

# THE DEEP ROOTS AND WIDE REACH OF COMBINING PUNISHMENT AND CARE

Tine Lee\*

Wendy Bach's *Prosecuting Poverty, Criminalizing Care* is a powerful indictment of the harm caused by the intertwining of care and punishment under Tennessee's fetal assault law, in existence from 2014 to 2016.<sup>1</sup> Through careful attention to the ideas behind the creation of this law, how it was applied, and the outcomes of many of the cases, Bach convincingly demonstrates that offers of care through criminal justice systems are a "smokescreen" for punishment and an attempt to extend systems of punishment, and that any care that is received is degraded by its proximity to punishment.<sup>2</sup> In this essay, I want to extend her work slightly in two ways. First, I will do a deeper dive into history to explore the long roots of intertwining care and punishment, and how these roots are nourished by a racial capitalist system and the idea of poverty as a moral failing. Second, I'll briefly point to another case of intertwining care and punishment from my own work in Wisconsin in order to illustrate how the systems that are supposedly focused on care—in this case, child welfare—also become oriented around punishment.

Tennessee's fetal assault law was justified by the idea that "the only way to help women who used illegal drugs while pregnant was to prosecute them, and that the prosecution itself was not only a road to treatment but was actually a form of treatment in and of itself."<sup>3</sup> It led to the prosecution of about 120 women in the state, both black and white, who were mostly low-income and living in poor communities in both urban and rural areas.<sup>4</sup> As Bach carefully documents, most of these women did not receive care, but

---

\* Professor of Anthropology; Program Director, Applied Social Science; University of Wisconsin Stout. Special thanks to the parents and professionals who shared their stories and experiences with me and to Wendy Bach for her phenomenal work. The research described here was supported by the Wenner-Gren Foundation (Dissertation Fieldwork Award), the American Association of University Women (American Fellowship), and a UW-Stout Ethics Center Ethics Fellowship.

1. *See generally* WENDY A. BACH, PROSECUTING POVERTY, CRIMINALIZING CARE (2022).

2. *See id.* at 4-7.

3. *Id.* at 1.

4. *Id.*

instead received probation, jail time, and criminal debt, and were brought into the child welfare system, which left them vulnerable to a finding of “severe neglect” that could be used to rapidly terminate their parental rights.<sup>5</sup> What care they did receive was corrupted in a variety of ways by its proximity to punishment. This care came with further risk of surveillance and continued punishment, and the fact that care providers were accountable to systems with the power to punish (drug courts, child welfare officials) undermined the trust necessary for the provision of care.<sup>6</sup> The women involved knew that they were at risk of being punished, and, thus, were strategic about what they shared, leading to situations in which care providers didn’t have all the necessary information.<sup>7</sup> The intertwining of care and punishment also meant that actors in the criminal justice system were empowered to influence treatment decisions, despite not having the medical expertise to do so, leading to ineffective treatment.<sup>8</sup>

Bach’s case study is a very clear example of a larger tendency in U.S. culture, and she situates it in the history of social welfare policy and how that policy has shifted towards punishment—a trend she and other scholars have seen as becoming more explicit and pervasive in the last few decades. Starting in the late 1970s, “as social welfare support for poor families shrank, carceral systems directed at the same communities grew exponentially” and the U.S. transitioned to a “penal state” that was increasingly reliant on criminal legal systems to regulate poor communities.<sup>9</sup> This trend has accelerated since the late 1970s, with a massive explosion of incarceration, the rise of “problem solving courts,” and cuts to essential social programs, including attacks on welfare programs, all culminating in the passage of “welfare reform” in 1996.<sup>10</sup> However, I think there are important lessons to be learned from the even longer history of efforts to deal with poverty in the U.S.

This linking of punishment/coercion with paltry efforts to provide minimal levels of care for marginalized groups has extremely deep roots in U.S. culture. First, it is firmly linked to the deep-seated and pervasive idea that poverty is primarily a moral failing and that it is possible to separate the “worthy” from the “unworthy” poor based on their behavior.<sup>11</sup> Second, it is

---

5. *See id.* at 1-2.

6. *Id.* at 8.

7. *Id.*

8. *See id.* at 167-69.

9. *Id.* at 61.

10. *See id.* at 60-64.

