CRIMINOLOGY AS A FIELD OF STUDY

Criminology is the study of making laws, breaking laws, and reacting toward the breaking of laws (Edwin Sutherland).

What is criminology? In a classic definition, the father of American criminology, Edwin Sutherland (Sutherland & Cressey, 1960, Principles of Criminology, 6th ed., Philadelphia: Lippencott, p. 3) said

Criminology includes the scientific study of making laws, breaking laws, and reacting toward the breaking of laws.

Note that the three (3) areas in Sutherland's definition (making, breaking, and reacting) form the foundation of specialty areas in criminology. Those who specialize in the study of making laws are criminologists with a legal bent (many have law degrees), and they refer to their area of study as the criminology of criminal law, or in the case of criminologists with sociology degrees, the Sociology of law. An example would be the conflict criminologist, William Chambliss, who in 1964 wrote a famous treatise on the law of vagrancy to argue for a ruling class domination theory of crime. Theories in this specialty area are sometimes called theories of criminalization, not theories of crime. They involve the study of why some acts, but not others, come to the attention of authorities, and why some acts, but not others, come to be formally penalized by the state as crimes.

The second area of specialization (breaking laws) is what most people think of when they think of criminology, and it is generally referred to as the area of criminogenesis, etiology (the study of causes), or crime causation. This area is the most interdisciplinary one in criminology, and pretty much, anyone with an interest in studying the criminal mind is welcome, regardless of whether their degree is in anthropology, economics, political science, psychology, or sociology (although sociology dominated criminology for most of the twentieth century). It is important to note that this specialty area is NOT concerned with fighting crime or catching criminals more effectively. It is concerned with scientific theory and method for uncovering truth. Any insights gained from studying the criminal mind are supposed to be useful in understanding human nature and the society we live in. There is some disagreement about this, however, with so-called clinical, applied, and praxis (theory in action) criminology, as well as the field of criminal justice, advocating better management, investigation, social change, and systems, respectively.

The third area (reacting to lawbreaking) is the most sociological of the three, and specialists here tend to refer to themselves as societal reaction theorists, social response theorists, normative theorists, relativity of crime researchers, or less commonly as criminologists of criminal justice. The authors of your textbook for this course represent this specialty area. Societal reaction theorists study things like media glorification of crime or the moral boundaries by which communities tolerate or do not tolerate crime in their midst. Social response theorists are interested in the justifications and consequences of different styles of reacting to crime (e.g., lock-em-up strategies versus mediation). Normative theorists are interested in the determinants of norms (expectations for behavior), since norm violations are often the root source of both deviance and crime. Relativity of crime specialists are interested in whether there is a consensus of public opinion about the seriousness of various criminal acts. Criminologists of criminal justice are often indistinguishable from criminal justice specialists (criminal justice being a separate, but related discipline) in that they study things like society's carrying capacity (rates of imprisonment and how many prisoners prisons can hold) or police strength (as an indicator of repressive social control). The three parts of Sutherland's definition are sometimes abbreviated as the study of lawmaking, lawbreaking, and reactions.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THEORY

Regardless of specialty area, all criminologists strive toward good theory. What is theory? As any dictionary definition makes clear, a theory is any system of ideas arranged in rational order that produce general
principles which increase our understanding and explanations. The general principles in a theory are derived from, 
and representative, of particular facts, but those principles are not dependant upon the particular thing to be 
explained (Kaplan 1964). This means that theories have a life of their own in the ever-increasing generalities they 
provide. Theories are like children. Someone gives birth to them, and they go out into the world and no longer 
belong to anyone. Some of them become ideologies (get used for political purposes) and others become endless 
puzzles that scientists work on for centuries.

Ideally, theory should (1) focus attention on a particular phenomenon; (2) fit the known facts about a particular 
phenomenon; (3) contribute to scientific paradigms; (4) provide a way it can be tested or falsified; (5) establish 
boundaries and domains by which laws and truth statements can be generalized; and (6) enable propositions which 
can be added or compared to those of other theories. In addition, theories should shed light on some of the 
more fundamental issues in metaphysics -- the problem of action, and the problem of order. Briefly, the 
fundamental problem of action has to do with motivation, whether behavior is motivated selfishly and rationally or 
whether it is motivated emotionally, unconsciously, or in non-rational fashion. The term "action" is used to 
distinguish behavior motivated by some purpose, or instrumentally, in other words. The fundamental problem of 
order is the basic quest of sociology when sociologists ask "how is society possible", and involves how collective 
systems, structures, and patterns are linked, if at all, to individual choices, decisions, and freedom. Criminology has 
an extensive set of fundamental issues it is concerned with, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rational v. Irrational</th>
<th>The problem of action, the metaphysics of motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macro v. Micro</td>
<td>The problem of order, the metaphysics of societal possibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure v. Process</td>
<td>Time or temporality; whether behavior is best explained by a snapshot observation or over a length of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus v. Conflict</td>
<td>Conceptions of society; whether people agree or disagree on the seriousness of crime and/or the building blocks of society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free will v. Determinism</td>
<td>Also known as the Classical v. Positivist debate (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism v. Pessimism</td>
<td>Concerns about whether crime control can be effective or not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every theory has at least 2-3 meta-theoretical levels above it (see Perspectives, Approaches, and 
Theories). The fundamental issues are usually addressed at the APPROACH level, and are often called the 
assumptions, or starting points, of a theory, although the term "assumptions" more strictly refers to the background 
or domain boundaries one can draw generalizations about. Above the approach level is the PERSPECTIVE level, the 
largest unit of agreement within a scientific community, and in fact, the names for the scientific 
disciplines. Perspectives are sometimes called paradigms or viewpoints, although some people use the term 
paradigm to refer to untenable ideologies such as (1) rational choice; (2) pathogenesis; (3) labeling; (4) critique 
for the sake of critique; and (5) theoretical integration.

Theory is the foundation of criminology and of criminal justice, and we study theory to know why we are doing 
what we do (Bohm 1985). Theory without research is not science. All research must be based on theory. People 
who are uninterested in theory choose to move blindly through life, or in the case of criminal justice, intervene in 
people's lives with only vague notions about why they are doing what they are doing.

The most important task of theory is explanation, which is also called prediction. An explanation is a sensible 
way of relating the facts about some particular phenomenon to the intellectual atmosphere of a people at a 
particular time or place. Any group of like-minded, receptive people at a particular time and place is called a 
school of thought. Explanations are always tied to context (inter-subjective reliability) and concepts (the 
intellectual words and phrases in use at any given time). What makes a person a 'theorist' is their creative ability
at wordsmithing, the ability to describe something that everyone knows is there, but no one has come along before to say it exactly like that. The theorist’s creativity is based on what are called constructs (images, ideas, or new words in the theorist’s head), and the art of theory construction is the translation of constructs into concepts.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CAUSATION

Now, criminology has no monopoly on explanation. Everyone makes explanations all the time. There are popular ones, spiritual ones, natural ones, unscientific ones. What makes a theory scientific is that it focuses on causal relationships between variables. What is a cause? Causes are sequential changes in the properties of one thing brought about by sequential, determinate changes in the properties of another thing. Causes are distinguished from primitive terms like factors. Causes get down into the qualities or properties of particulars. We call these properties variables, and they represent not the totality of an object, but various aspects or subsets of an object we suspect are involved in its efficient operation. In other words, we find causes where we find things that move about, which may only be present in varying degrees.

A variable is some subset of a phenomenon that you can have more or less of, as opposed to a constant, which you either have or don’t have. That’s why they’re called variables, because they vary. There are no such things as theories about constants. Everything in science is about variables. The cause of something is called the independent variable (you have more or less of what makes you want to commit crime), and the effect of something is called the dependent variable (you engage in crime on a more or less regular basis). This IV-DV relationship is important for two reasons: (1) concomitant variation is the basis for almost all the statistical methods in mathematics; and (2) by focusing upon a relationship of some kind, theories are inherently predictive. That makes prediction of something an important part of criminology, however:

- Classical criminology -- this free will approach is more concerned with explanation than with prediction. That’s because the independent variable (motivation to commit crime) is taken for granted or treated as a constant (everyone is equally possessed of free will). Classical criminologists therefore use variables like changes in the law and how that effects crime rates, that’s why they are often criminalization or deterrence theorists.
- Positivist criminology -- this deterministic approach is more concerned with prediction then with explanation. It takes the motivation as problematic (each person is exposed to a different set of forces that might make them want to commit a crime) and then relates that to variable outcomes (either generalized or specialized criminal behavior). That’s why positivists are often theorists interested in etiology (the causes of crime).

Finally, theories can be verified, falsified, or integrated. Verification is the process of testing theories, bit by bit, piece by piece. It’s the incremental process of science, moving slowly, going over each and every word the theorist had to say and constructing an hypothesis about it, designing an experiment to test it, carrying out research on it, and reporting the statistical results. It’s the most common procedure for handling theories in criminology, and involves two additional approaches: specification and elaboration. Specification is any effort to figure out the details of a theory (especially its dependent variable side, or the effect), how the variables work together; usually associated with a belief that many, competing theories are better than integrated efforts. Elaboration is any effort to figure out the implications of a theory, what other variables might be added to the theory (especially on the independent variable side, or the cause); often associated with the belief that theory competition is better than theoretical integration. Falsification is when the researcher does some of their own thinking, and devises a negative test case or some hypothetical situation which would test exactly what the opposite of what the theory is saying. It is intended to disprove or prove the theory, or at least some bit of it. It’s not done much in criminology; first of all, because theorists rarely provide any leads for constructing falsification statements; and second of all, because the theorist can always say it wasn’t a fair test, or that wasn’t
what they meant. Integration doesn't often involve any research at all, although it can with causal modeling and other advanced statistical techniques. Instead, it's usually when the researcher (or another theorist) combines the similarities or differences between two different theories to construct a bigger theory.

WHY IT IS SO HARD TO DEFINE CRIME

What is crime? This is a surprisingly difficult question to answer. What constitutes crime varies from culture to culture, and from time to time. Criminals have been various things to different people throughout time — heroes, villains, fools, revolutionaries, deviants, scumbags. Criminologists try to be scientifically objective and open-minded, however, rather than succumb to popular definitions. It's an important part of what makes criminology a science (other than its research and research methods). Some people regard the definitional problem as the most important task in criminology. Here's a list of some of the most common definitional approaches.

- Legalistic — In this view, crime is defined as behavior that violates the criminal code. Although this isn't suitable for criminologists of the criminal law (who take law as problematical), it is by far the most common approach in criminology, and it makes the field inherently conservative. It's associated with the arguments made in 1947 by Paul Tappan ("Who is the Criminal?" American Sociological Review 12:1, 96-102) who was responding to a challenge thrown down by the famous philosopher Mortimer Adler, the legalistic approach in criminology believes in the same principles of criminal law (culpability or criminal intent, male in versus male prohibits, and responsibility or justifications and excuses).

- Conduct norms — In this view, popularized by a 1938 book written by Thorstein Veblen (pronounced "vee-blun") (Culture Conflict and Crime, NY: Social Science Research Council), crime is just one form of conduct norm violations. Every group one belongs to, regardless of political boundaries, regardless of embodiment in law, has conduct norms. Norms are the unspoken rules of right (normal) and wrong (abnormal) that are contained in custom, tradition, ethics, religion, family, and other social institutions. The importance of the Veblen definition is that it frees criminologists as scientists to define their own subject matter.

- Social harm — This view is most closely associated with Sutherland's interests in white collar crime (1949, White Collar Crime, New Haven, Yale Univ. Press) although there are other influences. To Sutherland (and most criminologists), it is clearly unfair that white collar criminals get off with civilian fines rather than criminal punishments. Corporations that pollute the environment have to pay a million dollar penalty (nothing more than a slap on the wrist to them) while someone who shares a marijuana cigarette with a friend gets 6 years in prison for trafficking (quite a lengthly restriction of liberty). Criminologists adhering to this sense of unfairness tend to believe that crime is any socially harmful act or analogous social injury, whether legally permissible or not. In this view, crime includes untimely death, illness or disease, deprivation of food, shelter, clothing, medical care, racism, sexism, and tobacco, etc.

- Human rights violation — This view is most closely associated with the arguments made by Herman and Julie Schwindtger (1975, "Defenders of Order or Guardians of Human Rights' in Critical Criminology, ed. by Ian Taylor, Paul Walton & Jock Young, pp. 113-46, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul) although there are other influences. For the Schwindtgers, not only anything that causes social injury (imperialism, sexism, racism, poverty) is crime, but also anything that thwarts the right to dignified human existence (freedom of movement, free speech, a good education, employment, the right to unionize, life, liberty, happiness, and so on). The concept of human rights has the advantage of cutting across cultures and over time.

- Deviance and Social Control — The view that crime is deviance, or norm-violating behavior is associated most with sociological criminology. The norms can originated from any source; religion, political belief, etiquette, fashion, or criminal law. In fact, deviance occurs whenever there is stigmatization, isolation, rejection, segregation, punishment, treatment, or rehabilitation. Social control can be coercive (forceful), normative (attitudinal), or an exchange solution (sets of rewards and incentives). Not all deviant
acts are criminal (and vice versa). Deviance is in the eye of the beholder, Law is but one form of social control, a coercive, governmental solution, the term 'criminalization' refers to the process whereby criminal law is selectively applied to certain behaviors, and many criminalization specialists adhere to a deviance and social control viewpoint, asking the question if criminalization is a neutral process or if it serves the interests of the powerful. Other forms of social control are sometimes studied, like dispute resolution, mediation, therapeutic, counseling, rehabilitation, reconciliation, restitution (self-help, avoidance, negotiation, settlement, and toleration). Deviance and social control specialists tend to focus on distinguishing kinds of acts (contextual explanations) from kinds of people (compositional explanations). Those who adhere to a compositional explanation used to be called social pathologists, and study the three D's (delinquent, defective, and dangerous classes), but they are a dying breed.

- Social problem -- As almost any college student who has taken a social problems class knows, crime is but one of many enduring conditions that seems to have always been there and show no signs of going away (like homosexuality, teenage pregnancy, poverty, or aging). The social problems approach tries to avoid "reductionism", or explaining crime by virtue of any one explanation, biological, psychological, or even sociological. It tends to look at the social meanings, or collective definitions, of crime. It therefore closely studies things like media polls or public opinion. Media portrayals, images of crime, and the measurement of crime are serious concerns to social problems specialists, although they wouldn't call themselves specialists because they are anti-specialists, among other things, in adhering to the principles outlined in a little book called The Sociological Imagination by C. Wright Mills (1959, NY: Oxford Univ. Press). In that book, some of the most important principles are never infer value from fact; remember that a social problem, or issue, is trans-jurisdictional, not a local trouble; imagine micro-macro links; and keep a playfulness of mind (pure reason limits freedom) in shifting from levels of abstraction (no grand theory and no abstracted empiricism either).

- Sin or evil -- I hesitate to add this point of view. Few scholars do, but there are some similarities between theology and criminology worth noting. One of these is theodicy (the study of suffering) which has many similarities to a social harm approach. Another is the similarity between criminal intent (mens rea, or guilty mind) and evil mind. Although the Gluecks (a famous husband and wife research team of criminologists at Harvard during 1930-1950), among others, pretty much pointed out the futility of the evil causes evil fallacy, the fact remains that the law imputes a certain amount of blameworthiness that resembles the imputation of evil. These are other similarities we need not go into. It's not really an important area of study in criminology.

- Chaos -- I also hesitate to add this, because I basically don't feel all that literate in postmodern, chaos theory approaches, to defining crime. To the best of my understanding, there are things called oscillators and attractors, the former referring to what a time-series analysis of crime rates would look like if plotted on a three-dimensional graph, the latter referring to laws or social control mechanisms that produce nonlinear effects indicating more or less steady states of chaos (randomness).

Differences Between Criminology and Criminal Justice

Criminology is an older, larger field of study than criminal justice. Criminology adheres to the natural science model, trying to be like Biology, Chemistry, or Physics. Criminal justice adheres to the social science model, and is more receptive to disciplines like business, the arts, and humanities. Criminology borrows heavily from philosophy, psychology and sociology. Criminal justice borrows heavily from administrative public policy and lay sciences (like police science or investigative science). Criminology has many theories, some of which conflict with one another. Criminal justice has very few theories.

Many criminologists are hard-core, Vienna-school (measurable concepts only), logical positivists (Williams 1984). The most hard-core 'numbers crunchers', or quantitative criminologists, dominate the top journals. Even qualitative researchers are starting to use computers with software programs like NUDist and so forth. Criminologists conduct research incrementally, by data mining, and by working on puzzles that have been in existence for
decades. Criminal justice research operates by serendipity, and by going on "fishing expeditions" for topics to study.

Academic criminology is essentially a discursive discipline based on talk between its practitioners. Academic criminal justice is essentially ideological factionalization. Both fields suffer from the Wozzle Effect (where unique terms lose their unique meaning) and Obliteration By Incorporation (where unique contributors are lost), like the Matthew Effect. Criminal Justice is ascending vis-à-vis criminology because of its system focus and financial support. Theories in criminology may devolve into 'theories of the system' that emphasize pragmatic efficiency, rectification of social control, and political falsifiability. Now, more than ever, we need to increase our criminological IQ.

CRIME THEORIES

*The function of theory is to provide puzzles for research (Lewis Coser)*

To understand criminal justice, it is necessary to understand crime. Most policy-making in criminal justice is based on criminological theory, whether the people making those policies know it or not. In fact, most of the failed policies (what doesn't work) in criminal justice are due to misinterpretation, partial implementation, or ignorance of criminological theory. Much time and money could be saved if only policymakers had a thorough understanding of criminological theory. At one time, criminological theory was rather pure and abstract, with few practical implications, but that is not the case anymore. For example, almost all criminologists today use a legalistic rather than normative definition of crime. A legalistic definition of crime takes as its starting point the statutory definitions contained in the penal code, legal statutes or ordinances. A crime is a crime because the law says so. Sure, there are concerns about overcriminalization (too many laws) and undercriminalization (not enough laws), but at least on the surface, a legalistic approach seems practical. It is also advantageous to a normative definition, which sees crime as a violation of norms (social standards of how humans ought to think and behave), although there are times when criminology can shed light on norms and norm violators.

Every criminological theory contains a set of assumptions (about human nature, social structure, and the principles of causation, to name a few), a description of the phenomena to be explained (facts a theory must fit), and an explanation, or prediction, of that phenomenon. The assumptions are also called meta-theoretical issues, and deal with debates like those over free will v. determinism or consensus v. conflict. The description is a statistical profile, figure, diagram, or table of numbers representing the patterns, trends, and correlates of the type of crime taken as an example (most appropriate example) of all crime. The explanation is a set of variables (things that can be tweaked or changed) arranged in some kind of causal order so that they have statistical and meaningful significance. Criminological theories are primarily concerned with etiology (the study of causes or reasons for crime), but occasionally have important things to say about actors in the criminal justice system, such as police, attorneys, correctional personnel, and victims.

There are basically thirteen (13) identifiable types of criminological theory, only three (3) of which are considered ‘mainstream’ or conventional criminology (strain, learning, control). The oldest theory (biochemistry) goes back to 1876 and the last four theories (left realism, peacemaking, feminist, postmodern) have only developed in the past twenty-five years. The following table illustrates, with more information about each theory below the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Causes</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Biochemistry</td>
<td>heredity, vitamin deficiency, allergy, tumor, toxins, brain dysfunction, hormonal imbalance</td>
<td>isolation, treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Psychology</td>
<td>low intelligence, psychopathy, stress</td>
<td>treatment, counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ecology</td>
<td>disorganized neighborhoods</td>
<td>community empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strain</td>
<td>economic goal blockage</td>
<td>increased opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Learning</td>
<td>imitation, reinforcement schedules</td>
<td>more effective negative reinforcement, more use of positive reinforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Control</td>
<td>socialization, low self-control</td>
<td>child-rearing, social bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Labeling</td>
<td>stunning, identity immersion</td>
<td>nonintervention, reintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Conflict</td>
<td>power differentials, competition</td>
<td>increased equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Radical</td>
<td>class struggle, capitalism</td>
<td>praxis, socialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Left Realism</td>
<td>predatory relationships</td>
<td>more effective police protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Peacemaking</td>
<td>inner suffering and turmoil</td>
<td>spiritual rejuvenation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Feminist</td>
<td>gender inequality, patriarchy</td>
<td>end sex discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Postmodern</td>
<td>hierarchical privileges and language</td>
<td>more informal social control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Biochemistry is known by many names: biological, constitutional (having to do with the structure of the body's morphology), genetic, and anthropological criminology. The oldest field is criminal anthropology, founded by the father of modern criminology, Cesare Lombroso, in 1876. He was one of the first exponents of the positivist approach to explaining crime, positivism being a search for the causes of crime using scientific method, as opposed to the classical approach, which relies upon free will as the main cause of crime. Historically, theories of the biochemistry type have tried to establish the biological inferiority of criminals, but modern bio-criminology simply says that heredity and body organ dysfunctions produce a predisposition toward crime.

2. Psychological criminology has been around since 1914, and attempts to explain the consistent finding that there is an eight-point IQ difference between criminals and noncriminals. That gap isn't enough to notice, but it might make them more impulsive and foolhardy, and even smart people with high IQs are vulnerable to folly. Other psychocriminologists focus on personality disorders, like the psychopaths, sociopaths, and antisocial personalities.

3. Ecological criminology was the first sociological criminology, developed during the 1920s at the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago. Hence, it is also called Chicago School sociology. Ecological is the study of relationships between an organism and its environment, and this type of theory explains crime by the disorganized eco-areas where people live rather than by the kind of people who live there.

4. Strain, sometimes called the French word anomie, is a 1938 American version of French sociology, invented by the father of modern sociology, Emile Durkheim (1858-1917). This type of theory sees crime as the normal result of an "American dream" in which people set their aspirations (for wealth, education, occupation, any status symbol) too high, and inevitably discover strain or goal blockages, along the way. The only two things to do are reduce aspirations or increase opportunities.

5. Learning theories tend to follow the lead of Edwin Sutherland's theory of differential association, developed in 1947, although ideas about imitation or modeling go back to 1890. Often oversimplified as "peer group" theories, learning is much more than that, and involves the analysis of what is positively and negatively rewarding (reinforcing) for individuals.
6. Control theories in criminology are all about social control. Only those called containment or low-self control theories have to do with individual psychology. Control theory has pretty much dominated the criminological landscape since 1969. It focuses upon a person's relationships to their agents of socialization, such as parents, teachers, preachers, coaches, scout leaders, or police officers. It studies how effective bonding with such authority figures translates into bonding with society, hence keeping people out of trouble with the law.

7. Labeling theory was a child of the 1960s and 1970s which saw criminals as underdogs who initially did something out of the ordinary, and then got swept up in a huge, government-sponsored labeling or shunning reaction. It argues that anyone facing such an overwhelming, negative labeling social reaction will eventually become more like the label because that is the only way out for their identity formation. It points out that sometimes its best to do nothing (for minor offending), and that there are few reintegrative rituals designed to help people fit back into their communities.

8. Conflict theory holds that society is based on conflict between competing interest groups; for example, rich against poor, management against labor, whites against minorities, men against women, adults against children, etc. These kind of dog-eat-dog theories also have their origins in the 1960s and 1970s, and are characterized by the study of power and powerlessness.

9. Radical theories, also from the 1960s and 1970s, typically involve Marxist (referring to Karl Marx 1818-1883) critiques of capitalist society which allows things to exist like millions of billionaires and millionaires while the vast majority of people live in poverty or just get by. Such fundamental economic disparities reflect basic contradictions. In the way work is organized into dehumanizing, brutalizing, and oppressive conditions. Crime is seen as a reflection of class struggle, a kind of primitive rebellion with criminals behaving as rebels without a clue. Only through praxis (Informed action based on theoretical understanding) will the new socialist society be formed and crime will go away.

10. Left realism is a mid-1980s British development that focuses upon the reasons why people of the working class prey upon one another, that is, victimize other poor people of their own race and kind. It wants the police to have more power in protecting poor people, but on the other hand, doesn't want the police to be invasive or intrusive.

11. Peacekeeping criminology came about during the 1990s as the study of how "wars" on crime only make matters worse. It suggests that the solution to crime is to create more caring, mutually dependent communities and strive for inner rebirth or spiritual rejuvenation (Inner peace).

12. Feminist criminology matured in the 1990s, although feminist ideas have been around for decades. The central concept is patriarchy, or male domination, as the main cause of crime. Feminists also tend to call for more attention to female points of view.

13. Postmodern criminology matured in the 1990s, although postmodernism itself (as a rejection of scientific rationality to the pursuit of knowledge) was born in the late 1960s. It tends to focus upon how stereotypical words, thoughts, and conceptions limit our understanding, and how crime develops from feelings of being disconnected and dehumanized. It advocates replacing our current legal system with informal social controls such as group and neighborhood tribunals.

This has been only the briefest of overviews on crime theories. There is much, much more, and the reader is encouraged to find out more, including the comparative advantages and weaknesses of different theories.
WHAT IS A CRIME?

A crime is a violation of law. An understanding of what the law says is a crime requires an understanding of what law is. It is important to know that "law" is not a tangible object of the real world, like a set of books or something you can touch. Law is a social invention, or convention, that societies need to survive. Law is all around us, enveloping us like a cocoon. The citizen who fills out a tax form or is dealing with criminal charges is only having to deal with legislative behavior; i.e., written codes or statutes. Legislation, codes, statutes, and courts are only the tip of the iceberg. Think of society as one big "house" and of law as the "house rules."

The world of law is a world of authoritative rules; that is, they have some authority behind them. Who's authority? The authority of those who claim and deserve the special privilege of carrying out the physical or psychological force necessary to make those rules, interpret those rules, and carry them out. Here's a couple definitions of law by a famous anthropologist and famous sociologists:

"A law or legal norm exists if its neglect or infraction is regularly met, in threat or in fact, by the application of physical force by an individual or group possessing the socially recognized privilege of so acting." E. Adamson Hoebel (1954), The Law of Primitive Men, NY: Antheneum, p. 28.

"Law, legal rules, and order exist if they are externally guaranteed by the probability of coercion (physical or psychological) to bring about conformity or avenge violation, and is applied by a staff of people holding themselves specially ready for that purpose." Max Weber (In Max Rheinstein, 1954, Max Weber on Law in Economy and Society, Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press), p. 5.

A crime is an intentional violation of the law committed without defense or excuse and penalized by the state. However, this condensed legal definition doesn't do justice to all the characteristics necessary to make some behavior a crime. Technically and ideally, a crime has not been committed unless all seven (7) of the following characteristics are present:

1. Harm -- There are external consequences that injure somebody else physically or psychologically. Thinking about committing a crime or being angry enough to commit a crime is not a crime. Victimless crimes that injure only the offender are still crimes if it can be shown that there are consequences, like harm to families, friends, or the moral fabric of society.

2. Legality -- things less serious than crimes are called "wrongs" and although wrongs may be frowned upon, they do not consist of criminal behavior. People do a lot of bad things in this world, and just because it stimulates "there ought to be a law" response doesn't necessarily mean criminal law. Instead, crimes are forbidden things for which the evil-doing has been specified in advance. There can be no ex post facto law, which goes back retroactively and converts a wrong into a crime.

3. Actus reus -- (Guilty act) A crime always requires action, or people doing things. Inaction when the law calls for action is also a crime. For example, if parents do not provide adequate necessities for their children, this behavior of omission is just as much a crime as someone who does something actively. When the act is due to Infancy, Intoxication, Insanity, or other bodily disease, we say that the crime has an excuse and hold the offender less responsible.
4. Mens rea — (Guilty mind) A crime always has certain mental aspects, such as intent and purpose, but also recklessness and negligence. These are all mental states, short of motive, that the law recognizes as worthy of blame. The law realizes that clear cut, well planned motives don't happen all that often, whether the behavior is directed toward good or evil. When the mental state involves duress, self-defense, entrapment, or necessity, we say that the crime has a justification, and hold the offender less responsible.

5. Causation -- A crime must lead directly or indirectly to the harm without too much delay. Actual cause is direct and proximate cause is indirect. Logic must be used to determine the fairness of how far back in time the setting in motion of a chain of events resulted in foreseeable harm.

6. Concurrence -- The criminal conduct (actus reus) and criminal intent (mens rea) must occur together at about the same time or within a year and a day of when the intent was formed. This element refers mostly to the circumstances surrounding the criminal behavior, such as whether motive was accompanied by opportunity and means.

7. Punishment -- This is just the definition of law as having some authority behind it, but it clearly requires some sort of penal sanction, whether retribution, restitution, compensation, regulation, or rehabilitation.

THE MAJOR CRIMES

The major crimes are those that injure society, and there is some consensus about the degree of wrong done to society. Some things are just evil in themselves (male in se), others are evil because it is in the public interest to prohibit them (male prohibita), others are evil because of being old, outdated, or inflexible (male antiqua), others because of being too new (male nova), and still others because they are confusing and ambiguous (male ambigua). In each case, the wrong is done to society, and any harm done to the victim is just incidental. There are about twelve (12) different categories of crime in criminal law, and most typologies of this kind are simply analytical devices, but at a basic level, they shed light on whatever evils in society the law is protecting us from. The following table illustrates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>SOCIAL WRONG OR EVIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>Killing, force, violence, threats of violence, dangerousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime</td>
<td>Taking, depriving, trespass, converting, misleading, concealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes Against Morality</td>
<td>Forfeiture, seduction, illicit behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes Against Public Order</td>
<td>Disorderliness, threats to public safety and peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Against Government</td>
<td>Rebellion, treason, sedition, perjury, corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime By Government</td>
<td>Genocide, torture, brutality, civil rights violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate Crime</td>
<td>Bias, prejudice, discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized Crime</td>
<td>Illegal good and services, too highly disciplined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar Crime</td>
<td>Deception, fixing, gouging, nonviolent illicit financial gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Crime</td>
<td>Opportunism, misuse of professional capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimless Crime</td>
<td>Addiction, too strongly demanded, illegal exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Technology Crime</td>
<td>Theft, theftfulness, too sophisticated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inspiration comes from what are called the common law elements of a crime. These elements (enumerated below) provide the guidelines for police training and what evidence the prosecutor needs to convict. The common law (explained below) is an age-old consensus on what judges have always thought defined a crime. It is more the history of judicial decision-making than law of the (and an erroneous assumption). The process of translating the common law into statutory law is called codification, and the following table depicts some common law definitions and elements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIME</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>unlawful killing of a human being with malice eforeshought</td>
<td>1. unlawful killing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. of human being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. malice eforeshought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>the act of unlawful carnal knowledge, forcibly and against will</td>
<td>1. unlawful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. carnal knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. force or fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. without consent or against will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>felonious taking of money or goods with intent to steal from another, in their presence, forcibly and against will</td>
<td>1. trespass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. carrying away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. property of another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. with intent to steal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. in presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>unlawful offer or attempted injury of another with ability to create a fear of imminent peril</td>
<td>1. attempt or offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. force or violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. apparent ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. immediate injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery</td>
<td>unlawful touching of another in person or by some object</td>
<td>1. unlawful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. application of force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. to person of another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnapping</td>
<td>forcibly detaining or restraining another against their will or moving them to another place</td>
<td>1. detaining another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. force or without consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. without legal cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. moving another place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>willful and malicious burning of a dwelling or curtilage (outbuilding)</td>
<td>1. burning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. dwelling or curtilage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. belong or occupied by another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. maliciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>breaking and entering a dwelling of another at nighttime with intent to commit a felony therein</td>
<td>1. breaking or entering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. of another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. nighttime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. intent to commit felony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE ORIGINS OF LAW
In American society, criminal law is usually divided into two subtypes: substantive and procedural law. Substantive law is the penal law, the codes, statutes, and ordinances that specify a punishment and spell out what people legally may and may not do. The common law definitions of offenses (such as robbery and burglary) make up the substantive law. Procedural law is also called adjective or remedial law, and governs the way suspects are put under suspicion, arrested, searched, interrogated, tried, and punished. Procedural law is the same as due process of law.

The first laws were created about 5,000 years ago, and ruled over property and marriage relations. Around 2200 B.C. the Code of Hammurabi, like the Mosaic Law which came later, tended to focus on trade, family, and work-related injuries. Anglo-Saxon law (feudalism, which basically dealt with property relations) ruled England until the Norman Conquest in 1066 A.D., when the Normans (French) invented the Institution of the Eyrë, a system of traveling judges who represented the king in local courts. It was the decisions of these judges in eyre that formed the body of legal precedent that became known as the common law. Because the common law was built case-by-case, it is also known as case law. In the year 1215, the Magna Carta placed limits on royal power, and in 1639, the colony of Connecticut created the first written constitution. Constitutional law (federal, then state) is the highest form of law, and deals with the relationship between individuals and their governments.

Constitutional law in the U.S. is what governs criminal procedural law, specifically the first ten amendments, known as the Bill of Rights, passed in 1791. The Fourteenth Amendment, passed in 1868, incorporated the first ten, making them binding on the states, but they have also been selectively, or individually incorporated by landmark Supreme Court decisions since 1937, a process known as selective Incorporation. The study of these landmark Supreme Court decisions makes up the great bulk of criminal justice scholarship.

4th Amendment Jurisprudence (legal wisdom) — The Supreme Court has consistently held to a doctrine of "reasonableness" in 4th Amendment Jurisprudence. Precisely what reasonableness means remains vague after 100 years since the amendment was ratified. Since this amendment deals with searches and seizures (arrest), the most common interpretation is that police must always have a warrant before any search or seizure, and warrants can only be issued upon grounds of probable cause. Probable cause is but one of several standards of proof in criminal law, this being displayed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARDS OF PROOF IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mere suspicion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gut feeling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Police cannot even stop anyone with mere suspicion. Stop (and frisk) requires reasonable suspicion. To search or arrest requires probable cause. Preponderance is the main standard in civil law, and in criminal law is used in cases of inevitable discovery and waivers of counsel. Clear and convincing is the main standard in federal courts, and in criminal law is used to judge insanity. Beyond a reasonable doubt is what is needed to find someone guilty in a criminal trial. No criminal justice activity requires absolute certainty.
Exceptions to the warrant rule in 4th Amendment jurisprudence exist. To date, police can conduct warrantless searches when evidence is close enough to be destroyed (Chimel v. California 1969), possibly hidden in the passenger compartment and trunks of cars (California v. Acevedo 1991), within plain view (Harris v. U.S. 1968), revealed through a protective sweep search of closets and adjoining rooms (Maryland v. Bufi 1990), obtainable under consent to search even without telling people they have a right to withhold consent (Schenckloth v. Bustamonte 1973). In general, police can justify warrantless search under the exigent circumstances rule (any emergency, unforeseen circumstances).

The 4th Amendment also has some teeth in it to protect against police abuse. This is known as the exclusionary rule, first establishing in Weeks v. U.S. (1914), but applied to the states in 1961 with the case of Mapp v. Ohio. Simply put, if evidence is illegally obtained by the police, it cannot be legally admitted at trial. There are several exceptions to the exclusionary rule, however, that are not mentioned here.

5th Amendment Jurisprudence -- The Supreme Court has less consistently held onto the doctrines of "free and voluntary" and "knowingly and intelligently" with 5th Amendment jurisprudence. These doctrines reflect the law's reliance upon free will and the Constitution's purpose as a contract between each individual and the state. Because the 5th Amendment deals with confessions and other forms of self-incrimination, the legal doctrines in place are, by necessity, subjective standards, which require balancing what is in the mind of the individual with what is on the mind of the state. American police are quite good at extracting confessions; they are successful at it some 60% of the time; so the law requires balancing how "tough a nut" the suspect is to crack with how "coercive and hostile" the police interrogation is.

Specific guarantees include the protection against double jeopardy (Benton v. Maryland 1969), self-incrimination (Miranda v. Arizona 1966), the right to "plead the fifth" (Malloy v. Hogan 1964), and the right not to take the witness stand (Griffin v. California 1965). The right to a grand jury has not yet been specifically incorporated for the states.

6th Amendment Jurisprudence -- There are no less than six (6) different rights guaranteed by this Amendment: notification, assistance of counsel, speedy trial, impartial jury, confrontation, and compulsory process; and the Supreme Court has fairly consistently held to the notion of a "balancing test" for these rights. A balancing test (also called a two-prong, three-prong, or four-prong test) attempts to spell out, objectively, the criteria to be used in weighing the needs of the individual with the needs of the state.

Notification and assistance of counsel are pre-trial rights established in Twining v. New Jersey (1908) and Gideon v. Wainwright (1963) respectively, but Sixth Amendment rights can trace their origins at least to the Magna Carta, if not earlier. Fairness and orderliness are the objective criteria to be considered when balancing pre-trial rights. For speedy trial, the landmark case is Barker v. Wingo (1972) where the reason and impact of delay must be considered. Delay would be acceptable for a critical piece of evidence like the search for a missing witness, but that must also be weighed against any possible prejudicial effect of delay upon the defendant. For impartial jury, the landmark case is Duncan v. Louisiana (1968) which has to do with how cross-sectional, or representative, the jury pool is when selecting candidates for jury duty. The issue of venue (or place of trial) is a good example, and requires consideration of how great or small any local publicity is. For confrontation, the landmark case is Pointer v. Texas (1955) which, in essence, means the defendant has a right to suggest questions his or her lawyer should ask witnesses, but this is balanced by a consideration of how disruptive this would be. Compulsory process is the power of subpoena to call witnesses on one's behalf, and the landmark case is Washington v. Texas (1967). This is generally an unchallenged right, but there are important privilege exceptions for some witnesses.

8th Amendment Jurisprudence -- This Amendment prohibits excessive bail and cruel and unusual punishment. The Supreme Court has loosely held onto the standards of "wanton and freakish" and "evolving decency" with landmark cases including Wilkerson v. Utah (1878) which regarded any old punishments, such as
beheading and hanging, as too old-fashioned for society, and _Weems v. U.S._ (1910) which reversed this historical viewpoint and created the notions of proportionality and evolving decency. Another standard, "civilized society" was created in 1958 with the case of _Trop v. Dulles_. In 1972, the death penalty was declared unconstitutional in _Furman v. Georgia_, and in 1976, it was declared constitutional once again in _Gregg v. Georgia_. Current concern is with how the death penalty is arrived at, and carried out, and the so-called Gregg factors require juries to consider both mitigating and aggravating circumstances before issuing the death penalty. This area of law is one of the few areas where the Supreme Court regards the "will of the people" as important, as obtained thru public opinion.

**CRIME DATA**

_There are three types of lies, lies, Damn Lies, and Statistics (Mark Twain)_

No way of measuring crime is perfect, and it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to know exactly how much crime is going on in any jurisdiction at any time. First of all, crime is a label slapped on some behaviors and not on others. There are known inaccuracies in the labeling process. Secondly, much crime goes undetected. Finally, the police themselves may, for various reasons, not record something as a crime, or inaccurately report something as a crime when it is not. Criminologists refer to all crime that escapes counting for any of the above reasons as the dark figure of crime. Do we really know how much crime is out there? Perhaps what we do know is only the tip of the iceberg.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Accurate crime data serve important purposes. It is used by public agencies and officials in determining policies, budgets, legislation, funding priorities, and evaluation of existing programs. If the government was not in the business of trying to collect accurate crime data, it would have to rely upon mostly inaccurate and unrealistic public opinion polls. The agencies involved run all the way down from the White House Briefing Room to each state's Statistical Analysis Center. It may or may not also be apparent that crime data is often used to convince voters of the success or failure of crime control policies. Private, nonprofit agencies also use crime data to justify their position on crime issues. The web has an abundance of victim-oriented sites in this regard.

Social science researchers also analyze crime data in comparison to other data, like sociologists interested in "social indicators." A sociologist, for example, might compare emergency hospital room admissions for drug related problems with the numbers for drug related arrests by police. A criminologist might stick to criminal justice statistics and look at rising rates of the incarcerated offender population and how they relate to crime rates overall.

**MAIN SOURCES OF CRIME DATA**

_NCURS_, the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, maintains one of the largest repositories of web sites devoted to criminal justice statistics. _NCURS_ is probably the most extensive source of information on criminal justice in the world. It's a group of clearinghouses supporting all the bureaus of the U.S. Department of Justice; Office of Justice Programs, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), the Office of Victims of Crime (OVC), and the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP).

Academics and more serious researchers often make use the _Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics_, which highlights and tracks some of the most important tables or indicators in the field. Students often report that the _Sourcebook_ is an excellent place to download figures and graphics for term papers.
To go right to the source of crime data collection, however, one uses the FBI's *Uniform Crime Reports (UCR)* or BJS's *National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)*. It is customary for students to learn and remember various details about the UCR and NCVS as they are the oldest and most well-known methods of crime data gathering.

**THE UNIFORM CRIME REPORTS**

The UCR program was started in 1929 by order of the U.S. Attorney General, and the FBI is responsible for administering the program. Over 17,000 law enforcement agencies (city, county, state) report to the FBI monthly the number of crimes known to them in their respective jurisdictions. These crimes are reported as rates (which is the number of crimes per some unit of population, such as 1,000 people for a small jurisdiction, and 100,000 people for a large, or national jurisdiction). The idea since the beginning is that the UCR program would enable comparisons and serve as an indicator, estimate, or index of the nation's well-being or moral health, at least when it comes to crime. Eight (8) offenses -- murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson -- became the basis of this crime index, also known as Part I offenses.

UCR terminology includes things such as the hierarchy rule, which means that when multiple crimes are known to have been committed by an offender the same year, only the most serious crime is counted. The hierarchy rule is considered a limitation of the UCR. Another limitation is the limited amount of data on arrestees and victims (except in homicides), and the complete absence of any data on victim-offender relationships. Nonetheless, the UCR has been helpful in comparing the number of arrests with the number of crimes known to police. That comparison is the traditional measure of police effectiveness, and is known as the clearance rate. There are cases where the police know who did it, but cannot make an arrest for one reason or another (suspect fled the country, committed suicide, died, or was convicted in another jurisdiction), and these situations are called exceptional clearances. Below is a ranking of the (most frequently occurring) Index (and the less serious Part II) offenses, along with clearance rates for the year 2000:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Occurrence</th>
<th>Offenses Known</th>
<th>Clearance Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Larceny-Theft</td>
<td>7 million</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Burglary</td>
<td>2 million</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>1.2 million</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>1 million</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Robbery</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rape</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Arson</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Murder</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part II Offenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Drugs</td>
<td>1.6 million</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Driving under the Influence</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Simple Assault</td>
<td>1.3 million</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Liquor Law Violations</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Disorderly Conduct</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Public Drunkeness</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fraud</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vandalism</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Curfew Violation/Loitering</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Family Nonsupport</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UCR data provide information on patterns and trends in various offense categories, as well as patterns in the overall crime trend. Murder, for example, is known to be more common in southern states (a fact that theorists of the "Southerness hypothesis" have been trying to explain). We also know murder is a crime committed by friends or acquaintances; few strangers are involved. July and August produce the highest number of murders. Rape is a crime where it is estimated only one out of four offenses are reported, so use of UCR data on rape might not be wise, but according to it, rape follows some of the same patterns as murder. Robbery occurs quite frequently, primarily in urban areas among the young, and 20% of the time, the victim is shot, and 3% of the time, the victim is raped. Aggravated assaults ("aggravated" because it involves a weapon or results in hospitalization) are fairly easy to solve, and you'll notice the clearance rate is almost as high as murder. Burglary, believe it or not, tends to happen more frequently during daytime than nighttime, according to UCR records. Larceny-theft (larceny being the taking of anything not belonging to you and theft being the dollar amount) is the most frequently reported crime, and motor vehicle parts or contents tend to be the most common item taken. Motor vehicle theft tends to be frequently reported but rarely cleared.

The overall crime trend may or may not be a useful figure for indexing moral health, but it does tend to show certain regularities that may be of other theoretical interest, or more practically, for purposes of agency budgeting, personnel deployment, and tourism planning. Crime overall (both violent and property, but mostly violent) tends to exhibit a strong seasonality factor. For example, summertime is definitely crime time, and the crime season usually starts on Memorial Day weekend. The regularity in the cycle goes like this -- crime rates bottom out during January and February; in March they start to increase, increasing regularly over April and May; with June being the month when the crime rate usually rises above the national average; and with August being the peak month. In September, the crime rate usually starts to decline. Nobody is really sure how to explain this regularity, and explanations can be found ranging from thermal stress to the effects of air pollution, although opportunity may be the only important variable.

