
INTRODUCTION AND INSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATIONS OF CRIMINOLOGY

WHY THEORY MATTERS:

- Traditionally, the focus of criminology has been on:
 - The study of the causes of crime
 - The process of defining 'criminality' and various responses to it
 - The organisational framework established to address these issues (the criminal justice 'system')
- Theory informs each of these intellectual pursuits
- Theory helps to frame approaches to understanding crime and 'criminal justice'

WHY DO WE NEED THEORY?

- Criminology theory used to frame understandings of crime and its control by posing questions/propositions about:
 - What is/should be defined as 'crime'? (legal definitions, social processes, harm/victimisation)
 - Who is/should be defined as a 'criminal' (characteristics, vulnerabilities, social standing, psychology etc.)
 - How do we/should we respond to crime? (new definitions/law reform, enforcement practices, punishment, prevention)
 - How we can make the criminal justice system, and its components, better?
- Theory helps to both pose and answer questions based on more than just opinion - research or evidence based, and ideally should inform policy and practice
- Theory poses ideas to be tested, proved, refuted and/or challenged by research
- Theories have many diverse implications on research and policy

ALL THEORY EMERGES IN CONTEXT:

- The study of crime occurs within a context of political influence and government support (who gets funding, what data is available to researchers, what kinds of research influence policy and practices is deeply political)
- The emergence of criminology as a distinct academic discipline came in the wake of the 1940s post-WWII crime boom
- Early theorists came from sociology and psychology and brought a strong focus on youth crime and corrections
- Many early insights into crime causation have endured
- Arguably the politics of crime has now become so emotive and distanced from informed research that we are floundering in the conversion of theory to policy to practice.

THEORETICAL TENSIONS:

- **Administrative Criminology** --> technical, evaluative research for government and criminal justice practitioners
- VS
- **Critical Criminology** --> interrogate and understand the social, political and economic conditions that shape crime, criminality and the operations and institutions of criminal justice

APPLICATIONS OF THEORY:

- Schism between theory and practice:
 - Ideally, theory is built on/from research, to improve our understanding of crime and inform better policy

- In reality policies are often based on political factors, rather than research and theoretical debates
 - Example: Victoria and the introduction of onerous parole and bail laws 2017

EVALUATING THEORY:

- Theory must have research to support it
 - The research proves/disproves theory
 - Theories without supporting research evidence struggle for legitimacy
- Adopting a 'criminological imagination' (Jock Young, 2011):
 - Examine the assumptions of the theorist, and their concepts, methods, arguments;
 - Identifies their conception of society, of human nature and the world; implications for the reforms and institutions they support
 - Identifies silences in the theory; what is not being asked, and why not? Are these silences a consequence of social and historical context?

SEMINAR

THEORY IN CONTEXT:

Theories as a product of context (time) - shaped by political, social, environmental, scientific events of the era.

DATE	KEY THEMES	KEY EVENTS
1800-1889	● Moral reform (Lombroso) ● Origins of due process and modern criminal justice	● European colonisation, settlement & industrialisation ● Birth of modern mass media, early globalisation
1890-1919	● Rise of early psychology - Freud ● Extension of biological positivism ● Early sociology	● Birth of technology age ● Growth of modern industrial age followed by WWI
1920-1938	● Early social and environmental theories (Park) ● Consolidation of psychology	● Roaring 20s, alcohol prohibition ● Followed by Great Depression, aftermath of WWII ● Intensified urbanisation
1939-1949	● Criminology emerges as independent discipline (Garland)	● WWII - crime rates in affected regions stayed the same or rose ● Theory reconsolidated in the post-war period (Radzinowicz)
1950-1959	● Modern urban theories: strain, labelling, control and early cultural criminology ● Consolidation of psychological theories	● Post war reconstruction and economic boom ● Modern suburban cities ● Cold war, McCarthyism, communism and concerns over government surveillance of citizens ● O'Malley & Carson add immigration; mafia wars; drugs;
1960-1969	● Further consolidation of psychological, social, labelling and control theories ● Emergence of early radical theory	● Kennedy and Luther-King assassinated ● Counter-cultural revolution, drugs, hippies

