## Nicholas Corwin ALE Samples – Edited Oct. 25, 2021

I.

Recent decades have been witness toreplete with headline stories about featuring white—collar erimescrime in Israel and elsewhere, exemplified by Nochi Dankner's illegal stock manipulation by Nochi Dankner in Israel, and the Bernard L. Madoff's Ponzi scheme by Bernard Maydoff in the USA. United States. In the wake of these crimes segments of the population, many people have called for increasing the severity of punishment of increased severity (Holtfreter et al., 2008; Huff et al., 2010), in the hope that this such measures will prove to be a satisfactory deterrent.

No single definition of white—collar crime exists; nor is there <u>any</u> consensus regarding its interpretation (Ragatz & Fremouw, 2010). Ever since <u>the term was coined bysociologist Edwin</u> Sutherland (coined the term in 1939), various <u>precise</u> definitions have been <u>suggested</u>, <u>attestingproposed</u>, the range of which attests, among other things, to the <u>phenomenon's</u> complexity—of the <u>phenomenon.</u> According to Mann (1990), the term "white—collar offender" suggests a prototype based <u>onupon</u> a group of <u>parametersindicia</u>: the <u>offender's</u> privileged status—of the offender, abuse of position, <u>and</u> use of camouflage and deception; the economic damage, incurred; and perpetration of the crime <u>in—that occurs either privately or within</u> an organizational framework—or <u>privately</u>. <u>Although</u>. While these <u>parametersindicia</u> define the phenomenon, the absence of any one of them does not necessarily alter the <u>prototype's</u> fundamental nature—of the prototype.

Over time, attempts have been made to identify subtypes of white-\_collar criminals. Friedrichs (2009) makesdraws a distinction between organizational/corporate crime, which is \_\_(oriented to promoting thean organization's interests-of an organization,) and occupational crime, which is (acts committed in a professional capacity for the sake of personal gain. Grey \_). In addition, grey-collar crime has shadesconsists of elements of white-\_collar crime, but is committedoccurs in a "grey" area (Menard et al. 2011), consisting of involving an abuse of trust, including or fiduciary position. Such activities may encompass job poaching, insurance and credit card fraud, and tax evasion.

The present article refers inmakes particular reference to the white—collar (felon (whether organizational or occupational) felon who is a member of society'ssociety's privileged elite and abuses his or her senior position in order to commit and conceal financial crime (Logan et al., 2017; Onna et al., 2014; Sutherland, 1983). The offences that areOffences not normally associated with this category include fraud, blackmail, falsification of official documents, embezzlement, money laundering, breach of trust by means of briberytax offences, computer crimes, insider trading, illegal stock manipulation, tax offences and computer crimes breach of trust by means of bribery.

## Nicholas Corwin ALE Samples – Edited Oct. 25, 2021

Note 1: the final sentence contains certain ambiguities that cannot be satisfactorily resolved without obtaining additional information and amplification from the author. It is unclear whether breach of trust by means of pertains to every single item that follows (ranging all the way from bribery to computer crimes), to bribery alone, or to something in between, e.g., to bribery, insider training, and illegal stock manipulation, but nothing further. I have opted for the arrangement that I believe to be the clearest and most logical.

II.

The Over the last few decades, Christian-Jewish dialogue has been thriving in the last few decades, and gaining attention from both scholars and the public and scholarly attention. In. For the most easespart, this dialogue has taken placebeen held between representatives of the more receptive, open flankswings of both Christianity and Judaism, and. As a result it has involved participants who have awhose religious attitude attitudes are typically termed "liberal"," in a sense that both parties are united by a similar political and cultural vision that transcends thetheir differences between them. Dialogue seems to be. It appears that dialogue is an outcome of the weakening of radical voices, who which are allegedly regardhostile to relations with another religion with hostility other faiths, and to the growth of moderate religious approaches, which enables that facilitate rational and pragmatic inter faith interfaith discussions. Jewish Christian dialogue, in In other words, Christian-Jewish dialogue is judgeddeemed to be a phenomenon pertaining to arising from the secular, liberal setting of the postwarpost-World War II Western world, and isto be carried out through the by means of a modernized and universal religious language.

However, Yet this common understanding of the nature and scope of Jewish-Christian-Jewish dialogue is limited in two respects. FirstFirstly, it does notfails to cover the entire range of dialogical phenomena. As suggested by the studies discussed atin the workshop suggest, several dialogical initiatives do not adhere to liberal criteria, which that assume a rational agreement about the placerole of religious commitment and its contribution to a diverse society. In fact, Quite the contrary: one can findreadily discern dialogical inclinations in surprisingly illiberal settings. SecondSecondly, the liberal narrative of the Jewish-Christian-Jewish dialogue focuses mainly onprimarily upon the geographical and political settings of Europe and North America; it omits, omitting other types of dialogue that stemstemming from other landscapes and as well as their unique concerns. These non-western initiatives are grounded onin alternative religious grammars—and; moreover, such initiatives are oriented towards other sets of political agendas, which that often explicitly rejects reject the liberal program.

In order to overcome a narrow, parochial approach to religious dialogue, our workshop shall focus on two topics. First: first, an empirical examination of a variety of projects that have been performed in contexts that arenot normally not deemed amenable to the dialogical logic (narrowly understood). Shedding light on such initiatives, the process of which is often neglected by the liberal framework of dialogue, contributes in and of itself to the understanding of the Christian-Jewish dialogue in all its variety. Second, The second topic will be a critical inquiry of into the variety of dialogical initiatives enables, enabling us to interrogate probe more deeply into the logic behind the very concept of dialogue itself. The workshop attempts will attempt to formulate a grammar suitable forto the dialogical variety, and to think anew, withusing a theoretical language befitting of this multiplicity, including even phenomena that upwhich, until now, have been narrowly understood through the liberal grammar of dialogue.