11. *See* DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, *THE NEGRO FAMILY: THE CASE FOR NATIONAL ACTION* 5 (1965); *see* CHARLES MURRAY, *LOSING GROUND: AMERICAN SOCIAL POLICY 1950-1980*, at 29 (2d ed. 1994) (“[A]nyone with enough gumption could make a good living.”); *see*

tied to the fact that the United States is fundamentally a racial capitalist system.<sup>12</sup> Profit-making has, throughout our history, been based on defining some people as less than fully human and available to either be exploited, left without occupations that can support them, or have their land stolen.<sup>13</sup> Minimal systems of social support, which are designed to be shaming, have been present mostly to control unrest, crime, and other social problems that threaten middle-class folks or profit-making itself.<sup>14</sup>

The idea that poverty is a moral failing and that poor white folks and racial “others” aren’t fully and equally human accounts for the persistent linking of social supports and coercion throughout U.S. history.<sup>15</sup> According to U.S. cultural beliefs, poor and non-white folks cannot be trusted to make good decisions.<sup>16</sup> If they could run their lives properly, the logic goes, they would not be poor in the first place.<sup>17</sup> Thus, they need to be coerced into forms of supposedly “therapeutic” state interventions while the threat of punishment forces them to continue to engage.<sup>18</sup> As Andrew Polsky puts it in his book, *The Rise of the Therapeutic State*:

[P]ublic therapeutic intervention aimed at marginal citizens proceeds from the assumption that they cannot govern their own lives . . . . Lower-class clients . . . [require] wholesale personal and family reconstruction . . . . Further, resistance on their part will not be tolerated. The state has the legal tools to impose client status upon marginal citizens and the coercive instruments to complete them to remain in that exposed position.<sup>19</sup>

Efforts to deal with poverty in the United States have *always* rested on attempts to separate the “deserving” from the “undeserving” poor, with efforts made to support those defined as deserving while enforcing work or other behavioral changes or criminalizing those considered undeserving—even children.<sup>20</sup>

---

MICHAEL KATZ, *IN THE SHADOW OF THE POORHOUSE* xi-xii (1996); see SUSAN D. GREENBAUM, *BLAMING THE POOR: THE LONG SHADOW OF THE MOYNIHAN REPORT ON CRUEL IMAGES ABOUT POVERTY* 2 (2015).

12. See Charles R. Hale & Leith Mullings, *A Time to Recalibrate: Analyzing and Resisting the Americas-Wide Project of Racial Retrenchment*, in *BLACK AND INDIGENOUS RESISTANCE IN THE AMERICAS: FROM MULTICULTURALISM TO RACIST BACKLASH* 25, 28 (Juliet Hooker ed., Giroleny Altamirano Rayo et al. trans., 2020).

13. See *id.* at 21.

14. See FRANCES FOX PIVEN & RICHARD A. CLOWARD, *REGULATING THE POOR: THE FUNCTIONS OF PUBLIC WELFARE* xiii-xiv (Vintage Books 1993).

15. See KATZ, *supra* note 11.

16. See ANDREW J. POLSKY, *THE RISE OF THE THERAPEUTIC STATE* 3-4 (1991).

17. See *id.*

18. *Id.* at 4.

19. *Id.*

20. See KATZ, *supra* note 11, at 5-6.

The early nineteenth century, for example, was a time of increased urbanization, economic instability, and various uprisings by the poor who were unable to find jobs.<sup>21</sup> The wealthy and the rising middle class were confronted with urban poverty on an unprecedented scale, leading to increasing anxieties about the overall stability of society and the behaviors and family lives of the urban poor, especially recent southern and eastern European immigrants, who, it should be remembered, were not considered fully white at the time.<sup>22</sup> The urban poor (mostly immigrants) were described as the “dangerous classes” who were thought to be criminal, vicious, indolent, and intemperate.<sup>23</sup> In this context, “outdoor relief” (i.e., giving money directly to poor individuals to use as they saw fit) was limited.<sup>24</sup> Instead, various forms of punishment or efforts to enforce work were the preferred ways to deal with poverty. This included apprenticeships and placement in workhouses or prisons—young children could even be auctioned off as servants to reduce costs.<sup>25</sup> Children were subject to the same policies as adults—policies that sought to control costs, instill proper work habits, and maintain an abundant supply of cheap labor.<sup>26</sup>

When separate policies and institutions were created for children in the early twentieth century, punishment and work were still hallmarks. For example, when New York State first created a separate system to support poor children, ostensibly to separate them from the corrupting influence of adults in institutions, *law enforcement officers* were allowed to commit children to “orphan asylums,” often permanently.<sup>27</sup> In turn, asylums often sent children to work in private homes.<sup>28</sup> As Katz argues, part of the design of the system was to remove children from their parents as a way to interrupt the perpetuation of vice and indolence.<sup>29</sup> Ideas that poverty and crime were tightly connected and that poor individuals needed to be forced to work, both

---

21. See generally John A. James, *Changes in Economic Instability in 19<sup>th</sup>-Century America*, 83 AM. ECON. REV. 710 (1993).