		• Racial divisions • Challenges to dominant social ordering
1970-1979	• Radical, realist, gender theories consolidated and expansion of previous theories	• Watergate - government corruption USA • Counter-culture emerging in Australia • Whitlam era - new socialism and promise of reform never delivered • Mafia emerging • Punk counter-culture
1980-1989	• All previous theories consolidated except biological positivism and cultural criminology	• Thatcherism (privatisation, mass sackings and closure of industries) • Race riots, youth riots, mass political/social protests • (US) Mass incarceration • Rising concern about crime and emergent 'get tough' reactions
1990-1999	• Republican theory • Re-emergence of cultural criminology • Theoretical fragmentation and 'piggy-backing'	• Consolidation of privatisation • Police shootings, mental illness, 'no child shall live in poverty' • Clinton smokes pot but 'doesn't inhale' • New Labor conservatism (gaps between rich and poor, global corporate crimes)
2000+	• Theoretical fragmentation reinforced by 9/11: so many versions of truth people retreat to comfortable disciplinary boundaries • Governance and risk based on 9/11 and Giddens' 'risk society'; globalisation • New regulatory society - precrime and post-criminology • Crime policies recycled: revisiting old policies and ignoring extensive body of criminological thought • Repackaged old ways of doing law and justice • Increased perception of inter-agency cooperation • Management and technocratic culture - crime management?	• 9/11, Bali and terrorism • Bushfires and global mass disasters • Global Financial Crisis, Occupy Movement • Internet culture and digital technologies • Child porn and sexual abuse, sexual assault, white-collar crime, people smuggling, recreational drugs, tourism crime, hate crime • Endless possibilities for explaining deviance but few clear answers • Deakin Criminology formed

NOTES FROM CHAPTER ONE OF WHITE TEXTBOOK

Generally speaking, criminology focuses on three main areas:

1. The sociology of law, which examines why and how societies define crime a particular way and the implications this understanding has for the lives of people within those societies
2. Theories of crime causation, sometimes referred to as criminogenesis
3. The study of social responses to crime, which examines in more depth the formal institutions of criminal justice, such as the police, courts and corrections.

DEFINING CRIME:

To a certain extent, both crime and criminology are uncertain, in the sense that one's definition of crime is dependent upon one's particular interests and particular worldview.

Legal and Sociological Definitions of Crime:

- A formal legal definition says that a crime is whatever the state identifies as a crime; that is, if something is written into the criminal law, and is subject to state sanction in the form of a specific penalty, then that activity is a crime.
- A social harm conception of crime says that crime involves both criminal offences (such as assault) and civil offences (such as negligence), in that each type of action or inaction brings with it some type of harm. Each should therefore attract some sort of penalty.
- A cross-cultural universal norm argument states that crime, in essence, does not vary across different cultures. thus, murder is murder regardless of the society, and we can postulate conduct norms that cut across diverse cultural backgrounds.
- A labelling approach to the definition of crime argues that crime only really exists when there has been a social response to a particular activity that labels that activity as criminal. If there is no label, there is in effect no crime.
- A human rights approach says that crime occurs whenever a human right has been violated, regardless of the legality or otherwise of the action. Such a conception also expands the definition of crime to include oppressive practices such as racism, sexism and class-based exploitation, along with crimes against nature.
- A human diversity approach defines crime in terms of the manner in which deviance represents a normal response to oppressive or unequal circumstances. A major focus here is on power relations, and the attempts by dominant groups to restrict human diversity of experience, language and culture.