NEW METHODS OF CRIME REPORTING

NIBRS stands for National Incident-Based Reporting System and is a new FBI method of collecting data that was introduced back during 1985 and slowly became implemented in the states. About 4,300 law enforcement agencies (city, county, state) contribute NIBRS data to the FBI every year. This new system eliminates the hierarchy rule and collects a significant amount of more information about the crime, such as victim-offender relationship, property details, and other details about the offender such as motivation. Known as IBR (Incident-Based Reporting), this strategy allows analysts of the incidence of crime (# of events) rather than simply calculating the prevalence of crime (# of people). Incidents are the number of cases known to police, and incidence is treated as relationship linkages. For example, if five offenders attack five victims, the UCR would only count five crimes, but NIBRS would look at the age, race, sex, and ethnicity (in NC) of each offender, plus a relationship linkage between each victim and offender, and the database might be able to come up with a count of as many as ten or twenty crimes based on relationship linkages between these elements. Clearance rates are still based on arrest, but NIBRS "Group A" offenses consist not only of arrests, but investigative reports and incident reports as well, which include attempts and suspected events. "Group B" offenses are based solely on arrest. This method is ideal for strategic and tactical crime analysis at the local and regional level, and the database is robust enough to allow creation of new categories, such as Crimes Against Society, or for the researcher to explore other interesting relationships among the variables, usually online via the NACJD website. The crimes that make up Group A and B offenses are quite interesting, and of modern concern, such as pornography, counterfeiting, prostitution, embezzlement, bad checks, weapons violations, and Peeping Tom activity. The following is a table of Group A and Group B offenses, and items marked with an asterisk generally do NOT have investigative or incident reports associated with them, although sometimes they do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NIBRS Group A Offenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle theft</td>
<td>The taking of anything not belonging to you and theft being the dollar amount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>Crime overall (both violent and property, but mostly violent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Crime where it is estimated only one out of four offenses are reported, so use of UCR data on rape might not be wise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assaults</td>
<td>&quot;Aggravated&quot; because it involves a weapon or results in hospitalization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny-theft</td>
<td>Larceny being the taking of anything not belonging to you and theft being the dollar amount.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The asterisk indicates items that generally do not have investigative or incident reports associated with them.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Crime Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligent Manslaughter</td>
<td>Counterfeiting/Forgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justifiable Homicide</td>
<td>False Pretenses/Swindle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnapping</td>
<td>Credit Card/Theft Fraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Rape</td>
<td>Impersonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Sodomy</td>
<td>Welfare Fraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault with Object</td>
<td>Wire Fraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Fondling (Child)</td>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Stolen Property Offenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>Damage/Vandalism of Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Assault</td>
<td>Drug/Narcotic Violations*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>Drug Equipment Violations*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>Incest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extortion/Blackmail</td>
<td>Statutory Rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary/B &amp; E</td>
<td>Pornography/Obscene Material*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket-Picking</td>
<td>Betting/Wagering*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purse-Snatching</td>
<td>Assisting Gambling*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>Gambling Equipment Violations*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Building</td>
<td>Sports Tampering*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Coin-Operated Machine or Device</td>
<td>Prostitution*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>Assisting Prostitution*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Motor Vehicle Parts</td>
<td>Bribery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Thefts</td>
<td>Weapon Law Violations*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NIBRS Group B Offenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bed Checks*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curfew/Littering/Vagrancy Violations*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Conduct*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Under the Influence*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunkenness*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Offenses; NonViolent*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Law Violations*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peeping Tom*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaway*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespass of Real Property*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Offenses*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole and probation violations*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape from custody/resisting arrest*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contempt of court, perjury, court violations*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent exposure*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting (affray)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1990, Congress also passed two new laws, the Campus Crime and Security Act, which requires colleges to issue annual reports, and the Hate Crime Statistics Act, which requires police to document hate-related incidents. During the year 2000 on college campuses, there were 400 murders, 4,000 rapes, 13,000 robberies, 19,000 aggravated assaults, 31,000 motor vehicle thefts, and 70,000 burglaries. With regard to hate crime, police documented 8,150 incidents, including 19 murders, a few robberies and rapes, but the vast majority were assaults. The most common motive was racial hatred (60% of the time), religious bias (17% of the time), and based on sexual orientation (homophobic, 16% of the time). The remainder of cases had undetermined motive.

**THE NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMIZATION SURVEY**

The NCVS began operation in 1972, and continues to surprise analysts and researchers with its results. Cities and towns that the UCR showed to have little crime turned out, via the NCVS, to actually have high rates of crime. As a general rule for most places, NCVS data will most usually show twice as much crime as the UCR indicates. NCVS interviewers consist of both Justice Department employees and U.S. Census Bureau employees who interview 50,000 households twice each year. Households are rotated randomly every three years. The BJS publishes the report, entitled *Criminal Victimization*, every year. The NCVS uses the hierarchy rule and records the same Part I offenses as the UCR, but it doesn't ask about offenses that might be too sensitive. In an interview...
situation, like murder and arson. Not only does it not measure homicide, but it doesn't measure commercial crime (such as burglaries of stores), hence the name of NCVS reports are called Households Touched by Crime. It does a good job of focusing on precisely the amount of value attached to any property stolen. The NCVS collects information on crimes suffered by individuals and households, whether or not those crimes were reported to law enforcement. It estimates the proportion of each crime type reported to law enforcement, and it summarizes the reasons that victims give for reporting or not reporting. It provides information about victims (age, sex, race, ethnicity, marital status, income, and educational level), offenders (sex, race, approximate age, and victim-offender relationship), and the crimes (time and place of occurrence, use of weapons, nature of injury, and economic consequences). Questions also cover the experiences of victims with the criminal justice system, self-protective measures used by victims, and possible substance abuse by offenders. Supplements are added periodically to obtain detailed information on topics like school crime.

The patterns and trends from the NCVS indicate that 25% of all households are touched by crime every year. That's a total of 25 million victimizations, far greater than totals from the UCR. Below is a table indicating the most frequent crimes, according to NCVS data, 2000:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Larceny-Theft</td>
<td>14 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Burglary</td>
<td>4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Robbery</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rape</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated, the amount of crime indicated by the NCVS is significantly greater than that indicated by the UCR. The only exception to this is motor vehicle theft, which can probably be explained by insurance companies requiring a police report, which citizens dutifully do, even to discover later their vehicle was not missing. The NCVS relies upon random sampling of victims and their memories. Some respondents may also lie, cheat, or exaggerate (called falsification), but the main memory problems are decay (incident happened recently, but person forgot it) and telescoping (incident happened long ago, but person remembers it like yesterday).

SELF-REPORT CRIME SURVEYS

A third method of collecting crime data is to make up your own questionnaire or survey. This is exactly what is done by most academic researchers and private foundations, and a few government agencies have been doing it since the 1970s. The Monitoring the Future project and National Youth Survey are the best known examples. A few private projects have been federally funded, and several researchers hope to devise the perfect measuring instrument. Much of the information used in recidivism studies is derived from self-report data. A self-report survey is typically administered to high school students, although sometimes college samples are involved. Other samples have involved incarcerated prisoners as well as attempts to find uncaught criminals. Regardless of the sample population, the purpose is to get respondents to read the questions and mark down how many times they have committed a serious offense and gotten away with it.

The results of most self-report studies are shocking. They typically indicate, that for any population (even a law-abiding one), about 90% of the people in the sample have committed a crime for which the punishment is more than a year in prison. This has led many people to question the accuracy of such surveys. The main problems are, of course, validity and reliability; but it may be just as true that people lie or exaggerate on these questionnaires (falsification). There are few self-report studies of white-collar crime, and it is easy for researcher bias and measurement error to creep in. Golub et al (2002) probably provided one of the best summaries of the limitations of self report data when they found, compared to criminal records checks and urinalysis screens, things like marijuana use were most often accurately disclosed while involvement in violent crime was least often disclosed, but
If prior conviction matched self-reported data on prior convictions, then there was reason to believe that the rest of the data was fairly reliable.

OTHER TERMS IN THE STUDY OF CRIME DATA

There are a number of terms one will encounter with analyses of crime data, and a variety of definitions abound. Here are some of the most common terms with their definitions. The frequency of crime, or frequencies, refer to the time span the researcher, usually a self-report researcher, is interested in. The most common time spans are "ever" and "last year", but there is also one called "last month", with last year taken as a measure of seriousness and last month interpreted as a measure of persistence. Hence, one talks about a frequent, serious, or persistent offender as one who scores high on those survey items. Most surveys are retrospective; that is, they ask the respondent to report crime they did in the past. There are also surveys which are prospective, which ask the respondent how much crime they think they'll commit in the future. Prospective surveys are interesting, especially when the researcher combines them with items measuring possible causes of crime.

Criminologists often distinguish between prevalence and incidence, which is the distinction between the number of people committing crime (known offenders) and the number of offenses committed by criminals (known offenses). These terms are also known as participation and lambda, respectively. Dividing the number of known offenses by known offenders and multiplying by a constant, such as 100,000 is a way of calculating crime rates (Incidence divided by prevalence times 100,000). Lambda is the more important term for those interested in criminal career research, for those interested in identifying high-rate offenders whose crimality does not seem to decline with age. In most studies, lambda is usually calculated as between 3-8 offenses, which means that for every offender apprehended on the instant offense, there are an additional 3-8 other crimes they are responsible for in the past year. Deterrence can be measured by setting the arrest rate equal to the product of lambda and the probability of apprehension (which generally runs at 1/1000 for most offenses). Incapacitation can be measured by estimating career length.

Career criminal research involves some other terms one might encounter. The notion of chronicity (as in chronic offender) is commonly seen in the context of 7-70 theory (Wolfgang et al. 1972) like 'seven percent of offenders commit 70% of the crime', which is well-established in the literature. The notion of velocity (as in the velocity of crime) refers to calculating the average amount of street time to the next offense. Hence, a chronic offender, in and out of jail quite often, who averages 7-8 days between offenses, is less of a high-velocity offender than one who averages 2-3 days between offenses.

Chronic, high-velocity offenders out on the street are probably a rarity, however. Most research of this type is done on incarcerated offenders, which most likely produces overestimates. On the street, the study of what keeps people from a life of crime, or turns them away from it is called the desistance field of research. Theoretically, such variables as vulnerability and insulation (also called buffering) are important, which refer to conditions or states that tend good people bad or bad people good. However, researchers have been more interested in the deterrent effect of imprisonment, which has been estimated as having no more than a 10-20% deterrent effect per year (Shinnar & Shinnar 1975). The fact of the matter is that more people age out of crime than for any other method of desistance (Gottfredson & Hirschi 1990), and the so-called age-curve constant is remarkably stable, even for high-rate, persistent offenders. In fact, as Gott's (1990) research shows, imprisonment may actually disrupt the normal pattern of desistance.

CLASSICAL AND POSITIVIST SCHOOLS OF CRIMINOLOGY

It is better to prevent crimes than to punish them (Cesare Beccaria)

THE CLASSICAL SCHOOL

The "classical school" (so-called because the divergent ideas of many scholars with similar ideas during this epoch were called that by history) was a social movement that existed during the late 1700s and the early
1800s. The "classical" part of it is derived from the similarity in thinking between those scholars and early Greek philosophy (Aristotle, Plato, etc.) which also put forth the importance of free will. However, "free will" is NOT the only defining feature of something that is "classical", and in fact, there is a "neoclassical school" that is based on the idea of character (as a compromise between free will and determinism) and a rational choice school of thought which has similar but not the essential features of "classical". Rational choice is the idea that there are many more complex decision making variables in the reasoning process of offenders than the simple free will - deterrence model makes out.

Classical criminology originated the concept of deterrence, although they didn't call it that at the time. The concept of rationally preventing crime by punishment (what they meant by deterrence at the time) was considered a great humanitarian reform, superior in many ways to cruel and unusual medieval torture practices that existed. It is best understood against the backdrop of what history calls the Enlightenment. This broader movement (encompassing rationalism, naturalism, and humanitarianism) was the pinnacle of naturalism's rejection of all things spiritual, all things divine (such as divine right of kings, or in criminology, all explanations along the lines of the devil-made-me-do-it).

Some of the defining features of the classical school in criminology include:

- All people are guided by free will
- All behavior is guided by hedonism (pleasure/pain calculation)
- All crime is the result of free will and hedonism
- All punishment should fit the offense (equal treatment under law)
- Bad people are nothing more that the result of bad laws

The leading figure of the classical school was CESARE BECCARIA (1738-1794). One could almost say he was the leader. He was heavily influenced by and pretty much synthesized the ideas of Montesquieu (branches of government), Helvétius (learning theories), Voltaire (justice theories), Bacon (naturalism, anti-spiritualism), Rousseau (social contract), Diderot (encyclopedia knowledge, and Hume (epistemology of proof). BECCARIA in 1767 wrote the book called On Crimes and Punishment which made the following arguments:

- The social contractual basis of society (If you violate someone else's liberties, you violate the social contract by which we all live)
- The criminal law should have a restricted scope (It shouldn't try to legislate morality, for instance, although others, like Bentham, thought so)
- People should be presumed innocent until proven guilty (no torture)
- The law should be codified (written) with punishments prescribed in advance
- Punishment should be limited (less harsher) to only that necessary to deter people from ever committing it again (no capital punishment)
- Punishment should be severe, certain, and swift (of these, severity is the least important, certainty the next in importance, and cerlelty, or swiftness, is about as equal in importance as certainty)
- The criminal justice system should be organized around crime prevention

As you can see, BECCARIA synthesized a lot of different ideas going around at the time, and was indeed, the first one to apply Enlightenment thoughts to the problems of crime and crime control. What attracts the attention of most thinkers is Beccaria's notion that punishment ought to be swift, certain, and severe (although he actually said the third one of these was proportional to the harm committed, and only later interpretations of his text turned it into "severe"). On another note, it's important to note that the classical school wasn't all that concerned with criminals. They rejected retribution-based punishment because it focused too much on Individual criminals. They were more concerned with crime, crime control, the reform of the criminal justice system, and the making of good laws. (You might want to read about Beccaria or read some excerpts of his writing)
Someone who lived about the same time and can be considered part of the Classical School, JOHN HOWARD (1726-1790) made it his life's purpose to go into the prisons and clean them up, to make them more sanitary. (You may want to visit the John Howard Society's website or read some of John Howard's writings for more information.) Between 1775 and 1790, John Howard made seven journeys across Europe in search of a humane prison system. He conducted these investigations on his own and financed them himself. In 1866, the Howard Association was formed, dedicated to most efficient means of penal treatment and crime prevention and a reformatory and radically preventive treatment of offenders. Some of the issues that the Howard Association has dealt with over the years include:

- mothers and babies in prison
- overcrowding and prison regimes
- drugs in prison
- healthcare and mental health in prison
- children in the penal system
- educational programs
- suicide and self-injury in prisons

The next major figure we'll consider from the classical school is JEREMY BENTHAM (1748-1832). Unlike Beccaria who was an Italian, Bentham was an Englishman. Bentham's book, An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation made the following points:

- Society is based on social contract (exchange of liberties for freedoms)
- All people being equally possessed of free will and the capacity for rational thought should be treated equally (In fact, it's the moral responsibility of each person to act freely and rationally)
- People should be treated with due process (they should have civil rights; there should be rules of evidence)
- The law should be widely known (this is called cognoscibility, or a person being "cognizant" of the law at all times, at least in knowing what the actus reus is of each and every crime)
- Utilitarianism (Bentham's version of hedonism) should be the basis of social governance as it is for most human behavior
- Punishment should be severe, certain, and swift (of these, severity is the least important, swiftness next in importance, and certainty is the most important)
- Punishment should be the minimum required to deter the individual and others from doing or mimicking it (no capital punishment)
- Judges should not have discretion in sentencing; sentences should be about equal for equal crime (determinate sentencing)

You might want to read a little bit about Bentham at the Bentham Project homepage. For right now, I want to talk a little bit about UTILITARIANISM, and you'll probably detect a distinct Personian twist to it (Persons was an influential sociologist during the 1940s and 1950s, sometimes called the "transition figure" between classical and contemporary sociology). According to Persons, an utilitarian person is an actor, not a knower (unlike the Cartesian man conception). They have wants, needs, passions, interests, or goals, and these are what the personality system is organized around. Society not only allows these goals to be accomplished or thwarted, but it can, if it wanted, shape the goals that people want, and therefore their personalities (kind of like Madison Avenue advertising telling you what you want to buy). The trick is to set up the social system so that people don't even notice their wants are being shaped. It's called "normative social control", and it's much more important to utilitarians that you keep the whole social system going for the most people most of the time in terms of the larger constellation of wants, rather than crackdown on a few criminals with abnormal wants. This reflects something of the utilitarian idea of the greatest good for the greatest number, and it also explains why the classical school thinkers were more concerned with reforming the laws than with thinking about what makes
individual criminals commit crime. It's also a form of laissez-faire economics quite suitable to capitalism. If you set up the whole social system so there's some collective equivalent of individual self-interest (the government appears to be doing its business), then people will individually pursue their own best interests. [end of lecture on utilitarianism]

I mentioned earlier the "neoclassical school" of thought, and it emerged between 1880 and 1920 and I'm still with us today. A 1974 book called *We Are the Living Proof: A Justice Model* might be considered a modern example of the neoclassical compromise. *Living Proof* argued for flat sentencing, just deserts (no rehabilitation), fixed legislation, reduced prison terms and good time, restricted judicial discretion, the abolishment of parole, voluntary rehabilitation, and a humane prison environment -- all reforms consistent with some classical school features and some positivist school features. Neoclassical criminology tended to take different directions depending upon which country you're talking about, however. Essentially, it was a series of compromises between classicalists and positivists. It stressed individual accountability and individualization of punishment. Its leading proponents were figures such as Gabriel Tarde (1843-1904) and his pupil Raymond Seallas (1898). The general features of neoclassicism include:

- Character (not free will or determinism) is the source of criminality
- Crime and punishment should be equivalent, not necessarily proportional or "fitting"
- Imprisonment should be the normal method of punishment
- Treatment should be individualized, according to the incorrigibility of character
- Every punishment should include a measure of deterrence, exemplary but not vengeful (except for the insane who should be treated by other experts)
- Abolishment of the death penalty

**THE POSITIVIST SCHOOL**

The "positivist school" was a social movement that existed during the mid 1800s and early 1900s. The part of it that was "positive" was the forward-looking attitude toward social and personal betterment (the perfection of both society and human nature), kind of like what we mean when we use the phrase Positive Law (using law to change society). The term "positivism" refers to a method of analysis based on the collection of observable scientific facts. Its aim is to explain and (most importantly) predict the way facts occur in uniform patterns. Positivism is the basis of most natural sciences, and positivist criminology is the application of positivist methods to the study of people.

The positivist school is best seen as a reaction to the armchair philosophy and theorizing of the classical school. Many scholars began seeing hedonism and utilitarianism, for example, as rather oversimplified philosophies. The Rational Man model of human behavior was criticized. Positivism is the search for other, multiple factors as the cause of human behavior. It represents a distinct shift from a focus on law and crime control to the inner workings of the criminal mind and what makes it tick.

Some of the common, defining features of the positivist school in criminology include:

- The demand for facts, for scientific proof (determinism)
- There are body and mind differences between people (of these, the mens rea, or reasons for committing crime are important)
- Punishment should fit the individual criminal, not the crime (indeterminate sentencing, disparate sentencing, parole)
- The criminal justice system should be guided by scientific experts (rule by scientific elite, technocracy)
- Criminals can be treated, rehabilitated, or corrected (if not, then they are incurable and should be put to death)
Some say that positivist criminology was invented by an astronomer in Belgium named QUETELET during the 1820s who mixed meteorology, mathematics, biology, and early sociology into what was called "social physics" or the "social mechanics of crime." In France, someone named GUERRY was doing the same thing with maps that Quetelet was doing in Belgium. Guerry, however, was much more favorable to the idea that climate influenced crime, while Quetelet tended to favor biological explanations of criminal predispositions. Also in France, sociological positivism emerged, under the leadership of someone named COMTE, often called the father of sociology (he invented the word sociology because he was embarrassed that a mere astronomer came up with the phrase social physics). Whole societies were now able to be classified and social phenomenon could be predicted. Comte especially liked the idea of one big super-religion, led by sociological experts, who guided government leaders in how to make the world a better place. Most people believe the leading figure of positivist criminology (often called the father of criminology) was LOMBROSO (1835-1909). He was influenced by Darwin (social selection), Lebater (facial features), and Gall (phrenology, or bumps on the head—the cranium being a true reflection of brain size). Lombroso's book, *On Criminal Man*, was first put together in 1864, and made the following points:

- Criminals have a unique physical type (shorter in height, for example)
- Criminals are evolutionary degenerates (throwbacks, called atavism)
- There are four classes of criminals: born (atavists), insane, occasional (criminaloids—with some atavistic characteristics, some environmental factors), and passion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lombroso's Checklist of Physiognomic Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unusually short or tall height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small head, but large face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small and sloping forehead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receding hairline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrinkles on forehead and face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large sinus cavities or bumpy face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large, protruding ears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bumps on head, particularly the Destructiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center behind ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protuberances (bumps) on head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High cheekbones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushy eyebrows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You might want to read a little bit about Lombroso at this Body Politic site. It's important you understand that positivist criminology is NOT simply about biology or Darwinism. Lombroso only emphasized that part of it because he was trained in medicine. You could just as easily have psychological positivism or sociological positivism, in fact, any discipline could be positivist. Let's take a look at a couple of Lombroso's pupils who became famous, and then examine some different branches of positivism.

FERRI (1856-1929) was a pupil of Lombroso who is remembered mostly for his definitive attack on the concept of free will. He argued that all crime is involuntary behavior. Habitual criminals are mostly affected by the social environment, although there are biological and psychological factors too. Ferri ended up working for the socialist (fascist) cause in Italy (under Mussolini) to dismantle the classical foundations of law and try to help improve the living conditions of the working class.

GAROFALO (1852-1934) was another pupil of Lombroso who was actually influential on the American eugenics movement (1991-1930) which sterilized thousands of society's misfits and defectives, so they wouldn't reproduce. Garofalo believed in survival of the fittest. He was one who popularized the phrase "society is an organic body and crime is the disease" (often called the social defense approach to criminological positivism) as well as began the concern for more degeneration. Criminals, you see, suffered from defects in their moral
reasoning. They had deficiencies in pity (revulsion at seeing another human being suffer) and probity (respect for property of others).

In Germany, phrenology emerged. (You might be interested in learning about Phrenology). Scholars like Gall and Spurzheim were regarded by a small few as the true founders of criminology. They scientifically studied 35 different bumps on the head and successfully predicted crime in about 77% of their cases for people with bumps in certain areas. However, phrenology never quite caught on in America.

Two main branches emerged as the lasting legacy of Lombroso, and these will be taken up in future lectures. A table listing these two branches and the names of the most influential people associated with them is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTITUTIONALISM (the study of body types)</th>
<th>PSYCHOGENICS (the study of personality/mind)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goring (1913)</td>
<td>Dugdale (1877-1912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kretschmer (1925)</td>
<td>Goddard (1912-1927)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooten (1939)</td>
<td>Freud (1920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon (1949)</td>
<td>Alexander &amp; Healy (1935)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Gluecks (1950)</td>
<td>Alchorn (1936)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANTHROPOLOGICAL CRIMINOLOGY

Anthropology is the most humanistic of the sciences and the most scientific of the humanities. (Alfred Kroeber)

This lecture is divided into two parts: Part A relates to the discipline of criminology, and Part B is devoted to the study of personality/mind as it relates to the discipline of criminology. In this lecture, we will consider the views of the following individuals: Charles Darwin, Auguste Comte, and Sigmund Freud.

Charles Darwin's theory of evolution is based on the idea that all living things have a common ancestor. This theory has been widely accepted and is now considered to be the basis of modern biology.

Auguste Comte's theory of positivism is based on the idea that knowledge is gained through observation and experimentation. This theory has been widely accepted and is now considered to be the basis of modern science.

Sigmund Freud's theory of psychoanalysis is based on the idea that unconscious desires and conflicts are the basis of human behavior.

Phyllochronology is the study of the external characteristics of a person's skull as an indicator of his or her personality, abilities, or general propensities. Some bumps on the skull indicate lower brain functions (like combativeness). Other bumps represent higher functions and propensities (like morality). Crime occurs when the bumps indicate the lower propensities are winning out over the higher propensities. Phrenologists believed that with mental exercise, a criminal might be reformed. The most eminent phrenologists were Franz Joseph Gall (1758-1828) and his pupil, John Gaspar Spurzheim (1776-1832). The phrenologists turned out to be not all that off in where they thought certain brain functions (35 of them showing up on bumps) were located. The destructiveness center, for example, which is located right behind the ear above Darwin's point, is pronounced in 17% of criminals. Other bumps, in the back of the head, turned out to be pronouncements of the Amygdala and
Hippocampus, where tumors are associated with criminal behavior (as in the Texas sniper, Charles Whitman). The general rule is that any abnormality in the back of the head is bad ("back is bad"). The association between other bumps (on the head) and moral (or intellectual) functions were badly mistaken by phrenologists (such as Gall), but in his defense, research methods had not been well-developed by 1835 (note this early date; some regard Gall as the first criminologist).

Criminal anthropology is the name usually associated with the work of Cesare Lombroso (1835–1909) and his followers who performed autopsies on criminals and found they had characteristics similar to primitive humans, monkeys, and chimpanzees. Some of the anomalies (differences or defects) found among criminals included head width, height, degree of receding forehead, head circumference, head symmetry, and so on. Lombroso had his Goring (1870–1919), a scientist dedicated to disproving Lombroso. While Goring found height and weight differences, he concluded there was no such thing as a "born criminal" based on physical inferiority. The idea of degeneracy lived on, however, and criminal anthropology in the U.S. was spearheaded by a diffuse group of 8-9 degenerationists who were active between 1881 and 1911 (e.g. MacDonald’s *Criminology*, Benedict’s *Anatomical Studies upon Brains of Criminals*, Talbot’s *Degeneracy*, Lydston’s *The Diseases of Society*, and Persons’ Responsibility for Crime*, Fink’s *Causes of Crime*, Halle’s *Eugenics* are good secondary sources.) In 1911, Maurice Permelee (whom some regard as an early founder, if not the founder, of American criminology) began rejecting anthropological theories.

Cesare Lombroso (1836–1909) is known as the father of modern criminology, and the chief historical figure in the Italian positivist movement. His works include:

- (1895) *L’Homme Criminel*, Felix Alcan. (two volumes)

Lombroso popularized the notion of a "born criminal" which represents an extreme statement of biological determinism which had great influence well into the 20th Century (and for the founding of criminology) even though much of this thinking is now outdated except for the recurring idea that criminals have particular physiognomic defects or deformities. *Physiognomy* is the art of estimating character from the features of the face or the form of the body. Most students are familiar with his checklist of physiognomic indicators,

- Unusually short or tall height
- Small head, but large face
- Small and sloping forehead
- Receding hairline
- Wrinkles on forehead and face
- Large sinuses cavities or bumpy face
- Large, protruding ears
- Bumps on head, particularly the Destructiveness Center above left ear
- Protuberances (bumps) on head, in back of head and around ear
- High cheek bones
- Bushy eyebrows, tending to meet across nose
- Large eyesockets, but deep-set eyes
- Beaked nose (up or down) or flat nose
- Strong jawline
- Fleshy lips, but thin upper lip
- Mighty incisors, abnormal teeth
- Small or weak chin
- Thin neck
• Sloping shoulders, but large chest
• Long arms
• Pointy or snubbed fingers or toes
• Tattoos on body

Constitutionalism, or body-type theories, became popular in the 1930s, mostly on account of the work of Ernest Hooton, a Harvard anthropologist. He studied thousands of criminals and noncriminals from eight different states, concluding that criminals are inferior to civilians in all physical respects. There were also racist overtones to his work because he said the Negroid forehead was a perfect example of a criminal forehead. In the 1940s, the work of William Sheldon shifted attention away from adults to the physiques of juvenile delinquents. Sheldon produced an 'Index of Delinquency' based on three-way photographs which was used in many states to determine if a child in trouble should be institutionalized or not. Sheldon's approach is sometimes called somatotype theory. Sheldon's methods and results were given considerable support by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck in the 1950s who found that narrow faces, wider chests, larger waists, and bigger forearms were associated with 60% of delinquents and only 30% of nondelinquents.

Sheldon's classification of physique and temperament (somatotype theory) is as follows:

• **Endomorphic** -- tendency to put on fat, soft roundness of body, short tapering limbs, small bones, velvety skin; viscerotonic temperament, relaxed, comfortable person, loves luxury, an extrovert.
• **Mesomorphic** -- predominance of muscles, bone, and motor organs, large trunk, heavy chest, large wrist and hands, lean rectangular outline; somatonic or Dionysian temperament, active, assertive, aggressive, unrestrained.
• **Ectomorphic** -- predominance of skin, lean, fragile, delicate body, small bones, droopy shoulders, small face, sharp nose, fine hair; cerebrotonic temperament, sensitive, distractible, insomnia, skin troubles, allergies.

Each person possesses the characteristics of all three types. Sheldon therefore used three numbers, between 1 and 7, to indicate the extent to which the three types were evident in each person. A person whose somatotype is 7-1-4, for example, would have many endomorphic characteristics, very little mesomorphic characteristics, and an average number of ectomorphic characteristics. He found that the average institutionalized delinquent was a 3-5-2 somatotype. The Gluecks (always eclectic, or multiple factor, theorists) found that the average adult criminal was a 2-6-3 somatotype, and that 60% of delinquents were mesomorphs. Mesomorphy was associated with criminal behavior, flying in the face of fitness gurus, like Charles Atlas, who was trying to shape up Americans.

In contemporary times, ideas about physical appearance occasionally show up in criminology. All the constitutionalists studied tattoos, for example. They were never really able to make anything of it; they were just there for the study; lots of criminals had them. Tattoo removal (as well as plastic surgery) has found its way into a few catching rehabilitation programs (Kurtzberg et al. 1978). There's a whole subspecialty field that, for lack of a better term, can be called the 'physical attractiveness' studies (Cavlov & Howard 1973; Agnew 1984) which suggest that ugliness really has got something to do with becoming a criminal.

There's no necessary relationship between criminal anthropology and eugenics (the idea that a nation can save its stock by preventing reproduction of the unfit -- negative eugenics -- and simultaneously encourage the fit to produce more offspring -- positive eugenics). A small number of criminal anthropologists support the idea of eugenics; another, larger group strongly rejects it. Almost all criminologists today would be appalled at the idea of eugenics theory, yet it remains in the background of criminology as the field tries to develop agenda-free information, and at one time (during the 1930s, eugenics was taken quite seriously — more on this in the next lecture).
Physiognomy, or at least some bits of it, will sometimes find its way into social psychology and criminal justice, in studies of attractiveness and beauty, and in studies of jury lenience depending upon the physical look of the defendant. This literature is not well-organized, and only appears to be of sporadic interest to researchers.

Twin studies have also looked at physical similarities and differences. Identical twins are more similar in their (criminal) behavior than fraternal twins, however, no definitive conclusions can be drawn from twin studies in general. Adoption studies is another promising area of research, but again, strong causal statements are rare in the whole area of heredity-crime linkages.

The XXY chromosome syndrome became popular during the 1960s. People with this condition tend to be tall supermales who often exhibit aggression and violence. Some researchers have found that XXY types are more likely to have a criminal record. Other observers note that the prison populations are filled with fairly short people, a pattern noticed early on by physiognomists, who also took an interest in height.

Galvanic skin response (the rate at which electricity travels across the surface of the skin) also measures mesomorphy to some extent. Many criminals have slower GSR rates, which means they are somewhat more impervious to pain or at least may have a different neuromuscular system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An Aside Commentary on Demonology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Although there’s no connection between anthropology and demonology, for lack of a better place, I’ll discuss the latter here. Widely regarded as pseudoscientific, demonology sometimes is talked about as being how one scholar (Stitt 2003) has pointed out that both crimeology and theology are concerned with combating evil. Demons can be defined either under an Old Testament version as “fallen angels” or under a New Testament version as “malevolent spirits.” Many of them, for which names are known, are involved with various temptations toward lust, mischief, and crime. If these notions were to be taken seriously, the key research question would be whether demons work by temptation or possession. The more scientific question in crimeology is whether evil is too absurd a notion for serious consideration (Lyman 1973), but the word sometimes appears in discussions of psychopathy.

Asmodeus was believed to be the most active demon, and he could take male or female form to fill people with an insatiable lust and desire for adultery, buggery, and child molestation. Belphegor, identified in the Jewish Kabbalah, operated much the same way, but concentrated on breaking up romances and about-to-happen marriages. Beelzebub (not to be confused with Satan or Lucifer) was believed to be associated with murder, cannibalism, and anything to do with dead bodies (because of the flies he attracted). His favorite sin was gluttony whereas Lucifer’s was pride. Sammael, the bet-winged demon, was also associated with the joy of taking life, or murder. Rachshasas, the vampire demon known mostly in India, also was associated with murderlust, reanimation of dead bodies, and preventing the holy. |

MODERN ANTHROPOLOGY

It’s difficult to describe a field as vast as anthropology or to even begin listing all the inroads into criminology. When I majored in this as an undergraduate, the choices were either physical or cultural anthropology, and those are about the only choices you get at the undergraduate level, and if you express an interest in crime or criminals, they tend to steer you towards physical anthropology which studies bones (presumably so you’ll make a good crime scene investigator). However, the area of cultural or sociocultural anthropology is a much larger field (see Benedict 1934 or Garberino 1977), and then there’s symbolic anthropology (Douglas 1966), the field of social
anthropology, and all sorts of hard-to-classify kinds of anthropology (like Giddens 1979). In this section, I'll try to explain some of the most popular contemporary anthropologists and why their ideas are so popular.

Mary Douglas' book *Purity and Danger* is probably one of the top ten most influential books ever written in the last 500 years. It is about the subject of ritual, and rituals are the ways societies and people mark out their boundaries. There are many kinds of rituals for purification, reconciliation, renewal, purity, passage, and mourning, for example. Douglas is concerned with purity rituals, which relate to the feeling of safety from dangers such as crime. You might understand the idea as the notion that there are "lucky charms" which protect you from danger, and there are plenty of theological examples as well (the Ark of the Covenant; the Holy Grail), etc. Each person also has their "bubble space" for self-protection, which is a kind of purity ritual. The existence of an angry person in one's space is considered dangerous, and everything on the margins (of society; one's environment) is also considered strange or dangerous. When people do wrong things, they are also polluting the purity of the environment, and pollution rules are not as equivocal as moral rules. A pollution rule might call for the immediate execution of a transgressor, for example, while a moral code might give them the benefit of the doubt. Like others (Garfinkel 1967), Douglas is saying that our criminal justice system as well as what we consider rights and wrongs are determined by our underlying, tribal, ritualistic responses. We see criminals as contaminating our world (like dirt). Justice provides no guarantee, but our ritual impulses always come out.

Paul Ricoeur's book, *The Just* is a companion piece to his other book called *Chaste as Another*. In it, he develops what may be called a "fundamental anthropology" which focuses upon the effective or emotional sense of justice that we all feel as an object of desire. This goal of justice, says Ricoeur, has nothing to do with evil, vengeance, or any compensation for a slight, but instead is aimed at the primary goal of peace. Peace is the final destination of justice. Peace is achieved through self-esteem and self-respect, and people who are just are people who have a expanded concept of the "other" which is the notion of a neutral third party who can (if called upon, hypothetically) mediate our disputes over the subject of rights. Ricoeur goes on to say that every culture develops a meaningful conception of such a third party, and for most people, it's a conception of "everything and everyone." Those who commit crime are those who transgress this 'me/you' relationship and selfishly pursue justice only for themselves by adding violence to violence, and suffering to suffering. There is also something that Ricoeur calls a 'just distance' between the me and the you which has to do with the subjective sense of time or moment of justice. Our judicial systems fail to reflect this just moment because we are too caught up in prolonging the sensation of vengeance. Verdicts which establish peace are needed. Anthropologically, Ricoeur is comparing the justice process to the grief process or the healing process.

Rene Girard's book, with its *psychadelic cover*, is about mimetic desire which comes from the word mimesis, meaning imitation. Much of his work hasn't been translated yet from the French, but it's obvious that the main thread into criminology is with learning theory (Anderson 2003). If you've ever wondered why violence begets violence, then you should read this book. Here's an illustration that shows how the rich and poor both suffer from a reciprocal imitation complex:

![Illustration of reciprocal imitation complex](image)

Anthropological criminology is about the human condition, our human nature, our human impulses, our human bodies, and how we always seem to be creating rules and regulations in our communities that reflect those basic
things. People are diverse, and it is important to study how they get along, with all their different appearances, different languages, and different ways of life.

MENTAL DEFICIENCY AND CRIME

Three generations of imbeciles are enough. (Oliver Wendell Holmes)

Next to physical deformity, mental deficiency has been the second most popular explanation of crime. Although few criminologists adhere to the belief that the only explanation of crime is low intelligence, the idea remains popular among the general public and the media as something believed in and entertaining. Some people view intelligence along demonological lines much like the idea that ugly is evil (for physical deformity), the parallel being that mental slowness or dullness must be a curse of God (for mental deficiency). People with low intelligence are often seen as not knowing anything better. They are seen as not appreciating the reasons for the existence of law. It is believed they are too easily turned into accomplices or "dopes" by criminals. Zeleny (1933) identified at least four ways a person of low intelligence could commit crimes: (1) by being duped; (2) by sheer folly; (3) by inability to understand; and (4) by attempting to provide for self. While it may be true that foolish people do foolish things (and stupid is as stupid does), there are certain patterns to folly that deserve study in their own right. Perkins (2002) claims that there are three basic patterns to folly: (1) mistuning, (2) entrenchment, and (3) undermanagement, explained as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Note on Foolishness and Self-Inflicted Stupidity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mistuning is a problem in people with low intelligence that occurs when something is obviously wrong with the timing and intensity of their buildup toward an emotion. Take anger, for example, as you often see stupid people loose their temper too early and/or too strongly. This is not a sociological 'definition of the situation' but instead is their low intelligence causing them to prematurely quit processing information about something. (2) Entrenchment occurs among the mentally deficient when they get too absorbed in attempting to complete a task. Psychologists call this the "Zelgarnik effect," named after a German psychologist Bluma Zelgarnik (1927), where unfinished cognitive tasks tend to linger and take up valuable space in our memory until those tasks are resolved. (3) Undermanagement is a failure to manage the moment, or a failure to adapt, that is brought on by being caught up in one's own momentum or excitement as carried over from situation to situation. Such a person would be acting like a "fool" because they haven't calmed down yet from a previous situation. Everybody has a bit of foolishness in them, and lots of other things that quite frequently make people stupid, such as procrastination (putting something off for another day), backsitting (force of habit), vacillation (can't make up their minds), overcommitment (taking on too much responsibility), indulgence (laziness or wallowing in excess), self-handicapping (under achievement), and rationalization (the "leaky roof" syndrome - you can't fix the roof while it's raining and there's no need to fix it when it's not raining).

Last my note above give the wrong impression that all stupidity is self-inflicted, let me just say that "stupid people exist" who don't need to inflict anything upon themselves, and in cases of diagnosed mental retardation, such people have an organic disorder and cannot really be held accountable for their actions. Instead, my focus is upon those of average or slightly sub-average intelligence (who happen to make up the bulk of the criminal population). These people (say, with an IQ above 75) CAN be held accountable at law. Their willpower is regarded as mature enough to merit the examination of intelligence-related explanations for their "dumb" criminal behavior. I'm sure most criminals of this type think they're smart and are capable of formulating their own thoughts and intentions, so with that in mind, let's explore the idea that mental deficiency helps explain their involvement in crime.

It might help at the start here to review exactly what we're talking about by mental deficiency. "Intelligence" generally consists of different abilities, such as the ability to reason, solve problems, think abstractly, learn and
understand new material, adapt to novel situations quickly, grasp complex relationships, and profit from past experience (MSN Encarta 2003). In other words, intelligence is “catching on,” “making sense” of things, or “figuring out” what to do. IQ is probably best thought of as a measure of brightness, or what intelligence tests measure. There are different types of intelligence tests, with some using words or numbers and requiring cultural knowledge (like vocabulary), and others using shapes, designs, and only requiring simple, universal concepts (like up/down). Some intelligence tests are among the most accurate of all psychological tests and assessments. The brain processes underlying intelligence are becoming more understood, and current research is looking at speed of neural transmission, glucose (energy) uptake, and electrical activity of the brain. Some theories of intelligence look at the efficiency of information processing, and other theoretical models look at general adaptability.

IQ compares people to others of the same age, and is calculated by multiplying 100 times the quotient of mental age over chronological age. Mental age is determined by a score on a test. The first Intelligence quotient (IQ) test was invented by Alfred Binet and Theodore Simon in 1905 (the Simon-Binet scale, consisting of 54 questions, revised in 1908 and 1911). They advocated its use for assessing teachability and prediction of academic achievement. Overall, it accomplished these purposes. In 1912, Lewis Terman of Stanford University made some revisions to the test, and it became known as the Stanford-Binet scale (consisting of 90 questions), which produced a score called the Intelligence quotient, or IQ. One of the things about scales is that they predict future behavior (or effects), as opposed to indexes which collect symptoms (describe causes). Terman advocated its use for career counseling purposes. The meaning of IQ is as follows, although modern tests no longer use the IQ terminology, but instead a quintile score that reflects deviation from the average of others who are the same age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The IQ Ranges and Their Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141-160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161-180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181-200+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION OF TABLE: Most people cluster around the average (IQ 100), with about 3% of Americans regularly scoring above IQ 130 (the threshold for “gifted”), and about 3% regularly scoring below IQ 70 (the threshold for “retarded”). Ashkenazi Jews and certain East Asian ethnic groups regularly score higher than non-Hispanic whites, and nobody knows why. People at the lowest two levels, profoundly and severely retarded, have to be institutionalized, the moderately or mildly retarded can stay with family or friends, although the amount of care required would be burdensome. Slow learners are a large, diverse group. People in the low range (71-80) of this group have been variously called “idiots”, “morons”, “stooges”, or “sixth-graders” while people in the high range (81-90) have usually been called “challenged” or “disabled”. The average range is also a large, diverse group, and some studies indicate that daily variation in IQ (rather than a fixed score) is the norm once you reach this level. IQ tests like the Stanford-Binet are only good at measuring up to the “superior” level; i.e., up to an IQ of 140. After that, you would need to take a special test, like one constructed by the Mensa society, to see if your IQ measured in the “very superior”, “gifted”, or “genius” ranges. Also, full mental age is reached at the chronological age of 16, so giving a person under the age of 16 an IQ test is normally not appropriate, although some instruments claim to assess childhood IQ, like the Wunderlich or Werschler tests.
During World War I, the United States Army started using intelligence tests, and there were two types. The Alpha test was used for literate recruits, and the Beta test was used for illiterate recruits. The Beta test consisted of mazes, completion of pictures with missing pieces, and other pattern-solving exercises. The Alpha test evolved into the Scholastic Aptitude Test, or SAT, by 1926. The most widely used modern tests of intelligence today are the SAT, the Stanford-Binet, the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC), the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS), and the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children (Kaufman-ABC). There are at least 10 subtests or subscales on each of these. Most of them measure vocabulary, similarities and differences, memory, knowledge of common events, object assembly, mazes, and simple arithmetic. Those tests that are called achievement tests measure what a person has already learned, and those tests called aptitude tests predict future performance or potential for learning. Achievement and aptitude tests give much greater weight to knowledge, vocabulary, and arithmetic. Well-known tests that are called achievement or aptitude tests include the SAT, the Graduate Record Exam (GRE), the California Achievement test, the Law School Admissions Test (LSAT), and the Medical College Admission Test (MCAT). Intelligence tests are the most reliable of all psychological tests.

Psychologists literally have a monopoly over the study of intelligence. Sociologists ignore it because it's a "kind of people" explanation that is seen as non-sociological. Geneticists are somewhat interested in it, but only in the context of how it sheds light on research questions in hereditary science. In fact, the heredity-environment debate is largely unsettled and still a matter of debate among scientists. Well-known figures in the 1960s included William Shockley (who founded a sperm bank for geniuses) and Arthur Jensen, made the case that IQ is largely genetic, with Jensen claiming that environment can only affect 20% of intelligence at most. Other studies have noted that encouragement from parents and peers, as well as interest and motivation, can overcome genetically-endowed low intelligence.

THE RACIAL BIAS CONTROVERSY

Another controversy is the intelligence-race connection. African Americans (as well as some other minority groups), on average, score about 15 points below those of European ancestry on intelligence tests. Many studies have consistently found (and there's no getting around the fact) that the average IQ of an African American is 85 while the average IQ of a white American is 100, and that one in five African Americans have an average IQ of 75 (Seltzman 1992). Another way that this is often reported is to say that a 17-year-old African American performs at the reading, math, and science level of a 13-year-old white. High school proficiency testing mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act has confirmed this, that African American high school graduates can usually only perform academically at the eighth grade level. This consistent finding of a 15 point difference has led many critics to question whether IQ really measures intelligence or some sort of "test-taking" skill, whether or not the content of IQ test questions are "culturally biased," or whether or not predominantly African American high schools are doing their job. The vast majority of psychologists flatly deny that intelligence tests are culturally biased against African Americans or any other minority, but will admit that individuals who do not understand English well can have a hard time on intelligence tests. Another group of "egalitarian race theorists" (e.g., Montagu 2002) argue that since neither "race" nor "IQ" are well-defined, neither race nor IQ probably exist. However, most studies concur that the biggest gap between whites and other groups is on a subset of IQ tests that measures verbal intelligence. Verbal Intelligence is usually regarded as the first (and perhaps most important) subset of IQ test questions, the other subsets being quantitative ability, spatial ability, perceptual ability, memory, reasoning, and word fluency. Low verbal intelligence is related to the failure to develop higher-order cognitive processes such as moral reasoning, empathy, and problem solving. Other types of intelligence are sometimes called "performance IQ" where no significant differences usually show up between people.

You may have also heard about a controversial book in the 1990s, The Bell Curve, by Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray. In it, they argue that forces are at work in American society to lower the collective IQ. This is called the "dumbing down hypothesis" and it blames the problem on the fact that high-IQ people produce little or no offspring while low-IQ people have more children and have them at younger ages. Intermarriage doesn't occur...
much among people with different IQs (a process known as assortative mating). Some criminologists, like Travis Hirschi and Michael Hindelang, have agreed, in principle, with Herrnstein's thesis. They make a strong case for the argument that IQ is a better predictor of criminality than social class, e.g., there's at least an 8-point difference in IQ even when controlling for social factors. In psychology, the notion that people are getting smarter or dumber is known as the Flynn effect (named after a New Zealand philosopher called James Flynn). Research on the Flynn effect has shown, that overall, people are getting smarter, and on average, the world population is increasing 15 points in intelligence every 50 years. This increase, however, is only selective. People are getting smarter primarily with visual-spatial reasoning. Vocabulary and verbal intelligence are showing little to no change.

Genetic disorders (diabetes, poor vision, and phenal denaturue) as well as unlucky childhood experiences (injuries, exposure to poisons, severe neglect, and some diseases) all affect intelligence, but by and large, the consensus of scholars is that IQ is highly heritable (caused by heredity, but not completely by heredity). Most African Americans have white ancestors - the white admixture is about 20% on average - but studies on mixed ancestry populations do not seem to help explain IQ differences or prove the heritability thesis. The only way to truly test the notion that IQ is 100% inherited is to make environments equal for everyone: Science does not yet know how to do this, and scientists also do not know how to raise IQ permanently. Inter-racial differences in IQ also do not seem to be affected by social class. For example, African Americans from prosperous families do tend to score higher than African Americans from poorer families (inter-racial differences), but still tend to score lower than whites, even whites from poor families (inter-racial differences). There is clearly a need for more research on heredity and environmental factors.