22. See Karen Brodtkin Sacks, *How Did Jews Become White Folks?*, in RACE 78 (Steven Gregory & Roger Sanjek eds., 1994).

23. See Christine Stansell, *Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets: Class and Gender Conflict in New York City, 1850-1860*, in UNEQUAL SISTERS: A MULTICULTURAL READER IN U.S. WOMEN'S HISTORY 111 (Vicki L. Ruiz & Ellen Carol DuBois eds., 2d ed. 1994).

24. See Michael Grossberg, *Changing Conceptions of Child Welfare in the United States, 1820-1935*, in A CENTURY OF JUVENILE JUSTICE 7 (Margaret K. Rosenheim et al. eds., 2002).

25. See *id.*

26. See KATZ, *supra* note 11.

27. See DAVID M. SCHNEIDER & ALBERT DEUTSCH, *THE HISTORY OF PUBLIC WELFARE IN NEW YORK STATE, 1867-1940*, at 60-61 (1941).

28. See *id.*

29. See KATZ, *supra* note 11, at 108-09.

in order to instill proper behavior and as a way to supply cheap labor, show the intertwining of support with criminalization and coercion.

Poverty has also always been profoundly racialized in U.S. history. Under a racial capitalist system, gender and race have been used to segment the labor force and assign worth to different groups of workers,<sup>30</sup> leaving non-white or “not-quite-white”<sup>31</sup> others more vulnerable to having assistance linked to punishment or coercive policies. During colonial times, the extraction of wealth, land, and labor from non-white others was fundamental to profit-making (a situation that continues up to the present), while poor whites (including many European immigrants) have been defined as racially other throughout American history.<sup>32</sup> One thread in colonial America, alongside slavery and genocide of indigenous groups, was bringing large numbers of poor Europeans over who were defined as “waste people,” or rubbish to be exploited.<sup>33</sup> Nancy Isenberg points out that this even included “spiriting,” or taking poor “street urchins” off the streets of European cities so they could be put to work in the colonies.<sup>34</sup> Overall, since whiteness is a “flexible set of social and symbolic boundaries that give shape, meaning, and power to the social category white,”<sup>35</sup> discourse about different kinds of white folks is important because it serves to set the boundaries of the category and define some behaviors as deserving of punishment.<sup>36</sup> In the case of “white trash,” poverty, which is linked to criminality, disease, deviant families, and behaviors like alcohol and drug use, is seen as fundamentally threatening individuals’ claims to be fully in the category of white. Popular and scholarly discussion of these individuals has served, at least since the 1800s, to highlight what “proper” white behaviors and lifestyles should include while marking those outside it as deserving of control or punishment.

Welfare policies have also historically been constructed to regulate the supply of labor. Assistance expands during economic crises to keep order, shrinks in times of economic expansion or restructuring in order to create more workers, or enforces work discipline during times of economic

---

30. See Ida Susser, *Cultural Diversity in the United States*, in *CULTURAL DIVERSITY IN THE UNITED STATES: A CRITICAL READER* 4-5 (Ida Susser & Thomas C. Patterson eds., 2001).

31. See generally MATT WRAY, *NOT QUITE WHITE: WHITE TRASH AND THE BOUNDARIES OF WHITENESS* (2006), for further discussion of the stigmatization of “white trash.”