Historical Constructions of Crime:

- As early as 1530, in England there existed the crime of being a vagabond, which, in effect, meant that a person was unemployed and idle. Any person so identified could be branded a criminal. Vagabonds over the age of 18 could be hanged if they did not obtain suitable employment for two years.
- In the 17th century, witchcraft was a common crime in Europe. Crime here was constructed in terms of religion, and referred to conduct allegedly against God. Ny and large, such laws pertaining to witchcraft targeted women, as a means of controlling them, particularly those displaying eccentric and secretive tendencies.
- Property and theft are historically and culturally specific concepts. In many traditional First Nation communal societies, everything is shared. There is no concept of theft, because in these cultures property is communal.

Popular Media Images of Crime:

The images that permeate popular consciousness of crime are mainly generated by, and reflected in, the electronic and print media.

According to the media, in both fictional and factual types of programs and reportage, crime tends to be defined primarily as 'street crime'. Such crime is thus associated with personal terror and fear,

and violence is seen as central. Crime is sensationalised, with important implications for the fear of crime among certain sections of the population. This fear is heightened by the way in which crime is seen to be random in nature, with anyone and everyone a possible target for victimisation.

The 'criminal' is distinctive, and identifiably different from everyone else in society. Overall, the idea is that there is a continuing 'law and order' problem in society, and that things are constantly getting worse. Against this tide of disorder and lawlessness, the police and other crime fighters are generally portrayed as 'superheroes', who are infallible and who use violence legitimately in order to counter the violence of the streets.

The media shape our perceptions of crime, and in the process they define crime in particular ways. One aspect of this process is that the media often portray crime in terms of distinct crime waves. This refers to the way in which increased reporting of particular types of crime (usually street crimes, such as assault, rape, drug offences or homicide) increases the public awareness of this crime. Significantly, there need not have been an actual increase in the crime for there to be a perception of a crime wave.

MEASURING CRIME:

For present purposes, we can identify three broad strands within criminology that deal with measurement issues:

1. The **realist approach** adopts the view that crime exists 'out there' in society and that the 'dark figure' of crime needs to be uncovered and recorded. There are limitations to the gathering of official statistics (such as reliance solely on police records of reported offences), and the role of criminology is to supplement official statistics (those generated by the police, courts and prison authorities) through a range of informal or alternative measures. The emphasis is on the problem of omission - to uncover the true or real extent of crime by methods such as victim and victimisation surveys, self-report offending surveys, test situations and hidden cameras.
2. The **institutionalist approach** adopts the view that crime is a 'social process', and it rejects the notion that we can unproblematically gain a sense of the real extent of crime by improving our measuring devices and techniques. Instead, this approach concentrates on the manner in which official criminal justice institutions actually process suspects, and thus define certain individuals and certain types of behaviour as being 'criminal'. Criminologists adopting this approach also argue that statistics tell us more about the agencies that collect the figures than they do about the crime itself. The emphasis is on the problem of bias, and on showing how some people and events are designated by the criminal justice system as being criminal, while others are not.
3. The **critical realist approach** argues that crime measurement can be characterised as having elements of both 'social process' and a grounded 'reality'. The task of measurement from this perspective is to uncover the processes whereby the crimes against the most vulnerable and least powerful sections of the population have been ignored or underrepresented. The emphasis is on the problem of victimisation - to demonstrate empirically how certain groups are especially vulnerable to crime and to the fear of crime, and conceptually to criticise the agencies of crime control for their lack of action in protecting these groups.

CRIMINOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES:

There are three broad levels of criminological explanation:

- The individual,
- The situational, and
- The social structural.

Levels of Analysis:

The Individual:

The main focus is on the personal or individual characteristics of the offender or victim. A study adopting this level of analysis may consider the influence of appearance, dress and public image on the nature of crime causation or victimisation. Importantly, this level of analysis tends to look to psychological or biological factors that are said to have an important role in determining why certain individuals engage in criminal activity. The key concern is to explain crime or deviant behaviour in terms of the choices or characteristics of the individual person.