The issue of bias with intelligence testing arises from a concern for the long-known fact that ethnic and racial groups have always differed in their test scores. All psychologists admit that African Americans consistently score 15 points lower than whites on IQ tests. Hispanics also tend to do poorly, falling somewhere between the average for whites and African Americans. Asians tend to have an IQ that is 3-7 points higher than whites. The first attack on IQ tests came in the 1960s, and critics said the test items and questions themselves were biased. Research on the issue of item bias has found no specific cultural bias in any test questions. In other words, there are no inherent flaws in the tests. It may be, however, that poor performance reflects social and educational disadvantages experienced by some ethnic groups. In the 1970s (as with the 1979 Califormia case of Larry P. v. Wilson Rifles), the second attack on IQ tests involved challenging the placement of black children in special education classes. This case, and a similar one in Chicago (PAE v. Hanon), did not prove in court that IQ tests were biased, but judges have advised school systems to find ways to eliminate disproportionate minority placement in special education.

THEORIES OF INTELLIGENCE

An interesting contemporary controversy is the debate over single versus multiple intelligence. Followers of a line of work started by a psychologist named Spearman argue that Intelligence is a single, overriding factor (called the g-factor), and sometimes referred to as 'native' intelligence. The g-factor represents all intellectual and mental abilities. Spearman found that people who score high on any one of the subtests tend to do well on all others. Given this view, Intelligence is horizontal, largely nonlearned, and cuts across all other abilities. Biologists believe the g-factor measures some sort of mental "energy" or power, and may be related to neural capacity, neural speed, or other property of the brain. Spearman invented a correlation coefficient statistic to prove the existence of an underlying factor, and his method evolved into what we now call factor analysis.

Followers of a line of work started by a psychologist named Thurstone and also drawing upon the work of Piaget (like Howard Gardner - a 1990s proponent of the idea of multiple intelligences) argue that Intelligence is vertical, that there are different ways a person could be intelligent. An "idiot savant" (like in the movie Rain Man), for example, could have very strong mathematical abilities, but be very poor at verbal abilities. From an analysis of 56 different subtests, Thurstone identified seven primary mental abilities, as he called them. According to
Gardner’s (1983) schema, the complete list of multiple intelligence(s) and typical occupations where found is as follows:

- **Linguistic** — reading, writing, talking; journalists, politicians, lawyers
- **Logico-math** — categorizing, classifying, calculating; technicians, scientists, computers
- **Spatial** — visualization, drawing, orienting; architects, artists, pilots
- **Body-kinesthetic** — coordination, hardness, expressiveness; dancers, actors, crafts
- **Musical** — listening, perception, sensitivity; musician, singer, therapeutist
- **Interpersonal** — influential, sociological, ability to pick up cues; no specific profession
- **Intrapersonal** — disciplined, awareness, self-knowledge; teacher, clergy, psychologist

Critics of the multiple intelligence approach note that the studies conducted have primarily been on college students and adults, while the studies conducted on the g-factor have primarily been with children. College educators have indeed actively embraced Gardner’s ideas, mostly because it resonates well with active learning and other pedagogies of teaching. Sophisticated cluster and factor analysts comparing the two approaches have largely produced the finding that both approaches are measuring the same thing, i.e., that the battery of tests used in the multiple intelligence approach, when taken together, measure a g-factor.

There is also some controversy over what is called fluid versus crystallized intelligence. In the 1960’s, psychologists Raymond Cattell and John Horn discovered this difference. Fluid intelligence presumably measures the biological basis, and crystallized intelligence presumably measures knowledge and skills learned through experience. Fluid intelligence remains stable throughout the lifetime, and crystallized intelligence can increase indefinitely. Vocabulary and verbal intelligence, in this scheme, are regarded as part of crystallized intelligence. Cattell’s ideas for improvement in IQ are related to what he calls “investment,” which is a vague term referring to how much effort a person puts in making use of their biologically-given intelligence.

In the 1980’s, yet another theory of intelligence emerged, this time by the Yale psychologist Robert Sternberg (1985), and called the Triarchic theory of Intelligence. In this view, IQ consists of three parts: analytic intelligence, creative intelligence, and practical intelligence. These parts are not seen as separate, but as interconnected parts of a single system. Analytic intelligence involves skills at reasoning, analyzing, evaluating, judging, and comparing. Creative intelligence involves the ability to combine seemingly unrelated facts to form new ideas. Practical intelligence involves the ability to adapt, select, and shape the real-world environment. In Sternberg’s scheme, people are aware of which areas they are strong and weak at, and they try to capitalize on their strengths as well as compensate for their weaknesses. Research on these ideas is emerging, and full support has yet to be achieved for the idea of practical intelligence since there are so many contexts in which to test the theory.

In the 1990’s, the notion of emotional intelligence was raised by the psychologists Peter Salovey and John Mayer (Mayer & Salovey 1993). People with this kind of IQ tend to have abilities to perceive, understand, express, and regulate emotions. They use their emotions to guide thoughts and behavior, and also generally have the ability to accurately read others’ emotions. This conception is very similar to the notion of social competence, which has found a small place in the criminological literature. Research on emotional intelligence is far from conclusive, although it does seem plausible that for people with low intelligence, sometimes a strong emotion will overrule their common sense and make them do foolish things, although others regard the idea of emotional flooding over intelligence as a kind of folk psychology.

**INTELLIGENCE AND CRIME**

The earliest group of criminologists who looked at intelligence and crime comprise what are known as the “pedigree” studies. Pedigree study is the process of tracing the family tree of criminals to see if the genealogy
contains examples of family ancestors with low intelligence. Richard Dugdale, in 1877, went back 200 years to trace the ancestry of a family known as The Jukes. He found that not only were its current members always in trouble with the law, but that the family history extensively included pauperism, prostitution, forgery, illegitimacy, and degeneracy. His work was so influential that by 1899, Americans were clamoring for something to be done about the "Three Ds": the Dangers (mentally ill) class; the Delinquent (criminal) class; and the Defective (mentally retarded) class. Americans saw welfare, public assistance, and philanthropies as futile about this time. An Influential book at the time was written in 1901 by Charles Henderson, entitled The Dependent, Defective, and Delinquent Classes.

In 1912, another "pedigree" researcher, H.H. Goddard, of the New Jersey Training School for the Feeble Minded at Vineland, studied a family known as The Kallikaks. He traced this criminal family's history back six generations to the illegitimate offspring of a "feebleminded" barmaid. He popularized the idea of feeblemindedness as an alternative for the words "moron", "imbecile", and "idiot" (anyone with an IQ of around 75). Feeblemindedness is hereditary, passed on in a 3:1 ratio according to Mendelian Law through a recessive gene to what are called simplex cases in the second generation. If simplex marries simplex, all the offspring are guaranteed to be feebleminded. Goddard saw feeblemindedness as the breeding ground for crime. At that time in society, 97% of all female prostitutes, 80% of tramps, and 50% of paupers were feebleminded. Goddard did extensive mental testing in jails and prisons, finding that 70% of criminals were feebleminded (even today, incarcerated criminals normally score 20 points less on IQ tests than noncriminals).

The American government quickly accepted the idea that all feebleminded people were potential criminals and put Goddard in charge of Immigration and Naturalization at Ellis Island until 1928. From that position, he trained a group of clinicians to look for certain signs of feeblemindedness among the immigrants coming off the boats. Sometimes they just sized a person up, and sometimes they would take people aside, show them a drawing, and ask them to draw it from memory. The training wasn't all that sophisticated (and Goddard, according to Gould, later admitted to doctoring photos of what the feebleminded were supposed to look like), and included things like looking for criminals with glassy eyes that recede into eye sockets. Goddard, you see, also believed that masturbation and/or overindulgence in sex caused this (the eyes to recede into eye sockets); hence the popular warning American mothers used for years when they suspected their sons were masturbating ('Stop that Johnny, or you'll go blind').

Goddard also convinced the U.S. military to initiate IQ testing along the same lines as this feeblemindedness profiling (being able to pick 'em out by sight). The Army tests were called the "Beta" tests, and they led to a diagnosis of feeblemindedness among 37% of the Whites and 89% of the Blacks. Subsequent tests by the military have shown that draftees tend to have an average IQ of 75 (slightly above the feeblemindedness range). Even today, the military relies upon Intelligence to screen out volunteers. Ironically, dynamometer and other tests show that a large percentage of people with low intelligence have excessive strength, tallness, broad shoulders, a heavy thick-set build, primitive digestive system that isn't upset by swallowing anything, wounds that heal fast, resistance to certain diseases, and dullness to pain. Goddard also convinced the prison systems of 24 states that at least 50% of their inmates were feebleminded. Together with his team, and a doctor named Harry Sharp, they proceeded to perform mandatory vasectomies on delinquents and inmates throughout these prison systems. Many state prison systems had compulsory sterilization policies up until 1960.

Another colorful character in history was Charles Benedict Davenport, a doctor who ran the Station for Experimental Evolution in Cold Spring Harbor, NY from 1904 until the 1930s with funding from the Carnegie Institute. Black (2003) writes about Davenport as being the leader of the American Eugenics Movement. For three decades, the Cold Spring Harbor station was believed to be the command-and-control headquarters of the eugenics movement, and people sent there with allegedly inheritable moral failings (such as criminality, alcoholism,
promiscuity, and paupers) were involuntarily sterilized so they couldn’t have offspring. The Carnegie Institute pulled the plug on their funding for such activities in 1939.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Focus on the American Eugenics Movement (1907-1939)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The main years for the American Eugenics Movement lasted from 1907-1939. Eugenics (a word meaning “good in birth”) is the name for attempts at purifying the human race by the elimination or sterilization of “unfit” human beings. A majority of states (31) passed mandatory sterilization laws (known by a variety of names: miscegenation laws; sexual psychopath laws, registration laws, etc.). Indiana was the first state to legalize forced sterilization in 1907, but most of the other states followed after Oliver Wendell Holmes’ famous proclamation in the Buck v. Bell case of 1927 which involved Virginia’s law (below). These laws essentially rounded up welfare mothers, the mentally retarded, the mentally ill, the insane, epileptics, sex perverts, and moral degenerates. They were taken to hospitals and given euthanasia (mercy killing) if they were too bad off, but most people, against their will or talked into it (by genetic counselors), were sterilized by castration, vasectomy, or hysterectomy. When Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany, he claimed his idea of genocide against the Jews was inspired by the American Eugenics Movement, but other than the Holocaust, Hitler got away with killing 250,000 mentally disabled Germans between 1939 and 1945 with no complaints. Most people who administered the sterilization laws in America were WASPS (White Anglo-Saxon Protestants) who also had a distaste for foreigners, so the Johnson-Lodge Immigration Act was passed in 1924 to formalize the practice of sterilizing vast numbers of immigrants who were uncharitably called PIGS (Polish, Italian, Greek, and Slavic) or CIA (Catholic Irish Alcoholics). A number of Blacks were also caught up in sterilization campaigns, but the Irish suffered the most in terms of the numbers affected (estimates range from 150,000-750,000+ sterilized). Records were poorly kept, and some estimates of the numbers are much lower, for example, such as Black’s (2003) estimates of 6,000 by 1927, 36,000 by 1940, and 70,000 by 1970. Activities past 1939 were funded by Planned Parenthood and the birth control movement started by Margaret Sanger, an early American feminist. In the 1990s and beyond, scientists sometimes refer to the legacy of these ideas as eugenics, the new eugenics, or transhumanism (Dowbiggin 2003).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes for an 8-1 majority in Buck v. Bell (1927)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We have seen more than once that the public welfare may call upon the best citizens for their lives. It would be strange if it could not call upon those who already sap the strength of the state for these lesser sacrifices, often not felt to be such by those concerned, in order to prevent our being swamped with incompetence ... The principle that sustains compulsory vaccination is broad enough to cover cutting the Fallopian tubes. Three generations of imbeciles is enough,&quot; [see Virginia Eulogy of Buck v. Bell]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSIONS AND CONTEMPORARY INTELLIGENCE STUDIES

The generally accepted wisdom, according to a number of fairly well-done studies, is that the average (nonincarcerated) criminal IQ is 90 (92 or 93, depending upon who's study you use), but conventional wisdom holds that there is usually a ten point gap (90 v. 100) between criminals and the average for the rest of the population. The incarcerated criminals who have gotten caught tend to have much lower IQs, often around 85 or so, which triggers status as a mentally "disabled" inmate or one with a "learning disability." Contemporary researchers like E. Wilson (who wrote the first textbook on Sociobiology) and C. Ray Jeffrey (a Florida State criminologist) have tried to sort out the reasons for why criminals have at least an seven or eight-point gap. Some claim it's a neurotransmitter problem, others the inability to interact with the environment, and others the effect of alienating labeling in school. Some psychopaths and those with certain mental conditions (like paranoia) have high IQ, but these cases are rare. Be advised that even though a seven (7), eight (8), or ten (10) point difference in IQ may not look like much, and indeed, many researchers will dismiss such differences as being within the "normal" range of variation, more detailed research (Goodman 1995) will almost always find a FEW
POINTS MATTER, and even differences of six (6) points will be associated with more lying, cheating, stealing, and conduct disorders.

**Genetic Endowment Research**

The twin and adoption studies have been informative, especially by what this group of researchers call their “concordance” studies. Concordance is the likelihood that one individual (an identical twin, for example) will have the same or similar characteristics (Intelligence, Criminality) as a biological relative. In theory at least, the idea of concordance is the notion that there is some genetic input or determinism in the risk of becoming involved in crime. There’s a 77% concordance rate for identical twins (even when living apart), and a 20% concordance rate for adoptedees (with criminal biological parents and non-criminal adoptive parents). A strong genetic influence is suggested, particularly for property crime and particularly when low intelligence is involved (Mednick et al. 1987).

**Sex Differences Research**

Sex differences are also a contemporary area of study, and only slight differences between men and women have been found. Men, however, tend to dominate the extremes of IQ; the upper levels of genius and the bottom levels of retardation. Men are overrepresented among the ranks of the mentally retarded. Men perform better at spatial ability testing, and women perform better at reading comprehension, writing, perceptual speed, and certain memory tasks. There are few gender differences in math ability.

**Race Differences Research**

Most recent developments in this area have focused on ways to measure internal bias in mental testing, such as the use of techniques known as Differential Item Functioning (DIF) which can sort through databases and presumably detect manifest and latent bias. Minority affairs officers are usually mandated to be knowledgeable of such techniques. There is a difference between external bias (such as if the test had some political agenda to discriminate) and internal bias (which is the research question of whether a test has any systematic error in measurement). Bias, then, is a technical, not a political matter anymore.

**Learning Disability Research**

An area of study known as the LD-JD connection (Learning Disabilities - Juvenile Delinquency) started in the 1950s with the discovery of Thorazine (and later Ritalin) to control what was regarded as America’s number one problems hyperactive children. By the 1990s, several other names were developed for hyperactivity, the most common one being attention deficit disorder. Although learning disabilities come in a variety of forms, and speculation abounds about various connections between specific disabilities and crime, attention deficit disorder is the most widely studied disability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LD In the Delinquent Population:</th>
<th>LD In the Normal Population:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-73%</td>
<td>7-10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theoretically, a learning disability is a discrepancy between ability and achievement. Given this view, learning disabled people are either underachievers or overachievers. A learning disability is always, however, an intelligence problem. There’s a problem with receiving information, processing information, or communicating information. There are two approaches within criminology regarding the causes of crime among the learning disabled.

**The School Failure Hypothesis**

LD leads to Classroom Failure leading to Dropout leading to Delinquency

**The Susceptibility Hypothesis**

LD leads to some sort of Personality Disorder leading to Delinquency then Dropout
Schooling is obviously an important factor that affects intelligence. Attendance is the primary variable here, and regardless of debates over the quality of schooling, research has consistently shown that students who skip school on a relatively frequent or intermittent basis suffer from lower IQ. When parents move a child to a better school, there may be a small, measurable increase in IQ, but it is just as likely that there will be no change in IQ. Most research in this area has been directed at the effectiveness of early intervention programs, like Head Start, and the results are promising. Such pre-Kindergarten programs produce enormous boosts in IQ, as much as 15 points compared to control groups. However, there is an unfortunate thing called the "fade-out" effect, which happens when Head Starters graduate and enter regular school. Their IQ tends to decline down to the level found in the regular school.

Family Factor Research

Families are obviously important factors. Besides motivating children toward intelligence via encouragement, coaching, and modeling, other things families can do is be informed about the effects of family size and birth order. Studies have consistently shown that smaller families (with less children) tend to produce higher-IQ children. Also, first-born children are usually the smartest, with IQ decreasing as one moves down the birth order. Prenatal care for expectant mothers is very important, and there is a condition known as fetal alcohol syndrome (low IQ and behavioral problems) which happens if the mother drinks large amounts of alcohol. Low IQ is also produced when infants eat chips of lead-based paint or are exposed to lead contamination in the atmosphere. Prolonged malnutrition during infancy also produces low IQ.

Personality Disorder Research

The susceptibility of those with low intelligence toward development of a personality disorder (such as antisocial personality disorder) is also a contemporary area of research that needs to have more attention drawn to it. It is generally agreed in criminology that high intelligence "insulates" a person against maladaptive behavior that gets them in trouble with the law, but there is little research on exactly what personality traits or attributes account for this. Austin and Deary (2002) suggest that high emotional intelligence, the trait of Openness, and low Neuroticism play a role in helping keep people out of trouble, and that Angry Temperament is mostly likely the link between mental deficiency and personality disordered criminals.

APPENDIX: A TYPICAL IQ TEST (quickie, Readers-Digest-type version)

1. These words can be arranged to form a sentence. Is the sentence True or False? (one in 1 is number than more cars car)
   A. True
   B. False

2. What number is as much more than 10 as it is less than one-half of what 30 is 10 less than?
   Answer ___

3. George gets twice as large a share of profits as any of his three partners. The three partners share equally. What fraction of the entire profits is George's?
   Answer ___

4. Birds can only fly and hop, but worms can crawl; therefore:
   A. Birds eat worms
   B. Birds don't crawl
   C. Birds sometimes crawl

5. Stockings always have:
   A. Holes
   B. Weight
   C. Seams
   D. Garters

6. When Carol makes soup, she puts in 1 bean for each 2 peas. If her soup contains a total of 300 peas and
beans, how many peas are there?
Answer: ____

7. Pique is most similar in meaning to:
A. choice
B. Decoration
C. Dwarf
D. Resentment
E. Sorrow

8. In this series, what number comes next? (2 A 9 B 6 C 13 D)
Answer: ____

9. In this series, what number comes next? (2 9 6 7 18 5)
Answer: ____

10. Which letter does not belong in this series? (Z Y X B W)
Answer: ____

11. Botanist is to sociology as plant is to:
A. man
B. train
C. society
D. headache

12. If all men have shoes, then big men have:
A. big shoes
B. old shoes
C. shoes
D. green shoes

13. How many miles can a dog run in 3 minutes if the dog runs half as fast as a car going 40mph?
Answer: ____

14. In this group, which object does not belong?
A. Radio
B. Clock
C. Football
D. Battery

15. In this group, which word does not belong?
A. Builder
B. Bricklayer
C. Architect
D. Dentist

Answers: 1 (F), 2 (15), 3 (2/5), 4 (B), 5 (B), 6 (200), 7 (D), 8 (10), 9 (54), 10 (B), 11 (C), 12 (C), 13 (1), 14 (C), 15 (D)

Perfect score: 121-140 Superior Intelligence
One wrong: 111-120 Above average
Two wrong: 91-110 Average
Three wrong: 71-90 Slow learner
Four wrong: 51-70 Mildly retarded

PSYCHOBIOLOGICAL CRIMINOLOGY
(Hormones; Neurotransmitters; Vitamins & Drugs)

Biology may not be destiny, but it provides limits to the practical (Eric Palmer)
Biology, or at least some of the key principles of it (structure determines function; anatomy is destiny) has had an enormous impact on criminology. It’s the perfect (and most common) field to draw from, for any field, in fact, to become interdisciplinary. Sociology has even drawn upon it (with the fields of sociobiology and biosocial criminology), but psychology mixed with biology (psychobiology) has made the most inroads. Psychobiological criminology also overlaps with constitutionalism and mental deficiency theory, and to be sure, no purely biological theories of crime exist. Criminologists tend to refer to biological insights as ‘factors’, and some criminologists even water down the dependent variable to say that instead of explaining crime, they are explaining maladaptive behavior patterns.

One of the first things you’ll notice about psychobiological criminology is its inordinate concern for violent, aggressive crime. Many critics argue that the field ought to focus more on property crime (since some research shows a stronger genetic link with this type of crime). However, the fact remains that violent arousal is one of the most well-documented areas of biology. Not only are there certain organs inside the body that produce aggression, but aggressive stimuli outside the body will trigger bodily reactions producing a ‘neurological high’.

HORMONES

Hormones are chemical messengers produced by the endocrine glands, the brain, gastrointestinal organs, sex organs, the kidney, the heart, the pineal gland, the skin and the hair. They exert a strong influence on behavior, principally by inducing brain events that prompt people to behave in certain ways to environmental stimuli. Hormones not only influence reactive or conscious behavior after environmental cues, but they also influence anticiptory or unconscious behavior (by knowing what the body needs beforehand, hormones make a person think they want something before they see it).

Biologists separate them into two classes: peptide hormones, which act on cell membranes; and steroid hormones, which act on cell nuclei. The effects of peptide hormones are fast while the effects of steroid hormones are slow. When a hormone is released in the brain (usually a peptide), it’s called a neuropeptide. Hormones that are released elsewhere in the human body are referred to as activating in the periphery. Hormones are fluids, ‘secretions’ really, that you might compare to sweat, the fluid ‘secreted’ by the skin. The body, as you know, is mostly fluid, and hormone secretion is intimately involved with and limited by the need for fluid homeostasis and sodium maintenance. In addition to the whole body's need for homeostasis, the endocrine system itself maintains a state of endocrine homeostasis, regulated by the hypothalamus, arguably the most important region in the brain. Every form of life except one-celled organisms has a hypothalamus, and it regulates a number of biological clocks: circadian rhythms (sleep, diurnal, nocturnal activities), running activity (e.g., in hamsters), reproduction, menstruation, rapid-eye-movement, attention span, food preferences, migration, hibernation, and singling behavior (in nonhumans), and seasonal effective disorder (melancholy). In addition, the hypothalamus is located within the limbic system of the brain, controlling the Autonomic Nervous System (Involuntary functions). The limbic system is one of the most unmapped areas of the brain. It has been called the "crocodile" brain. One study found that 15 of 15 death row inmates had some kind of lobe dysfunction in their limbic system.

The key concept of endocrinology is central motive state. In psychology, the equivalent concept is desire. Some simple examples are thirst, hunger, and sex, and more complicated pathways or ‘circuits’ exist for various other states of excitement, arousal, or quiescence. Hormonal reactions also don’t occur in a vacuum. Desires have an appetitive (searching) phase and a consummatory (fulfilling) phase. Although individuals by themselves can probably generate the appetitive phase of a hormonal reaction, they need the hormonal reactions of others (pheromones) or additional environmental stimuli to generate the consummatory phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endocrine glands</th>
<th>Hormone released</th>
<th>Behavior Influenced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pituitary (anterior lobe)</td>
<td>Growth hormone, Prolecin, ACTH</td>
<td>Food preference, brooding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The criminological study of glands has been around since 1928 with the publication of Schiopp and Smith's *The New Criminology* (not to be confused with a book in radical criminology by the same name in the 1970s). Schiopp and Smith argued that criminals were two to three times more likely to have glandular disorders. Of course, there are many glandular disorders that have nothing to do with crime, but some of the ones that have been speculated about include hyperthyroidism (which causes personality change) and Cushing's disease (which often manifests abnormally compulsive and obsessive behavior). Both diseases predominantly affect the female population, however. Males are more likely to suffer from brain disorders, such as stuttering and dyslexia. Males are also usually right-brain dominant, which explains why left-handedness usually occurs one in two times more often in men as well as their greater spatial (exploratory) abilities.

Testosterone, and other androgens, are probably the most important hormones in criminology. Testosterone has been related to aggressive criminal behavior in a number of studies, almost as many as those linking crime to the female menstrual cycle. It is believed that high levels of testosterone reduce a person’s social integration, making them more of a loner, and freeing them up to deviate from society’s norms. Female menstrual cycles have been linked to irritability, aggression, and a patterned increase in hostility. Some 70% of women in prison claim to have committed their crimes while experiencing PMS (53% before menstruation; 17% during). Androgens are basically masculinizing hormones. Women normally have one-tenth as much testosterone as men. Too much androgen in the mother's body during pregnancy and birth is associated with aggressive behavior in children. Unfortunately, many of the anesthetic, childbirth-easing drugs given to women are androgen-based substances. In men, testosterone levels peak in the mid-teens, and sometimes lead to precocious sexuality (testosterone has this effect in early-teenage women too). The levels decline over the life course. Testosterone is highest in the morning right after waking up and decreases throughout the course of the day. It is also highest during the months of November and December, at least for men.
Speaking of seasonality, there are a number of seasonal disorders which may or may not be hormone-related. Seasonal Affective Disorder (SAD), or “winter depression” has been known about the longest and is possibly linked to melatonin, a sleep-related hormone secreted by the pineal gland in the brain. Dr. Cliff Arnall, a UK psychologist, has dubbed January 24 the “most depressing day of the year” and has also devised a formula for calculating when a person’s lowest point in the year occurs. His theory, or model, is as follows:

\[
(W + (D-d)) \times TQ \\
M \times NA
\]

The equation is broken down into seven variables: (W) weather, (D) debt, (d) monthly salary, (T) time since Christmas, (Q) time since failed quit attempt, (M) low motivational levels and (NA) the need to take action.

NEUROTRANSMITTERS

Neurotransmitters are chemicals that allow for the transmission of electrical impulses in the brain and are the brain’s way of processing information. They are not normally involved with the autonomic (regulatory) nervous system (as hormones are, although some glands trigger neurotransmitters, or neuropeptides, as well as hormones), but with the Central Nervous System and higher-order cognitive functioning. As such, they have become of great interest to criminologists who study things like antisocial personality and psychopathy which are believed to manifest brain systems with neurotransmitter levels “out of balance”. It’s well documented that alcoholism and drug dependence are associated with differences in neurotransmitter levels. In fact, the biggest research problem in studying neurotransmitters is finding criminal research subjects who aren’t already “self medicated” on alcohol or drugs. Although a person’s normal neurotransmitter levels are determined genetically at birth, it is quite easy to manipulate them with drugs (medications for the mentally ill, stop-smoking pills), with diet (sugar, caffeine, chocolate, food additives), with stress (stressful environmental conditions), and with altitude (hypoxia is a condition mimicking the effect of neurotransmitter imbalance at altitudes above 3,800 feet above sea level).

There’s not that many neurotransmitters in the central nervous system (see table for complete list), and the three most commonly studied ones are serotonin, dopamine, and norepinephrine. Antisocial people have significantly lower levels of serotonin than ordinary people. Schizophrenics have significantly lower levels of dopamine, and cocaine addicts have higher levels of dopamine. Levels of norepinephrine have also been associated with antisocial behavior. Perhaps a look at the table at this point would be instructive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neurotransmitter</th>
<th>Behavior affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serotonin (vitamin equivalent: Tryptophan)</td>
<td>Pain reduction, aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dopamine (vitamin equivalent: Tyrosine)</td>
<td>Pleasure enhancement, schizophrenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norepinephrine/Ephinephrine</td>
<td>Sodium homeostasis,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetylcholine (vitamin equivalent: Choline)</td>
<td>Alcoholism, sex drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melatonin</td>
<td>Biological clocks, obesity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glutamate</td>
<td>Moods, feeling states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspartate</td>
<td>Moods, feeling states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ-aminobutyric acid (GABA)</td>
<td>Moods, feeling states</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Serotonin is probably the most important neurotransmitter in criminology. As stated previously, antisocial people have lower levels of serotonin. This may be either genetic or environmental, because neurotransmitter balances are constantly changing as memories are stored in the brain. Every new memory permanently changes the neural pathway structure, thus creating the opportunities for neurotransmitter imbalances. People who are genetically endowed with lower serotonin levels ("born antisocials") may therefore "grow out of it," and likewise, someone who is born with normal serotonin levels may develop an antisocial personality (what is called "reduced serotonergic activity" or a "serotonin uptake problem"). Reduced serotonergic activity and crime is one of the strongest connections in biopsychological criminology.

Brain wave activity has been studied, and the general finding is that criminals have slower brain waves, i.e., slower EEG activity. Whether this is an indicator of a central or autonomic nervous system problem depends upon the researcher. The work of criminologist Hans Eysenck points at one of the reasons for why criminals can beat the lie detector is because their slower autonomic nervous system results in their not being easily stimulated, hence they seek out exciting, criminal behavior in a "stimulus hunger." Mednick, a sociobiologist, points out that criminals have a lower rate of skin conductance response (SCR), the time it takes the skin to conduct electrical current. He argues that this affects the ability of criminals to benefit from negative reinforcement, and since fear is the most powerful reinforcer known to psychology, criminals experience no fear or anxiety. Lobe dysfunction, which can occur with head injury or birth trauma, also has been studied in criminals. Prisoners often report having had a head injury involving loss of consciousness, and 80% of violent criminals had greater than average birth complications. There's evidence to suggest that frontal lobe dysfunction may characterize violent offenders while temporal lobe dysfunction may characterize sex offenders. Research involving newer imaging techniques (MRI, CT, PET, SPECT) is ongoing.

VITAMINS AND DRUGS

Vitamin deficiencies and/or dependencies (as well as food allergies, eating disorders, and cholesterol levels) have been implicated in crime. Vitamin B3 and especially B6 deficiencies and/or dependencies have been found in 70% of criminals as well as alcoholics and the mentally ill. There is a difference between a vitamin deficiency and a vitamin dependency. Vitamin deficiencies cause low IQ, mental impairments, and weak immune systems. In some Third World countries, vitamin food supplements are almost unheard of, and the lack of vitamin A (as well as Zinc), for example, causes almost as many deaths as the poverty diseases of malaria and cholera [see chart below].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worst Affected Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Burundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Angola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Burkina Faso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vitamin dependences work differently. For one thing, a person has to have a genetic disorder in order to have a vitamin dependency. There would have to be an inborn error in metabolism, and such a person would normally report stomach aches when eating certain kinds of food. A vitamin dependency works in the same way as toxicity or overdose. Some people die, others become sick and start vomiting, but most (who don't know they have a dependency) get headaches and become irritable. Regarding toxins, one of the things the body definitely does not need is lead. The human body has a fixed lead burden, as well as a low tolerance for other toxins and minerals. Cadmium, one such toxin, is an invisible gas given off by welding. If you trace the occupational history of many mass murderers and violent criminals, you'd be surprised at the number who were welders at one time or another. Almost all the effects of vitamin, food, toxin, and mineral factors are referred to as producing "transient states" of criminality.
Certain drugs, typically bought at a pharmacy (with or without prescription), and even some illegal drugs, may have a connection with regulating criminal behavior. I'm going to avoid the whole "drugs cause crime" (envelopment v. escalation) arguments, and jump right into the potential of creative pharmacology for crime prevention and criminal rehabilitation from this point on... (but first, some dead ends)

First of all, smoking cigarettes is a bad thing. Nicotine operates as a MAO inhibitor, and is associated with Parkinson's Disease and a high prevalence of the more dangerous psychiatric disorders and serious substance abuse. About 25% of pregnant women smoke and run the risk of their children having hypoxia-induced brain damage. Smoking alters synaptic pathways in ways that are largely unknown. The drug Buproprion (Wellbutrin; trade name Zyban) would not only be a good smoking cessation tool, but it would retard depression and perhaps help with other mantle-type conditions.

Alcohol is another deadend, like marijuana, cocaine, LSD, and the opiates. It alters the functions and communication between the liver, the brain, and other vital organs. When BAC increases, it activates the reward centers of the brain so that the simplest behavior is experienced as rewarding. When BAC decreases, there's a depressive effect. Some drugs are neurotoxic.

MAO (Monoamine Oxidase) inhibitors (complex polypeptides) cause a rise of norepinephrine, dopamine and serotonin, producing a sense of calm and serenity in a person, and making them much more amenable to therapy and treatment. Avoidance of cheese, red meat, and sausage (in short, a vegetarian diet) will produce the same effect as taking an MAO inhibitor.

SSRI (Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors) are a new set of drugs designed to replace the tricyclic antidepressants. They do not inhibit serotonin reuptake, and are extremely effective in treating obsessive and mood disorders, particularly impulsiveness and sensation seeking. They also reverse sexual dysfunction; Viagra is an SSRI. One could emulate the effects of an SSRI by taking Yohimbine, Ginseng, or Ginkgo. Hypericum, which is the active ingredient in St. John'sWort also has mood-elevating effects, there's some Initial speculation that SSRIs could decrease tendencies toward aggressive, criminal behavior (see this article).

The unpredictable anesthetic GHB (gamma-hydroxybutyric acid), which is a precursor of the neurotransmitter GABA, holds rehabilitative promise. It produces a touchy-feely sensation (similar to the illegal drug Ecstasy), a sense of serenity, feelings of emotional warmth, and the desire to socialize. It operates by inhibiting dopamine release to brighten mood and sharpen mental focus. It's effects can be emulated by the amnestic, date-rape benzodiazepine drug, flunitrazepam, better known as the hypnotic "forget pill", Rohypnol.

**PSYCHOLOGICAL CRIMINOLOGY**

"The faults we first see in others are the faults that are our own." (Honore de Balzac)

Within the psychological-psychiatric perspective, it has been psychiatry, and primarily psychoanalysis, that has made the most inroads into criminology. Psychiatry is the older profession, going back to the earliest days of medicine in dealing with the problems of mental disease. Psychoanalysis emerged out of psychiatry with the work of Sigmund Freud (1856-1939). Psychology, particularly that branch of it with the most relevance for criminology, abnormal psychology, has come into its own during the twentieth century. What they all have in common is the idea that the causes of criminal behavior originate in the personality. Personality is defined as the complex set of emotional and behavioral attributes that tend to remain relatively constant as the individual moves from situation to situation.

**THE FREUDIAN APPROACH**
The central concept of psychoanalysis, and the one that Freud first put forth, is the unconscious. The concept had been around before Freud, but he was the one that made the most out of it, arguing that traumatic experiences in early childhood left their mark on the individual despite the fact that the individual was not aware of these experiences. The idea of unconscious determination of behavior flew headfirst against the idea of free will, and was quickly jumped on by positivist criminology.

The next most important idea is conflict, and Freud postulated the existence of a three-part personality (an idea going back to Plato) consisting of id, ego, and superego which operated in constant conflict with one another (primarily between the id and superego) producing the basic problem of guilt which required the use of one or more defense mechanisms. The idea of personality conflict as a cause of crime became quite popular among both scientists and the general public.

The id is a part of the unconscious that contains all the urges and impulses, including what is called the libido, a kind of generalized sexual energy that is used for everything from survival instincts to appreciation of art. The id is also kind of stubborn, for it responds only to what Freud called the pleasure principle (if it feels good, do it), and nothing else.

The ego is the only part of the conscious personality. It's what the person is aware of when they think about themselves, and is what they usually try to project toward others. The ego is dominated by what Freud called the reality principle (an orientation to the real world in which the person lives). It is continually trying to mediate the demands of the id and prohibitions of the superego.

The superego is a part of the unconscious that is the voice of conscience (doing what is right) and the source of self-criticism. It reflects society's moral values to some degree (how much the person wants to "fit in"), and a person is sometimes aware of their own morality and ethics, but the superego contains a vast number of codes, or prohibitions, that are issued mostly unconsciously in the form of commands or "don't" statements. The superego is also somewhat tricky, in that it will try to portray what it wants the person to do in grandiose ways, using terms, what Freud called the ego-ideal, which arises out of the person's first great love attachment (usually a parent). The assumption is that children raised by parents experience love conditionally (when they do something right), and the child internalizes these experiences as a series of real or imagined judgmental statements.

Using this id-ego-superego model, the basic cause of crime is oversocialization, leading to an overly harsh superego, which represses the id so harshly that pressure builds up in the id and there is an explosion of acting-out behavior. This pressure build-up in the id contains both silenced and repressed urges as well as a kind of frustration called guilt for impulsive actions which did manage to slip out.

Guilt is a very common problem because of all the urges and drives coming from the id and all the prohibitions and codes in the superego. There are a variety of ways an individual handles guilt, and these are called defense mechanisms (see table for complete list).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sublimation</th>
<th>Desires of the id are diverted to healthy outlets approved by the superego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repression</td>
<td>Desires of the id are stuffed back into subconscious and the person denies they exist or engages in Freudian slips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>Desires of the id are followed impulsively to escape from hearing the superego (reality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial/Intellectualization</td>
<td>Anxiety about following desires of the id goes unacknowledged or treated unemotionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projection</td>
<td>Prohibitions of the superego are applied as standard for judging others and not oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixation</td>
<td>Prohibitions of the superego are so strong that the person develops fears/phobias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undoneing</td>
<td>Superego is so strong that the person continually makes amends or apologies for what they do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction formation</td>
<td>Both id and superego are so strong that person does the opposite of both, sometimes identifying with aggressors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>Both id and superego are so strong and ego is so weak that person settles for second best or any available substitute (something better than nothing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the defense mechanisms, psychoanalysts have put forward displacement as their number one choice for explaining crime. A few criminologists have explored the others, most notably, reaction formation, but the list remains largely unexhausted because, essentially, the ideas are untestable.

Freud also provided a theory of human development. These ideas revolved around his terms for the three stages of early childhood. The oral stage (age 0–2) is when a person develops their sense of satisfaction or satiation, of figuring out how much is enough (e.g., of food and drink) which has implications for much of an eater, drinker, or smoker a person is in adulthood. The anal stage (age 2–3) is when a person develops their sense of orderliness, of figuring out their preferred levels of cleanliness (e.g., as in toilet training). The genital stage (age 3–4) is when a person develops their sexuality, of figuring out their sexual preferences and whether they are capable of real love or not. Male children go thru what is called an Oedipus Complex (with a comparable Electra Complex in females). Both complexes involve sexual feelings for the parent of the opposite sex (and are called "inverted" complexes in cases of homosexuality), and how these feelings are resolved determines how capable the person is of real love later in life.

The primary technique of psychoanalysts is transference, the process of the patient, through free association and "talk therapy", re-enacting or reliving their early childhood experiences with the therapist. The therapist, in short, becomes a love object, for the patient, but without the therapist going too far or becoming too involved, which is called counter-transference. Without therapy, a person will engage in amateur transference with other people, a process whereby they play out a "script" or re-play the same failed relationships over and over again.

**NEO-FREUDIAN THEORIES**

Freud never really had much to say about crime, other than to say it was most likely motivated by guilt, committed by people with overdeveloped superegos, and characterized by unconscious errors (Freudian slips) which appeared to represent a desire to get caught and be punished (presumably as the superego punishes the id). Some of the inconsistencies in this (Is it Repression, Fixation, or what?) were never reconciled by history, and this is why it's often said that there is no purely Freudian theory of crime (other then the idea the criminals went to get caught). It was up to the followers of Freud who revised his theories (the Neo-Freudians) to shed light on the psychoanalytic explanation of crime.
One of the first and best-known neo-Freudians to do so was August Aichorn, author of Wayward Youth, who took the position that it was not overdeveloped superegos but an underdeveloped superego that primarily caused crime. Specifically, Aichorn argued that a lack of guilt would develop from too many selfish desires for immediate gratification, and that the superego would be overwhelmed most of the time (leaving little time for guilt). He believed that some criminals, raised as children without loving parents or parents at all, developed unregulated ids. Others were overindulged at the oral stage and required different treatments. Aichorn's ideas about encouragement as a way to heal the superego popularized the notion that delinquents needed unconditional love rather than a punitive, institutionalized setting. The ideas of maternal deprivation or love deprivation as a cause of crime are still popular.

Redl & Wineman were another group of neo-Freudians who studied Children Who Hate, and took on the Freudian notion of Oedipus Complex. According to orthodox Freudian theory, criminals should hate their fathers more than their mothers, but Redl & Wineman found that criminals hated both their parents, both father and mother. In fact, they hadn't even reached a genital stage at all. Their egos were therefore undeveloped, and with nothing to mediate between the id and superego, their personalities were nothing but an endless series of raging conflicts, and this is what they called the "delinquent ego."

Healy provided what is perhaps the greatest contribution to Neo-Freudian theory. He clarified that Displacement (compensating, substituting, ditching) was the most common defense mechanism used by delinquents. He discovered this by using the "life history" method at his psychiatric clinic in Chicago where he pioneered the process of a nurse taking vital, a physician examination, a social worker taking a social history, a clinical psychologist testing, and a psychiatrist treating. He estimated that 91% of delinquents were emotionally disturbed, 50% because of a broken home, and the rest because of too much or too little parental discipline.

THE ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY APPROACH

While Freudians and Neo-Freudians alike continued to view criminals as id-dominated individuals, there were those in psychology who never accepted this nor the whole psychodynamic model that frustrations build up from experiences in early childhood. The abnormal psychologists were one such group, preferring to replace terms like neurosis and psychosis with various disorders, anxiety disorders, mood disorders, and conduct disorders. Abnormal psychology is concerned with mental health, defined as the capacities to think rationally, cope effectively, and demonstrate stability and growth. Mental disorders exist on a continuum, like blood pressure or cholesterol levels. The cutoff between health and disease is somewhat arbitrary. Many people who have diagnosed mental illnesses are far better off than undiagnosed persons presumed to be mentally healthy.

The current approach to classification and diagnosis of the mentally ill is multifaceted. Rather than using a single term, such as schizophrenia, to label a person, the American Psychiatric Association prefers to describe a person in terms of clinically important factors, or axes. The first multifaceted system was developed in 1980 as the DSM-III (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders), revised in 1987 as DSM-III-R, and revised again in 1994 as DSM-IV. It's a multifaceted system with five axes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axis</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Any disorder or condition other than personality disorders and mental retardation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Personality disorders, mental retardation, and maladaptive defense mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Medical conditions relevant to the case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Psychosocial and environmental problems, stressful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A typical DSM-IV classification, for a patient reporting unwelcome thoughts, for example, might look like this:

**Axis I Disorders**
- Schizophrenia or other psychoses
- Mood
- Anxiety
- Somatoform
- Factitious
- Dissociative
- Sexual and Gender Identity
- Eating or Sleep
- Impulse control
- Adjustment
- Delirium and Amnestic
- Others not specified

**Axis II Disorders**
- Paranoid
- Schizoid
- Schizotypal
- Antisocial
- Borderline
- Histrionic
- Narcissistic
- Avoidant
- Dependent
- Obsessive-compulsive
- Others not specified
- Mental retardation (IQ)

The Axis I disorder known as schizophrenia has been statistically linked to violence and crime (Modestin & Ammann 1996), particularly when schizophrenia (a condition that leads to perceiving reality differently, to be socially withdrawn, and to react to social stimuli in inappropriate ways) is combined with characteristics of antisocial personality disorder. The Axis II antisocial personality disorder (APD) has received the most criminological attention (a condition in which individuals have no sense of empathy, are highly impulsive, seek immediate gratification, and often harm or take from others in criminal ways). It has been associated with criminal behavior as far back as the Freudians who believed that three childhood behaviors were associated with its: (1) bedwetting; (2) fascination with fire; and (3) cruelty to animals. As such, despite those who say it cannot be detected early, APD may perhaps be the one disorder that can be detected earliest in childhood. The Porteus Maze test, for example, works along the same lines by giving a child a drawing of a maze to solve, measuring antisocial tendencies by how well they stay inside the lines.

The APA does not recommend labeling anyone antisocial until they have reached the age of 18, and to not use any behaviors committed before the age of 15 (chronic conduct disorders before the age of 15 are considered under Axis I). From the standpoint of abnormal psychology, antisocial personality is not so much a matter of recording behaviors as it is a deeply ingrained pattern to life. They always seem to be using other people as gamepieces, and they seldom show anxiety or feel guilty. The clinical features of the disorder include:

- failure to conform to social norms
- deceitfulness, manipulativeness
- Impulsivity, failure to plan ahead
- Irritability, aggressiveness
- Reckless disregard for the safety of self or others
- Consistent irresponsibility
- Lack of remorse after having hurt or mistreated another

PERSONALITY TESTING

Various instruments, inventories, tests, rating scales, and questionnaires exist to measure personality differences. They are shortcuts, and shortcuts only, and not as good a measure as taking a long time to get to know a person. Abnormal psychologists rely on them quite extensively, and the most well-known personality test is the MMPI.

The MMPI (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory) was first developed in 1943. The current version is MMPI-2, published in 1989. The MMPI-2 produces sixteen scales,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypochondriasis (Hi)</th>
<th>Bodily preoccupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depression (D)</td>
<td>Lacking in self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hysteria (Hy)</td>
<td>Psychosomatic symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathic deviate (Pd)</td>
<td>Antisocial tendencies, impulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity-Femininity (MF)</td>
<td>Sex-role conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoia (Pa)</td>
<td>Suspicious, resentful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychasthenia (Pt)</td>
<td>Anxiety, Insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizophrenia (Sc)</td>
<td>Bizarre thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypomania (Ma)</td>
<td>Excessive psychomotor activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Introversion (St)</td>
<td>Shy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L scale</td>
<td>Need to give favorable impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F scale</td>
<td>Pathological lying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K scale</td>
<td>Defensiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fb scale</td>
<td>Inattention to some items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRIN scale</td>
<td>Inconsistent responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIN scale</td>
<td>Acquiescent responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scales that have received the most criminological attention are Psychopathic deviate (Pd), which measures antisocial tendencies, impulsiveness, authority conflicts, and shallow attachments; the F-scale, which has become pretty much a shorthand way of assessing psychopathy; Schizophrenia (Sc), which has been somewhat predictive of things like mass murder; and Hypomania (Ma), which has been used to track hyperkinetic children that become delinquent. In addition, some versions of the MMPI contain an Over-Controlled Hostility (oh) scale, which has been especially useful in predicting uncommonly violent acts.