32. See Sacks, *supra* note 22; WRAY, *supra* note 31, at 23.

33. See NANCY ISENBERG, *WHITE TRASH: THE 400-YEAR UNTOLD HISTORY OF CLASS IN AMERICA* xiv-3 (2016).

34. See *id.* at 13.

35. WRAY, *supra* note 31, at 6.

36. See JOHN HARTIGAN JR., *ODD TRIBES: TOWARD A CULTURAL ANALYSIS OF WHITE PEOPLE* 1-2 (2005); see also Matt Wray & Annalee Newitz, *Introduction*, in *WHITE TRASH: RACE AND CLASS IN AMERICA* 1-4 (Matt Wray & Annalee Newitz eds., 1997).

stability.<sup>37</sup> Welfare policies also allow non-white labor to be particularly exploited. As Piven and Cloward state, “When a particular racial group does the most menial work for the lowest wages, the relief system cooperates by reducing the amount of aid to that group or by closing off the possibility of any aid whatsoever.”<sup>38</sup> For example, Louisiana was the first state, in 1943, to adopt an “employable mother” rule denying assistance if “the mother was presumed to be employable in the fields” (a job almost entirely reserved for Black folks).<sup>39</sup> Even when Black women were able to get assistance, they were pressured to continue to work part-time or were given less money.<sup>40</sup>

Throughout much of U.S. history, the family, in particular, has been a primary site for intervening in the lives of poor individuals and communities. Thus, laws that target poor women in pregnancy are in line with very long-standing historical trends. Although there has been a persistent belief that the care of children should be the responsibility of individual parents and that public provision of support should be limited to those situations when families failed to meet their own basic needs, there has long been concern about the childrearing and reproductive lives of those at the bottom of our social hierarchy, and how they were or were not preparing themselves to be productive citizens.<sup>41</sup> Various philanthropic and government systems have sought to impose middle-class norms on poor and non-white families throughout much of U.S. history. Don Lash’s book, “*When the Welfare People Come*,” explains this in explicitly Marxist terms:

Real or perceived dysfunction in working-class families reduces the supply of labor power and raises the threat of a disruptive class . . . [T]he Marxist notion of social reproduction . . . is essential to understanding why capitalism needs to regulate poor and working-class families, and therefore why it needs an ideological framework to justify that.<sup>42</sup>

Family interventions are key in “regulating the poor”<sup>43</sup> because of the key role the family has in passing down culture and values. If you believe poverty is caused by the wrong values and behaviors, then removing children or trying to force parents to behave differently makes sense. Charles Loring Brace, a key figure in the creation of private systems that were the precursors

---

37. See PIVEN & CLOWARD, *supra* note 14, at xiii.

38. *Id.* at 133.

39. *See id.* at 134.

40. *See id.* at 135-36.

41. See ELIZABETH PLECK, DOMESTIC TYRANNY: THE MAKING OF SOCIAL POLICY AGAINST FAMILY VIOLENCE FROM COLONIAL TIMES TO THE PRESENT 12-13 (1987).

42. DON LASH, “WHEN THE WELFARE PEOPLE COME”: RACE AND CLASS IN THE US CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEM 8 (2017).

43. *See generally* PIVEN & CLOWARD, *supra* note 14, for further discussion of “regulating the poor” through the public welfare system.

to our modern child protection systems, for example, was driven, in part, by the belief that only by taking poor children out of their families and city slums would they be taught proper morals and behaviors and saved from a life of poverty and crime.<sup>44</sup> In addition, child separation has long been part of attempts at subjugation of marginal groups, whether this took the form of boarding schools that explicitly tried to destroy indigenous cultures, removing children from enslaved families, or using family separation to punish civil rights activism.<sup>45</sup>

Given this long history, the ideas that a new category of crime needed to be created in order to provide care and that prosecution is itself care are not surprising. Being “tough on crime” and using the policing and criminal justice systems to deal with a huge range of social problems are extensions of tendencies that have been part of U.S. culture for its entire history. The idea that some in our society lack discipline and need to be coerced into following hard-working, middle-class norms (recall the nineteenth century claims about intemperance and criminal behavior among the poor) or face punishment is a long-standing one. At the same time, being as explicit about the link between care and punishment, and defending it as good policy, as the Tennessee legislators did, is remarkable. The fact that the fetal assault law was likely to lead to children being separated from their mothers, although not necessarily acknowledged by law makers, was probably not a surprise.<sup>46</sup> That it was tolerated, I would argue, betrays long-standing beliefs that children need to be “rescued” from their poor caretakers.