The Situational:

The main site of analysis is the immediate circumstances, or situation, within which criminal activity or deviant behaviour occurs. Attention is directed to the specific factors that may contribute to an event occurring, such as how the participants define the situation, how different people are labelled by others in the criminal justice system, the opportunities available for the commission of certain types of offences, and so on. Key concerns are the nature of the interaction between different players within the system, the effect of local environmental factors on the nature of this interaction, and the influence of group behaviour and influences on social activity.

The Social Structural:

This approach tends to look at crime in terms of the broad social relationships and the major social institutions of the society as a whole. The analysis makes reference to the relationship between classes, sexes, different ethnic and 'racial' groups, the employed and unemployed, and various other social divisions in society. It also can involve investigation of the operation of specific institutions - such as education, the family, work and the legal system - in the construction of, and social responses to, crime and deviant behaviour.

Political Orientations:

Crime and crime control are inextricably linked with the operation of the state. It is, therefore, important to understand the major political theories and approaches employed to understand the causation, experience, and prevention of crime (Coleman et al. 2009). Brown's (1979) symbolic representation of particular political arrangement show:

- The circle --> this implies society is harmonious, and people share the same values of community and equality. The concept of crime is that perpetrators are deviant, or outside the circle, and thus they need to be either pulled back into the circle or kept outside the circle's confines.
- The triangle --> society is viewed as a hierarchy, since some people are situated at the top, possessing the wealth and power, and the majority are situated at the bottom. This vision of society implies conflict and inequality. The concept of crime is that it occurs in the context of struggles and hierarchies of control and power. Situated within this perspective are both meritocratic and critical views. According to a meritocratic view of the triangle, within the existing structure anyone who plays by the rules of the game is capable of rising to the top of the hierarchy on the basis of merit, and success is a question of ability and hard work. The laws are seen to exist as a means of sustaining the rules of the triangle. A critical view of the triangle translates inequality into injustice. The laws are seen to be unequally applied; it is argued that people on the bottom of the triangle are overrepresented in the criminal justice system, and this representation is questioned.
- The rectangle or square --> society consists of a variety of interrelated rectangles representing different interconnecting institutions, such as the family, work and school. Crime is studied in relation to how these institutions have an impact upon, and reflect upon, crime. The concern here is not with values, as in the circle, but with the smooth running of

the interconnected institutions. The issue is one of administrative efficiency and application of the right kinds of techniques to fix the particular social problem.

- Non-geometric forms such as stick figures --> here the focus is on individuals, as opposed to society as a whole, and the emphasis is on examining individual creativity and the way individuals construct their realities. The idea is that reality is socially constructed, and that how people act and react in relation to each other has a major impact in terms of defining behaviour and individuals as being deviant. How people think about themselves and each other is a significant factor in how they subsequently behave in their interactions with others.

There are three major paradigms in criminology. These paradigms inevitably incorporate specific kinds of value judgment. The motivation, conceptual development, methodological tools and social values associated with a specific approach are usually intertwined with one of three broad political perspectives:

1. Conservative --> this perspective on society tends to be supportive of the legitimacy of the status quo; that is, it generally accepts the way things are, the traditional ways of doing things, and traditional social relationships. Conservatives believe dissenters should be made to conform to the status quo. They believe that there is a 'core value system' to which everyone in society should conform. The function of the main institutions is to preserve the dominant system of order for the good of society generally. The values and institutions of society should apply equally to all people regardless of social background or historical developments.
2. Liberal --> this perspective on society accepts the limits of the status quo, but encourages limited changes in societal institutions. This approach tends to avoid questions relating to the whole structure of society. Instead it emphasises the need for action on particular limited 'social problems'. Specific problems such as sexism, racism and poverty can be resolved without fundamental changes to the economic or social structure. Rather, policies and programs that will serve to reform existing institutions and day-to-day interactions can be developed. Problems tend to be studied in terms of their impact on specific individuals or groups and the disadvantage these individuals or groups suffer.
3. Radical --> this perspective on society wishes to undermine the legitimacy of the status quo. Like the conservative perspective, it looks at society as a whole, but it sees 'social conflict' as the central concern. Society is seen to be divided on the basis of such elements as class, gender, ethnicity and 'race'. The key issue when adopting this perspective is the matter of who holds the power and resources in any particular community. The objective of radical perspectives is to change fundamentally the existing social order. Specific issues, such as poverty, are explained in relational terms (such as the relationship between the rich and the poor), and the solution is seen to involve dealing with the structural imbalances and inequalities that lead to the problem (of poverty) in the first place.