There are at least a dozen of other personality tests that regularly find their way into criminological research. Some of the more popular ones include the CPI (California Personality Inventory) which fairly regularly predicts criminality with its Low Socialization, Low Responsibility, and Low Self-Control scales; the TAT (Taylor-Abbey Test of Attributional Style); the MMPI-A (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory for Adolescents); the MMPI-2-RF (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 Reduced Form); the MMPI-2-YA (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 for Young Adolescents); and the MMPI-2-KS (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 for Kids).
Johnson Temperament Analysis) which tends to do as good a job as authoritarianism tests in distinguishing dominance and submission; the MPQ (Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire), which measures control, aggression, alienation, and well-being; Eysenck’s Extraversion Scale, which has been quite influential in linking “stimulation hunger” with criminality; and Zuckerman’s Sensation Seeking Scale, which measures “stimulation seeking” as well as impulsivity.

Impulsivity has, in fact, been the trait most consistently associated with the personalities of criminals. This was true even back in 1950 when the Gluecks were listing the personality traits of criminals to more recent writers such as Wilson and Herrnstein. Impulsivity is defined as the need for a high level of activity, a tendency to act without thinking, a tendency to become easily distracted, and a need to seek immediate gratification. The factor of immediate gratification does seem to characterize crime. The rewards from not committing crime are always in the future while the rewards from committing it are always in the present.

CRIMINAL PERSONALITY

It’s not a well-organized theoretical area, but the work of Yochelson & Semenow (1979) and by Walters (1990) does build on the concept of impulsivity. This particular approach, however, doesn’t recognize childhood or socialization problems as other areas of psychology does. Instead, it sees criminals as poor conditioners and people who just “think differently”. Poor conditioning means that delayed punishment amplifies criminality, and thinking differently means that criminals have learned to tell themselves various excuses and justifications that make it all right for them to commit crime. These excuses and justifications are best seen as criminal beliefs or self-talk.

Walters, for example, describes modification (reminding oneself of the unfairness in life), cutoff (some verbal cue like “f___k it” which helps to terminate further thought), entitlement (a belief they deserve something), sentimentality (looking back at all the good things done), superoptimism (believing that nothing bad will happen), Indolence (ignoring details), and discontinuity (ignoring commitments).

PSYCHOPATHY

This term is the subject of considerable debate. Society has gone back and forth in preference for the term sociopath, also. One of the things you’ll see in the literature is the distinction between an antisocial and a psychopath. Basically, the way it goes is that treatment programs for antisocials are less than promising while treatment programs for psychopaths are futile. In other words, psychopaths are the “incorrigibles” of psychological criminology. Not all of them are criminals. Criminals at least have a code of conduct. True psychopaths are beholden to nobody and nothing. They are rarely distinguishable from people in power, and they do a good job of “faking normality”; in fact, some are quite charming and possess high intelligence.

It’s probably the case that they were undersocialized as children, but research into the origins of psychopaths is almost nonexistent. Like antisocials, they don’t have a superego, but they also can’t express genuine desires, urges, or emotions that presumably come from the id. Essentially, they are extremely ego- or reality oriented. They live their lives looking out for number one, always careful to put on what Cleckley called a “mask of sanity”. Psychopathy involves:

- superficial charm and "good" intelligence
- absence of delusions and other signs of irrationality
- absence of nervousness and psychosomatic symptoms
- unreliability (they don’t seem able to keep time)
- untruthfulness and insincerity (pathological lying)
- lack of remorse or shame
- antisocial behavior (whim or caprice)
- poor judgment and failure to learn from experience
- pathological egocentricity and incapacity for love
- general poverty in major affective reactions (no tears)
- lack of self-insight
- unresponsiveness in interpersonal relations
- fantastic behavior (appearing intoxicated at times)
- suicide gestures (but rarely carried out)
- sex life poorly integrated, impersonal, trivial
- failure to follow any life plan

MORAL DEVELOPMENT AND DEVELOPMENTAL THEORIES OF CRIME

"there is no moral precept that does not have something inconvenient about it." (Biderot)

Moral development, sometimes called age or stage, theories are found in a number of fields, in general psychology, in cognitive psychology, in criminology, in sociology, and in adolescent psychology. This lecture briefly summarizes the moral development ideas of Piaget, Erikson, Kohlberg, and Gilligan in the larger context of a discussion about normal and abnormal adolescence. Moral development theories should be distinguished from ordinary developmental theories in criminology, also covered in this lecture. Developmental theories, according to Stiebel (2004) are either "latent trait" theories, which hold that criminal behavior is controlled by some master trait present at birth or soon after which remains stable and unchanging throughout a lifetime; or "life course" theories, which view criminality as a dynamic process, influenced by individual characteristics as well as social experiences. Moral development theories tend to be embraced by those with an interest in ethics; latent trait theories by those with an interest in the root psychological causes of crime; and life course theories tend to attract researchers interested in asking why and when do offenders stop offending (i.e., the study of desistance).

It should be noted that despite the threads of some fairly good ideas in criminology, moral development theories are most often regarded as "eclectic" theories in the field. Eclectic means "everything causes delinquency or crime." They're subject to what is also called the "evil causes evil fallacy." Blaming delinquency on being an adolescent is the same as saying "moods" or "states of mind" cause crime, and, of course, there are many things to blame delinquency on. Theoretical efforts are likewise diverse, shooting out in multiple directions. Neo-cognitive theory (Kelley 1994), for example, draws heavily upon the quite mysterious process of alienation that typically occurs in adolescence, and then, to take another example, there are important down-to-earth biological processes to note, such as the concept of "pubertal development" advanced by Felson & Haynie (2002), who incidently found that puberty (and an associated property crime to violent crime to drug crime pattern) was as reliable a predictor of delinquency as school performance and peer association. There is tremendous variability to be explained from this approach, and it is quite likely that this theoretical project will remain unfinished for some time in criminology.

ADOLESCENCE AS A STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT

It's been called the "transition" stage with no accomplishment nor completion. Its existence has been called an "historical accident." Experts can't even agree on when it begins (most simply use the age of puberty) and when it ends (some say an "extended" adolescence is possible up to age 25 or 30; other say there's an "early" 12-14 stage, a "middle" 15-17 stage, and a "late" 18-19 stage). There's more mythology than science when it comes to notions of "typical" or "normal" adolescence, and explaining the breakdown that occurs.

Daedalus, an inventor, and his son, Icarus (so the ancient Greek myth goes) were both imprisoned in a tower on the island of Crete. To escape, Daedalus built a set of wings out of feathers and wax, but only his son, Icarus was small enough to fit thru the tower window. Daedalus warned Icarus not to fly too high because Apollo, God of the Sun, would become jealous of someone entering his domain and melt the wax. But Icarus, exhilarated by being
able to soar above the Earth, flies too high, and his wings melt, plunging him into the Hellsport. Ever since, 'adolescents' have been seen as (a) disobedient toward parents; (b) wanting to "fly" too high; and, in some interpretations, (c) condemned to hell.

Hippocrates, the father of medicine, recommended two kinds of treatments for unruly children. For females, they should be made pregnant. For males, they should be flogged. Philo, a friend of Socrates, advocated infanticide if beatings didn't work. History actually records a long record of using sex, corporal punishment, and infanticide against unruly children. The common law doctrine of In loco parentis has deep roots in almost all civilizations.

Historically, adolescence can be considered a by-product of the Industrial Revolution. Prior to child labor laws, there had been no need to define any special period of life for those too young to work but too old to not be given at least some adult responsibilities. Over the years, the age at which society permits children to assume adult roles has gradually been raised. This "stretch" of time, then, has come to be associated with the "stress" of adolescence.

By the late 19th Century, numerous experts were popularizing the idea of adolescence being a "critical" stage of life. Baden-Powell (founder of the Boy Scouts) pioneered the technique of "not too much" but "not too little" discipline as a cure for the problems of adolescence. Dr. Spock, later in the 1950s, would advocate complete and total leniency. Counterculture experts such as Keniston and Roscal in the 1960s also advocated toleration as well as popularized the idea of being "stuck in adolescence." Freudian and Neo-Freudian ideas abounded, but it was Stanley Hall's ideas about the Six Themes of Adolescence that became the most popular hallmarks of "normal," as follows:

THE SIX THEMES OF ADOLESCENCE

1. Self-definition -- a concern for finding one's "real" self, a concern for habit formation, and little unstructured time to deal with these concerns, hence, a constant state of urgency.

2. Estrangement and Omnipotence -- estrangement takes the form of feeling like a marginal member of society, with unrealistic mobility aspirations and intense job anxieties. Omnipotence is the feeling of absolute freedom, a revealing in all the pure possibilities that the future may hold. For many, the "car" becomes a symbol for this.

3. Refusal of Socialization -- a critical if not rebellious stance at continued efforts to instruct, educate, or train for society's purposes. There's a feeling of always being under observation by a critical audience of all adult socializing agents.

4. Celebration of Youth Culture -- a rebellious sense of solidarity based on the perceived sharing of fads, fashions, and styles by others in the same age group or generation; intense age-consciousness.

5. Stasis as Death -- stasis means "standing still" or being in a rut, and this is avoided and despised at all costs. There's an irrational devotion to change, to putting oneself through changes merely for the sake of change. It takes two forms: a need to move (geographic restlessness); and a need to be moved (experimentation with states of consciousness).

6. Physical Obsession -- there's an obsessiveness or inadmissible sense of shame over uncontrollable physical changes, like sex fantasies, body weight and contours, dietary habits, the outgrowing of clothing, outbreaks of acne, etc.

INDICATORS OF NORMAL AND ABNORMAL ADOLESCENCE

Indicators of being on a "normal" course of moral development:
1. Obsessive concern for bodily appearance
2. Fear of abandonment expressed as assertion of independence
3. Desire to be different in terms of "fads"
4. Sexual desire and manipulativeness
5. Wanting to be like other races or cultures
6. Persistent wisecracking as long as it's witty
7. Obsessive desire for success and recognition
8. Lack of self-identity or distinct self-concept
9. Emotional extremes expressed as sensitivity to criticism

Indicators of being on an "abnormal" course of moral development:
1. Driven by whim or caprice rather than purpose or gain
2. Unmoved by overtures of help & harms helpers
3. Shows no loyalty to other adolescents
4. Words are inconsistent with feelings, language is strange, humor missing
5. Claims to have always been the first to do something
6. Pathological lying for no good reason
7. Superficially charming but unable to maintain intimate relations

Indicators of being an "at-risk" youth (Middle Schools):
1. Frequent absenteeism, tardiness, or suspension
2. Academic performance below grade level or repeating a grade
3. Oppositional stance towards authority
4. Drug/alcohol involvement
5. Police/probation involvement
6. Being a "latch-key" child
7. Coming from a single parent family or foster home

Indicators of "delinquent pathways" (Justice Dept.):
1. Authority Conflict Pathways: Early signs of stubbornness, outright defiance by age 11, running away, avoiding authorities, truancy, staying out late
2. Covert Pathways: Early signs of minor mischievousness, frequent lying, shoplifting by age 10, property damage, firestarting, vandalism
3. Overt Pathways: Early acts of aggression or bullying, annoying everyone around them by age 12, having no friends and numerous enemies, interested only in escalating problems

NOTES ON PIAGET'S MORAL DEVELOPMENT THEORY

1. Sensorimotor Stage 0-2
2. PreOperational Stage 2-7
3. Concrete Stage 7-14
4. Formal Stage 14-adult

In short, delinquents are seen as "stuck" in the Concrete stage, only seeing things as black or white, right or wrong. In short, they have a dualistic morality. They're only concerned with classifying things, and no other reasoning about them.

NOTES ON ERIKSON'S MORAL DEVELOPMENT THEORY

1. Trust/Mistrust Stage 0-1
2. Autonomy/Doubt Stage 2-3
3. Initiative/Guilt Stage 3-6
4. Industry/Inferiority Stage 7-12
5. Identity/Identity Diffusion Stage 12-18
6. Intimacy/Isolation Stage "twenty-something"
7. Generativity/Stagnation Stage 20s-50s
8. Integrity/Despair Stage 60s--

In short, delinquents are seen as "stuck" in the Identity Stage, in a semi-permanent state of Identity crisis. Male delinquents experience Identity without Intimacy, and female delinquents experience Intimacy without Identity. Self-worth and fidelity are virtues that have not yet developed.

NOTES ON KOHLBERG'S MORAL DEVELOPMENT THEORY

1. Punishment Concern stage - obedience to power and avoiding punishment
2. Individualistic Concern stage - meeting one's own needs, me first
3. Interpersonal Concern stage - having good motives, some concern for others
4. Conscience Concern stage - serving welfare of the group or society
5. Social Contract Concern stage - agreed-upon Individual rights in society
6. Universal Ethics Concern stage - principles of Justice for all humankind

In short, delinquents are seen as "stuck" in a state of moral immaturity. It doesn't depend on age, and any of the first three stages may be where they're stuck. Most hardcore delinquents would be at the Punishment stage, where they only believe something is right or wrong because it hurts if you do what society thinks is wrong. Others are in the Individualistic stage, where they decide what is right or wrong by reference to an egotistic sense of whether they can be blamed or not for doing wrong. A few may be in the Interpersonal stage, where they determine right or wrong by a sense of group honor. Kohlberg actually did some research with adult criminals, finding that they are more likely to be in stages 1 and 2 (detained from crime by fear of sanctions).

NOTES ON GILLIGAN'S MORAL DEVELOPMENT THEORY

The differences between males and females are seen as the difference between an ethics of justice and an ethics of caring. Boys game (for winners and losers) while girls play (for enjoyment of the game). The theory is a feminist critique of justice, as traditional justice conceptions are seen as not allowing room for an ethics of caring. Similar ideas can be found in what is called restorative justice or peacemaking criminology. Although these viewpoints in criminology have separate traditions, there is enough of a connection to mention them here. For a discussion of the similarities and differences between Kohlberg's ideas and Gilligan's ideas along with other minority perspectives, see Lecture on Minority Perspectives in Justice Ethics.

DEVELOPMENTAL THEORIES

The "latent trait" view holds that there is some personal attribute or characteristic present in all people which controls their inclination or propensity to commit crime. The most sophisticated model of this idea can be found in Rowe, Osgood & Nicewander (1990), but there have been a number of efforts since then to identify which trait is the "master" trait. Suspected traits include defective intelligence, impulsive personality, genetic abnormalities, physical-chemical functioning of the brain, and/or environmental influences on brain function. Wilson & Herrnstein (1985), for example, attempted to develop a human nature theory of crime which argued that personal traits outweigh the importance of social variables. In a later work, similar authors (Gottfredson & Hirschi 1990) argued that "low self-control" was the "master" trait, the root cause of which was inadequate child-rearing. Gottfredson & Hirschi's ideas in this regard are often treated as a control theory of crime (see Lecture on Control Theories).
A fairly new “latent trait” approach has been that of Mark Covin (Covin 2000; Unever et al. 2004) who argues that chronic criminals emerge from a developmental process characterized by recurring, erratic episodes of coercion. There are two types of coercion: interpersonal (which is direct, involving the use or threat of force from parents, peers, and significant others); and impersonal (which involves pressures beyond individual control). Covin’s differential coercion theory integrates several existing criminological perspectives, but in brief, attempts to locate the root cause of chronic offending in the fact that such offenders grew up in homes where parents used erratic control and applied it in an erratic and inconsistent fashion.

Also fairly new is Tittle’s control balance theory (Tittle 1995), which expands on the notion of personal control as a predisposing element of criminality. Control, as a concept, can refer to either the amount of control one is subject to by others, or it can refer to the amount of control one can exercise over others. Those who have an excess of the first kind of control tend to engage in exploitation, plunder, and decadence. Those who have a deficit of the second kind of control tend to engage in predation, defiance, and submission. All six behaviors are ways to restore a balance.

The “life course” view can probably be traced back at least to the Gluecks (Glueck & Glueck 1950), but most modern criminologists trace it to Sampson & Laub’s (1993) book, Crime In the Making. Two concepts are important from this point of view. One is the concept of “trajectory” which is the pathway of development over the life course marked by a sequence of transactions. Every trajectory has an entry point, success point, and the element of timing. Normal development is characterized by avoiding any event that may be called an “off-age” event. Two is the concept of “transition” which refers to the life events themselves which are embedded in the trajectories. Transitions can consist of tipping points or turning points, but generally refer to radical turnover points in life. Most life course theorists presume that the seeds of a criminal career are planted early in life, point to “age of onset” as being the best predictor of later, more serious criminality, and research things like getting married or joining the military as turning points. However, people may begin their trajectory into crime at different times in their life. For example, the forensic psychologist (see Lecture on Criminal Psychology) Terrie Moffitt argues that there are two (2) main trajectories, as explained below.

THE MOFFIT DEVELOPMENTAL THEORY OF CRIME

University of Wisconsin psychology professor Terrie Moffitt’s developmental theory (Moffitt 1993) begins with empirical research indicating that signs of persistent antisocial behavior can be detected early in life, as early as the preschool years, and extends to the idea that adolescent deviant behavior is greatly influenced by the behavior of peer groups even after parental variables are taken into account. The theory states that two groups of antisocial youth can be distinguished based on their ages of onset and trajectories of conduct problems. These two groups differ enough to require separate causal explanations. It might be helpful to illustrate some of the distinctions between these two groups in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Dual Trajectories In the Origins of Conduct Disorder (CD)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Early Starters&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Late Starters&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-course-persistent (LCP) offenders</td>
<td>Adolescent limited (AL) offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSM-IV conduct disorder; childhood-onset type</td>
<td>DSM-IV conduct disorder; adolescent-onset type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor aggression (bullying, fighting), lying, hurting animals, biting and hitting by age 4</td>
<td>Serious aggression (mugging, forced sex, use of weapon), stealing, running away, truancy, breaking &amp; entering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurological problems attention deficit or hyperactivity</td>
<td>Little to no problems with peer rejection; have learned how to get along with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10% of the male juvenile offender population (2% females)</td>
<td>Majority of juvenile offender population; cesses or stops offending around age 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the teenage years, the two types are indistinguishable, and no existing paper-and-pencil test for antisocial tendencies or psychopathy will be able to discriminate the two types. That's because many of the "late starters" will "begin" with rather serious delinquency, and many of the "early starters" will be just "escalating" into serious delinquent behavior at about the same time. Because many of the "late starters" may only be engaging in symbolic adolescent rebellion (perhaps because something is forbidden), have usually maintained empathy and avoided peer rejection, and are smart enough to see the rewards in more socially approved behavior, they usually "dropout" or desert from any pathway toward crime. Not so with the "early starters" (the most frequently studied group) who may only be precipitously escalating into serious offenses as a way of expanding the versatility of their antisocial ways across all kinds of conditions and situations. In fact, a trajectory toward versatility might be apparent with early starters at a very young age. The research clearly indicates that increasingly higher levels of early conduct problems are associated with increasingly higher levels of late conduct problems.

Although the number of early starters in the population of interest may only amount to 5-10% of the total, such children and adolescents usually account for more than 50% of referrals to authorities and mental health services. Their behavior is disruptive not only to authorities, but to their peers, and for this reason, they experience significant amounts of peer rejection. Not only does this limit their chances for "getting ahead" on the basis of normal, lasting relationships, but their poor interpersonal or social skills are combined with three other prominent features, as follows, and discussed in separate paragraphs below:

- hyperactive-impulsive-attention problems
- conduct problems
- below-average intelligence or low-IQ

The first feature -- attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) -- refers to a complex set of behaviors characterized by three central features: (1) excessive motor activity (cannot sit still, fidgets, runs about, is takative and noisy); (2) impulsivity (acts before thinking, shifts quickly from one activity to another, interrupts others, does not consider consequences of behavior); and (3) inattention (does not seem to listen, is easily distracted, loses things necessary for essential tasks). ADHD should not be confused with ODD (oppositional defiant disorder) which has the following cluster of symptoms: (1) arguing with adults; (2) refusing adults' requests; (3) deliberately trying to annoy others; (4) blaming others for mistakes; and (5) being spiteful or vindictive (Kossen et al., 2002). ADHS affects as many as 20% of American school-age children, boys more than girls (by a ratio of 9:1), and blacks more than other ethnic groups, for debatable reasons ranging from speculations about genetic predisposition to the possibility of exposure to hazardous toxins in black communities. Many people afflicted with ADHD never "outgrow" it, and theories about the continuity of learning disabilities into adulthood are also controversial. The most common treatment is methylphenidate, also known as Ritalin, but it has mixed effects, and a successful treatment regimen for ADHD has yet to be found.

Conduct problems refer to the variety of symptoms found in the diagnostic category of Conduct Disorder (CD), and among delinquent youth, these are usually "co-occurring psychopathologies" that exist between one or more of these symptoms and ADHD symptoms. In fact, Bertol & Bertol (2004) report on research indicating that as many as 50% of disruptive children exhibit having the symptoms of CD half the time and the symptoms of ADHD the other half of the time. According to the APA, the central feature of CD is a repetitive and persistent pattern of behavior that violates the rights of others, and early-onset CD generally begins before age 10. Symptoms of CD include stealing, fire setting, running away, truancy, destroying property, fighting, telling lies on a frequent basis, and being cruel to animals and people. It is the consensus of scholars that conduct disorder (CD) is roughly the juvenile equivalent of adult antisocial personality disorder. Conduct disorder typically gets worse as the child gets older, and it is often misdiagnosed as a learning disability (because there are frequent problems with school assignments) whereas someone with a "true" learning disability may not be conduct-disordered. CD affects about 16% of the male population and about 9% of the female population.
Below-average intelligence or low IQ refers to a lower cognitive ability and slow language development that, at times, is called by other names, such as 'neuropsychological dysfunction' or impairment of "executive functioning." Low IQ is strongly associated with an early age of onset for Conduct Disorder (CD) and has a relationship to delinquency which holds even when socioeconomic status (SES) is controlled for. An 8 to 10 point difference is usually found on any standard intelligence test comparing delinquents with nondelinquents (see Lecture on Mental Deficiency and Crime). There are some interesting findings regarding ethnic differences in how low-IQ is related to delinquency, as low-IQ whites tend to follow a 'susceptibility' pathway to the typical personality disorders, and low-IQ minorities (blacks, Latinos, and Asians) tend to follow a "school failure" (being held back) pathway to lower "emotional intelligence" which results in decreased empathy and violent misreading of emotional cues from others.

PSYCHOLOGY AND CRIMINOLOGY:
A CHECKLIST OF PSYCHOPATHY INDICATORS

Note: this is NOT Robert Hare's Psychopathy Checklist (See this other page if you want to see Hare's PCL-R items.)

"I prefer rogues to imbeciles, because they sometimes take a rest." (Alexandre Dumas)

One of the more fascinating contributions of psychology to criminology is the concept of psychopathy, also called sociopathy (the term preferred by sociologists), criminal personality (a term popularized by Yochelson and Semenow), and APD, or Antisocial Personality Disorder (the clinical DSM-IV disorder). Actually, the APD diagnosis (which predicts symptoms quite reliably) is much more common than the psychopathy diagnosis (which collects causes with more validity). Not all APDs are psychopaths; but all psychopaths are usually APDs. Persistant APDs usually wind up in prison, but psychopaths are more than persistent. APDs -- psychopaths are believed to be remorseless predators who use any means necessary to achieve their ends and to avoid detection.

Early-to-mid 20th Century criminology was heavily influenced by the psychological determinist position that all criminals were psychopaths. Much of this thinking is now outdated, but the field of Orthopsychiatry remains which, since the depression era, has held that all criminal behavior is an expression of mental illness. Karl Menninger (1965) is also a key figure in this regard. On any given day, about 70,000 inmates in the United States are psychotic, and a great number more (at least a quarter million) suffer from mental disorders such as schizophrenia, bipolar disorder and major depression. Prisons hold three times more people with mental illness than do psychiatric hospitals; and, U.S. prisoners have rates of mental illness that are up to four times greater than rates for the general population (Human Rights Watch figures, 2003).

The following checklist summarizes all if not most of the psychological or psychiatric defects or deformities that psychologists and criminologists thought, at one time, were indicative of psychopathy. These indicators were often the basis for insanity pleas, mitigating circumstances, or just understanding criminals in the early 20th century. Today, much of it is used by the law as aggravating circumstances. Please note that this list contains many items which are presently regarded as myths or falsehoods about criminals.

- Freidian slips of the tongue (indicative of mental conflict)
- Guilt feelings (covered up, but wants to be punished for something)
- Uses defense mechanism of projection (blaming others for own faults)
- Uses defense mechanism of displacement (ditching, self-handicapping, settling for 2nd best, being own worst enemy, but feels entitled to something or being 1st)
- Oral fixation (smokes or always has to have something in mouth)
- Oedipus complex (or other love/hate relationship with parents)
- Comes from dysfunctional family or broken home (absent or abusive father)
- Impervious to fear, anxiety, depression, or remorse (unremorseful) Superficially charming, a real cool cat (manipulative and conning)
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☑️ Inability to love or express emotions deeply, can't respond to kindness (cold)
☑️ Pathological lying (for no reason at all, can't help self)
☑️ No self-insight (doesn't reflect much upon own personality makeup)
☑️ No self-humor (can't stand to be the butt of jokes or can't laugh at self)
☑️ A fairly high IQ (good grades in school or disparity in achievement) Uses neologisms (makes up strange new words, abbreviations, or sayings)
☑️ Fascination with fire (or death, or purified ways to destroy something)
☑️ Cruelty to animals (or doesn't like animals)
☑️ Lack of probity, courtesy, or doesn't tolerate society's "niceties" or obligations
☑️ Moody, obsessive-compulsive, suffers from one or more phobias
☑️ Does not tend to learn from mistakes unless immediate punishment given
☑️ Lack of formal-operational thinking (tends to think in concrete, black-or-white terms)
☑️ Identity conflict (often with delayed adolescence, hasn't grown up in certain ways)
☑️ Preconventional morality (thinks things are wrong only because it might lead to punishment or it's not in his/her best interests right now, failure to understand disparities between own behavior and socially acceptable behavior, often in trouble with law)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A FOCUS ON SELF-HANDICAPPING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| One of the more interesting "myths" about psychopathic criminals is the notion that they have fairly high intelligence, yet make stupid mistakes. This notion pervades much of the psychological literature (e.g., Sternberg 2002) and popular culture (see Dumb Criminal Acts). This notion is sometimes used when a political leader, like a President or world-renowned scientist, jeopardizes their career, good name, and credibility by engaging in some sort of really stupid behavior - like having sex with an intern or underage child, for example. Hence, the "mythology" persists that psychopaths usually rise to power in politics or business with their mental illness undetected until they make some stupid mistake.

The name for this phenomenon -- when people slack off from using their best common sense -- is called SELF-HANDICAPPING, and the origins of this concept have been traced by Bergles (1990). Whether or not it's an attribute of psychopathy is controversial, but mainstream criminology embraces some related ideas in such concepts as displacement (strain theory), least effort (learning theory), and Impulsiveness (control theory).

Basiclly, self-handicapping is the belief that you're so truly smart, that you don't need to exert any effort to prove it. Such a person cares deeply about looking smart, but in order to avoid the appearance of being dumb, they decide to slack off and not try at all. Hence, if anyone judges their performance afterwards, they can always say "I wasn't even trying" and if they do manage to succeed at something without really trying, they can say "Look how good I did without really trying." Many college students do it all the time - give themselves a handicap - by getting drunk the night before a big test, or seeing how good they'll do in a course without buying the textbook, to name a couple examples of self-handicapping. In achievement-oriented contexts like school, business, or politics -- any context that emphasizes intelligence -- there is a tendency for people to be vulnerable to underachievement in this way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANTISOCIAL PERSONALITY, SOCIOPATHY, AND PSYCHOPATHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;When I'm good, I'm very good. When I'm bad, I'm better.&quot; (Mae West)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People who cannot contain their urges to harm (or kill) people repeatedly for no apparent reason are assumed to suffer from some mental illness. However, they may be more cruel then crazy, they may be choosing not to control their urges, they know right from wrong, they know exactly what they're doing, and they are definitely NOT insane, at least according to the consensus of most scholars (Semenov 2004). In such cases, they usually fall into one of three types that are typically considered aggravating circumstances in addition to their legal guilt - antisocial personality disorder (APD), sociopath, or psychopath - none of which are the same as insanity or
psychosis. APD is the most common type, afflicting about 4% of the general population. Sociopaths are the second most common type, with the American Psychiatric Association estimating that 3% of all males in our society are sociopaths. Psychopaths are rare, found in perhaps 1% of the population.

Antisocial Personality Disorder (APD) is practically synonymous with criminal behavior. It's so synonymous, in fact, that practically all convicted criminals (65-75%) have it, with criminologists often referring to it as a 'wastebasket' category. Antisocials come in all shapes and sizes, but psychologists consider the juvenile version of it to be a juvenile conduct disorder. The main characteristic of it is a complete and utter disregard for the rights of others and the rules of society. They seldom show anxiety and don't feel guilt. There's really no effective treatment for them other than locking them up in a secure facility with such rigid rules that they cannot think their way out. A full list of APD traits would include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of Antisocial Personality Disorder Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of entitlement; Unremorseful; Apathetic to others; Unconscionable behavior; Blameful of others; Manipulative and conniving; Affectionately cold; Disparate understanding; Socially irresponsible; Disregardful of obligations; Nonconforming to norms; Irresponsible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

whereas the DSM-IV "clinical" features of Antisocial Personality Disorder (with a person having at least three of these characteristics) are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Symptoms for an Antisocial Personality Disorder Diagnosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Failure to conform to social norms; 2. Deceitfulness, manipulativeness; 3. Impulsivity, failure to plan ahead; 4. Irritability, aggressiveness; 5. Reckless disregard for the safety of self or others; 6. Consistent irresponsibility; 7. Lack of remorse after having hurt, mistreated, or stolen from another person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sociopathy is chiefly characterized by something wrong with the person's conscience, they either don't have one, it's full of holes like Swiss cheese, or they are somehow able to completely neutralize or negate any sense of conscience or future time perspective. Sociopaths only care about fulfilling their own needs and desires - selfishness and egocentricity to the extreme. Everything and everybody else is mentally twisted around in their minds as objects to be used in fulfilling their own needs and desires, they often believe they are doing something good for society, or at least nothing that bad. The term 'sociopath' is frequently used by psychologists and sociologists alike in referring to persons whose unsocialized character is due primarily to parental failures (usually fatherlessness) rather than an inherent feature of temperament. Lykken (1995), for example, clearly distinguishes between the sociopath (who is socialized into becoming a psychopath) and a "true" psychopath (who is born that way). However, this may only describe the 'common sociopath', as there are at least four (4) different subtypes - - common, alienated, aggressive, and dyssocial. Commons are characterized mostly by their lack of conscience; the alienated by their inability to love or be loved; aggressives by a consistent sadistic streak; and dyssocials by an ability to abide by gang rules, as long as those rules are the wrong rules. Some common Sociopathic traits includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of Common Sociopathic Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egocentricity; Callousness; Impulsivity; Conscience defect; Exaggerated sexuality; Excessive boasting; Risk taking; Inability to resist temptation; Antagonistic, deprecating attitude toward the opposite sex; Lack of interest in bonding with a mate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Psychopathy is a concept subject to much debate, but is usually defined as a constellation of effective, interpersonal, and behavioral characteristics including egocentricity; impulsivity; irresponsibility; shallow emotions; lack of empathy, guilt, or remorse; pathological lying; manipulativeness; and the persistent violation of social norms and expectations (Cloninger 1977; Hare 1993). The crimes of psychopaths are usually stone-cold, remorseless killings for no apparent reason. They cold-bloodedly take whatever they want and do as they please without the slightest sense of guilt or regret. In many ways, they are natural-born intraspecies predators who satisfy their lust for power and control by charm, manipulation, intimidation, and violence. While almost all societies would regard them as criminals (the exception being frontier or warlike societies where they might become heroes, patriots, or leaders), it’s important to distinguish their behavior from criminal behavior. As a common axiom goes in psychology, MOST PSYCHOPATHS ARE ANTISOCIAL PERSONALITIES BUT NOT ALL ANTISOCIAL PERSONALITIES ARE PSYCHOPATHS. This is because APD is defined mainly by behaviors (Factor 2 antisocial behaviors) and doesn’t tap the effective/interpersonal dimensions (Factor 1 core psychopathic features, narcissism) of psychopathy. Further, criminals and APDs tend to “age out” of crime; psychopaths do not, and are at high risk of recidivism. Psychopaths love to intellectualize in treatment with their half-baked understanding of rules. Like the Star Trek character, Spock, their reasoning cannot handle any mix of cognition and emotion. They are calculating predators who, when trapped, will attempt escape, create a nuisance and danger to staff, be a disruptive influence on other patients or inmates, and fake symptoms to get transferred, bouncing back and forth between institutions. The common features of psychopathic traits (the PCL-R items) are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of Common Psychopathic Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and superficial charm; Grandiose sense of self-worth; Need for stimulation; Pathological lying; Conning and manipulativeness; Lack of remorse or guilt; Shallow affect; Callousness and lack of empathy; Parasitic lifestyle; Poor behavioral controls; Promiscuous sexual behavior; Early behavior problems; Lack of realistic, long-term goals; Impulsivity; Irresponsibility; Failure to accept responsibility for own actions; Many short-term marital relationships; Juvenile delinquency; Revocation of conditional release; Criminal versatility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these most well-known types, there have been criminologists who have put forward additional constructs. They are only mentioned here because of their relevance to serial criminals, and the interesting similarity in the way they compare to the FBI’s “disorganized – organized” typology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPISODIC AGGRESSION AND SOCIOPATHY COMPARED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disorganized Episodic Aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritualistic behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts to conceal mental instability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic search for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe memory disorders and an inability to tell the truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal tendencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of committing assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypersexuality and abnormal sexual behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head injuries; Injuries suffered at birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of chronic drug or alcohol abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents with history of chronic drug or alcohol abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of childhood physical or mental abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of an unwanted pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product of a difficult gestation for mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappiness in childhood resulted in inability to find happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary cruelty to animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to arson without homicidal interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptoms of neurological impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of genetic disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemical symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of powerlessness and inadequacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The patterns of episodic aggressive behavior scale is derived from Joel Norris (1990) Serial Killers, London: Arrow Books and also reproduced in Brian Lane & Wilfred Gregg (1992) The Encyclopedia of Serial Killers, NY: Berkeley Books. This particular sociopathic checklist is found in numerous places but extensively featured in both of Samenow’s works in the 1970s on criminal personality (thinking errors).

**DETAILED ANALYSIS OF ANTISOCIAL PERSONALITY DISORDER**

The diagnosis of APD has long been controversial, the criteria for it seem to change with each and every new edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-I 1952; DSM-II 1976; DSM-III 1980; DSM-III-R 1987; DSM-IV 1994). The diagnosis was substantially changed with DSM-III when the APA decided to distinguish between child and adult characteristics, and essentially substituted behavioral criteria (like truancy or law violations) for personality criteria (like callousness and selfishness). In the DSM-III-R (R for Revised), the focus was on violence and a list of violent acts (fighting, cruelty to others, cruelty to animals). The current DSM-IV approach essentially says that anything which is not sociopathy, psychopathy or dyssocial personality disorder is antisocial personality disorder, but there is considerable overlap, the diagnostic possibilities are endless; there are at least 3 million possible variations of symptoms on at least 62 different measurable items.

Ongoing research is quite prolific into the factor or principal components analysis of APD characteristics. Most forensic experts believe there are 3-4 factors (groupings of symptoms). One factor involves symptoms that cluster around what might be called a Lack of Planning (promiscuous, irresponsible, impulsive traits and behavior). Another factor clusters around the notion of Disregard for Others. A third factor is clearly related to Adult Criminality. A fourth factor is clearly related to Juvenile Delinquency. Impulsivity appears to be a prototypical (core) feature, but it can take many forms. Definitions of impulsivity are numerous -- a tendency to act without reflection; dysfunctional information processing; a tendency for risk taking; sensation seeking; and an inability to sustain attention. Rating scales are easily available to measure these.

The incidence of APD is twice as high for inner-city residents than in small towns or rural areas, and five times higher in males than in females. It affects people in all social classes, but if someone with APD is born into a family of wealth and privilege, they will usually manage to eke out a successful business or political career. Poorer people with APD tend to wind up in state prison systems. Since African-Americans are seven times more likely to be represented in state prison systems, it’s tempting to speculate the incidence of APD among African-Americans is high. However, there are most likely other causes of crime among African-Americans (like unemployment and racism). The fact is that most of the current prison population, white or black, shares the APD diagnosis. All it
takes is a juvenile record, an adult offense career, aggressivity, impulsivity, a checkered work history, and/or lack of demonstrable repentance. These can be easily found in almost any prison inmate's dossier.

One of the things closely related to APD is the comorbidity of alcoholism and narcotic addiction. Some of the criteria for a substance abuse disorder are very similar to theft, hazardous behavior, failure to fulfill role functions in home, school, and work. A strong correlation exists between substance abuse and factor 2 (antisocial behaviors) of the psychopathy construct. APDs with a drug addiction have some serious substance abuse problems -- the kind that lead to death by overdose or accident within five years. Are APD and narcotic addiction part of the same disorder, does one lead to the other, or are they spuriously linked together? From what little research there is, it appears that most of the time, APD precedes narcotic addiction, although some of the time, addiction leads to APD behaviors. People with such comorbid characteristics also usually have undiagnosed other Axis I and Axis II disorders.

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE SOCIOPATH

From the wild Irish slums of the 19th Century Eastern seaboard to the riot-torn anemic neighborhoods of Los Angeles, our society has always produced sociopaths who are quite often the products of illegitimacy, broken homes, and a lack of any bonding with male or societal authority. Some 70% of sociopaths come from fatherless homes. Father absence produces many consequences similar to the symptoms of sociopathy -- early, precocious sexuality; antagonistic, deprecating attitude toward the opposite sex; lack of interest in bonding with a durable, stable mate; aggressive acting-out; excessive boasting; and risk-taking behavior. Some 30% of children today are born out-of-wedlock, and another 30% live in divorced homes. These conditions -- a problem of unsocialization -- produce sociopath. Furthermore, sociopaths tend to reproduce themselves, that is, they produce more then own their share of illegitimate offspring themselves.

So what is a sociopath? You won't find criteria in the DSM IV or official psychiatric nomenclature, but the construct refers to the largest subgroup of APDs. Most are males, but an increasing number are female. They have otherwise normal temperaments (as opposed to psychopaths who have abnormal temperaments). Some are aggressive, fearless sensation seekers, and others are Machiavellian manipulators. A Machiavellian is a personality type who is a cross between an antisocial personality and a narcissist, and someone who also has an extremely high sense of entitlement. The one thing that all sociopaths have in common is that they are "too much" to handle for their parents or anyone else. It's common to refer to them as unsocialized, but the dysocial sociopath does socialize to the mores and values of a dysocial outgroup, like a gang. Let's explore the four (4) subtypes of sociopaths:

COMMON SOCIOPATHS are the largest subtype and have a weak or unelaborated conscience. They are not ashamed by the same things as you or I would be ashamed of. They are like feral children grown up, taking pleasures and gratifying impulses at every opportunity or temptation. They especially enjoy and take pride in bending or breaking the rules. As teenagers, they are often runaways. As adults, they are often geographically mobile, living in shelters, or taking advantage of welfare systems. They are experienced shoplifters. They have quite active sex lives. They are usually of average intelligence, but don't do well in school and never seem to break out of low-paying dead-end jobs. Nevertheless, they seem genuinely happy with their lives, unburdened by any sense of negative self-worth or the fact that they have not been a functional, contributing member of society.

ALIENATED SOCIOPATHS have never developed the ability to love, empathize, or affiliate in real life with another person. They will show more emotion toward their pet or a personal artifact than toward a person. Or, they may hate animals and live out their emotional life by watching TV (identification with soap opera characters is a common pattern). Dating and marriage relationships will be very barren and empty. They won't get along with the neighbors. They live in a shell. They have a cold, callous attitude toward human suffering or any social problem in the society they live in. They just don't care because it's outside their range of empathy. Most will believe they are justified in this because they feel they were cheated in some way themselves by society, and a few will be more
than happy to rant and rave about it to anyone who listens. They are chronic complainers, and underneath it all, they would like to see nothing better than all of society destroyed.

AGGRESSIVE SOCIOPATHS derive strong, yet nonpervasive gratification from harming others. They like to hurt, frighten, tyrannize, bully, and manipulate. They do it for a sense of power and control, and will often only drop subtle hints about what they are up to. They polish their aggressive, domineering manner in such a way to disguise any intimidation others might feel. They seek out positions of power, such as parent, teacher, bureaucrat, supervisor, or police officer. Their style is one of passive aggression as they systematically go about sabotaging the ideas of others to get their ideas in place. In their spare time, they like to hunt or occasionally do sadistic things like find stray dogs and cut them up. They are usually effective at getting their way, and are especially vindictive if resisted or crossed. They don't follow the social norm of reciprocity like others do.

DYSSOCIAL SOCIOPATHS identify and hold an allegiance with a dyssocial, outcast, or predatory subculture. Any subculture will do, as long as it runs counter to established authority. They are capable of intense loyalty, and even a feeling of guilt and shame, within such limited circles. They seem to continually fall upon bad luck and bad companions, however. While they will constantly complain that none of this is their fault, behind it all is a kind of self-defeating mechanism in the poor choices they made themselves.

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE PSYCHOPATH

Psychopaths cannot be understood in terms of antisocial rearing or development. They are simply morally deprived individuals who represent the 'monsters' in our society. They are unstoppable and untreatable predators whose violence is planned, purposeful and emotionless. The violence continues until it reaches a plateau at age 50 or so, then tapers off. Their emotionlessness reflects a detached, fearless, and possibly dissociated state, revealing a lower autonomic nervous system and lack of anxiety. It's difficult to say what motivates them - control and dominance possibly - since their life history will usually show no bonds with others nor much rhyme to their reason (other than the planning of violence). They tend to operate with a grandiose demeanor, an attitude of entitlement, an insatiable appetite, and a tendency toward sadism. Fearlessness is probably the prototypical (core) characteristic (the low-fear hypothesis). It's helpful to think of them as high-speed vehicles with ineffective brakes. Certain organic (brain) disorders and hormonal imbalances mimic the state of mind of a psychopath.

There are four (4) different subtypes of psychopaths. The oldest distinction was made by Cleckley back in 1941 between primary and secondary. However, we'll explore the other two subtypes first:

DISTEMPERED PSYCHOPATHS are the kind that seem to fly into a rage or frenzy more easily and more often than other subtypes, their frenzy will resemble an epileptic fit. They are also usually men with incredibly strong sex drives, capable of astonishing feats of sexual energy, and seemingly obsessed by sexual urges during a large part of their waking lives. Powerful cravings also seem to characterize them, as in drug addiction, kleptomania, pedophilia, any illicit or illegal indulgence. They like the endorphin "high" or "rush" off of excitement and risk-taking. The serial-rapist-murderer known as the Boston Strangler was such a psychopath.

CHARISMATIC PSYCHOPATHS are charming, attractive liars. They are usually gifted at some talent or another, and they use it to their advantage in manipulating others. They are usually fast-talkers, and possess an almost demonic ability to persuade others out of everything they own, even their lives. Leaders of religious sects or cults, for example, might be psychopaths if they lead their followers to their deaths. This subtype often comes to believe in their own fictions. They are irresistible.

PRIMARY PSYCHOPATHS do not respond to punishment, apprehension, stress, or disapproval. They seem to be able to inhibit their antisocial impulses most of the time, not because of conscience, but because it suits their purpose at the time. Words do not seem to have the same meaning for them as they do for us. In fact, it's unclear
If they even grasp the meaning of their own words, a condition that Cleckley called "semantic aphaesthesia." They don't follow any life plan, and it seems as if they are incapable of experiencing any genuine emotion.

SECONDARY PSYCHOPATHS are risk-takers, but are also more likely to be stress-reactive, worriers, and guilt-prone. They expose themselves to more stress than the average person, but they are as vulnerable to stress as the average person. They are daring, adventurous, unconventional people who begin playing by their own rules early in life. They are strongly driven by a desire to escape or avoid pain, but are unable to resist temptation. As their anxiety increases toward some forbidden object, so does their attraction to it. They live their lives by the lure of temptation.

Here’s PCL-R 20-item checklist is based on Cleckley's 16-item checklist, and the following is a discussion of the concepts in the PCL-R:

1. GLIB and SUPERFICIAL CHARM -- the tendency to be smooth, engaging, charming, slick, and verbally facile. Psychopathic charm is not in the least shy, self-conscious, or afraid to say anything. A psychopath never gets tongue-tied; they have freed themselves from the social conventions about taking turns in talking, for example.

2. GRANDIOSE SELF-WORTH -- a grossly inflated view of one’s abilities and self-worth, self-assured, opinionated, cocky, a braggart. Psychopaths are arrogant people who believe they are superior human beings.

3. NEED FOR STIMULATION or PRONENESS TO BOREDOM — an excessive need for novel, thrilling, and exciting stimulation; taking chances and doing things that are risky. Psychopaths often have a low self-discipline in carrying tasks through to completion because they get bored easily. They fail to work at the same job for any length of time, for example, or to finish tasks that they consider dull or routine.

4. PATHOLOGICAL LYING -- can be moderate or high; in moderate form, they will be shrewd, crafty, cunning, sly, and clever; in extreme form, they will be deceptive, deceitful, underhanded, unscrupulous, manipulative, and dishonest.

