like "moral reform should play a guiding role in incarceration rather than simply warehousing" (87) and "incarceration should be used to rehabilitate offenders to be better caregivers and citizens" (99) are welcome corrections to destructive retributive approaches. However, they may unintentionally support stigmatizing views that those in prison are morally deficient and require personal transformation. This perspective keeps the focus on the perceived weaknesses of the offender as the problem, rather than on the larger social context in which they are

expected to survive. The argument that "society has a responsibility to help those who are at risk of offending, to treat their behavioral illnesses, and to rehabilitate them into productive social roles" (23) contributes to the idea that people are in prison because of their own flaws. This perspective fails to address the many structural impediments to people being "productive" in extremely inequitable societies that are dependent on the disposability and marginalization of entire populations.

Likewise, the argument that "reintegration should be the goal of punishment for offenders, allowing them to reassume roles as caregivers, providers, and contributing members of society" (8) fails to adequately take into account broader circumstances. The goal of reintegration often ignores the highly exclusionary social context that people are being asked to "reintegrate" into: for many, this social context was likely a major contribution to why they were subjected to punitive policies in the first place.

Ultimately, these are small points to raise in what is an unequivocally important project that provides unique insights and connections into how we can address the cruel harms inflicted on the dependents of accused caregivers. This book is a valuable resource for those interested in theories of punishment and citizenship. It is a significant contribution to those working at the intersection of international and domestic policy—and a must-read for anyone concerned with what we owe to the most vulnerable members of our society.

Response to Sarah Cate's Review of *Born Innocent: Protecting the Dependents of Accused Caregivers*.

doi:10.1017/S1537592724000823

— Michael J. Sullivan 

I want to thank Sarah Cate both for her attentive review of *Born Innocent* and for the opportunity to review her monograph, which broadened my understanding of juvenile justice policy not only in California but also in Texas and Pennsylvania, where I previously lived and engaged with immigrants' rights and youth justice campaigns. I appreciate that she highlighted how punitive policies of family separation at the US southern border are the tip of the iceberg, pointing to my comparative case studies that show how Canada and other countries have long used practices that involve family separation to deter irregular migration. Here, I have taken care to examine the distinct political and economic contexts of these countries, including the governments of Indigenous nations, while making broader international comparisons where appropriate. We share a deep concern with how inequality and punitive policies affect young people and their communities, despite occasional philosophical differences that may lead

us to perceive contradictions where our arguments are in fact complementary.

My point about family separation's social and economic costs does not simply rest on an appeal to fiscal responsibility, but rather I emphasize the ways in which states "inflict vicarious punishment upon innocent family members" (16), undermining "a key civic role" performed by parents in "raising their children as citizens in becoming" (83). Although I note that family separation through incarceration creates additional financial burdens for the state, this is an ancillary point to broaden the appeal of my argument to policy makers for whom cost is also a concern. Part of my aim is to forge coalitions to influence policy in ways that will lessen family separation in the justice system. In that respect, I take issue with Cate's claim that I am somehow proposing family unity as a "substitute for the responsibility of society to address economic, political, and racial inequalities." My entire book highlights the state's responsibility to prevent unequal treatment and criticizes carceral interventions in marginalized communities such as Indigenous nations (chap. 6), among African Americans (87–88, 165), and within mixed-citizenship–status migrant families (58–63). Protecting *jus soli* birthright citizenship and preventing racially targeted child welfare interventions (179) are among the many policy interventions I highlight in *Born Innocent* to prevent state-mandated family separation. And

I appreciate the need for broad-based structural policy reforms to address the "broader inequitable social environment" outside prisons, including community family assistance programs (as illustrated, for example, through the implementation of the Anishinabek Nation Child Well Being Law in Ontario).

Cate acknowledges my concern for "the social determinants and structural causes of crime." Yet I was taken aback by her comment that my "call for rehabilitation [was] at times an odd choice," which may point to philosophical differences about what rehabilitation should involve. I never intended to, as Cate claims, "stigmatize those who are in prison" or understate "structural impediments to people being 'productive' in extremely inequitable societies." I do, however, argue that community and family leaders can reach young people at risk of crime. In particular, they can help young people embark on a more positive path by giving them role models who understand their life challenges from experience. This is a task that we strive to achieve as teachers and parents.

The economy of words required by this format does not permit me to fully express my gratitude for Cate's careful reading and positive review of *Born Innocent*. I look forward to future discussions about how we can further our shared goal of mitigating the harms of structural injustice and inequality for youth and families in the justice system.