NOTES FROM EMMA RYAN'S CHAPTER IN A GUIDE TO CRIMINOLOGY

CLASSICISM:

The classical school of psychology sees crime as a function of free will, dependent on an individual's rational pursuit of pleasure and avoidance of pain, sometimes termed the "pleasure pain principle". It represented a divergence from previous spiritual conceptions of criminality and argued that law must be proportionate and predictable rather than severe and arbitrary. Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) argued that without government and law to organise society, people's lives would be almost wholly unpleasant. For this reason, by their citizenship, people entered into an unspoken contract with a sovereign power in which certain freedoms are given up in return for protection against violence and the potentially brutish nature of other citizens. This conferred power and responsibility on the state to both protect and regulate its citizens. Beccaria (1760s) argued that state power must

be limited by the extent to which its exercise afforded the greatest happiness to the greatest number of people.

Classical thinking continues to be evident in western democracies in practices such as proportionate sentencing, which is still considered a cornerstone of due process and in the notion of deterrence, which remains firmly at the heart of many criminal justice practices. The argument that certainty of detection could deter crime led to the introduction of the modern institution of policing. These developments all reflect the classical assumption that humans are rational beings, capable of making reasoned choices. As it was argued that humans will maximise their pleasure and minimise their pain, well publicised and predictable punishments for certain acts influence their rational choices about how to behave. Harsh penalties should then in theory deter people from committing crimes such as murder. Further, classical theorists held that penalties could only be effective insofar as they considered proportionate or reasonable in relation to the act they were trying to address.

POSITIVISM:

This "school" takes its name from the term coined by Auguste Comte (1798-1857) to describe the rational, scientific approach to understanding the world, which stood in opposition to spiritual or more primitive interpretations of society. This tradition sought to observe and measure society according to scientific methods.

Biological Positivism:

Joseph Gall (1758-1828) began the new "Science" of phrenology, which held that the bumps on people's heads reflected brain abnormalities and could be used to identify potential criminals. Based on marked features he found, Cesare Lombroso argued that criminals were atavistic, biological throwbacks. The implication of Lombroso's work was that crime was not a result of poor choices, but was something innate to physically unevolved people. He identified a range of features that, he argued, distinguished the criminal from others. For example, having an overly large or small skull or ears, an asymmetrical face, thin or fleshy lips or tattoos all signified a potential criminal. Lombroso also wrote about female criminals, seeing them as even worse and less evolved than their male counterparts (Brown, Esbensen & Geis 2015). Of course, there were serious methodological flaws in Lombroso's "Scientific" approach, especially because his sample was neither random nor representative. He also took a very linear view of what types of behaviour constituted crime.

It is important to note that the work of early biological positivists and beyond brought a fundamental theoretical split in attempts to explain deviant behaviour and identify how best to respond to it. After all, if criminality is determined by biological flaws, and is an inherited or otherwise biological trait, then it makes little difference what governments and legislators do to prevent crime. In direct opposition to classical theory, Lombroso felt that the best thing to do about the crime problem was to identify potential criminals and try to treat them somehow. From this point of view, no measure of punishment would deter a criminal actor. Instead, they must be treated and cured or failing that, banished and eradicated.