5. CONNING AND MANIPULATIVENESS -- the use of deceit and deception to cheat, con, or defraud others for personal gain distinguished from Item #4 in the degree to which exploitation and callous ruthlessness is present, as reflected in a lack of concern for the feelings and suffering of one’s victims.

6. LACK OF REMORSE OR GUILT -- a lack of feelings or concern for the losses, pain, and suffering of victims; a tendency to be unconcerned, dispassionate, coldhearted, and unempathic. This item is usually demonstrated by a disdain for one’s victims.

7. SHALLOW AFFECT -- emotional poverty or a limited range or depth of feelings; interpersonal coldness in spite of signs of open gregariousness.

8. CALLOUSNESS and LACK OF EMPATHY -- a lack of feelings toward people in general; cold, contemptuous, inconsiderate, and tactless.

9. PARASITIC LIFESTYLE -- an intentional, manipulative, selfish, and exploitative financial dependence on others as reflected in a lack of motivation, low self-discipline, and inability to begin or complete responsibilities.

10. POOR BEHAVIORAL CONTROLS -- expressions of irritability, annoyance, impatience, threats, aggression, and verbal abuse; inadequate control of anger and temper; acting hastily.

11. PROMISCUOUS SEXUAL BEHAVIOR -- a variety of brief, superficial relations, numerous affairs, and an indiscriminate selection of sexual partners; the maintenance of several relationships at the same time; a history of
POVERTY, INEQUALITY, AND CRIME

"There are two kinds of money: your money and my money." (Milton Friedman)

Poverty, or stratification by social class, was the first sociological variable ever looked into as a possible cause of crime. Some sociologists would say religion was the first sociological variable, but the field of criminology claims a slightly different heritage. There are two reasons why poverty came to be of interest: (1) It was an enduring social problem in all societies across time, like crime; and (2) it was suspected that something in the causes of poverty were the same as the causes of crime. The heart of the criminological mode of inquiry, from the start of the sociological perspective, was that deviant behavior and crime were NOT the inherent properties of individuals, but were instead the results of a series of relationships characteristic of a given society, and unfolding together with (much more than unfolding against) the development, or progress, of that society. In other words, things like poverty and crime seemed like things that were here to stay, as part and parcel of any given society. In a sense, nothing could be more sociological than that, although sociologists came to realize that particular approach to the functionalist backburners of their discipline.

Criminologists, for their part, did the same thing, evolving from poverty researchers into inequality researchers. Poverty and inequality are not the same thing. The last 'poverty causes crime' criminologists were
Guerry and Quetelet in France during the early 1800s, and perhaps a few Marxist-Inspired criminologists in the early 1900s. Poverty is generally regarded as absolute deprivation (or at least a rate or average across an entire population), and modern criminologists study inequality (who's worse off), which is regarded as relative deprivation. Poverty is defined as the lack of some fixed level of material goods necessary for survival and minimal well-being. For example, the government's official measure of a poverty rate only counts cash income in determining whether a family is poor; cash welfare programs count, but benefits from noncash programs, such as food stamps, medical care, social services, education and training, and housing are not included. Taxes paid, such as social security payroll taxes, and tax credits, such as the Earned Income Credit, are also excluded from poverty rate calculations. Inequality, on the other hand, refers to a comparison between the material level of those who have the least in a society and the material level of other groups in that society. Inequality is measured by such things as the Gini Index, and other scales and indexes created by researchers. Consequently, a country in which everyone is poor will have poverty but no inequality. Likewise, a fairly well-off country can have inequality but no poverty. Structural poverty may exist in different forms in different regions of the same country.

There are at least twenty different ways to measure poverty and inequality (e.g., unemployment, high rates of divorce, single-parent households, high population density, dilapidated housing, poor schools, residential mobility, population turnover, concentration of minorities, etc.) The problem is that all these things are highly correlated with one another. In research, this is called the problem of multicollinearity, where all the possible causal factors are highly intercorrelated with one another. Teasing out the effects of everything being a cause of everything else is a logistic order problem in social science.

Theoretically, the relationship between inequality and crime is believed to operate through a person's individual assessment of the equity of a particular distribution of economic resources. Their assessment is partially shaped by the sociocultural environment, but there is no isomorphic (one-to-one) relationship between aggregate (national statistic) measures and psychological factors; this is called making the ecological fallacy. If inequality is perceived, there must be some interpretive or intervening mechanism that channels or diffuses the effect in different directions. In criminology, that intervening mechanism is referred to as relative deprivation, and some individuals respond by resorting to property crime to address their grievances, and other people develop a deep anger which can be manifested in violent ways. Relative deprivation is illustrated in the following quotation:

Karl Marx once said "A house can be large or small; as long as the surrounding houses are equally small it satisfies all social demands. But if a palace rises beside the little house, the little house shrinks into a hut."

Not all people who perceive wage inequality resort to crime. Some become entrepreneurs, others get involved in political action, and still others direct the feelings of anger and frustration toward themselves. The type of crime traditionally associated with economic inequality is property crime, but this may be simply an "opportunity" explanation (since when poor people live side by side with rich people, there's more opportunity). In recent years, however, the "deep anger" explanation has become more popular, and many criminologists now associate economic inequality with violent crime. Perhaps the most common association is with "conventional" or street crime. For example, when unemployment goes up 1%, there's a 4% increase in homicides, a 6% increase in robberies, a 2% increase in burglaries, and measurable effects on rape and other crimes.

It has been suggested that poverty produces an immediate "opportunity" effect and a lagged "motivation" effect. People experiencing downturns in economic conditions usually don't feel the full effects until support from their family runs out, government assistance is exhausted, etc. Hence, some period of delay, or "lag" is expected before the effect shows up on crime rates. A one or two-year lag is typical, with researchers looking in 1996 for the crime rate effects of a bad economic year in 1994, for example.
TYPES OF INEQUALITY

ECONOMIC INEQUALITY

Economic inequality is usually measured as income inequality, and mathematically using features of the Lorenz curve, specifically four coefficients the Gini, Mehran, Bonferroni, and Plesch. The Gini coefficient is the most commonly seen one in criminology, and it weights extreme outcomes in inequality; the Plesch high incomes; and the Mehran and Bonferroni, low incomes. The weightings are done to the tails of the distribution. The Gini coefficient ranges from 0 where everyone is fairly equal to 1 where one person has all the wealth and everyone else has none. Gini indexes of as low as 0.10 have reached statistical significance in relationship to crime. The U.S. average Gini is 0.25 and rising.

WAGE INEQUALITY

Wage inequality overcomes some of the income reporting problems associated with using income inequality, and just counts wages instead of total family income. One of the things about the U.S. economy is the constant widening of the gap between rich and poor in terms of the distribution of wage income. The ratio of a college educated worker's wages to a high school graduate's wages (a commonly seen measure) always seems to be widening.

CRIME AND THE BUSINESS CYCLE (UNEMPLOYMENT)

It's often thought that more crime occurs during economic downturns, and this is generally true, for the most part. However, some studies have found that crime actually decreases during such periods. Juvenile delinquency, for example, is often referred to as a crime of affluence, because it goes up during economic upswings; i.e., when unemployment is low.

Unemployment does cause crime among ex-offenders. Unemployment also has stronger effects at the neighborhood rather than aggregate level. It also depends on how you define unemployment. Official rates only count people who are looking for work, so a whole lot of people who aren't but are still unemployed don't get counted. There's also the existence of underemployment, low-wage, dead-end jobs with terrible working conditions, and these people get counted officially as employed when maybe they shouldn't. Some people may mix crime and employment in various ways, thus confounding any research efforts. Underemployment, which is sometimes called dual labor market theory, is illustrated by the following quotation:

Elliot Currie once said "the important things are the quality of work — its stability, its level of pay, its capacity to give the worker a sense of dignity, the esteem of peers and the community. In our society, these fundamental needs are virtually impossible to satisfy without a job — and are all too often difficult even with a job."

RACIAL INEQUALITY

Recent theoretical attention has focused on the specific inequality between blacks and whites in the U.S. The concept of relative deprivation is revised to a concept of "resource deprivation" cluster. According to this conception, crime is greatest in cities that have extensive residential segregation; i.e., blacks live on one side of the tracks, whites on the other. Research results using this approach have been mixed, however.

Unequal economic racial and class conditions have traditionally been associated with hidden economies. These are transactions that are unreported and often illegal or outside the view and control of the state.

CONCENTRATIONS OF POVERTY
Poverty and inequality tend to concentrate in cities, although rural poverty is a less-studied reality. Within certain cities, distinctive clusters tend to form that are economically self-contained ghettos, barrios, slums, or enclaves. Residents in these areas often have some ethnic or minority status that they share. Some of these places have elaborate decorations at their entrances, such as Chinatowns. Others provide no signs or warning that you are entering the area, such as Skid Rows. Such areas form in cities primarily because they are areas that no one else wants. Homeless people usually move into such areas first, and then a settlement pattern, involving immigrants, tends to follow. What follows are some descriptive analyses of some well-known poverty areas in America.

CHICAGO'S "BACK OF THE YARDS"

One of the most famous areas studied by criminologists (at least during the 1930s) was the stockyards area between 39th and 55th street from Lake Michigan to Western Avenue. For those not familiar with the area, it is also known as the midway close to the University of Chicago. Traditionally settled by Polish, Czechoslovakian, Lithuanian, and German immigrants, it was also Chicago's junk yard and city dump for years. It is also the area where various meat-packing companies built their plants.

Crowding housing was the norm in Chicago's Back of the Yards. Family members usually slept three to a bed, and families were so large that kitchens and living rooms also served as bedrooms. People with housing also took in boarders to help pay the rent that landlords kept raising. Smoke from nearby factories fouled the air, so there were incredibly high rates of lung disease. Rats the size of cats roamed the area. Swarms of flies would come around from the nearby city dump. Inadequate city sewer facilities and street lighting aggravated the problem. Alcoholism became a community problem, and delinquency rates increased. When researchers investigated why delinquents acted up, the answer that came back that the delinquents were tired of being "cooped up." Prostitution became acceptable to the so-called working girls in the neighborhood. Local churches and labor unions helped clean up the area somewhat by the 1940s.

DETROIT'S AFRICAN-AMERICAN Ghetto

Inner-city Detroit (the Near East Side) is probably America's most-studied ghetto for African-Americans, at least during the riot years of the 1960s and 1970s. For about fifteen blocks from the Renaissance Center to downtown Detroit, along the Detroit river, is an area that looks like a war zone, consisting of abandoned buildings, burned-out buildings, weedy lots, gutted apartment buildings, and boarded-up stores. 85% of Detroit's African Americans live in this area. On a windy day, you can't see very well because the dirt, grime, and trash are blinding. In how it blows down the streets. But if you look closely, you'll see little children playing on porches or in yards. In fact, there are lots of little children, ones that survived the high infant mortality rate and low life expectancy rate. Fires break out regularly in the area, and drive-by shootings are a regular event. Public services, like firefighting and police protection, are inadequate for the demand. The area also happens to be the target of racist vigilantes who periodically terrorize and attack.

Residents of Detroit's Near East Side have tried building barbershops, saloons, drugstores, and restaurants, but businesses don't seem to stay open long. Many families in the area live in unregistered shacks or stables located in alleys, and their children don't attend school. Churches have had a hard time being established, and there are no employment opportunities other than the occasional day labor programs run by white employers who enter the area. Crime, teenage pregnancy, welfare dependency, gangs, and other social problems are rampant. When criminals are interviewed as to why they became that way, the answer is usually "because there's no place else to go."

SAN FRANCISCO'S CHINATOWN

The seventeen-block area between the Pacific Ocean and the Financial District in San Francisco is probably America's most-studied Chinatown. It has been around since the earthquake of 1906 which had its epicenter in this area. One of the first things you'll notice here is that nobody speaks English. There is also a well-developed "hidden economy" of child labor along with immigrant "sweatshops" that make the area seem busy. Gambling is a
common activity, along with prostitution and drug dealing. And, there is a long history of organized crime involving police corruption. Most of the restaurants have back rooms for illegal gambling, and most of the nightclubs have rooms upstairs that serve as brothels. The area is male-dominated, and young Asian males roam the streets at night looking for action, their favorite target being to get back at some unlucky white tourist who happens to represent the “continuing insult” they feel at the hands of whites. This pattern is relatively similar with other ethnic enclaves such as Little Taipei and Little Saigon, but it should be noted that many Asian groups have done well in establishing economic prosperity by creating banks, shopping malls, TV and radio stations, and making use of educational opportunities.

SOCIAL DISORGANIZATION THEORIES OF CRIME
“How did East New York become a Ghetto” (Walter Thabit)

Social disorganization is a rather difficult term to define. It basically refers to the failure of social institutions or social organizations (e.g., schools, business, policing, real estate, group networking) in certain communities and/or neighborhoods (although nothing prohibits such theories from being couched at the "macro" level to talk about all of society). It has its origins in the study of ecology, which is the examination of relations between an organism and its environment. In criminology, social disorganization is usually treated as both perspective and theory, while ecology is an approach or "school." The ecological school refers to a group of professionals associated with the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago from 1920 to 1932, hence their other name, Chicago School Sociology. These professors included Smel, Thomas, Mead, Park, Burgess, Feris, Ogburn, and Wirth. In addition, Sutherland and Thrasher worked there for awhile, and some of the more well-known students were Shaw and McKay, Everett and Helen Hughes, and Saul Alinsky.

Modern social disorganization theories exist, but Shaw & McKay (1942), who borrowed from Park & Burgess, and developed cultural transmission theory in the 1930s and 1940s, are probably the most famous. However, as you can imagine, Shaw & McKay’s ideas have been extensively improved upon in recent years. For example, the work of Harvard professor Robert Sampson [see author’s website] and colleagues (1997) added the terms “collective efficacy” and “social capital” to the criminological vocabulary. Collective efficacy refers to a community’s ability to maintain order in public places; social capital refers to having many informal networks (interdependence, relying upon one another, ties) within a community; and a community must first have social capital in order to have collective efficacy. Cohen and Felson’s (1979) routine activities theory is also often treated in criminology as an example of a modern social disorganization theory. Routine activities theory holds that in order to eliminate crime anywhere, you need to address three necessary conditions pool of motivated offenders; suitable targets of opportunity; and ineffective guardianship. All social disorganization theories are really theories about place, not people (contextual, not composition); and to understand them, it’s best to start at the beginning with the Chicago School.

ASSUMPTIONS OF THE CHICAGO SCHOOL

Although there is probably much disagreement over it, the following are some of the important assumptions in most, if not all, social disorganization theories.

1. Crime and delinquency are caused primarily by social factors (environmental determinism)
2. The facts speak imperfectly for themselves, but better if fitted into theory (positivism)
3. Official statistics are OK, but fieldwork is better (acceptance of official arrest data)
4. The city is a perfect natural laboratory (cities like Chicago reflect society as a whole)
5. Components of social structure are unstable (conflict, anomie, social disorganization; conflict or anomie if talking about political economy or society; social disorganization if talking about cities and neighborhoods)
6. Instabilities and their effects are worse for the lower classes (lower class crime focus)
7. Human nature is basically good (social ability thesis) but subject to vulnerability and inability to resist temptation.

A couple of points can be made about the above. Environmental determinism means that people are NOT ordinarily going to know what causes all the crime around them, and in fact, under such circumstances, they are most likely to blame bad people rather than the bad places (this is often what is meant when it is said sociological forces are mostly invisible). The components of social structure being unstable implies that there is a stable pattern somewhere, someplace where all social institutions and organizations function as they’re supposed to (in other words, a functionalist perspective on social systems is somewhat taken, however, social disorganization theorists do NOT tend to be functionalists). The social ability thesis refers to the revolution in social psychology in shifting from Freud’s Id-Ego-Superego model of the self to Mead’s I-Me model of the self. The shift from a tripartite to a homo duplex model, where the Me develops thru role taking (what others see you as), became nothing less than the birth of symbolic interactionism in sociology. In criminology, it represented a shift from a social disability conception of the self (social disability thesis) which saw people as socially as well as physically and mentally handicapped to a social ability conception of the self (social ability thesis) which saw people as inherently capable of doing many things competently.

FOUR WISHES THEORY

One of the first things to be called a theory out of the Chicago School was really a typology, not a theory. The theoretician behind “Four Wishes Theory” was W. I. Thomas, who is famous in sociology for the “Thomas Theorem” (if a person defines something as real, it’s real in its consequences). Thomas is also famous for co-authoring a book called The Polish Peasant which, among other things, discussed the Polish concept of neighborhood, “okolica”, which means a neighborhood stretches as far as a person’s reputation stretches. This concept became part of the idea in sociology that secondary groups and reference groups play as important a role as primary agents of socialization like the family or school.

Four Wishes Theory is based on the idea that values in a given environment produce ‘wishes’, which are the sociological equivalent of drives or instincts. In other words, what the person senses is important to their community or neighborhood as a whole becomes the core of their being in terms of the fundamental or generalized thing that ‘drives’ them. The Four Wishes are:

- New experience (Bohemian personality type)
- Security (Philistine personality type)
- Response (or mastery of instinct or emotion)
- Recognition (or status)

Thomas defined social disorganization as “the inability of a neighborhood to solve its problems together” which is a very simple and useable definition, almost as quick and dirty as ‘no sense of community.’ To be sure, the term ‘disorganization’ was objectionable to some Chicago School sociologists. It smacked of overtones associated with pathology and personal disorganization. The term, “differential social organization” was preferred by many, and may have been the source of Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory. Many of the psychological ideas of Thomas were never really incorporated into social disorganization theory, or criminology for that matter, primarily because Thomas was frequently willing to postulate “subconscious” and/or “unconscious” motivations for crime which were far more deterministic about non-social factors that sociology was willing to tolerate. Thomas’s wife also developed a quite deterministic model in business which connected crime rates to economic boom and bust cycles.

GANG THEORY
One of the more important contributions of the Chicago School was the defining features (classic definition) of a "gang." Frederick Thrasher made much out of the recognition wish, extracting the significant features of a "gang" — group awareness, shared tradition, solidarity and cohesiveness, group cooperation, esprit de corps, turf, and unreflectiveness. Even today, some of the most common reasons for joining a gang — status and belonging — are derived from Thrasher's pioneering work. Modern sociologists have added identity, discipline, love, and money as further reasons for joining a gang (see Gans' work on this). And modern criminology (see Intelligence Analysis of Gang Crime) even has general models. Thrasher saw gangs as originating in play groups, like juvenile delinquency, and like dust, collecting in the nooks and crannies of "interstitial areas" — low level neighborhoods existing in places located on the boundaries between developed neighborhoods.

Early gang theory gave way to a host of different approaches that are often called cultural deviance or subcultural theories, which emerged in the 1950s. These involved explanations into how delinquent subcultures arise in urban, lower class areas (strain theories); how subcultures of violence remain so enduring in city slums (Wolfgang's approach) or throughout the South (Southernness hypothesis); how lower class culture as a whole influences urban gang delinquency (Miller's controversial focal concerns) and how the mechanisms of learning delinquency work (Akers et al's approach). Many modern gang theories continue to reflect these concerns and have decidedly cultural and subcultural emphases. Much of Kornhauser's (1978) devastating (or "straw man") critique against social disorganization theory is aimed at these offshoots, and it may be worthwhile to examine Kornhauser's criticism in depth.

**Kornhauser's Critique of Subcultural Theories**

Kornhauser (1978) classifies the major theories of criminal or delinquent subcultures as either "pure cultural deviance theories" or "mixed models" of delinquency. Pure cultural deviance theories state that deviance is normative to the adherents of a delinquent subculture, that the root cause of delinquency lies in conflicting subcultures, and that the intervening cause of delinquency is socialization into a subcultural value system that condones as "right" what happens to be defined by the legal system as "wrong." Other theoretical models of delinquency are not "pure" because they combine assumptions from cultural deviance theory and other analytical models of delinquency, such as control theory or strain theory. That is, mixed models of delinquency assume that individuals are "selected for delinquency on the basis of experienced strain or weak controls," but that delinquency will not ensue "without the endorsement of a delinquent subculture."

Kornhauser's critique of pure cultural deviance theories and mixed models of delinquency concerns the logical status of their underlying assumptions. According to this critique, pure cultural deviance theories (namely differential association theory) are problematic in a logical sense because one can derive from them a set of incoherent assumptions that leave nothing left to explain. Arguably, mixed models of delinquency are even more dubious. Not only do they contain a set of untenable assumptions from which only absurdities can be derived, they are also internally inconsistent. Shaw & McKay's social disorganization theory is the running exemplar of this problem in Kornhauser's analysis. On the one hand, social disorganization theory holds that social disorganization produces weak institutional controls, which in turn loosen the constraints on individuals' natural propensity to deviate. Most proximately, delinquency results from weak social bonds. On the other hand, Shaw and his associates emphasize, especially in their later work, that delinquent youths' denial of the moral validity of the laws they violate explains their illegal behavior. In this sense, delinquency is assumed to require the endorsement of a delinquent subculture; this latter assumption, Kornhauser argues, is not necessary to make social disorganization theory work. For in fact, it only confounds the logical structure of the theory, which can stand alone on the former assumption that disorganization produces weak institutional controls, and thereby frees people to deviate. [from Kalkhoff, W. (2002). "Reviving the Subcultural Approach" Electronic Journal of Sociology]

**CONCENTRIC ZONE THEORY**
Park and Burgess were two Chicago School professors who shared the same office, and they were the ones to take the ecological "plant" or organic approach the farthest in sociology. They saw cities as consisting of five zones (CBD - Central Business District, transition, workingmen, residential, and commuter), each gradually invading and dominating the adjacent zones, with an overall growth outward. The "natural" process was one of invasion, dominance, and successions much like the way a new species of plant takes control of an ecosystem. Their "zonal hypothesis" was that delinquency is greatest in the zone of transition. At the time, their findings were quite radical for the idea that cities grow from the inside out.

They defined social disorganization as "the inability of a group to engage in self-regulation" which is a social control theoretical formulation. Their model of the city tested well in most places except the west and with modern planned cities. Their model looked like the following, and there are many different pictures of it, but they all should pinpoint Zone 2, or the Transitional Zone, as the place where the high crime always is.

**The Concentric Zone Model:**

1. **Central Business District**
   - **Transitional Zone**
     - Recent Immigrant Groups
       - Deteriorated Housing
       - Factories
       - Abandoned Buildings
   - **Working Class Zone**
     - Single Family Tenements
   - **Residential Zone**
     - Single Family Homes
     - Yards/Garages
   - **Commuter Zone**
     - Suburbs

---

**CULTURAL TRANSMISSION THEORY**

Shaw and McKay were a prolific couple of researchers at the Chicago School who specialized in using official data to make pin maps, spot maps, rate maps, and zone maps. They took over the Institute for Juvenile Research from Henry Taggart. They aggressively borrowed from Park and Burgess. They were hardcore sociologists of deviance. Shaw once said "I never met a delinquent who acted alone." They studied and noticed that the same neighborhoods in Chicago seemed to have about the same delinquency rates regardless of which ethnic group moved in. This fact proved true for most later research except for Asian ethnic groups which didn't fit the pattern.

Their ideas developed into Cultural Transmission Theory (or Shaw & McKay's 1942 social disorganization theory), which was a dominant criminological theory for much of the 20th century. The theory simply states that "traditions of delinquency are transmitted through successive generations of the same zone in the same way language, roles, and attitudes are transmitted." They defined social disorganization as "the inability of local communities to realize the common values of their residents or solve commonly experienced problems." Many researchers in criminology have focused on how criminal traditions get embedded into the functioning of a community and co-exist alongside conventional values. Some of these foci resulted in subcultural theories, a separate (and somewhat ethnocentric) area of criminology that emerged in the 1950s, which argues that lower-class neighborhoods simply tend to have different values and needs, and are simply organized differently in ways that best serve their interests. Sutherland (1947) himself termed the phenomenon differential social organization.
(Instead of disorganization, to avoid any implied value judgments the term "disorganization" implies). The three traditional sources of social disorganization in social disorganization theory are: residential instability; racial/ethnic heterogeneity; and poverty. These were also the three ways in which "criminal traditions" got embedded into communities.

- **Residential Instability/Mobility** — population turnover where many residents move frequently or are looking to move (nobody invests in community they are going to leave anyway)
- **Racial/Ethnic Heterogeneity** — different races, cultures, and language create the perception of insurmountable barriers (diversity not happening as a good thing) with people isolating themselves and avoiding meaningful interaction or common ground to share
- **Poverty** — inadequate resources, primarily due to a low tax base, which prevent a community from being able to deal with local problems (significant portions of the population are focused on survival in an area they would much prefer to leave as soon as possible)

Shaw and McKay were also concerned about the three D's of poverty: Disease, Deterioration, and Demoralization. They never said that poverty causes crime. Poverty, by itself, is never a cause of crime; it only facilitates crime by deprivation of adequate resources to deal with crime. They only said that "poverty areas" tended to have high rates of residential mobility and racial heterogeneity that made it difficult for communities in those areas to avoid becoming socially disorganized. These two population variables (mobility or turnover which impedes informal structures of social control, and heterogeneity which obstructs the quest to work together on common problems) have become the primary causal variables for social disorganization theories. The causal chain is sometimes called the "gradient tendency" for the mechanistic way in which successive declines in the effectiveness of neighborhoods leads to higher and higher rates of delinquency. One of the best ways to defeat the gradient tendency is to stop sending so many community residents to prison, then back to the community, and then back to prison again. Since incarceration crime control policies only added to residential instability, most policy implications in social disorganization theory are dedicated to finding alternatives to incarceration. Social disorganization would justify youth athletic leagues, recreation programs, summer camps (things tried with the Chicago Area Project and the later Mobilization for Youth), along with urban planning and alternatives to incarceration as crime control policy. By contrast, differential organization (and other theories where people are seen as simply differently organized) might lead to interventionist policies which are seen as ethnocentric and actually increase crime in some neighborhoods. Backlash or boomerang effects have been known to occur when applying social disorganization theory in practice or in applied criminology.

Shaw and McKay, however, are regarded as the most important of the social disorganization theorists in criminology. Although their ideas were not without plenty of criticism, they generated a ton of research, facts, ideas, and puzzles for theorists and researchers to work on for years. Control theorists in recent years have adopted many of their ideas, working them into their formulations with almost as much zeal as Durkheim's Ideas have been integrated in many ways.

**THE ECOLOGICAL FALLACY**

Robinson (1950) was one of the many critics of social disorganization theory, and his article pointed out the problematic nature of making individual-level inferences on the basis of aggregate data. Doing so to the extent that individual decision making processes or group "mechanisms" are inferred would be making the " ecological fallacy" and is just not the appropriate use of aggregate data. For many, this criticism led to the use of aggregate data for such purposes becoming a taboo in criminology, except for possible appropriate use in "opportunity" models and victimization theories based on routine activities. To abide by the warnings of the ecological fallacy, instead of saying "socially disorganized neighborhoods produce delinquent behavior among children in those neighborhood," a researcher would have to say "socially disorganized neighborhoods produce problems associated with the concentration of low-income families."
THE PROBLEM OF MULTICOLLINEARITY

As we saw in the previous lecture on Poverty and Crime, the problem of multicollinearity comes up whenever all the causal factors are intercorrelated with one another. It's a potential problem with Shaw and McKay's theory because they never clearly separated the presumed outcome of social disorganization (delinquency) from disorganization itself. This leads to equating the causal construct with the phenomenon to be explained (a confounding of cause and effect).

The so-called 'Lender approach' (Lender 1954) defines social disorganization as delinquency, and vice-versa, and examines these intercorrelations for clues into the total "general complex" of factors that lead to delinquency, crime, broken homes, and other socio-pathological conditions. Since correlations are quite commonly found in this area of criminology (more so than 'true' causes), there is a need to make sense of them in some way without being ethnocentric in any way. According to this line of research, the following correlations with delinquency are fairly well-established:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard housing</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent nonwhite</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent renting</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent low education</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent foreign-born</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTEXTUAL AND GUARDIANSHIP THEORIES

The 1980s and 90s have seen a resurgence of interest in developing social disorganization theories. The so-called "contextual" movement attempts to achieve linkage between the effects of neighborhood contexts on motivational processes that may lead to criminal behavior. Two basic approaches have characterized this movement: (1) the "sanctions" approach (characterized by the work of Bursik) in which official arrest data are used as an indicator of community guardianship or loss of social control; and (2) the "structural density" approach (characterized by the work of Sampson) in which official data sources are mixed with qualitative data sources to better understand the effects of deteriorting informal as well as formal controls. A certain amount of controversy and debate characterizes the directions for contextual research.

The victimization, or guardianship, movement draws upon the routine activities approach developed by Cohen and Felson (1979). In this view, victimization data at the local level is sought to test the idea that spatial structures of a city (lack of guardianship or supervision) partially determine the rate at which motivated offenders meet criminal opportunities. Aggregating the local data back up into "pseudoneighborhoods" or cities experiencing "decay and disorder" allows tests for many aspects of social disorganization theory as well as traditional victimization variables like fear of crime. Routine activities theory does NOT, however, focus as much as other social disorganization theories do on aspects of informal social control or networks of interpersonal relationships. Instead, routine activities theory focuses on the opportunities for crime. Other "opportunity" approaches exist in criminology (most notably in strain theory), but opportunity is conceptually different than either "place" or "situation" which are all-important in social disorganization approaches. Routine activities theory treats the offender as a given and the opportunity as problematic, which is part of its design to look strategically at how long-term change, for example, might lead to increased or decreased opportunities for crime.

LEGACY AND IMPACT OF THE CHICAGO SCHOOL
Not only did the disorganization theorists help establish sociology as a viable discipline, they left an enormous legacy in criminology, spawning cultural deviance theories, strain theories, learning theories, and control theories. One could even say that all modern criminological theory can be traced back to social disorganization theory.

Beginning in the 1930s, Shaw attempted to put theory into practice by establishing the Chicago Area Project (CAP). The idea was that workers would be recruited from the local community to help local residents organize against crime, to rebuild communities from the "bottom up," to create role models (detached social workers) that would advocate for the people. First of all, the strongest emphasis of the CAP program was the creation of recreational opportunities (baseball lots, playground equipment). Secondly, efforts were made to physically clean up the community. Thirdly, CAP workers would often try to intervene in juvenile court on behalf of a child in trouble. The closest things today that resemble what CAP tried to do includes public housing tenant councils; citizen task forces; citizen patrols; and neighborhood watch groups. Subsequent research tended to show that what worked best were youth athletic leagues, recreation programs, summer camps (things tried with the Chicago Area Project and the later Mobilization for Youth), along with urban planning and alternatives to incarceration as crime control policy. Such programs also fall, research shows, primarily because there is not a sustained financial commitment to them, since the programs most needed are non-entrepreneurial in nature and non-self-sustaining.

Modern theories in this tradition include the recent examples of Newman's (1972) defensible space theory, Cohen and Felson's (1979) routine activities theory, and Wilson and Kelling's (1982) broken windows theory. Newman was an architect who wrote that flaws in the physical environment served as attractors or facilitators for crime. He wrote mainly about housing projects and how they seemed to be designed to provide easy access with common entrances and exits for criminals, and also with hiding places and poorly placed windows which allowed easy surveillance by would-be criminals. Cohen and Felson (1979) wrote routine activities theory, a theory of victimization, which is to say that it predicts a high rate of potential victims becoming actual victims whenever three things occur in space and time together -- absence of capable guardians -- abundance of motivated offenders -- and suitable targets. Wilson and Kelling's (1982) broken windows theory, which in some circles has become a classic foundational document for community policing, referred to physical signs that an area was uncared for. Abandoned buildings and automobiles, the accumulation of trash and litter, broken windows and lights, and graffiti or profanity (signs of crime or incivilities) all invite criminal behavior. It is perhaps not too much of an exaggeration to say that the ideas of social disorganization in criminology have never been, and probably never will be, fully exhausted or exploited, either in all the theoretical or policy directions.

**STRAIN THEORIES OF CRIME**

"When people get mad, they act bad." (Robert Agnew)

Durkheim's theory of anomie is the basis for strain theory, at least in so far as 'anomie' is translated as "deregulation." It should be noted that control theorists also trace their inspiration to Durkheim, and have translated "anomie" as "normlessness." Durkheim's influence has been extremely broad in criminology and sociology. His view that social forces caused crime was extremely radical at the time.

The concept of anomie is most developed in the book, *Suicide*, published in 1897, although Durkheim's theory of crime is embedded in his more general theory of modernization (the progression of societies from mechanical to organic solidarity). In mechanical societies, crime is normal (punishing criminals maintains social solidarity through a process of rudimentary interaction). In organic societies, the function of law is to regulate the interactions of various parts of the whole of society.

When this regulation is inadequate, a variety of social problems occur, including crime. Strain (structural strain) refers generally to the processes by which inadequate regulation at the societal level filters down to how
the individual perceives his or her needs, Strain (individual strain) refers to the frictions and pains experienced by the individual as they look for ways to meet their needs (the motivational mechanism that causes crime). Let's look at what Durkheim actually said in *Suicide* (paraphrased, author's translation):

> Whenever one's needs require more than what can be granted, or even merely something of a different sort, they will be under continual friction and only function painfully.... the more one has, the more one wants. A regressive force must play the same role for moral needs as it plays for physical needs.... Society alone is the only moral power superior enough to do this.... It alone can estimate the rewards to be proffered for every human endeavor. When society is disturbed by some crisis or abrupt transition, it is momentarily incapable of exercising this influence, whence the sudden rises in suicides as we have seen.... So long as the social forces freed have not gained equilibrium, their respective values are unknown and all regulation is lacking for a time. The limits are unknown between the possible and the impossible, what is just and what is unjust, legitimate hopes and claims and those which are immoderate. Consequently, there is no restraint upon aspirations.... Appetites, not controlled by public opinion, become distorted...and more impatient of control. A condition of anomie results from passions being less disciplined, precisely when they need more disciplining.

The following discussion focuses on the varieties of strain theory at the hands of Merton (1938), Cohen (1955), Cloward and Ohlin (1960), Agnew (1992), Messner and Rosenfeld (1994). Strain theory has fairly consistently captured the imagination of criminologists for over a century, and may well be the most theoretically explored area of criminology. It served as the policy basis for the war on crime during the 1960s, the most famous program of which was *Mobilization for Youth* (MFY), based almost entirely on Cloward and Ohlin's theory, with the two scholars, in fact, working for the Kennedy-Johnson administration. Today's preschool programs, legal aid clinics, mobile bookmobiles, and voter registration outreach programs are all legacies of MFY.

**MERTON'S STRAIN THEORY**

The cornerstone of what is known as "the means-end theory of deviance" is that crime breeds in the gap, imbalance, or disjunction between culturally induced aspirations for economic success and structurally distributed possibilities of achievement. The theory assumes fairly uniform economic success aspirations across social class, and the theory attempts to explain why crime is concentrated among the lower classes who have the least legitimate opportunities for achievement. "It is the combination of the cultural emphasis and the social structure which produces intense pressure for deviation" (Merton 1968). The lower classes are the most vulnerable to this pressure, or strain, and will maintain their unfulfilled economic aspirations in spite of frustration or failure. The system can be stabilized by providing rewards for noneconomic pursuits, but the stress, or "strain toward anomie" (Merton 1968b:211) is still operative in exclusive concern for outcome over intrinsic satisfaction of competition. Imperfect coordination of means and ends leads to limited effectiveness of social structure in providing regularity and predictability and a condition of "anomie or cultural chaos supervenences" (Merton 1968).

The causal mechanism in Mertonian strain theory is a matter of debate. Agnew (1987) argues in favor of tests focusing on the disjunction between aspirations and expectations or levels of frustration. Bernard (1987b) argues for more aggregate and objective measures than frustrations or aspirations. Messner (1988) argues in favor of a dual theory, one of motivation and another of social organization, each deserving of separate empirical testing.

It must be remembered that Merton (1938) regarded his typology of adaptations as making links between structural inequality and individual behavior for the sole purpose of shedding light on structural strain. Behaviorally, however, Figuerire-McDonough (1983) has shown that innovators tend to be more involved in property offenses, ritualists more involved in deviance, retreatists more involved in drug use, and rebels represented in all crime categories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptations</th>
<th>Cultural Goals</th>
<th>Structural Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritualism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retreatism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebellion</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where + means accepting attitude toward (goals or means) and - means rejecting attitude, and a mixed accepting/rejecting attitude is represented by +/-.

Akers (2000: 144) has operationalized most of Merton’s adaptations as follows:

- **Conformity**: Merton recognized conformity as the most common type of the five modes. During this mode, people strive to obtain success by the most pure conventional means available.

- **Innovation**: During innovation, Merton identified a miniscule, but substantial change in the perspective of the people whose mode is still in conformity and that of whom has shifted to innovation. The people continue to seek success; however, by innovation they strive to obtain the success by taking advantage of illegal goals available to them in place of less promising conventional means in order to attain success.

- **Rebellion**: Merton suggested that by the time people reach the mode of rebellion, they have completely rejected the story that everybody in society can achieve success and have leaped into a rebellious state. They neither trust the valued cultural ends nor the legitimate societal means used to reach success. Instead, these people replace such ideas with irrational objectives to include the violent overthrow of the system altogether. In many members of the urban lower socioeconomic populous and disadvantaged minorities this period of short-lived and slightly increased gains takes nearly a lifetime to obtain and to recognize its worth in a modern industrial society.

- **Ritualism**: Identified by Merton as the escapist response of the five modes, ritualism occurs when people become practically dropouts of society. They give up all goals and efforts to achieve success because they see it as an impractical, impossible, almost imaginary, and irrational possibility. Merton attributes this mode as the one to which drug addicts, alcoholics, vagrants, and the severely mental ill function because their reactions to not being able to obtain success by legitimate means represses them from society.

- **Rebellion**: During ritualism, the final mode, people realize that they have no real opportunity to advance in society and accept the little relevance that they have. It is in this mode that people concentrate on retaining what little they possibly gained or still have in place of concentrating on a higher yield of success. They return to adhering to conventional norms in hopes of maintaining the few possessions or possible gains that they have attained. For many members of the urban lower socioeconomic populous and disadvantaged minorities this period of short-lived and slightly increased gains takes nearly a lifetime to obtain and to recognize its worth in a modern industrial society.

There’s not much agreement on the appropriate ways to measure strain in Merton’s theory. All that Merton said was that all persons have high economic aspirations, and that social class aspirations are linked independently to crime. Liska’s (1977) review suggests that high aspirations (income, education, or occupational goals) combined with low expectations (perceived chances of achieving these goals) is the proper strain measure. Studies that used a measure of educational goals over educational expectations (Hirschi 1969; Liska 1977; Quinlivan 1974) were generally unconvincing with Hirschi (1969) suggesting income as a better component to use. Other studies used occupational goals over occupational expectations (Short 1964; Johnson 1979; Elliott, Hirsching and Agebon 1985) with only Short (1964) reporting any ordering with criminal involvement. Using occupational components for individually reported status, Epps (1967) found little support for Merton’s theory. Fernworth and Leiber (1989) find reason to suggest using the convention of an income over education measure.
The components of income, education, and occupation (hereafter referred to as expectations) seem to be of some utility in measuring strain. They are indicators of goal blockage. When income expectations exceed educational expectations, structural strain is present. These economic concerns can be hypothesized to predict an innovative pattern of involvement in crime.

Perception of blocked opportunities (Datassmen, Scarpitti, & Stephenson 1975) as well as variation in aspirations (Cernkovich & Giordana 1979a) have been looked at, predicting both male and female crime. Simons and Grey (1989) found lower class black males respond to structural strain the same as middle class white males. Cernkovich and Giordana (1979b) found white females more responsive to structural strain, but Hill and Crawford (1990) found the criminality of black females more directly tied to structural forces while white female criminality was mediated by socio-psychological variables.

A review of Mertonian concepts is not complete without mentioning the reference group. Merton (1968) used it to illustrate how relative deprivation could mediate between social structure and interpersonal patterns of behavior. Indeed, while Merton (1968) is vague on why individuals choose certain adaptations over others, he is clearly explicit in pointing to normative concerns as evidence of anomie at the individual level, all the time denying that anomie is a concept applicable to the individual level (Merton 1964). At that level, however (sometimes called the anomie level), individuals presumably compare themselves to similar others, evaluating their own condition by reference to the general conditions of their peers and associates. Runciman (1966) made a useful distinction in this regard between egocentric and interstructural deprivation, the one referring to injustices within one’s group, the other referring to injustices against one’s group. The latter seems to be consistent with Merton’s (1968) discussion of the reference group concept.

COHEN’S STRAIN THEORY

Cohen’s fundamental point is that, except perhaps for the category of rebellion, Mertonian strain theory is incapable of explaining purposeless crime, just for the “fun” of it (Cohen 1955). Cohen’s thesis is that class based status frustration is the origin of subcultures; malice, nontraditionalism, and negativism form the content of subcultures; and young, working-class males explain the distribution of subcultures. Cohen’s focus is on school based achievement status. The institution of the school embodies middle class values for honesty, courtesy, personal integrity, respectability, and so forth (“middle class measuring rod”). It is this milieu where competition takes place for status, approval, or respect. Strain for Cohen is therefore not structural, but interpersonal, located at the level of group interaction. “Group interaction is a sort of catalyst which releases potentialities not otherwise visible” (Cohen 1955:136).

Losers in the competition for status experience strong feelings of frustration or deprivation. Most of them adopt a corner boy attitude (Whyte 1955), accepting their fate, but a significant number turn to crime. For Cohen as opposed to Merton, the working class, a configurative term including lower, working, and qualitatively similar middle class (Cohen & Short 1958), are more or less incapable of revising their aspirations downward (Rodman 1963). What distinguishes those who turn to crime is the social variable of peer influence and the psychological variable of reaction formation. These two variables, representing a type of interpersonal and normative strain, respectively, and cannot be understood without clarification of Cohen’s more important concept of status frustration.

Frustration is generally regarded as an aversive internal state due to goal blockage or any irritating event (Berkowitz 1993). In criminology, it has often been implicated in explanations of unexpected acts of violence (Glueck & Glueck 1950; McCord, McCord & Zole 1959). Unexpected acts of disrespect for property could just as easily be predicted by Cohen’s strain theory since versatility in offending is assumed. Frustration due to lower status origins would appear to be associated with more serious, repetitive offending, according to some aspects of the theory and Gold’s (1963) research. Incidence of crime among a low status group was found to be explained
by low expectations in spite of aspirational downgrading. High status repeaters did not anticipate failure at getting a prestigious job, but showed the same aspirational concerns for self-respect. The combination of high ascribed status with low achieved status has been found to be particularly frustrating (Jackson & Burke 1965).

Stinchcombe’s (1964) research demonstrated the pervasiveness of status frustration in all social classes and for each gender using a measure of anticipated social class over expected prestigious job attainment, which significantly differentiated those who thought school was unfair and those who did not. Perceptions of unfairness were associated with more diffuse status concerns, such as personality, intelligence, and grooming. Reiss and Rhodes (1963) found feelings of deprivation about clothes and housing to be related to deviant involvement with negligible social class, ethnicity, and gender differences (Reiss & Rhodes 1963). These findings suggest that status frustration is intimately involved in peer comparisons regardless of the referent. Beliefs about what are fair allocations of tangible and intangible rewards are also important causal factors.

While theoretical importance in Cohen’s strain theory is granted to the more immediate goal of intangible rewards (Short & Stradbroek 1965; Greenberg 1977), another line of related research focuses upon tangibles in the school failure experience. Proponents of “school status theory” (Polk 1969; Kelly & Beich 1971) ignore status deprivation altogether claiming poor performance in school alone is responsible for crime and deviance. School failure in terms of grades, spelling ability, language usage, and general intelligence has been found to lead to crime and deviance even when perceived deprivation (Phillips 1975), familial based class (Kelly & Pink 1975), and outside misconduct (Phillips & Kelly 1979) were controlled. These researchers argue that ascription based stratification and tracking systems in schools lead poorly skilled students to reject being taught and create their own failure (Polk & Schefer 1972). These same researchers also take issue with the idea that higher status groups are equally involved in crime, but do not contest the idea that peer influences can provide the belief that crime will be status rewarding.

According to Cohen’s strain theory, there is no abrupt, discontinuous leap from a pressure situation to crime. Instead, action is “tentative, groping, advancing, backtracking, and sounding out” (Cohen 1965a; 8). The psychological variable, reaction formation, is necessary to complete the causal chain from frustration to crime. Middle class values, such as honesty, are not just rejected but flouted. At the same time, dishonesty represents a desperate need for status approval according to precepts of Cohen’s reaction formation as well as related tenets of alternative theories (Matza 1964). Cohen does not go quite so far as saying criminals are pathological liars, but his reaction formation concept suggests they are convinced of their own truthfulness. Liebow (1967) has documented the kind of fictions deprived people live by. Many interpersonal problems are self created. There is some research supporting the idea that status frustration leads to dishonesty of the kind that can be measured by use of social desirability scales (Allison & Hunt 1959; Stephenson & White 1968).

For Cohen (1977), the importance of having deviant friends is to help deal with a common problem of legitimacy. There is no need for attachment, as control theory postulates (Hirschi 1969). Actors become insulated from conventional standards, resolving their inner doubts and conflicts, they may even plan offenses that will legitimize their group. There is some evidence from case studies in recidivism to suggest that youths in trouble do derive psychological satisfaction from their peer groups in this fashion (Haskell 1961). More recent research on serious offending indicates that peer groups have some of the same characteristics as gangs, and effect both males and females in the same directions (Moresh 1986).

CLOWARD AND OHLIN’S STRAIN THEORY

The main emphasis of the “theory of differential opportunity systems” (Cloward & Ohlin 1960) is on the intervening variables that account for the particular forms that crime and deviance can take (Cullen 1988). Cloward (1959) had earlier shown how blocked access to legitimate as well as legitimate opportunities would be a logical extension of Mertonian strain theory. An illegitimate opportunity is more than simply the chance to get away
with a criminal or deviant act; it involves learning and expressing the beliefs necessary for subcultural support. These beliefs constitute the main intervening variables in Cloward and Ohlin's strain theory.