The idea that drug-using mothers would deserve care at all is, as Bach points out, surprising given previous responses to “epidemics” of drug use, most prominently crack cocaine in the 1980s, which were almost entirely punitive.<sup>47</sup> That the opioid epidemic particularly impacted poor and white communities, and that it began with the actions of doctors and pharmaceutical companies, certainly accounts for the greater sympathy and treatment focus.<sup>48</sup> At the same time, however, the white women prosecuted in Tennessee were still punished, and this has everything to do with race and how privilege falls along lines of race, as Bach expertly analyzes. The purity of the category of white requires “some white people and some white behavior . . . to be excluded from the racist ideal.”<sup>49</sup> Thus, women who used

---

44. Stansell, *supra* note 23, at 119-22; see LEROY ASHBY, ENDANGERED CHILDREN: DEPENDENCY, NEGLECT, AND ABUSE IN AMERICAN HISTORY 3-5 (1997).

45. See LAURA BRIGGS, TAKING CHILDREN: A HISTORY OF AMERICAN TERROR 2 (2020).

46. See BACH, *supra* note 1, at 158-60.

47. See *id.* at 39.

48. *Id.* at 97.

49. *Id.* at 57.

opioids during pregnancy were defined as bad mothers, and therefore, not quite white.<sup>50</sup> The coexistence of punishment and stigma with some amount of sympathy is also tied to longer historical patterns. Matt Wray, for example, traces the long and complicated history of how stigma and sympathy were intertwined in discussions of poor whites stretching across almost the entire history of the U.S.<sup>51</sup>

This pattern of intertwining punishment and care has played out with drug epidemics in other parts of the country as well. My own work in rural Wisconsin, for example, is starting to document the treatment of parents who use methamphetamine. Similarly, cases of parental meth use in the child welfare system (by far the most common type of child welfare case) show a striking intertwining of law enforcement in this supposedly service-providing system that is required to make “reasonable efforts” to reunify families.<sup>52</sup> Although it has been clear from my interviews that caseworkers do not see themselves as engaging in punishment or in using coercion to deal with families, there are numerous parallels between policing and social work—and even direct cooperation between the two—that can lead to coercion and punishment. Caseworkers praise their increasingly good relationships with law enforcement and regularly enlist their help in approaching families during investigations. Caseworkers reported that more drug testing and more accurate testing had led to more child removals since the early 2000s. I suspect this is, in turn, related to the presence of law enforcement. One state report on the epidemic notes:

Wisconsin social services stated the Eau Claire area’s Drug Endangered Children (DEC) program prosecuted more child neglect cases in 2015 than the previous five years combined . . . Social services in western Wisconsin also noted a decrease in cooperation from meth-using parents, which has led law enforcement and social service workers to make joint home visits. Law enforcement is more skilled than social service workers in identifying meth in the home, and therefore parents are unable to deny meth use or ignore the social service workers.<sup>53</sup>-ft

It’s unclear that law enforcement is “more skilled” than social workers in spotting meth use, since social workers get extensive training in this.<sup>54</sup>

---

50. *See id.* at 56-58.

51. *See* WRAY, *supra* note 31, at 17-20.

52. *See* WIS. STATEWIDE INTEL. CTR. ET AL., WISCONSIN METHAMPHETAMINE STUDY 33 (2016), <https://www.doj.state.wi.us/sites/default/files/news-media/Wisconsin%20Meth%20Study%2C%20Unclass%20Version%2C%20Final.pdf>.

53. *Id.* Interestingly, the sources for this information are electronic communications from the FBI.

54. *See generally* Elizabeth A. Wells et al., *Social Workers and Delivery of Evidence-Based Psychosocial Treatments for Substance Use Disorders*, 28 SOC. WORK. PUB. HEALTH 279 (2013).

Instead, it is probable that parents are more likely to cooperate when a law enforcement officer is present. This account can be read as a direct reference to law enforcement being used as a threat to get parents to cooperate, a tactic caseworkers fell back on when parents became less compliant.

Caseworkers also pointed out profound issues with their casework practices, which creates situations where parents are punished with child removal and given little opportunity to regain custody. There are three main issues: lack of effective treatment options, court practices that set up conditions for reunification that are often impossible for parents to comply with, and strict adherence to the timelines for termination of parental rights set out in the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA)<sup>55</sup> (i.e., termination of parental rights proceedings should be initiated when children have been in foster care for fifteen of the previous twenty-two months, although there are provisions that allow for this timeline to be extended).<sup>56</sup>

First, caseworkers are adamant that they do not have nearly enough treatment options and that the options they do have are inadequate. As one caseworker stated:

[Available treatment is] twenty-one days and you're out, or maybe thirty days and you're out. Uh-uh [no, laughs], like, we need long-term treatment. When we look at, like, research tells us like six months to a year is a critical time in a meth user's, you know, sobriety and whether they'll relapse or not and we're like sending them out after twenty-one days of sobriety? Like they're not sober!