Psychological Positivism:

In psychoanalytic criminology, an individual's environment is viewed as a secondary influence that helps shape internal desires and reactions to them - individual drives and desires are paramount in understanding deviance.

Personality traits are also used to explain crime, with the work of Hans Eysenck (1916-1997) influencing a theoretical line that underpins many "personality tests". An individual's propensity to be conditioned can be understood as a key determinant of whether or not a person is likely to commit crime. Identifying key character traits that positively or negatively influence deviant

behaviours (extraversion, neuroticism and psychopathy), Eysenck also made links to biological characteristics, especially of the limbic system, in his theories.

SOCIOLOGICAL CRIMINOLOGY - STRUCTURES, PROCESSES AND REACTIONS:

Early sociological explanations focus on forces outside an individual's direct control as the main driver of crime and so in this sense can be considered a branch of criminological positivism.

Explaining "crime" is not a simple undertaking since there are many different kinds of crime beyond those commonly considered (robbery, assault, murder) such as crimes of the powerful (state crime, white collar crime, environmental crime, cyber crime). A further complication is that crime is not the same across time and place (what is considered criminal behaviour varies over time and according to socio-cultural norms e.g. gay marriage). As such, the notion of crime is intrinsically fluid and inextricably linked to particular forms of social reaction and social control. These explanations shift the focus from analysing the individual to considering social forces largely outside an individual's immediate control.

A useful way to understand sociological criminology is to see the range of theories as coming at the problem of crime at different levels, often reflecting the political perspectives of the various theorists. Brown, Esbensen and Geis (2015) suggest organising these theories according to whether they see crime as a function of:

- Social structures --> how society is set up and how it functions as a series of interconnected parts;
- Social processes --> how people interact and what they experience in their lives as they negotiate the social world, or;
- Social reactions --> how people react and respond to social realities.

SOCIAL STRUCTURES - FROM DURKHEIM TO STRAIN THEORY:

Durkheim was the first social theorist to focus directly on the issue of deviance and to see it as a consequence of certain social facts (which could be scientifically measured and studied). He saw crime as central to the function of society, and in some ways beneficial in that it helped create behavioural boundaries essential for setting norms and expectations. For Durkheim, crime was a natural feature of all societies, an expression of human desire to push boundaries and common to every single community, including within religious orders. His most famous work, published in 1879, centred on the study of suicide, finding that the higher the levels of prosperity brought about by industrialised capitalism, the higher the suicide rate (Durkheim 1979). It represented the first published statistical analysis of human behaviour. Also, in searching to understand the genesis of human behaviours, it shifted the focus away from the individual as a rational or biologically flawed agent, and towards the study of the society or structure in which the individual existed.

Durkheim's understanding of society rested partly on the notion of the common collective consciousness. Linked to Hobbes' idea of the social contract, the common consciousness represents the idea that healthy societies have a shared set of values in which each member is equally invested. It is like a social glue that helps maintain the solidarity of the community, and crime plays an important role in achieving this. This is because it so clearly signifies unacceptable behaviours, providing people with a point of reference for right and wrong. Durkheim saw crime as an essential regulator of behaviour.

Durkheim's work looked particularly at the major social changes he observed during his lifetime, a movement from what he termed "mechanical" to "organic" societies. This movement, he argued, resulted in subtle but important changes to the nature of the collective conscience and how it is reinforced. In mechanical societies social solidarity was straightforward because people largely

performed the same tasks as each other and held very similar beliefs. Life was predictable, because one's place in the world, including their means of subsistence, was largely inherited and predetermined. In later organic societies, social solidarity rested in a new individual interdependence. The divisions of labour which characterise modern societies, in particular, increased the need for interdependence between people since the provision of essential goods and services depended on the labour of many.