The theory relies upon previous work showing that communities vary by the extent criminal and conventional values are integrated (Kobrin 1951). While the form that behavior takes depends on how well criminal beliefs are learned, the causal mechanism is a class linked sense of injustice from actual or anticipated failure at achieving status by conventional standards. "Our hypothesis can be summarized as follows the disparity between what lower class youth are led to want and what is actually available to them is the source of a major problem of adjustment" (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960:86).

An individual's search for solutions to their adjustment problem will be triggered by a gap between their aspirations and expectations. The effect of this gap will vary depending upon precisely what it is that the individual aspires toward. Cloward and Ohlin (1960) believe that many individuals aspire to a middle class lifestyle but that many others simply want money without having to improve their lifestyle or change their present social class membership. These latter types (Type III) are then under the most pressure to become criminal or deviant because of their desire for money and need for conspicuous consumption. Thwarted in their materialistic aspirations, they turn to "seeking higher status within their own cultural milieu" (Cloward & Ohlin 1960:96). Because such individuals resent the push for social mobility but are led to believe that money is the means for success, the gap they experience would be predictive of more serious criminal involvement. Bernard's (1984) review shows that Cloward and Ohlin's theory merits considerable support when the focus is on more serious and persistent crime.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Youth</th>
<th>Middle Class Orientation</th>
<th>Money Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, the distinction between materialistic and lifestyle aspirations has been supported by research on different success symbols, such as housing versus clothing (Reiss & Rhodes 1963). Studies have reliably shown incarcerated youth differ significantly in terms of rejecting lifestyle values such as self improvement, work, courtesy, education, and wealth (Landis, Dinitz, & Reckless 1963; Landis & Scarpitti 1965). Lower educational expectations combined with expectations of improvement in economic position were found to be associated with anticipated failure and effectively distinguished gang and nongang members (Rivera & Short 1967). Higher job goals than educational expectations would make an adequate measure of Cloward and Ohlin's structural strain.

Whether the proper focus of Cloward and Ohlin's theory is serious crime is questionable. My contention is that they were concerned with persistency, not seriousness. Elliott's (1962) research showed that lower class youths do aspire to middle class status in terms of jobs but engage in crime only when they do not expect to go far in school. Further, the relationship held when social class position was held constant. Spergel's (1964) research showed low educational expectations explained both lower and middle class crime regardless of illegitimate opportunity structure. Both Epps (1967) and Hirschi (1969) found variation in expectations to be more significant in explaining self reported crime and deviance. Inability to revise aspirations downward signifies persistency with deviance or trivial crime because of an unwillingness to expect being "less well remunerated" (Cloward & Ohlin 1960:94).

Central to Cloward and Ohlin's strain theory are intervening variables that further help to determine the specific form that crime and deviance will take. These intervening variables have generally not been seen in the empirical
research (Ireland 1990). Probably the most important of these is degree of integration between criminal and conventional values in a community environment. Spergel's (1964) study and more recent research by Bursik (1980) show that some degree of specialization can be predicted by a community organization variable. Briefly, the theory predicts that actors are not free to assume any role they like, but that well integrated communities offer more legitimate opportunities for property offending, disorganized communities for violent offending, and if neither theft nor violent subcultures exist, retreatist crimes emerge. The causal chain is similar to Cohen's strain theory except that inner conflict is demonstrated by a tendency to attribute blame for actual or anticipated failure to the "social order or himself". In fact, internal attributions are associated with solitary adaptations, and outside the scope of the theory. Research by Simons and Gray (1989) indicates that system blaming helps an individual to overcome feelings of guilt or remorse and is associated with experience of more repeated anticipatory failures. System blaming points to persistence, and because the individual is still conflicted, they are likely to engage in more deviance than crime until they learn more subcultural beliefs.

The intervening variable that stabilizes inner conflict and prepares the individual for recruitment into a subculture is withdrawal of legitimacy. Cloward and Ohlin (1960a) discussed this variable as a "challenge to the legitimacy of the basic institutions of the society", separating crime from deviance. The beliefs that a subculture looks for are signs that an individual has given up hope of any fairness in the world. Withdrawal of legitimacy can be hypothesized to predict involvement in serious crime.

**AGNEW'S STRAIN THEORY**

Agnew's (1984a) effort to uncover success goals not linked to social class or cultural variables can be seen as part of efforts to refocus strain theory on self-generated norms (Coleman 1961) and more nebulous survivings such as a life free of hassles (Mizruchi 1964). Acute rather than simple anomie is the focus, a distinction made by DeGrazia (1948), characterizing individuals rather than society. Strain for Agnew is neither structural nor interpersonal, but emotional, involving a breakdown of beliefs in the role others play for expectations about normally occurring events (Mizruchi & Perrucci 1962). Avoidance of noxious events affects the ability to establish or maintain relationships, leading to alienative reactions, as Parsons (1951) once pointed out. Perception of an adverse environment will lead to strongly negative emotions that motivate one to engage in crime. Involvement in crime is sporadic for Agnew (1985), and people would "desist" if not for persistent negative events and effect (Shoham & Hoffman 1991). Akers (2000: 159) has operationalized most of the variables in Agnew's strain theory, as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agnew's Three Major Types of &quot;Deviance-Producing Strain&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Failure to Achieve Positively Valued Goals</strong> -- The first of the three major types, the failure to achieve positively valued goals, is subdivided into three further categories. These are the traditional concept, the gap between expectations and actual achievements, and the difference between the view of what a person believes the outcome should be and what actually results. Under the first category, Agnew includes personal goals that are both long term and immediate. In addition, he adds the personal realization that some of the set goals will never become true because of certain circumstances that are unavoidable in life, which include individual weaknesses and blocked opportunities. The second subtype continues to increase personal disappointment and the final subtype encourages the person to stop desiring to put as much effort into relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Removal of Positively Valued Stimuli</strong> -- The next major type of &quot;deviance-producing strain&quot; identified by Agnew occurs primarily during adolescence when a dramatic change or loss happens. Examples of this type include experiencing the stressful impact felt before and after moving and when a death or serious illness befalls a family - to include close friends or other individuals that have close ties to the person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confrontation with Negative Stimuli</strong> -- The last major type of &quot;deviance-producing strain&quot; also applies most to adolescents than any other age group. Usually the individual is forced to remain among negative actions that through an anger-induced response create deviant behavior. Examples of negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General strain theory is generally concerned with "types of strain rather than sources of strain" (Agnew 1992). The contributions of previous strain theorists are necessary for development of a complete model, and Agnew (1992) also suggests drawing upon other disciplines. Solitary adaptations may be possible with the two main causal factors, stress and hassles, but little or no variation by socio-demographic categories is postulated. There is also a third causal factor, inequity or sense of injustice, which has unfortunately seen little coverage in the literature (see O'Connor 1993 and perhaps others' unpublished dissertations).

Stressful events interfere with achievement of existentially based expectations or just/fair outcomes. "All manner of positive stimuli" previously experienced or observed constitute expected goals, and their frustration leads to "anger, resentment, rage, dissatisfaction, disappointment, and unhappiness—that is, all the emotions customarily associated with strain in criminology" (Agnew 1992). General strain theory claims that actors do not enter interactions with specific outcomes in mind, only that certain distributive justice rules will be followed in establishing equitable relationships. Distress occurs when individuals feel unrewarded for their efforts compared to the efforts and rewards of similar others for similar outcomes. The negative emotions associated with negative relationships may be more successfully handled by engaging in delinquent behavior than in nondelinquent behavior (Brezina 1996).

Environmental aversion was measured by Agnew (1985) as being compelled to live with one's family in a certain neighborhood, to go to a certain school and to interact with the same group of people repeatedly. Unhappiness in these contexts was scaled, had a direct effect on anger, and had indirect effects on serious crime and aggression. Anger, in turn, had a significant impact on all measures of crime and deviance. Frustration was not due to interference with valued goals, but to inability to escape from or cope with persistent reminders about the importance of these contexts. Much crime among students fits this description (Be-Yurus 1971).

In the first test of general strain theory (Agnew and White 1992), environmental aversion was redefined as stressful life events and hassles because the complete theory includes other types of strain such as loss of positively valued stimuli and presentation of noxious stimuli (Agnew 1992). Most versions of stressful life event scales (Holmes & Rahe 1967; Dohrenwend & Dohrenwend 1974) contain items indicating some kind of loss or nuisance. Unweighted scores purged of positive and crime related events are used in criminological research, and most studies find little more than ten percent variance explained using stressful events as sole predictors (Reckin & Struening 1976). Agnew and White's (1992) test explained more than forty percent variance but added variables from other theories and had interaction terms in the equation. Robert Agnew and his co-researcher and co-writer, Helene Raskin White, have produced definitive empirical evidence that suggested that general strain theory was positively able to relate delinquents and drug users. They further concluded by the use of this theory that the strongest effect on the delinquents studied was the delinquency of their peers.

Tests of general strain theory are just now emerging, but other research indicates that anger is related to crime and deviance. It has been found to be a major influence on middle class delinquency (Richards, Berk & Forster 1979). Agnew (1992) treats anger as the most critical emotion since it is almost always outer directed. Deum (1992) found anger a better predictor than anxiety and other measures of psychological distress. Stress related anger seems to be related to breakdowns in relationships (Spencer 1964) as the theory specifies, and the stress/crime relationship appears to hold regardless of guilt feelings (Schlesinger & Revitch 1980), age (Mofol 1980), and incapacity to cope when events occur simultaneously or in close succession (Linsky & Streus 1986). Studies indicating the nonspecific nature of stress with respect to criminal behavior have been reviewed by Mawson (1987). In general, both positive and negative events (Dobrin 1993) can predict the kind of incenous behaviors that bring one in contact with authorities (Masuda, Cutler, Hein, & Holmes 1978; Linsky & Streus 1986).
The determinants of deviance may be different according to general strain theory. Drug use as deviance was given special treatment in Agnew and White (1992) because it did not really represent an attempt to direct anger or escape pain, but "is used primarily to manage the negative affect caused by strain." A distinction between stressful life events and life hassles may be useful in connection with what Agnew (1992:57) curiously regards as "events" and "nonevents." Hassles are clearly nonevent "microstressors" that irritate, frustrate, and in some way characterize everyday transactions with the environment (Monet & Lazarus 1991). While nonspecificity can be expected with hassles, it is more likely to be associated with deviance because the reaction is one of more caution instead of less. Hassles were measured by attitudinal scores on everyday concerns and difficulties and found to have slightly more explanatory power for drug use than crime in Agnew and White (1992). Hassles demoralize, leading to emotional withdrawal from the rules of compulsory role interaction (Merton 1968). Generalized role stress has been equated with everyday tension and found to explain minor forms of crime and deviance (Palmer 1983; Friday 1983).

MESSNER AND ROSENFIELD'S STRAIN THEORY

Messner and Rosenfield (1994) developed an institutional anomie theory similar to Merton's, sometimes called "American Dream" theory. The American dream is a broad, cultural ethos that entails a commitment to the goal of material success, to be pursued by everyone, in a mass society dominated by huge multinational corporations. Their argument is not only that concern for economics has come to dominate our culture, but that the noneconomic institutions in society have tended to become subservient to the economy. For example, the entire educational system seems to have become driven by the job market (nobody wants to go to college just for the sake of education anymore), politicians get elected on the strength of the economy, and despite lip service to family values, executives are expected to uproot their families in service to corporate life. Goals other than material success (such as parenting, teaching, and serving the community) are just not important anymore.

The cause of crime is anomie, and the American Dream fosters anomie. Since the emphasis is upon seeking the most efficient way to achieve economic success, crime is often seen as the most efficient way to make immediate monetary gain. Beliefs, values, and commitments are the causal variables, and the closer they are to those of the marketplace, the more likely the logic of the economy (competitive, individualistic, and materialistic) will dictate a powerful social force that motivates the pursuit of money "by any means necessary." Since this lawlessness-producing emphasis is caught up in society's structural emphasis upon the economy (and little else), none of the many "wars" on crime will ever be successful (since they indirectly attack the economy).

While commitment to the goal of material success is the main causal variable, other variables consist of values and beliefs. Two of the values that make up the American dream are achievement and individualism. Achievement involves the use of material success to measure one's self-worth. Individualism refers to the notion of intense personal competition to achieve material success. Other beliefs that are related to the American Dream include universalism, the idea that chances for success are open to everyone. This belief creates an intense fear of failure. Another belief is the "fetishism" of money, which in this instance, refers to the notion that there are no rules for when enough is enough, when it comes to money.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS OF STRAIN THEORY

Strain theory has been (and can be) taken in a variety of different directions. In fact, what is often called "anomie strain theory" has progressed steadily in the field of criminology. Many fine ideas (and debates) have been perpetuated over the years, such as studies on the sociological phenomena of altruism, egoism, and other things that Durkheim pointed out, and there is, in fact, a fairly useful modern perspective (mostly owing to Parsons and not Durkheim) called neofunctionalism (O'Connor 1994). Merton's more narrowed use of anomie has prompted many academic studies of societal incoherence, and Merton will probably always be remembered for phrases such as "role model" and "self-fulfilling prophecy," but consider the following as a modern application of Merton's
During a Congressional hearing, U.S. Senator Joseph Biden made the following remarks to a presenter:

"I respectfully suggest they have responsibilities slightly above your pay grade...to decide whether
or not to take the nation to war alone or take the nation to war part-way, or to take the nation to war
half-way. That's a real tough decision. That's why they get paid the big bucks. That's why they get the
imos and you don't. Their job is a hell of a lot more complicated than yours.

Think about the above quote. The most important sets of words are "have responsibilities slightly
above your pay grade" and "they get paid the big bucks." U.S. Senator Joseph Biden is saying that
someone who gets paid not so much is not smart and that people who get paid a lot are smart, and
U.S. Senator Joseph Biden is suggesting—How dare you question higher authorities or your
superiors. However, it can also be said that how much a person makes does not equate with how
smart a person is. A person can be, for instance, a politician be paid a lot of money and still be
stupid, uninformed, et cetera. Professional baseball players, football players, hockey players, and actors
make millions and millions of dollars a year, and their making that much money has nothing to do
with the ability to think (at least, beyond matters related to sports); also, anyway, it is usually the
agents of players who do the negotiating on behalf of the players with employers and potential
employers. In America, some people may define themselves as better than you are by the money they
make, and/or smarter than you are, because they make more money than you make. [excerpted from
http://www.hologlobexpress.com/thoughts.htm]

Today, enomine strain theory continues to attract attention and support as the empirical evidence acquired from
constant testing and research increases its empirical validity.

LEARNING THEORIES OF CRIME

"You, too, can learn to be a serial killer." (Robert Hale)

Some theories in criminology believe that criminality is a function of individual socialization, how individuals
have been influenced by their experiences or relationships with family relationships, peer groups, teachers, church,
authority figures, and other agents of socialization. These are called learning theories, and specifically Social
learning theories, because criminality never really embraced the psychological determinism inherent in most
learning psychologies. They are also less concerned for the content of what is learned (like cultural deviance
theories), and more concerned with explaining the social process by which anyone, regardless of race, class, or
gender, would have the potential to become a criminal. Social Learning, Control, and Labeling theories are all
equivalent of social process theories.

Learning is defined as habits and knowledge that develop as a result of experiences with the environment, as
opposed to instincts, drives, reflexes, and genetic predispositions. Associationism (developed by Aristotle,
Hobbes, Locke, and Hume) is the oldest learning theory. It is based on the idea that the mind organizes sensory
experiences in some way, and is called cognitive psychology today. Behaviorism (developed by Pavlov and
Skinner) is the second oldest learning theory. It is based on the idea that the mind requires a physical response
by the body in order to organize sensory associations. There are two types of learning in behavioral psychology:
classical conditioning (where stimulus produce a given response without prior training); and operant conditioning
(where rewards and punishments are used to reinforce given responses). Examples of operant conditioning include
verbal behavior, sexual behavior, driving a car, writing a paper, wearing clothing, or living in a house. Most social
behavior is of an operant nature. Imitation (sometimes called contagion) is the oldest social learning theory, and
derives from the work of Tarde (1843-1904), a sociologist who said crime begins as fashion and later becomes a
custom. The Social learning theory that has had the most impact on criminology is associated with the work of
Bandura (1969), a psychologist who formulated the principles of "stimulus control" (stimulus-to-stimulus
reinforcement rather than stimulus-behavior reinforcement), outlined the stages of "modeling" (attend, retain,

rehearse, perform), and pioneered the field of "vicarious learning" (media influences, for example). Of these many contributions, the one about stimulus-to-stimulus chains of learning is the most important since it does away with the need for extrinsic rewards and punishments, arguing that observational learning can take place without them. Bandura's ideas about role modeling resonated well with criminology because since the 1930s, criminology had a similar theory (differential association). Julian Rotter was also another psychologist who had an enormous impact on social learning theory in criminology.

SUTHERLAND'S DIFFERENTIAL ASSOCIATION THEORY

Sutherland (1883-1950) is called the father of American criminology. In 1924, he wrote a book called *Criminology*, the first fully sociological textbook in the field. He first put forth his theory in the second edition of 1934, revised it again in 1939, and the theory has remained unchanged since the fourth edition of 1947. When Sutherland died in 1950, Donald Cressey continued to popularize the theory. It's called Differential Association (DA) theory, and Sutherland devised it because his study of white collar crime (a field he pioneered) and professional theft led him to believe that there were social learning processes that could turn anyone into a criminal, anytime, anywhere. Let's look at the 9 points of DA theory:

1. Criminal behavior is learned.
2. Criminal behavior is learned in interaction with others in a process of communication.
3. Learning criminal behavior occurs within primary groups (family, friends, peers, their most intimate, personal companions).
4. Learning criminal behavior involves learning the techniques, motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes.
5. The specific direction of motives and attitudes is learned from definitions of the legal codes as favorable or unfavorable.
6. A person becomes a criminal when there is an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to violation of law. (This is the principle of differential association.)
7. Differential associations vary in frequency, duration, priority, and intensity (frequent contacts, long contacts, age at first contact, important or prestigious contacts).
8. The process of learning criminal behavior involves all the mechanisms involved in any other learning.
9. Although criminal behavior is an expression of general needs and attitudes, criminal behavior and motives are not explained nor excused by the same needs and attitudes (criminals must be differentiated from noncriminals).

Sutherland's theory is tested mainly on juveniles because delinquency is largely a group crime. The principle research problem is determining which comes first, the delinquency or delinquent friends. It may be that "birds of a feather flock together" and delinquency "causes" delinquent friends, but delinquent friends do not cause delinquency. There are plenty of negative test cases showing that not everyone who associates with criminals becomes a criminal. The theory doesn't even try to explain where the first, original unfavorable definition comes from. There's some research showing that more recent than earlier delinquent friends have more influence (Warr, 1993), and other research (Short, 1957; Jensen, 1972) has produced mixed findings. Another problem is the complex modeling involved (Matsueda, 1988) to specify the causal structure in Sutherland's theory, especially the ratio of definitions favorable and unfavorable to violating the law, as the following examples indicate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitions favorable</th>
<th>Definitions unfavorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair play</td>
<td>Cheating and shortcuts are OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgive and forget</td>
<td>I don't get mad, I get even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good always wins</td>
<td>Sometimes evil wins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite these criticisms, DA theory applies to most types of crime (upper world and underworld; juvenile and adult; it doesn’t explain spontaneous, wanton acts). It sensitizes criminologists to the role of ideas, not social conditions, as influences on criminal behavior.

AKERS’ DIFFERENTIAL REINFORCEMENT THEORY

In the late 1960s, new social learning theories were developed which dropped Sutherland’s point that learning criminal behavior takes place in primary groups (Burgess & Akers 1968). Differential reinforcement theories, as they were called, tried to incorporate the psychological principles of operant conditioning, and held that even nonsocial situations (such as the physical effects of drug use) could reinforce learning criminal behavior. In sociology, there’s also a group of theories called differential identification, which deal with imaginary, or comparative reference groups as influential in perceiving deviance as respectable.

According to Akers (1985), people are first indoctrinated into deviant behavior by differential association with deviant peers. Then, through differential reinforcement, they learn how to reap rewards and avoid punishment by reference to the actual or anticipated consequences of given behaviors. These consequences are the social and nonsocial reinforcements that provide a support system for those with criminal careers or persistent criminality. Structural conditions affect a person’s differential reinforcements. Criminal knowledge is gained through reflection over past experience. Potential offenders consider the outcomes of their past experiences, anticipate future rewards and punishments, and then decide which acts will be profitable and which ones will be dangerous. To get to the point where criminal behavior is activated by discriminative cues (norms), the whole process follows seven stages:

1. Criminal behavior is learned through conditioning or imitation.
2. Criminal behavior is learned both in nonsocial reinforcing situations or nonsocial discriminative situations and thru social interaction.
3. The principal components of learning occur in groups.
4. Learning depends on available reinforcement contingencies.
5. The type and frequency of learning depends on the norms by which these reinforcers are applied.
6. Criminal behavior is a function of norms which are discriminative for criminal behavior.
7. The strength of criminal behavior depends upon its reinforcement.

This theory has been tested fairly successfully on teenage deviance such as tobacco, drug, and alcohol use (Akers et al. 1979). It tends to explain 50-60% of the differences between users and abstainers using measurement items like perceptions of actual or anticipated praise or absence of praise; and the total good things felt from deviance minus the total bad things felt. Differential reinforcement theory tends to fit well with rational choice theory because they both explain the decision making process involved in developing the motivation, attitudes, and techniques necessary to commit crime. It can explain solitary offending (since learning is sometimes solitary). Like all learning theories, it claims to be a general theory of crime.

JEFFERY’S DIFFERENTIAL REINFORCEMENT THEORY

Not to be overlooked, Jeffery’s (1965) theory of differential reinforcement is based on the ideas of conditioning history, deprivation, satiation, the proceeds of crime being reinforcing in themselves, and the absence of punishment. This last variable (absence of punishment, or not getting caught) makes the theory tend to resemble a social control theory of crime (Conger 1976).
Jeffrey takes for granted the existence of constant stimuli in the environment, but argues that the key variables of deprivation and satisfaction are what make these stimuli reinforcing or not. A person deprived of something will respond to a stimulus in a much different way than a person satiated with something. Crimes against property produce things, like money or cars, which are themselves powerful reinforcers. Crimes against persons most often involve what Jeffrey calls negative reinforcement, the removal of an aversive stimulus (such as when a man kills his unfaithful wife). Drug offenses are reinforced by biochemical changes in the human body.

A criminal act may lead to reinforcement, but it may also lead to punishment. Punishment is an important variable in Jeffrey's theory because, essentially, he argues that crime occurs because criminal acts in the past, for a particular actor, have not been punished enough. Criminals have different conditioning histories, but it is possible for a person living in a criminal environment to not become a criminal and for criminals to be found in noncriminal environments. Associations with others do not matter. The behavior is shaped by discriminative stimuli rather than reinforcing stimuli.

Jeffrey's theory is compatible with the classical school of criminology in that the perceived certainty of punishment, not its severity, is what deters people from criminal acts. He's also concerned with sloppy administration of the criminal justice system, in the sense that it's administration produces avoidance and escape responses rather than aversive consequences. Hence, a criminal doesn't refrain from crime, but from apprehension, detection, and conviction (by not leaving fingerprints, hiring a good lawyer, pleading insanity, etc.).

MATZA'S NEUTRALIZATION THEORY

Neutralization theory (Sykes & Matza 1957) holds that people learn the values, attitudes, and techniques of criminal behavior through subterranean values, which exist side by side with conventional values. Few people are "all good" or "all bad." Matza argues that most criminals are not involved in crime all the time. They drift from one behavior to another, sometimes deviant, sometimes conventional. Sykes and Matza state that criminals frequently admire honest, law abiding persons, and therefore are not immune from guilt and the demands of conformity. They have to use excuses that allow them to drift into crime. In this way, neutralization theory is a control theory if the excuses are seen as post-hoc rationalizations. If they exist in a subterranean fashion (as originally thought), then it's a learning theory. They identified the following techniques of neutralization that criminals use to escape from the demands of conventionalism:

1. Denial of responsibility -- It's not my fault; I didn't have a choice
2. Denial of injury -- It's no big deal; they have too much money
3. Denial of victim -- They had it coming; they had a bad attitude
4. Condemnation of the condemners -- Everybody does it; why me?
5. Appeal to higher loyalties -- Only cowards back down; protecting

Neutralization theory can explain the behavior of occasional criminals, like shoplifters or poachers. Further, specific types of crime may be related to specific types of excuses. Learning theories, in general, have the capacity to explain a wide assortment of criminal activities. Agnew (1994), for example, applied neutralization theory to violent crime, and Minic (1980) has come up with several extended neutralization techniques. Some criminologists think of neutralization theory as a CONTROL theory while others believe it fits into a symbolic interactionist, or LABELING, perspective which focuses upon identity formation processes.

CONTROL THEORIES OF CRIME

"To be able to fill leisure intelligently is the last product of civilization." (Bertrand Russell)

Control theories take the opposite approach from other theories in criminology. As their starting point, instead of asking what drives people to commit crime, they ask why do most people not commit crime. Control
The relationship between RELIGION and the social bond has attracted the attention of criminologists for years, and sociologists for many years beforehand. Among social bond theorists in criminology, those who postulate the primary importance of family factors usually emphasize the attachment element of the social bond, while those who postulate the primary importance of religion usually emphasize other elements of the social bond, such as commitment (along with commitment in the school setting), belief, or religion as a composite or fifth element of the social bond. Regarding religion, the slight majority of research is in agreement that religion is a moderate Insulator from delinquency and crime (Burkett & White 1974; Albrecht et al. 1977; Tittle & Welch 1983; Bear & Wright 2001; Johnson et al. 2001). However, there are many studies which have NOT supported this conclusion (Hirschi himself in Hirschi & Stark 1969; Jensen & Erickson 1979; Evans et al. 1996; and Bendt & Corwyn 1997). Most limitations reported in the literature center around the problems of how to measure 'religiosity' as well as what kind of crime to measure. So-called 'hellfire' by itself (usually measured as beliefs about the consequences of bad behavior) does NOT tend to insulate unless the crime being studied has some personal health issue associated with it (such as alcohol, drugs, smoking, and premarital sex). Religion does not appear to have much of an effect at influencing less-trivial crime, and the reason may be that living in secular society (which condones much bad behavior) "washes out" the religion effect.

The earliest known control theory was presented by Reiss in 1951 who argued that delinquency was the result of a failure of personal and social controls. Personal control problems stemmed from the juveniles' inability to refrain from meeting their needs (in a psychiatric sense). Social control problems were measured by Reiss as the degree to which school authorities labeled the juveniles as behavior problems. This particular theory launched a series of studies into Insulation and vulnerability factors affecting delinquency, as in the work of Reckless and Dintz at Ohio State during the 1960s which became known as containment theory, a conception of social controls consisting of 'pushes' and 'pulls' with self-concept as the main "Insulator" from delinquency.

Another early theory was provided by Toby in 1957 who introduced the concept of 'stakes in conformity' — how much a person has to lose when he or she breaks the law. He argued that some youths risk more than others because they do not care about jeopardizing their future careers. This particular study, besides popularizing the stakes in conformity concept, launched a series of studies into suburban and urban differences in Juvenile delinquency.

In 1958, Nye published a study claiming the family was the single most important source of social control. He found that delinquents were more likely to come from homes where there was complete freedom or no freedom at all. The family connection became important in the history of control theory [see the section of this lecture on family factors] because it was useful as a device to explain both personal and social forms of control. Nye also pioneered the use of self-report data — using questionnaires to ask delinquents themselves what behaviors they had engaged in.
Modern control theory can be said to begin with the framework provided by Matza (1964). His ideas are called Drift Theory, and the key notion is that delinquents 'drift' in and out of crime on an occasional basis, most of the time conforming, some of the time offending. In addition, most offenders 'age out' of crime and settle down to law-abiding lifestyles. Their part-time involvement in crime is due to their 'neutralizing', not rejecting, society's standards. Drift is caused by a broad sense of injustice and a sense of irresponsibility, both reinforced by the potential delinquent's perceptions of conventional legal standards for justice.

The theorist most closely identified with control theory is Hirschi (1969) and his book *Causes of Delinquency* which launched a whole research revolution (the use of self-report data collection) in addition to dominating ideas about social control for many years. His model of the family, the school, and peers as the most important factors became (and still is) the Justice department's model for considering grant applications. While Hirschi's social control theory deserves more treatment than it will be given here, the following table summarizes components of what he calls the 'social bond' -- things that keep people from committing criminal acts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>affection and sensitivity to others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment:</td>
<td>Investment in conventional society or stake in conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvements:</td>
<td>being busy, restricted opportunities for delinquency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs:</td>
<td>degree to which person thinks they should obey the law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The elements of Hirschi's social bond theory have become the subject of considerable attention by criminologists. Attachment, for example, has come to be associated with research into family factors. Commitment has come to be associated with peer relationships, in the sense that stakes in conformity are passed through intimate channels of communication, usually in a school context. Involvement has also come to be associated with school factors, study habits, working, dating, and time spent watching TV. Finally, Hirschi found a strong association between self-reported delinquency and agreement with the statement 'It's OK to get around the law if you can get away with it', and this and related statements became measures of the belief component. Most literature on the subject holds that Involvement and belief are two of the weakest parts of Hirschi's social bond theory (although there are many arguments over this among control theorists). Some sample measurement items for a simple test of social control theory are presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>1. There's always someone to turn to in time of need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I have a lot of close friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I am not eager to move out from my parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. My parents are good role models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment:</td>
<td>1. Haven't smoked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Haven't drunked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Haven't skipped school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Haven't missed much church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Have dated a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Have participated in school activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvements:</td>
<td>1. Haven't been wasting time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Have spent time with family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Have participated in extracurricular school activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. I generally keep busy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs:</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. It is important to own a home
2. It is important to respect police
3. Teachers are good people
4. Generally, the law should be obeyed

Self-Reported Delinquency questions:
1. Have you ever taken little things (worth less than $2) that did not belong to you?
2. Have you ever taken items (between two and fifty dollars) that did not belong to you?
3. Have you ever taken items (worth over fifty dollars) that did not belong to you?
4. Have you ever taken a car for a ride without the owner’s permission?
5. Have you ever bungled up something that did not belong to you on purpose?
6. Not counting fights you may have had with a brother or sister, have you ever beaten up on anyone or hurt anyone on purpose?

THE ROLE OF THE FAMILY

Family structures and functioning have crucial impacts on socialization, the capacity for symbolic interaction, self-concepts, and to the extent that psychogenic theories are true, personality characteristics. Families are primary agents of socialization, and as such, are tempting to consider as direct causal agents of crime. All except a handful of jurisdictions recognize the immediacy of this connection in “contributing to delinquency” statutes, parental liability laws, and a number of other restitution schemes. In both *proximate* and *distal* terms, many criminological theories (social disorganization, social learning, and especially social control) grant the family causal significance. Ample empirical work has demonstrated statistically significant causal relationships between family contexts and both juvenile and adult crime. This lecture reviews that empirical evidence.

Seven (7) family conditions are considered parental imprisonment, divorce, stepfamilies, adoption, punitive parenting, incompetent parenting, and single parenting. The first four come primarily from what is called the “broken home” (family structure) literature. Punitive and Incompetent parenting have been taken from the literature on dysfunctional families, which are in fact “functionally broken.” Single parenting refers to unwed mothering, either by misfortune or choice, the latter not qualifying as either broken or dysfunctional but deviating from the cultural standard of nuclear family structure. Six (6) behavioral outcomes are considered property crime, violent crime, mental disorder, alcoholism, drug addiction, and status offenses. Where significant, variation by age, gender, ethnicity, social class, and neighborhood support will be mentioned.

Parental imprisonment studies stem from the classic works of Dugdale and Goddard (pedigree theorists) on the genetic transmission of crime. Dugdale found a 14% transmission rate of property crime by tracing descendents of the Juke family, and Goddard found a 9% transmission rate of violent crime among Kalikaks. Larger percentages were obtained by the Gluecks (1974) who found that 40% of delinquent boys had paternal criminal heritage and 55% had maternal criminal heritage with respect to serious crime, suggesting a “like mother, like son” effect. Pedigree studies have also found significant transmission rates for alcoholism, drug dependence, mental disorder, and sexual deviance. Few studies have looked at how children adjust to criminal parentage, with the possible exception of Moerk (1973) who compared the effect of an incarcerated father with the effect of divorce.

Divorce is the most studied broken home variable and is often compared to death of a parent. West & Farrington (1973) and Wedsworth (1979) are both longitudinal studies of homes broken by divorce, desertion, or separation. The results showed that such homes were more likely to produce serious delinquency than homes broken by death. Wedsworth indicates impact is greatest when the child is young, while Needle et al. (1990) find greater impact in teenage years, with Power et al. (1974) arguing that age at time of break has no impact at all. The causal direction of divorce impact appears mostly in the direction of property crime (Berger & Simon 1974; Belson 1975). Divorce has not been strongly associated with alcoholism and status offenses like runaway behavior.
(Sauller & Amberl 1983; Rankin 1983); however, Byram & Fly (1984) found DUl and joyriding significantly related to the impact of divorce on white males. Being African-American and from a broken home is strongly associated with drug dependence (Dembo et al. 1979), but not so for Hispanics. In general, the effect of a broken home on person and property crime is greater for blacks than nonblacks (Matsueda & Heilner 1987). Social class seems to play a greater role in the divorce-serious crime relationship (Gove & Grutchfield 1982). Gender-specific effects include females tending toward status offending and males leaning toward felony offending (Datesmen & Scarpitti 1975; Canter 1982). Austin (1978) concludes that white females are the most affected by the broken home. Meta-analyses of the literature on divorce (Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber 1986; Wells & Rankin 1986) reveal a consistent statistical relationship between parental absence and delinquency, and interpret this finding as support for a lack of supervision explanation.

Stepfamilies have been found to increase delinquency. Johnson (1986) reports that white male stepchildren, in particular, are more involved in serious crime than those raised in other types of broken homes. The effect of a stepfather on drug dependence by white males is also indicated by the literature (Blechman, Berberian & Thompson 1977). In fact, the majority of studies show a greater effect of stepfamilies on drug dependence than for other forms of behavior (McCarthy et al. 1982; Floorling & Baum 1990). Other studies have linked stepfamily influence to runaway behavior (Rankin 1983) and antisocial personality disorder (Steinberg 1987). Rebelliousness among white male stepchildren appears to be the predominant explanation, and the stepfamily-drug dependence effect is greatest for those with middle-class status (Blechman et al. 1977; Needle et al. 1990).

Adoption studies are of interest, of course, to genetic researchers, but here, we are concerned with reactions to being adopted as a precursor to delinquency. Goldberg (1955) has observed that adoption as a broken home effect occurs only if adoption occurs after the child's age three, and other studies have indicated the importance of age at impact of finding out that one is adopted. Johnson (1986) finds a significant relationship between adoption and serious crime, but this finding is not supported by any other studies in the literature. Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber (1986) suggest a "sleep effect" for awareness of being adopted. The strongest evidence exists for a connection with alcoholism (Fishbein 1990), drug dependence (Toc 1974), and mental illness (Bowby 1951). For drug dependence, being white and adopted increases the effect (Johnson 1986; Blechman et al. 1977). For mental illness, being female and adopted increases the risk of disorders in thinking, feeling, and relating (Wilkinson 1980). Maternal rejection is often the explanation for these effects, relying upon psychoanalytic interpretations that can seldom be tested directly. Taking antisocial personality disorder as the main effect (it occurs before drug dependence, conforms to a "sleep effect", and if due to adoption, explains recidivism (Bulbutfen & Hoekstra 1974)), explanation may simply be loss of attachment (Alsoworth 1982; Hirsch 1983). Problems in creating and maintaining significant (sleep and meaningful) relationships would be explained by the symbolism in the loss of a significant other. With adoption, the criminogenic effect is presently foursquare in the center of the family structure-family function debate (Rosen 1985; Van Voorhls et al. 1988).

Punitive parenting is most strongly related to violent delinquent behavior. The consensus of scholars is that violence breeds violence according to comprehensive reviews of the literature (Wildon 1989). Older, black males with punitive parents tend to become murderous, while young, white females under the same conditions tend to develop depressive mental disorders (Bryer et al. 1987). Punitive parenting, of course, correlates highly with runaway behavior (Gutierrez & Giovannolfi 1981). The cycle of violence explanation that predominates in this literature comes full circle with the recent emergence of the phenomenon of reactive paternalism (Sorrel 1977).

Incompetent, ineffective, or inconsistent parenting is most strongly related to lucrative delinquency (Wilson & Herrnstein 1985), but the majority of studies (McCord & McCord 1959; Robins 1966; and Patterson 1982) indicate that erratic discipline is also directly related to the development of sociopathic personality disorder. The significance of this effect is even more alarming when one realizes it holds even if the home is intact and only functionally discordant. Sociopathy, due to ineffective techniques of child-rearing, has been
Single parenting has only been studied recently. The non-nuclear structure predicts no effect on serious crime or delinquency (Cleaver 1982). Other studies have estimated the effects from situations in which the father is unknown or the mother decides to eliminate male figures from her life. These studies (McCarthy et al. 1982; Rankin 1983; Finkelstein & Murphy 1990) predict a greater involvement in status offenses (smoking, truancy, and runaway behavior) and "home delinquency" (damaging and stealing family property, and hitting mothers). Several studies have begun researching the mediating effect of neighborhood context (attachment to neighbors) under these kinds of conditions (Kreus & Smith 1973; Johnstone 1986; Leib & Sampson 1988), but the results are inconclusive on neighbors as family surrogates, other than the finding that there is no variation by ethnicity (Free 1991).

The following table summarizes the information on family factors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Factors</th>
<th>Strongest Criminogenic Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Parentage</td>
<td>Property Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>Serious Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepfamily</td>
<td>Rebelliousness/Drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>Mental Illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitive Parenting</td>
<td>Violence/Mental Illness/Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetent Parenting</td>
<td>Property Crime/Mental Illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parenting</td>
<td>Status Offenses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOTTREDSON AND HIRSCHI'S LOW SELF CONTROL THEORY

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) believe that classical theories are control theories and also general theories. General theories (as opposed to middle-range theories) purport to explain the varieties of crime (street, suite, female, juvenile) and theoretically equivalent events (fires, accidents, traffic jams, etc.). Low self-control (LSC) theory attempts to do this while describing what is right and wrong within the field of criminology. Most tests of LSC theory are essentially tests of Hirschi's social control theory (attachment, commitment, involvement, belief) with some personality variables thrown in.

The authors hold that logical consistency and parsimony are more appropriate than testability, claiming that the low self control concept is an improvement over older concepts such as impulsiveness and spontaneity, and that their theory avoids the criticism of all temperament theories — which came first, the trait or the criminality? This issue takes up most of the discussion, as the authors modify classical theory to include family factors, but appear unwilling, as others have done (Wilson and Herrnstein 1985), to grant the possibility of a societal trend toward greater parental permissiveness.

It is important to note that LSC theory makes individualistic causal arguments; that is, each and every act of criminal behavior is the result of unique individual factors such as traits, which are semi-permanent enduring personality characteristics. Individuals possess three (3) sets of traits: (1) traits composing low self-control; (2) traits predicting involvement in crime; and (3) other traits that are the result of socialization. LSC traits appear in the first six or eight years of life, and include only "factors affecting calculation of the consequences of one's acts". The second set of traits include low intelligence, high activity level,
physical strength, and adventuresomeness. The third set of traits include impulsivity, insensitivity, and inability to delay gratification. Let's consider these in reverse order.

**Traits That Are the Result of Socialization**

Impulsivity is sometimes defined as acting on impulse without reflecting upon consequences (Chaplin 1985). Impulsiveness connotes irrationality and an inability to profit from experience.

Insensitivity, or lack of guilt, is a trait associated with psychopathy (Cleckley 1976) and has been included in scales measuring social control (Wiatrowski, Griswold, and Roberts 1984; Agnew 1985). Guilt is painful and lack of guilt is pleasurable. This modified hedonism in LSC theory is consistent with control theories in general which assume that pleasures are constant and motivation unproblematic. The authors are concerned, however, with the consequences of a lack of guilt for the individual, not the emotional poverty from an inability to form relationships. They appear to be saying that individuals miscalculate or devalue the pain of guilt, and that this is something one gets from their parents.

Immediate gratification is also associated with psychopathy and means self-absorption in one's own needs which vehemently demand satisfaction (McCord and McCord 1964). LSC theory treats it as an individual decision process, there is some support for this in the work of Mischel (1976) who equates self-control with self-regulation during the waiting period when rewards are delayed, this author says that the ability to keep oneself occupied and to tolerate frustration are the skills that self-control demands.

**Traits Predicting Involvement in Crime**

Adventuresomeness, or spontaneity is defined as self-initiating behavior occurring without the necessity of external stimulation (Chaplin 1985). It's the only non-biological factor in this second category of traits in LSC theory. It's a personality trait that loosely differentiates between delinquents and nondelinquents (Wilson and Herrnstein 1985). It is furthermore a valued trait given the societal trend toward greater tolerance for self-expression and assertiveness, while possibly related to extraversion, spontaneity per se is nothing more than a weak predictor because it suggests concern, not insensitivity, for others and also suggests self-esteem, or a concern for a positive image of one's self. A person could be adventuresome and still not have LSC traits.

**LSC Traits**

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) offer the concept of shortsightedness as an LSC trait which is consistent with a conception of decision processes during a waiting period. Shortsightedness refers to a lack of foresight, poor judgment and planning, and is apparently a defect that appears early in life. It subsumes certain capacities for calculation.

Other LSC traits are the inability to profit from experience; poor judgment with respect to delay time; and miscalculation of pain prospects. Inability to profit has also been treated as a sociological variable in Hirschi's (1969) bond of attachment since people or institutions are sources of learning. LSC theory, by contrast, is more behavioral to the extent that profit means the calculation of benefits minus the likelihood of detection. LSC theory is classical to the extent that profit maximizing is implied. LSC theory is general to the extent that learning to profit is imperfectly manifested in most people, implying that all are not equally social or moral.

Poor judgment has some relationship to Hirschi's (1969) bonds of commitment and involvement since it refers to activities engaged in while one is deferring gratification. LSC theory is rational choice to the extent that choice over delay activities is implied. LSC theory is classical in the image of a rational calculator with abilities to see into the future, LSC theory is general as it applies to self-activity during 'downtime'. Staying busy, or
restrained, is an obvious deterrent to crime, but certain personalities apparently have difficulty with this "busywork" approach to self-expression.

Miscalculation of pain also has some relationship to Hirschi's (1969) bond of belief in the moral validity of norms. LSC theory is classical in the sense that the risk of penalties serve as a crime deterrent, although the authors are pessimistic about deterrence. LSC theory is general to the extent that self-protection is implied. Not guilt, but fear, is the self-sent emotion. Some individuals seem to discount the risk of injury from victims and guardians.

The LSC personality configuration is, then, composed of self-seeking, self-expression, and self-protection. It presents an image of the potential (predictable) offender at odds with society and ignoring or defying caretakers at every turn. Hirschi (1986) has, in fact, characterized this image of the offender as that of the loser, one who chooses to enter a (nonexistent) career in crime that goes no place but downward.

GENERAL COMMENTS ON LSC THEORY

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) believe that there are stable individual personality differences in offending patterns, but they also believe in versatility. Versatility means that any kind of crime can be predicted from evidence of LSC early on in life. It also means that crime can be reliability measured by various forms of deviance, given that there is no other evidence of offender specialization. Excluded from the general theory are what the authors call "exotic crimes". LSC personalities are destined for failure, either through crime or theoretically equivalent events, such as financial ruin. The whole argument is compatible with the social contract assumption that everyone has equal chances for ruin or failure.

LSC theory is also somewhat tautological, in that the only way to determine if people have LSC is to see if they engage in LSC behavior. What the authors are after is a logical deduction of the properties of individuals who are fit an opportunity model of crime without specifying a priori a list of necessary conditions (situations, targets, victims) for committing the crime. Suitably motivated (insufficiently restrained) offenders are taken for granted, but the opportunity model is the weakest part of LSC theory. Opportunities are taken for granted and treated as distal (distant) causes (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990:24). Their general qualities consist of immediacy, brevity, and efforts of opportunities, there is no calculation of opportunities. Opportunities are viewed as plentiful and interexchangeable. Proximate causes are the actualizing (will to behave) conditions of control theory. The ability to avoid choosing crime is a variable psychological matter while pleasures are constantly surrounding the individual. This treatment of individual decision-making successfully transforms criminal inclinations (motives) into pain-reduction strategies (cost-calculations) for the individual.

The example of female crime (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990:148) illustrates the point that social control of pain is a necessary element for the production of self-control. Girls are not portrayed as more criminally inclined, only that their misbehavior is more costly. On the one hand, there is the socializability (proximate cause) factor; on the other hand, there is the supervision (distal cause, or minimalization of opportunities) factor. The authors are clear on the point that supervision does not affect differences in self-control, but provide some leeway for arguing that some female deviant behaviors are less "proximately" related to crime.

The 'logical structure of crime' device (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990) is used to define crime as ordinary, requiring little in the way of effort, planning, preparation, or skill. The basic pattern of the device is to transform complexity into simplicity. Minimal technical requirements include factors such as 'there must be a weapon', 'there must be an automobile', 'there must be an attractive victim', and 'there must be a drug'. Crime simply requires the intersection of an offender with people or property. This is parsimony at its best. It allows almost any research that fits their model to be offered as support of the model. Almost any description of the criminal act is exactly similar to a description of criminality. The nature of individual characteristics are derived from the nature of criminal acts. Crime is characterized by being simple and easy; hence criminals are characterized by being simple.
and easy. The advantage of this device is that surplus terms, like aggression, frustration, and relative deprivation, are avoided. The problem is that it leads to notions such as "only crime can predict crime".