In terms of court-ordered reunification plans, another caseworker told me:

I think that we struggle with having these court conditions that are, honestly, I mean I'm gonna be totally honest, I don't know that I could complete and comply with the court order, um, the way that they are written . . . I think when you take a parent who most likely is struggling with mental health, they're struggling with AODA [alcohol and other drug] issues, and we throw a list of conditions on them, and things that they need to comply with . . . So, when I look at it, if I were a single mom, and I was working full time, how on earth am I gonna get to three AODA appointments in a week? How on earth am I going to get to my mental health appointments in a week? Then you don't have transportation . . . So, I think it's super overwhelming, there's probably, um, three to four pages of conditions that they have to comply with . . . And most of them are like, "I give up! Like

---

55. This is quite different from what I saw in New York City, where the timeline is not strictly adhered to.

56. Michael Fitzgerald & Katie Gonzales, *Advocates and Officials Press Case for Overhauling Key Adoption and Child Welfare Law*, IMPRINT: YOUTH & FAM. NEWS (Feb. 21, 2022, 10:37 AM), <https://imprintnews.org/child-welfare-2/advocates-and-officials-asfa-overhaul/62671#:~:text=The%201997%20Adoption%20and%20Safe,pursue%20termination%20of%20parental%20rights.>

how am I ever going to do this? What am I—how do I achieve reunification honestly?”

Note that in this account, sobriety and strict compliance—not child safety—drive the decision-making after a child is removed, and compliance is acknowledged to be extremely difficult. This caseworker went on to tell me that caseworkers themselves write the court orders and have debates about what to include and how detailed to make them. Despite finding the orders not only unhelpful, but detrimental, it was unclear in her comments why this caseworker continues to write them this way. It is likely that she is directed by supervisors to be very detailed and that orders are used to cover the department in the event of a termination of parental rights case. These orders likely attempt to show that the department made “reasonable efforts” at reunification by including a long list of services and conditions while also setting up a case about lack of compliance to convince a judge and jury (Wisconsin is one of the few states to require a jury trial in this circumstance) to terminate a parent’s rights. However, caseworkers fundamentally critique these orders as not reasonable, especially in the absence of effective treatment options.

Finally, caseworkers acknowledge that the ASFA timeline is not appropriate in cases of addiction:

We will tell our clients that, like, relapses are expected, quite honestly. But then we have the state who says fifteen out of twenty-two months and if you have a relapse at twelve months, what does that look like? In three months, I’m supposed to be filing TPR [Termination of Parental Rights]? But I haven’t even given this parent a chance to come out of their relapse and get back into treatment, and you know, it just—it’s super hard.

The state is removing children from their parents’ homes while caseworkers and others are aware of how very unlikely it is that parents will be able to deal with their addiction quickly enough to regain custody. Although caseworkers acknowledge to parents that recovery from substance abuse and traumas takes time, caseworkers start discussing terminating parental rights or finding other permanent arrangements for children almost immediately and are very up-front with parents about how little time they have to meet service and other requirements to move toward reunification. It is thus hard to see how this system is supporting or serving parents with substance abuse issues, and caseworkers vividly described the pain this causes parents. Although further research on parent views and experiences is sorely needed, it is hard to imagine that these practices would feel like anything other than a punishment.

In short, practices in the supposedly helping system of child welfare, a system that is allegedly about protecting children and working to reunify families whenever possible, are, in a way, the mirror image of the fetal assault

law Bach describes. While Bach powerfully critiques policies that claim to provide care within the criminal justice system, my work, along with the brilliant work of scholars, including Dorothy Roberts, Kelly Fong, Shanta Trivedi, and Jane Spinak, among others, documents that linking support for families within helping systems to legal systems that can separate families also causes harm and rarely provides the needed assistance. As activists like to say, “some social workers are cops.” Bach’s book is a brilliant contribution to our understanding of the mechanisms that create harms and an important voice in the growing calls to create radical change. Given the pervasive damage caused by intertwining care and punishment, there is an urgent need to create systems of care that are walled off from punishment and policing while working for abolition of all kinds of carceral systems.