In an organic society, law (and custom) had to regulate difference rather than simply reflect consensus. Durkheim saw that this was not readily achieved in societies undergoing great social change. For Durkheim, the danger of modernity was that the collective conscience became weakened resulting in a social condition he described as anomie. Anomie described the conditions that arise when society is in flux and standards (or norms) are unclear or poorly established, and such a state provided a possible precursor for deviance.

THE CHICAGO SCHOOL:

Merton (1910-2003) was heavily influenced by Durkheim, pioneering Strain Theory in 1938. He argued that crime was largely a function of individuals finding ways to adapt to the anomie they experienced as a result of their opportunities to attain culturally desirable goals being severely restricted. Such goals included gaining a good education, securing meaningful employment, homeownership and raising a family in comfortable circumstances. Merton also argued that the strain of blocked opportunities resulted in a series of necessary adaptations that sometimes led to criminal activity. A person's particular "mode of adaptation" was determined by whether they accepted or rejected dominant cultural goals and values and institutionalised, or commonly accepted, means to achieve these goals.

CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROCESS:

Edwin Sutherland developed differential association theory in the mid 1930s. This approach took the view that crime was a learned behaviour, culturally transmitted through people's interactions with each other. Whether a person became a criminal or not depended on the influence of people with whom they closely associated and how this shaped their view of the world, and particularly their views of law as either favourable or unfavourable.

Control theories examine the way societal norms work to control individual behaviour. Travis Hirschi (1935-) developed Social Bond Theory in 1969. This theory identified three key variables that could be used to help explain, and perhaps predict, future criminality: attachment, commitment and involvement. This theory was later developed into Self Control theory (Gottfredson & Hirschi 1990). This "general theory of crime", which claims to be applicable to all crime types, sees crime as principally a function of a lack of self-control on the part of an individual, due to inadequate social bonds which result from poor parenting and weak familial bonds.

CRIME AS SOCIAL REACTION - FROM CONFLICT THEORY TO CRITICAL CRIMINOLOGY:

Conflict theories examine the role of power in both producing and rendering criminal certain behaviours in the interests of preserving the status quo. A core assumption is that society is not based on a moral consensus, but more on conflict and lack of consensus. Such conflict meant that some had power that others could not access, and criminalisation was seen as a product of this unequal dynamic.

Bonger identified class struggles as a driver of crime, and argued that it was people of lower classes that were routinely subjected to criminal law (Bonger 1916). He argued that "those who produce legislative majorities win control over the power and dominate the policies that decide who is likely to be involved in violation of the law". The work of early conflict theorists (like that of classicists)

challenged traditionally held views about the causes of crime and was consequently not popular in mainstream scholarly thought. Tannenbaum (1938) examined what he termed the "dramatisation of evil" which argued that young people who engaged in delinquent activity attracted a "tag" which labelled them in such a way as to affect identity, linked to the way people treated them differently. He saw this process as increasing the likelihood of reoffending and actively producing crime. This laid the foundations for Labelling theories.

Left realists, such as Jock Young (1942-2013), Stan Cohen (1942-2013) and Ian Taylor (1944-2001) declared that it was also important to "take crime seriously" rather than romanticising crime socially concerning crime types (such as robbery, rape and assault) as purely expressions of the class struggle, as Marxist theorists had arguably done. Left realists noted that crime was, in the main, committed by and against lower and working classes. So rather than seeing the criminological enterprise as one designed to spur on a social revolution, they felt that criminology had the more practical and pragmatic purpose of championing social justice. They identified the "square of crime" and demonstrated how four key variables could be used to explain crime. These variables were the victim, the offender, the state and the community and for left realists, each deserved the close attention of governments, policy makers and criminologists.

CONTEMPORARY EXPLANATIONS:

Feminist Theories. Law is harsher on women than men.

Queer theories. Focusing on looking at the rights of those who are non-binary or not heterosexual. Equality.

Rational choice theorists continue to assume that crime is a function of individual choice, while positivist studies of genetics, child rearing practices and social experiences continue to work towards the development of "grand theories" of crime.