Consider the logical structure of drug use. Here, even drugs that do not affect mood (tobacco) are correlated with crime because they share features that satisfy both criminality and the requirements of crime. Both crime and drug use provide short-term, immediate, and easy pleasure, and more importantly, in this view, drug use is not attributable to peer pressure, but to the fact that it is prohibited and has an adverse impact on health. LSC personalities must logically come prior to criminality because they are predisposed to disregard legal prohibitions and negative consequences for their own health. Drug users are people who "tend toward criminality", and may self-destruction in any number of ways. Another way of saying this is that LSC is the domain and criminality only covers a portion of this domain. LSC allows almost any deviant act that is "logically" possible.

LSC personalities are predisposed to criminality to the extent that there are no other personality factors that interfere with this predisposition. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) mention charm and generosity as factors that may offset LSC traits. A person does not simply "age out" of criminality. LSC can be dealt with early on, but criminality is forever. LSC theory is a pessimistic, mechanistic theory, there would appear to be nothing society can do about it except rise to the challenges of early identification and selective incapacitation. Perhaps new child-rearing techniques might work, but Gottfredson and Hirschi might say not everyone is fit to be a parent. Parents may have to give up some freedom to raise their kids any way they want. Collectively, action may be needed to elevate values such as charm, generosity, and discipline over the present climate of self-expressiveness and assertiveness.

The following table summarizes the factors of LSC theory:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSC traits</th>
<th>Shortsightedness, Inability to Profit, Poor Judgment, Miscalculation of Pain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictor traits:</td>
<td>Adventurousness, Low IQ, High Activity Level, Physical Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialized traits:</td>
<td>Impulsivity, Insensitivity, Immediate Gratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Insulating) traits:</td>
<td>Charm, generosity, discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LABELING THEORIES OF CRIME

"If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences." (W.I. Thomas)

"Ideas that are only parts of our experience become true in order to get into satisfactory relations with other parts of our experience." (William James)

Labeling theorists believe that labeling and reacting to offenders as "criminals" has unanticipated negative consequences, deepening the criminal behavior and making the crime problem worse. They believe that the criminal justice system is dangerous in the sense that it is "casting the net" of social control too widely. Thus, net-widening, or any state intervention, is inherently crimogenic. Furthermore, scholars in this tradition work with revisionist assumptions of what crime is. Broadly defined, revisionism in criminology refers to a rejection of legalistic conceptions of what crime is. Labeling theorists therefore are critical of conceptions that crime is behavior that violates criminal law. To be sure, they agree that certain acts, like murder, are inherently reprehensible. However, they argue it's not the harm that makes an act "criminal", but whether the label is conferred on the act, and this varies from situation to situation. The audience, not the actor, determines when certain behavior becomes defined as crime. This is called the Social constructionist viewpoint, that crime varies from
situation to situation, across time and place. It's also called the symbolic interactionist viewpoint, that crime is defined by reference to the symbols and meanings that people communicate to one another.

EARLY LABELING THEORISTS

Tannenbaum (1938) was perhaps the first labeling theorist. His main concept was the dramatization of evil. With it, he argued that the process of tagging, defining, identifying, segregating, describing, and emphasizing any individual out for special treatment becomes a way of stimulating, suggesting, and evoking the very traits that are complained of. A person becomes the thing they are described as being.

Lemert (1951) is regarded as the founder of what is called the "societal reaction" approach. Briefly, this approach distinguishes between primary deviance (where individuals do not see themselves a deviant) and secondary deviance (which involves acceptance of a deviant status). Primary deviance arises for a wide variety of reasons, biological, psychological, and/or sociological. Secondary, or intensified deviance becomes a means of defense, attack, or adaptation to the problems caused by societal reaction to primary deviation. Societal reaction is more important to study since it sheds light on things like community tolerance quotients. Societal reaction theorists often make claims similar to functionalists, that the process of defining and suppressing deviance is important to social solidarity. Sometimes, this is also referred to as the "morality panic" literature (Goode & Ben-Yehuda 1999).

Becker (1963), whom many consider as the founder of labeling theory, coined the term "moral entrepreneur" to describe individuals who lead campaigns to outlaw certain behaviors by making them "criminal." The outlaw's subsequent behavior is therefore not the important thing to study because what is more important is whether the innocent are falsely accused and exactly which outlaws are rounded up and processed through the criminal justice system. Most labeling theorists believe the system exercises a lower-class bias in rounding up offenders, and that FBI statistics are useless as a measure of how much crime is really out there, but useful in measuring class, race, and gender bias (since mostly urban poor black males are arrested). Sometimes these are referred to as extra-legal factors.

Being a "criminal" becomes a person's master status. It controls the way they are identified in public. Others do not consider their other statuses — that of spouse, parent, or worker — only that they are first and foremost a criminal. Sometimes this public scrutiny might scare or shame a person into conformity, but most likely it has the effect of pushing the person to the point where they forfeit all further attempts at conformity. An identity change takes place where the person's self-concept loses any further stake in conformity, and because a deviant self-image is now in place, there's pressure to behave consistently as deviant. Furthermore, people who are labeled deviant tend to lose contact with their conformist friends and start associating with similarly-labeled deviants.

Becker's focus on moral entrepreneurs and those who seize power seems to have been his most enduring contribution. Campaigns to define and suppress deviance have been studied by a number of criminologists, whether the motive is to seize power, as in the war on drugs (Silver 1974), to ritually expel evil from society in the form of scapegoats like witches (Erikson 1966) and the mentally ill (Szasz 1970), or to make symbolic crusades, as in the case of alcohol crackdowns (Gusfield 1963). Campaigns to redefine deviance are also self-initiated by deviant groups themselves, a process known as stigma contests (Schur 1980).

MODERN LABELING THEORIES

Today, one rarely finds labeling theories like those which predominated in the late 1960s. To be sure, there are still social constructivist accounts of some type of deviance or another, and studies about the meaning of crime
to criminals and criminalizers are still done. A shift seemed to have taken place around 1974 in which labelling theory accommodated itself to legalistic definitions, or at least a focus on state power. Modern labelling theories came to recognize that societies "create" crime by passing laws, and that the substantive nature of the law should be an object of study. Sometimes, these are called criminalization theories (Hartley 1974), and they have some resemblance to societal reaction approaches, but they more closely fall into a field that criminologists trained in sociology call the sociology of law perspective or the study of law as a mechanism of social control. Labelling theories that focus on state power can be considered as branches of control-ology (Ditto 1979), a little-known British perspective. Most modern labelling theorists have been influenced by a critique of the underdog focus which was provided by Liezos (1972) when he said that sociologists need to stop studying "nuts, sluts, and prevents."

Control-ology refers to a group of theories with some interest in crime waves and moral panics, but mostly the view that criminal justice agencies are part of broader social control mechanisms, like welfare, mental health, education, the military, and the mass media, all of which are used by the state to control "problem" populations (Arvanites 1992). The foundation of control-ology was built by Foucault (1967; 1979) who argued that various instruments of social control (more humane, enlightened, reasonable responses to deviance) are packaged and sold by the state to cover up the Inherent coercion and power in the system. The state is always trying to portray a "velvet glove" where its ultimate goal is to exercise its "iron fist" where the ultimate goal is to control troublesome populations. Theorists who see the world this way tend to focus heavily on the thinking and words of the more activist groups in society, what is called the universe of discourse. Other theorists draw heavily from other philosophical areas, as we'll see with the next example below.

**KATZ’S MORAL SEDUCTION THEORY**

Asserting the thesis that "the causes of crime are constructed by the offenders themselves" in ways that are compellingly seductive, Jack Katz (1988), author of *Seductions of Crime*, provides a phenomenological theory of crime causation. It is intended as a corrective to materialistic, positivistic, and deterministic criminology (read Merton) which has neglected foreground for the sake of background. Phenomenology is a more radically empirical (sometimes called "grounded") labelling theory which attempts to get at things-in-themselves (phenomena) rather than accepting things-for-themselves (nomina). Reflective actors are always engaged in practical projects of transcending everyday reality in consciousness, but are limited by the embodiment of their senses. Other phenomenological writers include Merleau-Ponty on the concept of terror, Schutz's fundamental anxiety of the life-world, and Ricoeur's phenomenology of evil. Like many other labelling theorists, Katz draws his data from autobiographies, biographies, and ethnographies, and there is a distinct tendency to avoid legalistic terminology.

Hot-blooded murder, for example, is described by Katz in terms of a triad of conditions: Interpretive, emotional, and practical. Interpretive conditions include defense of morality, the role of a teasing or daring victim, the role of a supportive audience, and the role of alcohol in casual settings of last resort (e.g., the home). Emotional conditions involve a process of transcending humiliation with rage via the steppingstone of righteousness. Practical conditions are a marking, or desecration, of the victim's body as in when offenders can recall precisely the number of stitches it took for a victim to survive. The key term is 'humiliation', defined as a "profound loss of control over one's identity, or soul" (p. 24). humiliation is also a key term for analyzing other types of crime. Katz' theory treats all forms of criminality as a moral response to humiliation. Katz also introduces another key term, 'uncertainty', which eliminates inevitability in the event. Cursing by the attacker and silent prayers by the victim are treated as priestly omens and sacrificial service honoring the sacred which must be approached by a "leap into faith", and the final seduction into "the unknown" (p. 43). [Pretty phenomenological, huh?] Katz belongs to a tradition of naturalistic sociology along the lines of Becker and Matza, but is more logically consistent within a strict phenomenological tradition.
Foreground is defined as individual consciousness and associated mental processes (p. 51) while the lesser-important background involves factors such as social class and gender. Background differences can vary the experience of humiliation and open up possibilities for rituals of forgiveness, but foreground, or what is going through the criminal's head at the time of the crime, is more important.

Crimes such as shoplifting and pizza theft involve imputing sensual power to an object so that the seduction is like a 'romantic encounter.' Practical conditions involve flirting with the object and a dialectic of being privately deviant in a public place. Emotional conditions involve transcending uncontrollable feelings of thrill. Interpretive conditions involve resonating metaphors of self (bounding immorality), game (timeouts & goal lines), religion (secret defilement), sex (like an orgasm), and the interrelationship between deviance and charisma (reaching for mysterious forces). The resonating of these metaphors makes the seduction irresistibly compelling. In an interesting twist on Spinoza's question about whether it's the finger that pulls the trigger or the trigger that pulls the finger, Katz says the following about pizza theft — it's not the taste for pizza that makes the crime happen, but the crime that makes the pizza taste good.

Gang violence requires learning to be a badass by projecting symbols of impenetrability, which Katz relates to the hardness of male phallic imagery. He feels that gang behavior requires a commitment to firmness of purpose so that other have to make the calculations of costs and benefits. Badasses engage in the 'accidental bump' and hog the sidewalk when they walk. Katz relates this to the way nations escalate war. Interpretive conditions involve posturing in the form of medieval elites. Practical conditions involve creation of an oppressive background image to emphasize one's status as a street survivor, or elite. Emotional conditions involve 'getting over' from 'here' to 'there' and the personal insults involving others' violations of artificial turf space.

Robbery is believed by Katz to be a prototypical "breeding ground" for crime. Pickup men seek "continuous action" and embrace a death wish (thematos) in that they will commit to any degree of violence necessary, even to the point where it risks their own fatality. Pickup men also develop a sense of competence at superior-perceptual ability (in exploiting contextual weaknesses in a target, be it victim or architecture) and claim a special morality about this. Katz gives Becker a twist to develop the notion of "Immoral entrepreneur" (p. 184). Likewise, "uncertainty" is related to "chaos" in that during a pickup, the offender is required to maintain suspense and manage the impression of coming from an alien world.

The desire to seek continuous action (e.g., crime, drugs, sex, and gambling, the last being what Goffman called the prototype of action) is what Katz says distinguishes the persistent, or career criminal. Such offenders (aka "heavies" or omnibus felons) will often pursue action to the point of physical and mental exhaustion. They do this by remaining open to all spontaneous opportunities, maintaining permeable boundaries for associates, and reckless, superfast spending with the proceeds from crime. Katz admits his description of the hardman is just one version of the hustler prototype.

The main problem for criminals is the transcendence of chaos which exists as an ongoing project. Chaos is the master dialectic, acting as both resource and barrier to action. Katz draws heavily upon Metza (1969) in describing the "dizziness" of a criminal career. Caught up in a lifestyle of frequent intoxication, compounded lies, jealous lovers, and being a constant target for rip-offs and a regular suspect for police, the arrest, or more final end to the project, almost comes as a relief. Katz depicts the project of transcending chaos as a process of imposing discipline and control on one's life. Imposing discipline often means the humiliation and physical abuse of women and children. Imposing control is seeking to get caught by sarcastically thanking the authorities, doing some moral accounting ("got away withs" exceed "got caughts"), and looking forward to the opportunities for action in prison.

The attractions of crime are seen as extensions, or "celebrations", of being male and being black (p. 247). Research on childhood socialization (Lever 1978) is cited to suggest that the main effect of being male is
preparation for a life of pretensions. Being black means to live in a culture of continuous insult, even from fellow blacks, and this tradition prepares blacks for becoming ‘bad’ by overcoming insult with insult. Crime emerges in the process of establishing a gendered, ethnic identity.

Cold-blooded murder involves coping with the dizziness, or dis-ease, of an immoral career. Practical conditions, drawn from Irwin’s work on incarcerated felons, involve the realization of potential through dreams and fantasies of criminal escapes. Katz ties this condition into a ‘death wish’ by way of transcending the dialectic of eros and thanatos. Interpretative conditions return to the idea of crime as ritual sacrifice and criminals as priestly servants. Cold-blooded killers are seen as believing in a primitive god of devastation whose sacredness must be experienced by negativity, or doing evil. To explain the gruesome lengths these killers go to in order to say, make extra work for the coroner, Katz draws upon Douglas (1985) and her analysis of “holiness” in purification rituals which requires that one “leave nothing half-finished.” Ritualism is for Katz what sadism is in more traditional explanations of crime.

BRAITHWAITE’S REINTEGRATIVE SHAMING THEORY

In 1989, John Braithwaite, in Crime, Shame and Reintegration set out to explore the process of social control known as shaming. There are two types of shaming: reintegrative (bring the offender back into the fold of society) and disintegrative (shunning the offender for good from society). Consistent with the claims of labelling theory, Braithwaite argued that disintegrative shaming does indeed create a class of outcasts. Offenders are prevented from bonding back into society, and can only become more entrenched in crime as a result of being branded a criminal.

Reintegrative shaming, however, can be accomplished if there were societal rituals or gestures of forgiveness, or better yet, ceremonies to decertify the offender as deviant. Braithwaite correctly points out that the United States, because of its high urbanization, heterogeneity, residential mobility, and ideology of individualism, has a surplus of ceremonies to confer deviant status on people, but few to no ceremonies allowing people the opportunity to exit the deviant role. At least one other author (Garfinkel 1965) has referred to criminal trials as “status degradation ceremonies.”

CONFLICT CRIMINOLOGY

"History without sociology is like hard work without brains, and sociology without history is like brains without the hard work taken out." (Raymond Michalowski)

Conflict criminology is best understood by reference to the various domain and background assumptions behind the various traditions (Gouldner 1970). All conflict theorists have in common a conflict view of society, that is, that society is held together, not by consensus, but by competition and conflict between incompatible values and interests. One implication of this idea is that people with less power are more likely to be defined and processed as deviants and criminals. We’ll see why in a minute, but it is important to realize there’s a variety of conflict theories that can be classified in various ways. Although some would argue it’s unimportant how conflict theories can be classified, for learning purposes, this lecture classifies them by their affinity, or closeness, to the ideas of Karl Marx (1818–1883), Max Weber (1864–1920), and Georg Simmel (1858–1918), three of perhaps the greatest dead sociologists. It was Marx (1867) who said “there must be something rotten in the very core of a social system which increases its wealth without diminishing its misery, and increases in crime even more than its numbers.”

THE MARXIST TRADITION

Regardless of whether it’s called ‘radical’, ‘new’, ‘materialist’, ‘dialectical’, ‘socialist’, ‘critical’, or ‘conflict’ criminology, there is a fundamental if not partial adherence to Marxism (Garofalo, 1978; Bernard, 1981; Bohm, 1982; Hawkins, 1987). While in the popular imagination, Marxism is associated with communism, Marxism as a scientific
tradition is best distinguished by a particular ontology (view of human nature) and epistemology (way of knowing). The various adherents can then be distinguished by methodology and models. The closer one gets to models of society and crime, the more theoretical differentiation can be made.

Marx held to an ontology of homo faber, not homo sapiens (Engels, 1845). Quinney (1965) elucidates this conception best as the idea of human nature being essentially unfinished and constantly realizing its potential. Explanations of crime based on socialization experiences, normative structures, and cultural demands are therefore incompatible with Marxism because humans are never completely socialized, claim higher loyalties than societal norms, and are culture-builders not culture-products. This ontology, like Rousseau's conception of native goodness, is a rejection of both classical (free will) and positive (determinism) traditions. It's also part of the deep structure of romantic thought in Western philosophy (Gouldner 1970).

Marxian epistemology is realism, not the philosophical kind like Plato, but the skepticism or disenchantment of the legal realism tradition that exists in jurisprudence. It's a mature coming to grips with the facts of constant change and the inevitable loss of Idealism. Think of it as a kind of skepticism, if you will. In many ways, it's the basis of the idea that nothing is morally neutral, that people retain the right to critique, expose, pass judgment, and demystify (Quinney 1974). Critique for the sake of critique is important to followers of Marx.

The methodology of Marxism is dialectical historical materialism. Hegel was the idealist philosopher who first popularized this method, and it is sometimes said Marx turned Hegel on his head. Hegel was interested in looking forward to a progressive future when thesis and antithesis would result in synthesis. Turning Hegel on his head means that the starting point for Marxian analysis involves looking backward, and tracing the centuries-old conflict between the group that produces the means of material survival and the group that lives off that production (Chomsky 1976; Reiman & Heedlee 1981). This methodology attempts to discover the total, fundamental, and indispensable source of conflict -- economic relations. Such economic reductionism is at the heart of the Marxian tradition. The invention of capitalism is often taken as a starting point in Marxism because capitalism is believed to be inherently contradictory, and the point in history where the forces of production (equipment, technology) increased while the relations of production (means of distributing produced goods) remained fixed (Marx 1859).

Lastly, the evolving, non-organic whole model of society and criminal behavior in the Marxian tradition is utopian and revolutionary. Social institutions such as laws and the state as well as ideologies are only reflections of economic realities. Because the surplus population created by an increasingly efficient capitalism is seen as a threat, the economically powerful use the laws and state to protect their interests. Economic powerlessness translates into political powerlessness. In response to the expropriation of their labor and the exploitation of their potential in commercialized relationships, criminals come to recognize their true objective interests and engage in protorevolutionary action to bring about the end of capitalism and the start of socialist or guaranteed freedom from want and misery. Marxist scholarship is strongly committed to age-old as well as new, as-yet-undiscovered humanistic values (Kramer 1985), keenly aware of the dangers of having ideas co-opted by other reformists (Platt 1974), and thoroughly partisan inasmuch as theorizing is intended to bring about the politicization of criminals who have not yet recognized their rightful place in history (Quinney 1977). Treating criminals as protorevolutionaries is sometimes called the primitive rebellion thesis. Here's what Marx (1867) said about criminals on page 734 of Volume One of Capital.
Conflict Criminology in the Marxist Tradition

There are many interpretations about what Marx said or meant. The two-class model of social stratification, while still popular as an explanation of fiscal crisis (O'Connor 1973), is today seen as a form of vulgar Marxism (Poulantzas 1969). Similarly, only Instrumental Marxism views law as a tool of the ruling class (Chambliss 1989). Structural Marxism denies deliberate intention to the ruling class and believes it rules by ideas (Althusser 1966) or conspiracies (Mills 1956). The Frankfurt School (Jay 1973) incorporated Freudian psychoanalysis into Marxism. In addition, neo-Marxism (Friedrichs 1980) makes use of the fact that Marx implied most criminals were lumpenproletariat who could not be counted on for revolutionary purposes.

Bonger (1916), a traditional Marxist, saw capitalism as breeding social irresponsibility. The dialectical interplay between capitalist business cycles and crime rates was his focus. Using a two-class model, Bonger saw conflict as likely to continue indefinitely because capitalism creates a climate of motivation for crime. Offenders are motivated by self- rather than social interests. Criminologists today regard Bonger's ideas as too psychological.

Rusche and Kirchheimer (1939) took a broader historical focus to examine imprisonment rates and the fluctuations of capitalism. It is indeed both a historical and statistical fact that imprisonment rates vary in sync with the booms and busts of capitalism, adding some element of truth to the surplus labor hypothesis. Marxist penology (Adamson 1984) pays little attention to the abolition of crime, but very definitely wants to abolish prisons. Rehabilitation of prisoners is rejected as a strategy because it would only serve bourgeois interests (Scull 1977). Almost all criminologists today regard the Marxian focus on prisons as appropriate, and prison and punishment studies is where you'll find most Marxist scholarship.

Gordon's (1971) theory sees crime as a rational response to the political and economic structure of institutions. He claims that what are traditionally viewed as noneconomic goals (status, respect) are tied to chances for material survival. Taking an Instrumentalist view of the State, he argues that token enforcement of upperworld crime, a major concern of conflict criminology (Pearce 1976), is explained by protection of power and profits, and more violent street crime is explained by protection of self from greater risk of arrest and incarceration. Almost all criminologists today regard the Marxian focus on upperworld (white collar, corporate, state) crime to be an appropriate application of Marxism.

Taylor, Walton, and Young (1973) had substantial impact with their call for a "new criminology." Their revisionist account of criminology even made Durkheim out to be a radical. They were strongly committed to a non-atomistic view of humans, instrumental as well as expressive rationality, a dialectic of resistance and control, and the elimination of all crime. They were dedicated to decriminalization of lifestyle diversity, and claimed that micro-processes of interaction are conditioned by macro-structures, particularly the social totality, or political economy. Their points gave rise to what might be called social psychological or marginalization theories of Marxism, starting with ideas that mode of production determines mode of self-formation (Michalowski & Bolender 1976; Michelowski 1985), gender differences (Bekker, Berger, & Schmidt 1980; Schwendinger & Schwendinger, 1983; Messerschmidt 1986), peer group formations (Greenberg 1977; Schwendinger & Schwendinger 1985), and opportunities for social bonding (Colvin & Pauly 1983). Certain offshoots of labeling theory, such as controlology (Ditton 1979) and amplification theory (Cohen 1980) were inspired by new criminology insights. Many criminologists like this approach because it allows the study of micro-structure (how the ruling class uses covert discrimination by look and gesture) as well as macro-structure (how the ruling class lobbies the legislature for tougher laws).
Chambless (1975) formulated a theory of lawmaking, lawbreaking, and law enforcement based on ideas that law expands as class gaps widen and both crime and crime control divert attention from real economic problems. His theory, elaborated in Chambless & Seldman (1982) and to some extent encapsulated in Reiman (1984), presents a picture of confused humans pretending to think in terms of living while the logic of capitalism curtails any new institution-building. This view is one of the State presenting images and ideologies that function as bread and circuses for the population. Erikson (1966) had a similar idea in *Wayward Puritans* when he said societies only really debate their norms and values through celebrity cases of some notoriety. In any event, the net result of anything like this is that the status quo is constantly maintained, and only laws that protect the system as a whole are passed. Within criminology, most of these ideas are referred to as behavior of law studies, or sometimes as a form of structurelist or constitutive criminology (Krisberg 1975; Pepinsky 1976; Platt 1977).

Spitzer (1975) focuses upon surplus populations created by capitalism, Skid-row alcoholics and others who do not pose a threat to the system are called Social Junk. Dangerous acts and people who do pose a threat are called Social dynamite. The contradiction is that the more capitalists try to control these populations, the more exposed becomes the fiscal crisis. Social dynamite are seen as protorevolutionary. Spitzer’s analyses has led to a variety of loosely-connected studies on the safety net of capitalism, including welfare and mental health reforms (Liska 1992). Sometimes, you’ll see Marxist criminologists study the medicalization of deviance, which takes them into such topics as the insanity defense and so forth.

Quinney’s writings (1974; 1977) tend to center upon the notion of class fragmentation, or how the ruling class gets the lower classes to fight amongst themselves. Quinney is critical of the increasing efficiency of repression. Increased repression brings increased resistance. Repression also results in manipulation of consciousness, another of Quinney’s (1974) main concerns. Resistance can also be accommodating, a concept Quinney (1977) uses to argue that all working class crime is more-or-less conscious rebellion. Politicization of prisoners will pave the way for a crime-free socialist future. Pepinsky & Quinney (1991) have recently suggested that new ideas, like peacemaking, and religious or moral thought, may bring about desired change.

**THE WEBERIAN TRADITION**

Weber held to an ontology of homo sociologicus (Rheinstein 1954) where humans are seen as benevolent and brotherly. Flesh and blood (repolitik) individuals are both actors and agents of society. They pursue a variety of ends, not always in a rational manner. The most important of these ends is the power to affect decisions of authorities. Norms and values are internalized to the extent that authorities have legitimacy. Legitimacy can be obtained by personal charisma, an appeal to past tradition, or by what Weber (1964) considered the most important, rational-legal authority, appeal to value systems or practical consequences. He believed bureaucracy to be the finest example of rational-legal authority. The Weberian tradition squarely implicates authority structures and how they act in socialization and social control processes.

Weberian epistemology is neo-Kantianism, defined as the use of a priori categories to make sense of the multiplicity of matter leaving behind only the residual explanation of spirit. This is illustrated by Weber’s way of writing in which he retains ideas “in solution” until fully matured. As a formal model-builder, Weber attempted to devise concepts that would supply regulative unity to phenomena, and these are called Ideal-types. He also believed in value-free science, the exclusion of ideological or non-scientific assumptions from research. Facts should not speak for themselves. Ideal types should provide a basis for interpretation.

Ideal-type methodology involves being completely holistic with respect to examining every phenomenon, even anomalies, that bear on the subject at hand. In fact, Weber’s central questions concerned anomalies, why one form of social organization would develop here and not there. Rigidly historical and comparative, Weber attempted to develop ideal-types that were abstracted from different contexts to get at the essential elements of a concept.
This often involved highly particularistic analyses followed by probabilistic statements about the tendencies of human action. Weber was no determinist. He did not look for universal laws. He was interested in finding the historical or situational contingencies for the origins of conflict, power, and success.

Weber's model of society and its implications for criminal behavior is pluralistic and pessimistic. Societies develop in episodic ways conditioned by historically contingent circumstances, the most important of these being inward- or outward-worldly orientation. To be sure, Weber (1964) held structuralist ideas about political and economic stratification, distinguishing between class, party, and status; the last being most strongly related to perception of life-chances. Conflict is not limited, however, to these structural features, as humans also fight over ideas and values. This focus opens the door to socialization and motivational explanations based on resistance to the iron cage of rationalization, the master trend where every area of life becomes subject to calculation and administration. His emphasis on the behavior of authorities makes struggle over political, especially legislative, power (to improve the life chances of one's status group) his central contribution to conflict criminology. Weber's approach is pessimistic in the sense that capitalism can only try to remain flexible in face of the permanence of conflict and its tendency to become routinized.

Conflict Criminology in the Weberian Tradition

Although consensus theorists at heart, Shaw and McKay's (1942) work has some affinity with Weber's ideas, as others have pointed out (Meier 1977). Another group of look-alikes would be the elite theories of Veblen (1934) and Mills (1956). Elite theorists tend to analyze the struggles between authorities as these impact on the maintenance of authority-subject relations.

Gerth and Mills (1953) take a Weberian approach that ties not only motivation but character development to symbol manipulation by authorities at the institutional level of society (polity, economy, religion, military, and kinship). People are seen as adding and dropping roles in response to increasing compartmentalization of life. Weber (1930) had much to say about personality characteristics, and one can easily find more clinical treatment of his Protestant Ethic idea (Mirels & Garrett 1971).

Dehrendorf (1959) presents a theory of interest group formation which is quite consistent with the Weberian tradition. His approach relies on concepts such as "quest-groups" and "imperatively coordinated associations" (Dehrendorf 1959, p. 167 & 173). The former concept describes a fragmented and multidimensional stratification system, and the latter describes if and when classes would form. Dehrendorf uses Weber's concepts of power and authority to state the conditions when interest groups form. These include sharing a culture and the requirement of a liberal State. Conflict is inevitable given competing interests and occurs systematically in the struggle to obtain the prize of state power. Norms are simply reflections of these power struggles, not of consensus (Dehrendorf 1958b). Mobility systems de-intensify conflict, and the absence of conflict is due to effective coercion.

Turk's (1966) theory of criminalization is an account of how people are conditioned into roles of domination and deference and capable of more-or-less conscious disagreement with laws or the way they are enforced. Turk's focus is on realistic conflict with moves and tactics increasing chances for success. Conflict between authorities and subjects leads to the opening up and closing off of probabilities for success, and in a later work (Turk 1969) examines the anomalous category of mental disorder as a substitute for criminality. He adds the concept of sophistication to his theory which increases conflict when either subject or authority is less sophisticated. Criminalization is explained by a pluralist conflict model of statuses and norms rather than class (Turk 1977). These ideas are similar to the notion of status contests or stigma contests in labeling theory.
The sociologist Collins (1975) offered a Weberian theory of social organization. People are seen as preferring to give rather than receive orders, with prestige being their main interest, and conflict is inherent in competition for scarce resources. Collins makes use of game theory, especially zero-sum, negotiated, and compliant relationship games. A pluralist, non-utopian model of society is presented which is based on factional fights between occupational, educational, and political groups. The analysis of ideology and symbol manipulation is similar to Weber's conception of worldly outlook. Rational-legal authority is analyzed in terms of ritual, which stabilizes conflict, but at the individual level, people tire from receiving too many orders, and credential inflation results (Collins 1979). Cosmopolitan outlooks are assumed and everyone is treated as belonging to a large-scale, bureaucratic organization.

The Weberian tradition also gave rise to a number of behavior of law theories. The most well-known of such theorists is Black (1976) whose theory of social control styles is an elaboration of Weber's charismatic, traditional, coercive, and rational-legal typology. The model is one of a planned and increasingly organized society similar to Weber's with an emphasis on respectability, which explains criminal offenders as status and power seekers. Law is seen as a quantitative variable, so there can be more or less of it at different times and places. Law can be penal, compensatory, therapeutic, or conciliatory. One of Black's hypotheses is that penal law is greater in a direction toward less culture than more culture. Hence, the law will be used more severely against the poor and uneducated. Law is also greater where other forms of social control (like etiquette, custom, folkways, and ethics) are weak.

Hagan's (1989) power-control theory and structural criminology focus on the fact that criminal acts as well as the defining of crime represent power relations. People are seen as conditioned to be more- or less risk-takers, perceiving better chances for pursuing their interests the more egalitarian the power structures they find themselves in. According to this view, juvenile delinquency is more likely to be found in homes where the parents are lenient, but sometimes also when parents are strict, for the same reason that it is the consistency in power structure which matters.

McSorley and Castellano (1991) provide a theory of differentiation consistent with the Weberian tradition. Differentiation is defined as a societal condition where people are vastly different in race, ethnicity, religion, urbanization, and inequality. Greater differentiation is associated with greater interpersonal and intergroup conflict. The higher the level of conflict, the greater the use of criminalization as a method to deal with the conflicts. Media accounts of this criminalization result in more fear and vicarious victimization within the population, leading to more repressive police measures to stem the fear, and a more unstable political arena in which any vocal opportunist can trigger events to enact crime policy. This approach provides a good example of how fear of crime studies are tied in with conflict criminology.

THE SIMMELIAN TRADITION

Simmel (1908) wrote extensively on the sources of conflict, and is a neglected founding father of sociology (Frisby 1984). Some of his approaches became part of the basic underpinning for symbolic interactionism, but he also fostered a conflict tradition unique for its idealistic tendencies and intuitive proclivities.

Simmel held to an ontology of homo homini lupus, where people are seen as wolves to others (Wolff, 1950). Their true selves are only visible as fragments that come out in the course of group involvement, that is, when they want something from somebody. The self is always situated, and there are as many selves as there are layers of situations or groups in society. Because the self is social, there can be no antisocial interests because this would be self-destructive. People experience feelings like love and contempt at the same time. Anytime they think they are being a loner, they are really thinking of others. These insights led Simmel to focus on group conflicts where
envelopes, wants, and desires are expressed. Groups provide more-or-less enduring interaction and relative constancy of pattern, but they do not exhaust all there is about an individual.

Form, rather than content, is important for Simmel (1900) who studied money and found that comparison of quite different contexts yielded a number of stable and recurring social types, such as the stranger, the enemy, the criminal, and the peeper. Strangers, or immigrants, are often societal scapegoats. Content varies, but forms are the stable, permanent patterns of interaction. Intuitionism is used to find the inner nature of things without being distracted by sensory observation of what goes on in the contexts being drawn from. Units of analysis did not matter to Simmel as the forms of interaction open to three nation-states were the same options open to three people. He was also fascinated with numbers, providing excellent analyses of dyads and triads (Simmel 1908).

Simmel believed that aesthetic appreciation would avoid a static picture. Everything from Simmel’s perspective was dynamic. This appreciative stance is a form of phenomenology, detaching the scholar from value judgments and positions on public issues. A scholar would do well to look at the empty space in the boundaries between antagonistic social groups (Simmel, 1908, p. 18). The forms he said you would discover there are super/sub-ordination, competition, conflict, imitation, parties, division of labor, art, fashion, ritual, and secrecy. The origin of power is skill at spontaneity, and it cannot exist without the complicity of the powerless.

Socilation, the real object of society, is viewed as an art, a game, or play. Social groups are everywhere in (internal) conflict because no one group would exhaust one’s individuality, and constantly in (external) conflict because of cross-cutting allegiances. Collins (1988, p. 123) has not so charitably called this ‘the grid-lock model of social conflict’. However, it's best seen as the ongoing expression of selves, and not a conception of conflict as the opposite of consensus or order. Because people deceive themselves and others every time they try to express their individuality, social structures are distinguished by their relative permittibility of lying, and society itself is a lie, a fiction (Simmel 1906) A criminal offender is one who has given up too much integrity and lost their real self, or on the contrary, one who is seeking too much individuality or anonymity; i.e., the criminal social type (Simmel 1900).

Conflict Theories In the Simmelian Tradition

There are few successors to Simmel’s tradition. Symbolic interactionists borrowed extensively from him, and conflict as an identity characteristic is most closely associated with identity theory (Strauss 1959; McCall & Simons 1978), Social worlds analysis (Shibutani 1962; Urry 1980), labelling theory, and role theory (Biddle & Thomas 1966). Theories, in particular, that make use of the model of society as play and game and/or crime as fun tend to be consistent with the Simmelian tradition.

Simmel’s (1938) culture conflict theory falls in the Simmelian tradition because of an emphasis on group codes or rules for behavior in certain situations. While not the first to extract the concept of culture conflict from Simmel’s interests in assimilation and ethnicity, Simmel (1938) differed from Wirth’s (1931) emphasis on psychological reactions and vision of a homogeneous, crime-free future by saying that conflicting cultural norms just simply give more occasion for crime and deviance to occur. This was largely a sociological re-expression of the Simmelian idea that society exists as a fiction in people’s minds. Simmel’s key concept was conduct norms, certain rules about what a person is supposed to do if they find, for example, their wife in bed with another man. While a few less modern societies might specify exactly what you’re supposed to do (kill your cheating wife and the other guy), more modern societies offer less by way of guidance. This state of confusion and contradiction is what causes crime in modern societies.

Coser (1956), a functionalist, also comes close to Simmel’s position. Several of Coser’s propositions have to do with the intensity of conflict which is increased when conflict is suppressed, when fighting is on behalf of a
group, and when parties are in close proximity, closeness begets intensity because that is when love and hate occur together, clearly a Simmelian insight. Other propositions have to do with constructing social forms, like stability and rigidity, which are drawn from comparing cross-cutting group memberships. Nonrealistic conflict is found to have safety-valve functions. Coser’s necessity for hierarchy is drawn from a need to manage group size and complexity, the image of the ever-present and always-emerging offender is also consistent with the ideas of Simmel, except that Coser follows a more “crime is functional” approach.

Voil’s (1958) group conflict theory consists of the idea that continually competing interest groups come into conflict with one another, and those that oppose the interests of dominant groups are more likely to violate the law. Groups are continuously being formed and at risk of displacement by other groups. Group contact is described as the expression of force-ratios between dominant and minority interests. Law formalizes these ratios as positions of strength to positions of weakness. Society is seen in uneasy equilibrium. Voil model of offending is “minority group behavior out of sympathy with and in more or less direct opposition to dominant groups” (Voil 1958, p. 211). Crime is always in defense of one’s group interests, and Bernard (Voil & Bernard, 1986) presents a unified conflict theory of crime, unified because it attempts to explain law as well as behavior. It substitutes vicariously learned reinforcement schedules for person-to-person interaction, and explaining law enforcement by the principle of least effort.

Quinney (1969; 1970) provided important group conflict ideas. His social reality of crime model (Quinney 1970) builds on Simmel’s psychic nature of society. The social types of “villain”, “hero”, and “anti-hero” are analyzed in terms of “reactive norms” and rules on spontaneity. Segments or socio-demographic aggregates are seen as providing conflicting normative systems, behavioral learning opportunities, and self-conceptions. Crime is explained by the conceptual conflict inherent in these competing definitions of behavior, realities, and self. The powerless will have their definitions labeled criminal by agents of social control, and law enforcement is seen as an extension of law enactment. The image is of an innocent offender who happens to conform too much to the belief system of the “wrong” social group. This is exactly the thrust behind Simmel’s lament that secrecy, strangeness, marginality, and deceit were likely to be our collective fate.

CONFLICT CRiminology

“History without sociology is like hard work with the brain taken out, and sociology without history is like brains with the hard work taken out.” (Raymond Michalowski)

Conflict criminology is best understood by reference to the various domain and background assumptions behind the various traditions (Gouldner 1970). All conflict theorists have in common a conflict view of society, that is, that society is held together, not by consensus, but by competition and conflict between incompatible values and interests. One implication of this idea is that people with less power are more likely to be defined and processed as deviants and criminals. We’ll see why in a minute, but it is important to realize there’s a variety of conflict theories that can be classified in various ways. Although some would argue it’s unimportant how conflict theories can be classified, for learning purposes, this lecture classifies them by their affinity, or closeness, to the ideas of Karl Marx (1818-1883), Max Weber (1864-1920), and Georg Simmel (1858-1918), three of perhaps the greatest dead sociologists. It was Marx (1867) who said “there must be something rotten in the very core of a social system which increases its wealth without diminishing its misery, and increases in crime even more than its numbers.”

THE MARXIST TRADITION

Regardless of whether it’s called “radical”, “new”, “materialist”, “dialectical”, “socialist”, “critical”, or “conflict” criminology, there is a fundamental if not partial adherence to Marxism (Garofalo, 1978; Bernard, 1981; Bohm, 1982; Hawkins, 1987). While in the popular imagination, Marxism is associated with communism, Marxism as a scientific tradition is best distinguished by a particular ontology (view of human nature) and epistemology (way of knowing).
The various adherents can then be distinguished by methodology and models. The closer one gets to models of society and crime, the more theoretical differentiation can be made.

Marx held to an ontology of homo faber, not homo sapiens (Engels, 1845). Quinney (1965) elucidates this conception best, as the idea of human nature being essentially unfinished and constantly realizing its potential. Explanations of crime based on socialization experiences, normative structures, and cultural demands are therefore incompatible with Marxism because humans are never completely socialized, claim higher loyalties than societal norms, and are culture-builders not culture-products. This ontology, like Rousseau’s concept of native goodness, is a rejection of both classical (free will) and positive (determinism) traditions. It’s also part of the deep structure of romantic thought in Western philosophy (Gouldner 1970).

Marxian epistemology is realism, not the philosophical kind like Plato, but the skepticism or disenchantment of the legal realism tradition that exists in jurisprudence. It’s a mature coming to grips with the facts of constant change and the inevitable loss of idealism, think of it as a kind of skepticism, if you will. In many ways, it’s the basis of the idea that nothing is morally neutral, that people retain the right to critique, expose, pass judgment, and demystify (Quinney 1974). Critique for the sake of critique is important to followers of Marx.

The methodology of Marxism is dialectical historical materialism. Hegel was the idealist philosopher who first popularized this method, and it is sometimes said Marx turned Hegel on his head. Hegel was interested in looking forward to a progressive future when thesis and antithesis would result in synthesis, turning Hegel on his head means that the starting point for Marxian analysis involves looking backward, and tracing the centuries-old conflict between the group that produces the means of material survival and the group that lives off that production (Chambless 1976; Reisman & Headlee 1981). This methodology attempts to discover the total, fundamental, and indispensable source of conflict — economic relations. Such economic reductionism is at the heart of the Marxian tradition. The invention of capitalism is often taken as a starting point in Marxism because capitalism is believed to be inherently contradictory, and the point in history where the forces of production (equipment, technology) increased while the relations of production (means of distributing produced goods) remained fixed (Marx 1859).

Lastly, the evolving, non-organic whole model of society and criminal behavior in the Marxian tradition is utopian and revolutionary. Social institutions such as laws and the state as well as ideologies are only reflections of economic realities. Because the surplus population created by an increasingly efficient capitalism is seen as a threat, the economically powerful use the laws and state to protect their interests. Economic powerlessness translates into political powerlessness. In response to the expropriation of their labor and the exploitation of their potential in commercialized relationships, criminals come to recognize their true objective interests and engage in proto-revolutionary action to bring about the end of capitalism and the start of socialism or guaranteed freedom from want and misery. Marxian scholarship is strongly committed to age-old as well as new, as-yet-undiscovered humanistic values (Kramer 1985), keenly aware of the dangers of having ideas co-opted by other reformists (Platt 1974), and thoroughly partisan inasmuch as theorizing is intended to bring about the politicization of criminals who have not yet recognized their rightful place in history (Quinney 1977). Treating criminals as proto-revolutionaries is sometimes called the primitive rebellion thesis. Here’s what Marx (1867) said about criminals on page 734 of Volume One of Capital:

The proletariat created by the breaking up of feudalism and the forcible expropriation of people from the soil could not possibly be absorbed by the newly-created capitalist manufacturers. At the same time, the proletariat could not suddenly adapt to the discipline of their new conditions, and so were turned into beggars, robbers, and vagabonds, partly from inclination, but in most cases from the stress of circumstances. Hence, by the end of the 16th century, the whole of Europe engaged in a bloody war against vagrancy, and legislation was created to treat them as criminals. It was also assumed that their criminal behavior was voluntary and the result of free will, when in actuality it was
Conflict Criminology in the Marxist Tradition

There are many interpretations about what Marx said or meant. The two-class model of social stratification, while still popular as an explanation of fiscal crisis (O’Connor 1973), is today seen as a form of vulgar Marxism (Poulantzas 1969). Similarly, only Instrumental Marxism views law as a tool of the ruling class (Chambliss 1989). Structural Marxism denies deliberate intention to the ruling class and believes it rules by ideas (Althusser 1966) or conspiracies (Mills 1956). The Frankfurt School (Jay 1973) incorporated Freudian psychoanalysis into Marxism. In addition, neo-Marxism (Friedrichs 1980) makes use of the fact that Marx implied most criminals were lumpenproletariat who could not be counted on for revolutionary purposes.

Bonger (1916), a traditional Marxist, saw capitalism as breeding social irresponsibility, the dialectical interplay between capitalist business cycles and crime rates was his focus. Using a two-class model, Bonger saw conflict as likely to continue indefinitely because capitalism creates a climate of motivation for crime. Offenders are motivated by self—rather than societal interests. Criminologists today regard Bonger’s ideas as too psychological.

Rusche and Kirchheimer (1939) took a broader historical focus to examine imprisonment rates and the fluctuations of capitalism. It is indeed both a historical and statistical fact that imprisonment rates vary in sync with the booms and busts of capitalism, adding some element of truth to the surplus labor hypothesis. Marxist penology (Adamsen 1984) pays little attention to the abolishment of crime, but very definitely wants to abolish prisons. Rehabilitation of prisoners is rejected as a strategy because it would only serve bourgeois interests (Sculf 1977). Almost all criminologists today regard the Marxist focus on prisons as appropriate, and prison and punishment studies is where you’ll find most Marxist scholarship.

Gordon’s (1971) theory sees crime as a rational response to the political and economic structure of institutions. He claims that what are traditionally viewed as noneconomic goals (status, respect) are tied to chances for material survival. Taking an instrumentalist view of the State, he argues that token enforcement of upperclass crime, a major concern of conflict criminology (Pearce 1976), is explained by protection of power and profits, and more violent street crime is explained by protection of self from greater risk of arrest and incarceration. Almost all criminologists today regard the Marxist focus on upperclass (white collar, corporate, state) crime to be an appropriate application of Marxism.

Taylor, Walton, and Young (1973) had substantial impact with their call for a “new criminology.” Their revisionist account of criminology even made Durkheim out to be a radical. They were strongly committed to a non-atomistic view of humans, instrumental as well as expressive rationality, a dialectic of resistance and control, and the elimination of all crime. They were dedicated to decriminalization of lifestyle diversity, and claimed that micro-processes of interaction are conditioned by macro-structures, particularly the social totality, or political economy. Their points gave rise to what might be called social psychological or marginalization theories of Marxism, starting with ideas that mode of production determines mode of self-formation (Michelowski & Bolinder 1976; Michelowski 1985), gender differences (Becker, Berger, & Schmidt 1980; Schwendinger & Schwendinger, 1983; Massenschmidt 1986), peer group formations (Greenberg 1977; Schwendinger & Schwendinger 1985), and opportunities for social bonding (Colvin & Pauly 1983). Certain offshoots of labeling theory, such as controlology (Ditton 1979) and amplification theory (Cohen 1980) were inspired by new criminology insights. Many criminologists like this approach because it allows the study of micro-structure (how the ruling class uses covert discrimination by look and gesture) as well as macro-structure (how the ruling class lobbies the legislature for tougher laws).
Chambless (1975) formulated a theory of lawmaking, lawbreaking, and law enforcement based on ideas that law expends as class gaps widen and both criminal and crime control divert attention from real economic problems. His theory, elaborated in Chambless & Seldman (1982) and to some extent encapsulated in Reiman (1984), presents a picture of confused humans pretending to think in terms of living while the logic of capitalism curtails any new institution-building. The view is one of the State presenting images and ideologies that function as bread and circuses for the population. Erikson (1966) had a similar idea in *Wayward Puritans* when he said societies only really debate their norms and values through celebrity cases of some notoriety. In any event, the net result of anything like this is that the status quo is constantly maintained, and only laws that protect the system as a whole are passed. Within criminology, most of these ideas are referred to as behavior of law studies, or sometimes as a form of structuralist or constitutive criminology (Krisberg 1975; Pepinsky 1976; Platt 1977).

Spitzer (1975) focuses upon surplus populations created by capitalism. Skid-row alcoholics and others who do not pose a threat to the system are called Social Junk. Dangerous acts and people who do pose a threat are called Social Dynamite. The contradiction is that the more capitalists try to control these populations, the more exposed becomes the fiscal crisis. Social dynamite are seen as protorevolutionary. Spitzer’s analysis has led to a variety of loosely-connected studies on the safety net of capitalism, including welfare and mental health reforms (Liska 1992). Sometimes, you’ll see Marxist criminologists study the medicalization of deviance, which takes them into such topics as the insanity defense and so forth.

Quinney’s writings (1974; 1977) tend to center upon the notion of class fragmentation, or how the ruling class gets the lower classes to fight amongst themselves. Quinney is critical of the increasing efficiency of repression. Increased repression brings increased resistance. Repression also results in manipulation of consciousness, another of Quinney’s (1974) main concerns. Resistance can also be accommodating, a concept Quinney (1977) uses to argue that all working class crime is more-or-less conscious rebellion. Politicization of prisoners will pave the way for a crime-free socialist future. Pepinsky & Quinney (1991) have recently suggested that new ideas, like peacemaking, and religious or moral thought, may bring about desired change.

THE WEBERIAN TRADITION

Weber held to an ontology of homo sociologicus (Rheinstein 1954) where humans are seen as benevolent and brotherly. Flesh and blood (realpolitik) individuals are both actors and agents of society. They pursue a variety of ends, not always in a rational manner. The most important of these ends is the power to effect decisions of authorities. Norms and values are internalized to the extent that authorities have legitimacy. Legitimacy can be obtained by personal charisma, an appeal to past tradition, or by what Weber (1966) considered the most important, rational-legal authority, appeal to value systems or practical consequences. He believed bureaucracy to be the finest example of rational-legal authority. The Weberian tradition squarely implicates authority structures and how they act in socialization and social control processes.

Weberian epistemology is neo-Kantianism, defined as the use of a priori categories to make sense of the multiplicity of matter leaving behind only the residual explanation of spirit. This is illustrated by Weber’s way of writing in which he retains ideas “in solution” until fully matured. As a formal model-builder, Weber attempted to devise concepts that would supply regulative unity to phenomena, and these are called Ideal-types. He also believed in value-free science, the exclusion of ideological or nonscientific assumptions from research. Facts should not speak for themselves. Ideal types should provide a basis for interpretation.

Ideal-type methodology involves being completely holistic with respect to examining every phenomenon, even anomalies, that bear on the subject at hand. In fact, Weber’s central questions concerned anomalies, why one form of social organization would develop here and not there. Rigidly historical and comparative, Weber attempted to develop ideal-types that were abstracted from different contexts to get at the essential elements of a concept.
This often involved highly particularistic analyses followed by probabilistic statements about the tendencies of human action. Weber was no determinist. He did not look for universal laws. He was interested in finding the historical or situational contingencies for the origins of conflict, power, and success.

Weber’s model of society and its implications for criminal behavior is pluralistic and pessimistic. Societies develop in episodic ways conditioned by historically contingent circumstances, the most important of these being inward- or outward-worldly orientation. To be sure, Weber (1964) held structuralist ideas about political and economic stratification, distinguishing between class, party, and status, the last being most strongly related to perception of life-chances. Conflict is not limited, however, to these structural features, as humans also fight over ideas and values. This focus opens the door to socialization and motivational explanations based on resistance to the iron cage of rationalization, the master trend where every area of life becomes subject to calculation and administration. His emphasis on the behavior of authorities makes struggle over political, especially legislative, power (to improve the life chances of one’s status group) his central contribution to conflict criminology. Weber’s approach is pessimistic in the sense that capitalism can only try to remain flexible in face of the permanence of conflict and its tendency to become routinized.

Conflict Criminology in the Weberian Tradition

Although consensus theorists at heart, Shaw and McKay’s (1942) work has some affinity with Weber’s ideas, as others have pointed out (Merton 1977). Another group of look-alikes would be the elite theories of Veblen (1934) and Mills (1956). Elite theorists tend to analyze the struggles between authorities as these impact on the maintenance of authority-subject relations.

Gerth and Mills (1953) take a Weberian approach that ties not only motivation but character development to symbol manipulation by authorities at the institutional level of society (polity, economy, religion, military, and kinship). People are seen as adding and dropping roles in response to increasing compartmentalization of life. Weber (1930) had much to say about personality characteristics, and one can easily find more clinical treatment of his Protestant Ethic idea (Mirels & Garrett 1971).

Dehendorf (1959) presents a theory of interest group formation which is quite consistent with the Weberian tradition. His approach relies on concepts such as “quest-groups” and “imperatively coordinated associations” (Dehendorf 1959, p. 167 & 173). The former concept describes a fragmented and multidimensional stratification system, and the latter describes if and when classes would form. Dehendorf uses Weber’s concepts of power and authority to state the conditions when interest groups form. These include sharing a culture and the requirement of a liberal State. Conflict is inevitable given competing interests and occurs systematically in the struggle to obtain the prize of State power. Norms are simply reflections of these power struggles, not of consensus (Dehendorf 1958b). Mobility systems de-intensify conflict, and the absence of conflict is due to effective coercion.

Turk’s (1966) theory of criminalization is an account of how people are conditioned into roles of domination and deference and capable of more-or-less conscious disagreement with laws or the way they are enforced. Turk’s focus is on realistic conflict with moves and tactics increasing chances for success. Conflict between authorities and subjects leads to the opening up and closing off of probabilities for success, and in a later work (Turk 1969) examines the anomalous category of mental disorder as a substitute for criminality. He adds the concept of sophistication to his theory which increases conflict when either subject or authority is less sophisticated. Criminalization is explained by a pluralist conflict model of statuses and norms rather than class (Turk 1977). These ideas are similar to the notion of status contests or stigma contests in labeling theory.
The sociologist Collins (1975) offered a Weberian theory of social organization. People are seen as preferring to give rather than receive orders, with prestige being their main interest, and conflict is inherent in competition for scarce resources. Collins makes use of game theory, especially zero-sum, negotiated, and compliant relationship games. A pluralist, non-utopian model of society is presented which is based on factional fights between occupational, educational, and political groups. The analysis of ideology and symbol manipulation is similar to Weber's conception of worldly outlook. Rational-legal authority is analyzed in terms of ritual, which stabilizes conflict, but at the individual level, people tire from receiving too many orders, and credential inflation results (Collins 1979). Cosmopolitan outlooks are assumed and everyone is treated as belonging to a large-scale, bureaucratic organization.

The Weberian tradition also gave rise to a number of behavior of law theories. The most well-known of such theorists is Black (1976) whose theory of social control styles is an elaboration of Weber's charismatic, traditional, coercive, and rational-legal typology. The model is one of a planned and increasingly organized society similar to Weber's with an emphasis on respectability, which explains criminal offenders as status and power seekers. Law is seen as a quantitative variable, so there can be more or less of it at different times and places. Law can be penal, compensatory, therapeutic, or conciliatory. One of Black's hypotheses is that penal law is greater in a direction toward less culture than more culture, hence, the law will be used more severely against the poor and uneducated. Law is also greater where other forms of social control (like etiquette, custom, folkways, and ethics) are weak.

Hagan's (1989) power-control theory and structural criminology focus on the fact that criminal acts as well as the defining of crime represent power relations. People are seen as conditioned to be more- or less-risk-takers, perceiving better chances for pursuing their interests the more egalitarian the power structures they find themselves in. According to this view, juvenile delinquency is more likely to be found in homes where the parents are lenient, but sometimes also when parents are strict, for the same reason that it is the consistency in power structure which matters.

McSorley and Castellano (1991) provide a theory of differentiation consistent with the Weberian tradition. Differentiation is defined as a societal condition where people are vastly different in race, ethnicity, religion, urbanization, and inequality. Greater differentiation is associated with greater interpersonal and intergroup conflict. The higher the level of conflict, the greater the use of criminalization as a method to deal with the conflicts. Media accounts of this criminalization result in more fear and vicarious victimization within the population, leading to more repressive police measures to stem the fear, and a more unstable political arena in which any vocal opportunist can trigger events to enact crime policy. This approach provides a good example of how fear of crime studies are tied in with conflict criminology.

THE SIMMELIAN TRADITION

Simmel (1908) wrote extensively on the sources of conflict, and is a neglected founding father of sociology (Frisby 1984). Some of his approaches became part of the basic underpinning for symbolic interactionism, but he also fostered a conflict tradition unique for its idealistic tendencies and intuitive proclivities.

Simmel held to an ontology of homo homini lupus, where people are seen as wolves to others (Wolff, 1950). Their true selves are only visible as fragments that come out in the course of group involvement, that is, when they want something from somebody. The self is always situated, and there are as many selves as there are layers of situations or groups in society. Because the self is social, there can be no antiscocial interests because this would be self-destructive. People experience feelings like love and contempt at the same time. Anytime they think they are being a loner, they are really thinking of others. These insights led Simmel to focus on group conflicts where
envies, wants, and desires are expressed. Groups provide more-or-less enduring interaction and relative constancy of pattern, but they do not exhaust all there is about an individual.

Form, rather than content, is important for Simmel (1900) who studied money and found that comparison of quite different contexts yielded a number of stable and recurring social types, such as the stranger, the enemy, the criminal, and the peaker. Strangers, or immigrants, are often societal scapegoats. Content varies, but forms are the stable, permanent patterns of interaction. Intuitionism is used to find the inner nature of things without being distracted by sensory observation of what goes on in the contexts being drawn from. Units of analysis did not matter to Simmel as the forms of interaction open to three nation-states were the same options open to three people. He was also fascinated with numbers, providing excellent analyses of dyads and triads (Simmel 1908).

Simmel believed that aesthetic appreciation would avoid a static picture. Everything from Simmel's perspective was dynamic. This appreciative stance is a form of phenomenology, detecting the scholar from value judgments and positions on public issues. A scholar would do well to look at the empty space in the boundaries between antagonistic social groups (Simmel, 1908, p. 18). The forms he said you would discover there are super/sub-ordination, competition, conflict, imitation, parties, division of labor, art, fashion, ritual, and secrecy. The origin of power is skill at spontaneity, and it cannot exist without the complicity of the powerless.

Sociation, the real object of society, is viewed as an art, a game, or play. Social groups are everywhere in (internal) conflict because no one group would exhaust one's individuality, and constantly in (external) conflict because of cross-cutting allegiances. Collins (1988, p. 123) has not so charitably called this 'the grid-lock model of social conflict'. However, it's best seen as the ongoing expression of selves, and not a conception of conflict as the opposite of consensus or order. Because people deceive themselves and others every time they try to express their individuality, social structures are distinguished by their relative permittability of lying, and society itself is a lie, a fiction (Simmel 1906) A criminal offender is one who has given up too much integrity and lost their real self, or on the contrary, one who is seeking too much individuality or anonymity; i.e., the criminal social type (Simmel 1900).

Conflict Theories in the Simmelian Tradition

There are few successors to Simmel's tradition. Symbolic interactionists borrowed extensively from him, and conflict as an identity characteristic is most closely associated with identity theory (Strauss 1959; McCull & Simmons 1978), social worlds analysis (Shibutani 1962; Urry 1980), labelling theory, and role theory (Biddle & Thomas 1966). Theories, in particular, that make use of the model of society as play and game and/or crime as fun tend to be consistent with the Simmelian tradition.

Selin's (1938) culture conflict theory falls in the Simmelian tradition because of an emphasis on group codes or rules for behavior in certain situations. While not the first to extract the concept of culture conflict from Simmel's interests in assimilation and ethnicity, Selin (1938) differed from Wirth's (1931) emphasis on psychological reactions and vision of a homogeneous, crime-free future by saying that conflicting cultural norms just simply give more occasion for crime and deviance to occur. This was largely a sociological re-expression of the Simmelian idea that society exists as a fiction in people's minds. Selin's key concept was conduct norms, certain rules about what a person is supposed to do if they find, for example, their wife in bed with another man. While a few less modern societies might specify exactly what you're supposed to do (kill your cheating wife and the other guy), more modern societies offer less by way of guidance. This state of confusion and contradiction is what causes crime in modern societies.

Coser (1956), a functionalist, also comes close to Simmel's position. Several of Coser's propositions have to do with the intensity of conflict which is increased when conflict is suppressed, when fighting is on behalf of a
group, and when parties are in close proximity, closeness begets intensity because that is when love and hate occur together, clearly a Simmelian insight. Other propositions have to do with constructing social forms, like stability and rigidity, which are drawn from comparing cross-cutting group memberships. Nonrealistic conflict is found to have safety-valve functions. Coser’s necessity for hierarchy is drawn from a need to manage group size and complexity. The image of the ever-present and always-emerging offender is also consistent with the ideas of Simmel, except that Coser follows a more “crime is functional” approach.

Vold’s (1958) group conflict theory consists of the idea that continually competing interest groups come into conflict with one another, and those that oppose the interests of dominant groups are more likely to violate the law. Groups are continuously being formed and at risk of displacement by other groups. Group contact is described as the expression of force-ratios between dominant and minority interests. Law formalizes these ratios as positions of strength to positions of weakness. Society is seen in uneasy equilibrium. Vold model of offending is “minority group behavior out of sympathy with and in more or less direct opposition to dominant groups” (Vold 1958, p. 211). Crime is always in defense of one’s group interests, and Bernard (Vold & Bernard, 1986) presents a unified conflict theory of crime, unified because it attempts to explain law as well as behavior. It substitutes vicariously learned reinforcement schedules for person-to-person interaction, and explaining law enforcement by the principle of least effort.

Quinney (1969; 1970) provided important group conflict ideas. His social reality of crime model (Quinney 1970) builds on Simmel’s psychic nature of society. The social types of “villain”, “hero”, and “anti-hero” are analyzed in terms of “reactive norms” and rules on spontaneity. Segments or socio-demographic aggregates are seen as providing conflicting normative systems, behavioral learning opportunities, and self-conceptions. Crime is explained by the conceptual conflict inherent in these competing definitions of behavior, realities, and self. The powerless will have their definitions labeled criminal by agents of social control, and law enforcement is seen as an extension of law enactment. The image is of an innocent offender who happens to conform too much to the belief system of the “wrong” social group. This is exactly the thrust behind Simmel’s lament that secrecy, strangeness, marginality, and deceit were likely to be our collective fate.

**FEMINIST CRIMINOLOGY, FEMALE CRIME, AND INTEGRATED THEORY**

*All men are rapists and that's all they are. (Marilyn French)*

Feminist criminology contains many branches. Liberal, radical, Marxist, and socialist feminism are widely recognized, although other “strands” exist such as postmodernism and ecofeminism. Most feminist criminology involves critiques about how women offenders have been ignored, distorted, or stereotyped within traditional criminology, but there is no shortage of separate theories and modifications of existing theories. Almost all women criminologists or criminologists of women who examine gender and crime have addressed the “gender ratio” problem (why women are less likely, and men more likely, to commit crime). Others study the generalizability problem (whether traditional male theories can modified to explain female offending). Most feminists are quick to point out where stereotypical thinking and theoretical dead ends exist, although the main problem complained about in most criminology is the simple fact that gender matters and should not be ignored.

Liberal feminism operates within the existing social structures to draw attention to women’s issues, promote women’s rights, increase women’s opportunities, and transform women’s roles in society. Radical feminism looks at how women came to occupy subservient roles in the first place, what male power consists of, and how societies themselves can be transformed. Marxist feminism ties patriarchy or male privilege into the economic structure of capitalism, as when female offenders are sentenced for property or sexual crimes (by threatening male dominance of property relationships or male control of women’s bodies). Socialist feminism offers ideas about more equitable roles for women as sex providers, child bearers, nurses, and homemakers, so that they can take their
rightful place in society. Postmodern feminism substitutes language production for economic production and studies how discourse and male-dominated thinking is used to set women apart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HISTORY OF AMERICAN FEMINISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American feminism has its origins in the 1848 women's rights convention held at Seneca Falls, New York where a &quot;Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions&quot; was passed. This first wave of feminism was anti-slavery oriented and wished for the emancipation of peoples everywhere who were being usurped and exploited. It ended in 1920 with passage of the 19th Amendment giving women the right to vote. Second-wave feminism started in the late 1960s and was called the &quot;women's liberation movement&quot;, devoted to greater social, political, and economic equality. It focused on the emancipation of women and liberal correctives to the role of women in society. The third wave of feminism started in the late 1980s, devoted to an analysis of patriarchy, or the pervasiveness of male dominance. It was basically a critical or radical movement that looked into how society could be transformed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MALE THEORIZING ABOUT FEMALE OFFENDERS

Masculine theorizing tends to be linear, rational, quick, certain, objective, and hierarchical. Feminine theorizing tends to be slower, intuitive, more circular, iterative, and tentative. Therefore, feminist criminology contains little by way of grand theories or confirmatory statistical analyses. The existing techniques for evaluating and assessing criminological theories may not apply to feminist criminology. Nevertheless, there have been some interesting strands of thought in the criminology of female offenders, as follows:

Some Early (Stereotypical) Theories

Sigmund Freud's theory consisted of the idea that all women experience penis envy and suffer an inferiority complex over it, which they try to compensate for by being exhibitionistic and narcissistic. Freud thought that women were also basically irrational in that they were not concerned with being builders of civilization, but with scanty, trivial matters. Freud thought, for example, that women don't have much of a sense of justice. Female crime was interpreted as longing for a penis. This is obviously a characterization of female criminals that feminists reject.

Gesare Lombroso in 1903 published The Female Offender which characterized short, dark-haired women with males and masculine features as good candidates for becoming criminals. He thought criminal women were stronger than men, that they could handle pain better, and that prison would hardly effect them at all. This is also a characterization of the female offender that feminists reject.

W.I. Thomas in 1923 published The Unadjusted Girl which claimed that women committed crime out of wishes for excitement and new experiences. Women were seen as feeling confined under monogamy, and having a lot of pent-up sexual energy which was released in criminal acts. This notion is rejected by feminists.

Otto Pollock in 1950 published The Criminality of Women which characterized female offenders as sneaky, deceitful, vengeful, and unemotional. He claimed, for example, that they prefer professions like maids, nurses, teachers, and homemakers so they can engage in undetectable crime. He thought they were especially subject to certain mental diseases like kleptomania and nymphomania. This notion is also rejected by feminists.

Critiques of Traditional, Mainstream (Male Stream) Theories

Social disorganization theory, which posits an environmental or subcultural tradition of criminal values that exist in an area, regardless of who lives in the area, is strongly criticized by feminists for only making pernicious reference to women. Thresher, a leading exponent of the social disorganization perspective, felt that girls and
women committed less crime because they were more closely supervised by boys and men. This notion of patriarchy is formed by at least one modern theory, called power-control theory by Hagan, Simpson & Gillis (1987), but the main feminist critique of the disorganization perspective involves the absence of qualitative, case-study research on the lives of women themselves.

Strain theories are criticized by feminists as betraying a double standard. Under strain theory, when a male offender commits a crime under certain conditions of opportunity blockage, their commission of crime is somehow seen as a "normal" or functional response. When women commit crime, strain theory views it as some form of "weakness" which betrays the double standard. Nafmine (1987) probably represents the best example of this critique, but there are other critiques, such as the characterization of females as "helpmates" or facilitators of crime in the strain theories of Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin.

Learning theories, such as Sutherland's differential association theory, is primarily criticized by feminists for relying upon male examples, using case studies of males only, and being a male-dominated perspective that glamorizes the male criminal, or at least the sociable, gregarious, active, and athletic characteristics of the male criminal.

Control theories, such as Hirschi's social bond theory, is primarily criticized by feminists for focusing almost exclusively on social class at the expense of gender and race. Feminists tend to focus on gender, and the interaction of gender and race (women of color) as obdurate, hardened, near-group characteristics that have about the same causative influence as class.

**FEMALE THEORIZING ABOUT FEMALE OFFENDERS**

In 1975, two books, Freda Adler's *Sisters in Crime* and Rite Simon's *Women and Crime* proposed that the emancipation of women and increased economic opportunities for women allowed women to be as crime-prone as men. Simon also predicted that the criminal justice system would start treating men and women offenders equally. There is mixed empirical evidence for this emancipation or liberation thesis, and some would say that absolutely no empirical evidence exists for it and the notion is discredited (Chesney-Lind & Pasko 2004). Women are not committing the "big take" offenses (like stock fraud and other white collar crimes) men do. Instead, they are committing vastly different crimes than they did back in the 19th century (like poisoning). The chivalry thesis (that the criminal justice system treats women more leniently) also has produced mixed empirical results. In some ways, the system is more lenient; in other ways, it comes down more harshly. Sex differentials in sentencing are subject to a variety of interpretations, and not all feminists want the criminal justice system to treat women equally.

Studies of Patriarchy tend to look at everything from female membership in male-dominated professions to the "rape culture" with promotes female victimization. The study of patriarchy has allowed feminists to uncover hidden forms of violence (like leering) against women. Feminist critiques of pedagogy (how teachers teach) have also become quite common, as education, particularly criminal justice education, becomes the domain for discovering examples of male-dominated thinking and examples of the marginalization thesis (women being reminded that they are only women).

**More Recent Female Theories**

The role of extralegal factors in the administration of justice is a long-standing area of research. The bulk of studies have concluded that women are accorded more lenient treatment than men, however, whether this is a function of the lesser seriousness of the charges against them or something else remains unanswered. The most common hypotheses have involved the notions of chivalry and paternalism. Chivalry represents the idea that the criminal justice system puts women on a pedestal, and treats them like a protector. Paternalism is a more sinister...
view of the criminal justice system, that women are treated more childish or mentally challenged. See Crew (1991) for a good review of how researchers have tried to separate the chivalry and paternalism factors.

Another area of research related to the study of chivalry and paternalism involves the evil women hypothesis (Erez 1992), which involves a conception of female offenders processed by the system as being "unladylike" and violating gender-role expectations. Such offenders usually receive no leniency. Again, this approach, like Hagan's power-control theory, is a not-so-subtle variant of the liberation hypothesis.

Sex differentials are rarely statistically significant. This does not mean, however, that this area of study is not socially significant or meaningful in other ways. Research in this area does tend to shed light on extralegal factors (things that should not influence the justice system) as well as how systems of informal social control merge, mix, or influence formal system of social control. There is also the matter of finding a theoretical framework or model in which to do feminist scholarship in criminology. One of the problems is this last area is the seeming inability of such scholarship to find itself into refereed journals. Most feminist criminology is the subject of presentations at professional conferences or in venues other than the publication outlets that male criminologists use.

STATISTICS ON FEMALE OFFENDERS

Reliable statistics on the extent of female crime are hard to come by. It is widely known, for example, that females usually account for about 15% or 17% of all violent crime and 28% of all property crime. However, there has been about a 140% increase in the number of crimes committed by women since 1970, and the upward trend is steady. Researchers typically track female offenders on FBI Part II offenses since they far outnumber men in two Part II categoryless prostitution and runaway. However, they have significant numbers in embezzlement (41%), fraud (39%), forgery (36%), and larceny-theft (33%). For homicide, one of the most frequently cited facts is a Justice Department study in 1991 which found females who were incarcerated for murder were twice as likely as men incarcerated for murder to have killed an intimate (husband, boyfriend, or child). Female serial killers also account for 8% of all American serial killers. Hickey's (2002) subsample of 62 females out of 399 serial killers found the following methods and motives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Motives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Poison (80%)</td>
<td>1. Money (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shooting (20%)</td>
<td>2. Control (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bludgeoning (16%)</td>
<td>3. Enjoyment (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Suffocation (16%)</td>
<td>4. Sex (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stabbing (11%)</td>
<td>5. Drugs, Cult Involvement, cover up, or feelings of inadequacy (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Drowning (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among female offenders, minorities compose a slightly larger percentage of the inmate population than among male offenders. Female offenders are also slightly older (by at least three years) than typical male offenders, and the average age of a female offender is 30+ years of age. Only 28% of all female offenders are juveniles. Between two and three million female offenders are arrested every year, and 60% of them tell the police they have experienced physical or sexual abuse in the past. The vast majority of female offenders commit their crime alone, alcohol and drugs are involved most of the time, and the most common places where the crime occurs is near a tavern, at home, or in the workplace. Female offenders are more likely to use their fists and feet when they assault somebody, as opposed to men who are more likely to use a weapon, the exception to this being use of a knife, which is about equally likely for men as it is for women.

Every year, about 11,000 children are killed by their parents, and mothers or stepmothers account for about half of these murders, actually slightly more than half (statistics vary from 53% to 57%). The most typical pattern is
for a female offender to kill a child while the child is young or still an infant. When fathers or stepfathers murder their children, the child is typically age 8 or older. Here's a comparison table of who kills whom based on 1998 data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-spouse</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy/ Girlfriend</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is somewhat controversial, and indeed, a key research question, if female crime is more violent today than in the past (Chesney-Lind & Pasko 2004). Let the reader get the impression that female offenders are strongly involved in violent crime. It is important to remember that they are much more heavily involved in property crime, followed perhaps by drug offenses and nuisance crimes, like prostitution. Larceny-theft is not only the most common crime in America, but it is the offense category in which female offenders predominate. Larceny-theft entails a variety of crimes characterized by the taking away of someone else's property. Examples of larceny-theft include shoplifting, credit card fraud, bad check writing (fake check forgery), price tag switching, welfare fraud, telemarketing fraud, con games, improper title transfers of property, real estate fraud, motor vehicle registration fraud, Intellectual property theft, theft or false complaining about food, lodging, or services. In all these offense categories, female offenders are heavily involved, and qualitative research suggests that they typically see their behavior as an entitlement, habit, or way of life. In fact, almost all female crime is concentrated in just two offense categories: larceny-theft and drugs.

CONCENTRATION IN LARCENY-THEFT AND DRUGS

Larceny-theft by women is composed first and foremost of arrests for shoplifting, and the study of shoplifting has a long legacy in criminology (Cameron 1953). Some estimates are as high as 80% of all shoplifters being women, and although men sometimes engage in shoplifting, women are far more likely to steal more items than men, steal items from several stores, and steel items of lesser value. Men shoplift by knowing what they want, coming in the store, and stealing it. Women shoplift and are often so mesmerized by the seductive properties of an object they see for the first time that they feel they have to steal it. Women tend to steal clothing, cosmetics, jewelry, and personal hygiene products, in that order. Both women and men are equally likely to steal something they don't really need, but women are more likely to steal necessities. Studies of modern shoplifting patterns among women (e.g., in Morris 1987) indicate that women may be more frequently caught for this offense simply because store detectives are on the lookout more often for women than men. Embezzlement is the next most common type of offending in the larceny-theft category, and a good deal of this is bank embezzlement. 60% of women convicted of embezzlement were bank tellers. Pillaging or stealing from one's own employer is also quite common, and generally doesn't support the legal charge of embezzlement, but is counted as some type of fraud or business offense. Studies that have been done on female embezzlers (Zietz 1981) indicate that most are fairly careless or foolish in how they go about it, often forgetting to cover or disguise their tracks.

With drug offenses, female offenders are much more likely to be arrested and charged with possession, as opposed to males, who are more likely to be charged with trafficking or intent to deliver. Likewise, with public order offenses, such as driving while intoxicated, where women are much more likely than men to receive probation. With nuisance offenses like prostitution, it depends upon the jurisdiction where there might be variable degrees of community tolerance. Finally, there are some interesting regional variations in female crime. States like Texas and California (followed 1998 Florida, New York, Ohio, Illinois, Georgia, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Michigan) tend
to have inordinately large female offender populations. This may be because those states are tougher on female criminals, or there may be something in those regions that is associated with the causes of female crime. Women arrested for DUI tend to be older than men who are arrested for DUI, and the average age range for male DUI arrest is the mid-thirties. Women also tend to drink alone, for escapist reasons, and to deny treatment (Coles 1991). Any substance abuse counselor will tell you that there are significant gender differences in addiction and alcoholism. Women tend to rationalize their addiction in gendered ways with drugs being used as appetite suppressants (tobacco, cocaine, meth) or as refuge from strained family relationships (alcohol and marijuana). A body of research indicates that women are more likely to become polydrug users than men, and to be more ready to experiment with drugs such as heroin. Another line of significant research has looked at crack cocaine, and specifically the notion of "crack pipe as plump" which means that an exploitative form of prostitution has been developed by men around women's addiction to crack cocaine. Men are to blame for developing the crack culture since men have discovered that crack is extremely good at reducing a woman's inhibitions. Harrowing stories of crack-for-sex abound in the literature.

LIST OF WOMEN IN CRIMINOLOGY & CRIMINOLOGISTS OF WOMEN

I don't know how useful this may be to readers, but I've managed to maintain a list of significant writers and researchers in the field, although I make no guarantees that it is complete and hasn't left somebody out, but the fact that such a list can be easily assembled gives some idea of how small the field actually is.

ADLER, Freda, author of *Sisters in Crime* 1975 predicts new female criminal based on women's liberation

ADLER, Patricia, co-author of 1985 *Wheeling & Dealing* ethnographer of drug dealing, sports

AGETON, Suzanne, author of *Sexual Assault among Adolescents* 1983 delinquency researcher

BASKIN, Deborah, routine activities researcher of female robbery using knife and fists

BERNARD, Jessie, popular feminist of motherhood

BLOCK, Carolyn, ecological homicide researcher, co-author of *Homicide In Chicago* with husband, Richard

BOX-GRAINER, Jill, left realist theorist of rape

BRAITHWAITE, John, male labeling theorist who writes about women

BRANTINGHAM, Patricia, co-author of *Patterns In Crime* 1984 ecological/learning researcher

BROWNE, Angela, author of 1987 *When Battered Women Kill*

BROWN MILLER, Susan, author of *Against Our Will* 1975 rape as violence, men as natural predators

CAMERON, Mary Owen, author of *The Booster & The Switch* 1964 studied shoplifters (80% female)

CAMPBELL, Anne, author of 1991 *The Girls In The Gang* female gang ethnographer

CANTER, Rachel, researcher of sex differential in crime and family correlates of female delinquency

CARINGELLA-MACDONALD, Susan, feminist researcher on rape, race and gender, feminist peacemaking

CAUFIELD, Susan, peacemaking criminologist

CAVAN, Ruth, Chicago-school sociologist of prostitution and suicide, comparative delinquency

CAVAN, Shern, author of *Liquor License* ethnographer of b-girls

CHESNEY-LIND, Meda, co-author of 1988 "Feminism and Criminology" *Justice Quarterly, 5*, 497-538 synthesized feminist criminology, researched chivalry, female inmates

CLARK, Shirley, early learning theory researcher

COHEN, Jacqueline, rational choice and lambda (crime persistence) researcher

COHN, Ellen, author of "Weather & Crime" 1990, researcher of famous criminologists

COWIE, Valerie, co-author of 1968 *Delinquency In Girls* female offender as lumpish, uncouth & ungraceful

Crites, Laura, editor of 1976 *The Female Offender*

DALY, Kathleen, co-author of 1988 "Feminism and Criminology" *Justice Quarterly, 5*, 497-538 synthesized feminist criminology, researcher of white-collar crime by females

DATESMAN, Susan, strain researcher of female crime

DAVIS, Nanette, labeling/critical theorist of prostitution

DeKESEREDY, Walter, male socialist feminist, author of 1991 *Women Abuse*

DOBASH, Rebecca, co-author of 1979 *Violent Against Wives* along with husband, Russell
DWORKIN, Andrea, author of 1987 *Intercourse* idea of all men as loving death and murder
EREZ, Edna, victimologist and researcher of situational influences on planned offenses
ESTRICH, Susan, author of 1987 *Real Rape* rape victim/law professor, debunked "jump-out-of-bushes"
FARROW, Margaret, strain/integrated theorist of female crime
FIGUEIRA-MCDONOUGH, Josephine, a strain theory researcher
FINCH, Diane, psychobiologist of female crime
GARTNER, Rosemarie, women and crime cross-national studies
GIBBONS, Ros, early researcher of women's prisons
GIDO, Rosemary, researcher of women in corrections
GILLIES, Carol, author of *In a Different Voice* 1982 moral development theorist, female ethic of care
GIOVANNA, Peggy, strain researcher of female crime
GLUECK, Eleanor (& Sheldon), 500 Delinquent Women 1934 eclectic researcher/theorist
HEBBING, Ann, labeling theorist and researcher of women who kill
GOTTFREDSON, Denise, routine activities researcher and preventive intervention specialist
GRAY, Phyllis, strain/learning researcher
HESS, Susan, author of widely reproduced 1971 article "Rape: An All-American Crime"
HAGAN, John, male conflict theorist who writes about women
HINTON, Julia, researcher of judicial decision making
HOROWITZ, Ruth, researcher of female Chicano gangs, welfare
HUNT, Jennifer, differential treatment researcher of policing
JACKSON, Pamela Irving, researcher of policing
JAMES, Jennifer, researcher/theorist of prostitution; cognitive psychologist, females minimize risk
JENKINS, Patricia Harris, control researcher of social bonds and school delinquency
JURK, Nancy, labeling theorist and researcher of women who kill
KLEIN, Dorle, synthesized psychological literature in "The Etiology of Female Crime"
KONOPKA, Gisela, author of *The Adolescent Girl*, 1966, Isolation and love deprivation explanations
KORNHAUSER, Ruth, criticizer of traditional theories
KRUTITSCHMIT, Candace, labeling researcher of differential treatment and statuses related to gender
LEONARD, Ellen, textbook writer who recasted old theories, 1982 *Women Crime & Society*
LEVER, Janet, sports sociologist, only 37% of girls' games competitive girl's play, boys game
LOMBROSO-FERRERO, Gine, daughter of Lombrosa, popularized her father's ideas.
LUXENBURG, Joan, prostitution researcher, peacemaking theorist
MACCOURT, B. Linda, differential sentencing, ethics researcher
MCCREARY, Joan, co-author of 1959 *Origins of Crime*, inconsistent discipline causes crime
MACCOBY, Eleanore, cognitive psychologist of sex differences
MACDONALD, Joan, rape researcher, women in professions, educational theory with husband J. Garofalo
MACKINNON, Catherine, Marxist researcher of rape, all sex is coercion, all men are warmongers
MANN, Coreene Ritchey, researcher of black female homicide, racism and sexism
MESSERSCHMIDT, James, male socialist feminist, author of 1993 *Masculinities and Crime*
MILLET, Kate, author of radical feminist text *Sexual Politics* 1970 coined the term "patriarchy"
MOORE, John, researcher along with Ruth Horowitz on Chicano gangs and migration factors
MORASH, Mary, researcher of female gangs & recidivism
MORRIS, Ruth, author of 1964 "Female Delinquency and Relational Problems"
MOYER, Imagene, researcher of women's prisons, educational theorist
MYERS, Marthe, researcher of court discrimination
NAFFINE, Ngaire, author of 1987 Female Crime crtitizer of traditional theories
NAGEL, Ilene, power-control researcher of court discrimination
OAKLEY, Annie, popular feminist of sex and gender roles
OBUDUEKUN, Lola, researcher of differential sentencing
PEETERSILIA, Joan, learning theorist and policy researcher
PETERSON, Ruth, researcher of female offense patterns and trends
POLLAK, Otto, author of 1950 Criminology of Women which saw female offender as sneaky
RADFORD, Jill, left realist researcher of crimes against women
RAFTER, Nicole, marxist critical theorist of crimes against women, prisons, integrated theory
RENZETTI, Claire, author of Violent Betrayal 1992 which analyzes partner abuse in lesbian relationships
RICHARDS, Pamela, author along with Brenda Forster of 1979 Crime as Play, middle class theorist
ROSS, Catherine, powerlessness researcher with John Mirowsky, scale developer, strain theorist
RUCKER, Lisa, prison researcher, peacemaking theorist
RUSSELL, Dianna, author of Rape In Marriage 1982 and co-author of Femicide 1992; politics of crime
SANDAY, Peggy, author of Frenemy Gang Rape 1990; male bonding rituals
SCHWENDINGER, Julie, co-author of 1983 Rape & Inequality & 1985 Adolescent Subcultures; notion of crime as human rights violation, Marxist feminist, conflict theorist with husband Herman
SCOTT, Jocelynne, australian learning researcher; liberation thesis tester
SHEEHY, Gail, sociologist of prostitution, debunked syndromes
SIMON, Rita, author of The Contemporary Woman 1975 predicts new female criminal, end of chivalry
SIMPSON, Sally, author of 1989 "Feminist Theory, Crime & Justice"; synthesizer, white collar researcher
SMART, Carol, author of 1976 Women, Crime & Criminology criticizer of traditional theories
SMITH, Douglas, male researcher of female crime, studied sex differentials and aging-out
SOMERVILLE, Dora, co-author of 1975 The Delinquent Girl female offender as nymphomaniac
SPOHN, Calsia, researcher of Judicial decision making
STANKO, Elizabeth, author of Intimate Intrusions 1985 criminal justice system as 2nd assailant
STEINMETZ, Suzanne, family researcher and author 1978 "The Bettered Husband Syndrome"
STEFFENSMEYER, Darrell, male liberal feminist, researcher of sexual differentials, masculinity theorist
SOUTHAMER-LOEBER, Magda, synthesizer of family research, co-author of Rolf Loebert
STRAUS, Murray, male researcher of spouse abuse, conflict tactics scale, 1980 Behind Closed Doors
SUTHERLAND, Anne, deviance researcher of gypsies & women hustlers
SWIGERT, Victoria, labeling theorist, integrationist, 1976 Murder, Inequality and the Law
THOMAS, Dorothy, wife of W.I. Thomas, popularized her husband's ideas
TRIPLETT, Ruth, labeling researcher of self-image
VAN VOORHIS, Patricia, researcher on family factors, prison classification methods
VISHAY, Christy, researcher of chivalry and career criminals
WALKER, Lenore, author of 1984 The Bettered Woman Syndrome
WARNER, Barbara, researcher of policing
WARSHAW, Ruth, author of I Never Called It Rape 1988; campus party culture, quote systems
WIDOM, Cathy, researcher of early abuse exeriences in women and men
WILSON, Margo, researcher of male sexual proprieteriness and spousal homicide
WILSON, Nancy, researcher of women in CJ education
WISE, Nancy, researcher of middle class delinquency
WONDERS, Nancy, peacemaking criminologist
WOOTEN, Barbara, early male In se/male prohibita theorist
YOUNG, Varnetta, researcher/theorist of black female offending
ZAHN, Margaret, researcher of female violence, homicide, sudden rage
ZATZ, Marjorie, researcher of differential sentencing

INTEGRATED THEORY IN CRIMINOLOGY

Comprehensive, general, unified, synthetic, grand, and configurational — these are just some of the terms routinely encountered as synonymous with the term "Integrated." Theoretical integration became quite the fashionable thing to do in the 1960s, and numerous criminologists have debated the advantages and disadvantages. It is important for students to know what integration is, what it is not, what it really is, how it is done, and the criteria for proper assessment. A couple of criteria for "good" integrated theory are adequacy and utility. Adequacy refers to the ability to keep up with recent developments or emerging trends, and utility refers to how well a theory addresses recurrent dilemmas in social science.

One must avoid the so-called integrationist error which diverts attention from matters of substance to matters of form. Integrative efforts have, by convention, been interdisciplinary efforts, and to some degree, imperialistic as they step all over the turf of other disciplines. Sometimes it is good to see what other disciplines are doing, but in most cases, there is a need to be singular and get one's own house in order. A basic rule is that one should not do integration for the sake of integration. There must be more lofty goals involved. In the grand tradition of systems theory, there is believed to be a common language (isomorphism) that can be identified for all disciplines, and it may be important to find and use that language for integrated theory. For example, Karl Manninger's sin-crime-illness model is isomorphic in the sense that all societies seem to go through a sequential stage of defining a problem as sinful, then criminal, and then as some sort of disease to be cured. Other criminologists have thought about self-control and social defense as endpoints of a spectrum, and criminal justice, of course, has the concept of pendulum swing between due process and crime control. It's important to build on these efforts, and not neglect them.

What Integrated Theory Is Not

What is called an integrated theory of the middle range often amounts to conceptual borrowing, or conceptual integration. It's the easiest thing to do, but it rests on looseness of operationalization. A conceptual borrower frequently argues that even though the hypothetical constructs are different, they mean the same thing for explanatory purposes. Such a theorist is basically taking liberties with validity and reliability to construct integrated theory in this manner. An interdisciplinary facade often masks reductionism. Synthesis becomes the grouping of concepts within concepts. Explanation is often sacrificed for prediction. OBI (Obliteration By Incorporation) occurs, or theorists fall victim to the "Wobble Effect," where terms with qualification and richness change meaning and are passed on through multiple references in the literature. There's too much of this already, and it should cease.

Another "bad" approach is what some people call metatheory. Here, testability is avoided, and a noncompetitive theoretical environment is sought, and the theorist argues for things like "open space" to enlarge room for discourse. Metatheory can be an orienting strategy for a discipline that has lost its way, but a metatheory also has antipathy for unit theories, implying the latter were deliberately designed to produce ambiguous hypotheses. Metatheory does not engage in reductionism but instead engages in abstraction to the neglect of one or another discipline. It is best seen as an effort to wipe out the remnants of some discipline, like biology or psychology. Within criminology, it can be argued that sociology is the metatheory. Metatheory commits the fallacy of affirming the consequence. Metatheory, when done properly, is always at the presuppositional level, never at the level of explanation.

What Integrated Theory Really Is

Criminology has all forms of social organization and behavior as its subject matter. The level of explanation problem derives from the field's long-standing interest in conformity. It is sometimes just as important to ask why people obey the law as it is to ask why they disobey it. Types of integration that derive from this approach are called "general," "unified," or "synthetic," and try to subsume motivational, interactionist, and systemic domains. The reduction is often to a social psychology that bridges the micro-macro gap, either frustration-
aggression or relative deprivation, or in other cases, reduction to some type of social psychological concept.

Other attempts at integration derive from a long-standing recognition of the relativity of deviance. What is considered "bad" or "wrong" is, of course, always in the eye of the beholder. Variously called "comprehensive," "grand," or "configuration" theory, these kinds of efforts aim at unification or convergence, although the claim is much more modest, such as saying the time is right to recognize more inclusive definitions of phenomea under study. Perhaps integrated criminology should be less modest, but I imagine that criminologists who remember wouldn't want a return to the grand, ecumenical scheme of Parsonian sociology. Parsons saw convergence everywhere, yet there is this thrust within the integrated theory movement that we are experiencing a "glut" of too many ideas, and they all need to be connected somehow.

How Integrated Theory Is Really Done

There are a number of schemes for doing integrated theory. One method, called parallel integration, or "side-by-side" integration, partitions the act and actor characteristics, while avoiding a "hardening of the categories." Theorists who go down this route are usually those applied criminologists who want to achieve something useful for practitioners or law enforcement. The FBI and Justice Department is famous for this because all they do is take the best ideas of all the criminological theories, such as strain, learning, and control, and lay them alongside one another as some sort of "master" theory producing such things as the idea that all crime is caused by blocked economic opportunity plus peer influence plus improper parenting. Real theorists are genuinely interested in creating a structure-process synthesis that asks what comes first instead of laying ideas side by side. Often the result of parallel integration is an ideal-type typology, the better ones leaving room for exceptions and particular. Parallel integration should mean that individual differences can be construed as heterogeneity without marginality, but frequently it results in stereotypes. This method should have some appeal to feminists and those who study ethnic minorities, but it is ironic that we don't see more typologies from them. Perhaps they are afraid of stereotyping, or have their ideas co-opted by law enforcement.

Next, there is a method called sequential integration, or "end-to-end" integration, which involves careful causal ordering of variables to focus on intervening or mediating influences. Sometimes, this method is called elaboration by statisticians. Both graphic depiction and quantitative tests usually show the last variable as the best predictor. One can, of course, reverse the independent and dependent variables across unit theories, or do what is called "contextual analysis." The latter is not so much ecological as it is an attempt to find natural, quasi-experimental situations in lieu of statistical manipulation of the independent variable. Integrated criminology often cannot manipulate the independent variable, not can we wait for the resolution of controversies in quantitative methodology. Theory ought to be way out ahead of statistics anyway. Sequences can be cycles or spirals, traced-back from outcomes, traced-forward from episodes, or traced-through stages, steps, periods, or phases, with all sorts of stage-skipping opportunities. Sequential integration calls attention to the need for a developmental criminology or a dialectical criminology.

Finally, there is a method called deductive integration, or "up-end-down" or "top-to-bottom" integration, which identifies a level of abstract generality, and generates or synthesizes new concepts. Lesser units are subsumed as a special case of the grand theory. The Herculaneum task is to synthesize along logico-deductive lines while avoiding both revisionism and reductionism. This approach derives from criminological eclecticism, going back to the Gluecks, and explicitly refuses to make a priori assumptions about the relative importance of any level or concepts within and between levels. Often, the focus is upon the points of contact between processes, as in the conflict-accommodation-consensus paradigm. I don't mean to sound pessimistic, but it is doubtful if an encyclopedic criminology can ever be developed in this fashion. This is the most difficult way to do integration.

The first requirement for a "good" integrated theory is a clear and explicit epistemology. It is wrong to equate epistemology with ideology, as some critics are prone to do. Recent epistemological developments in criminology include a hedonistic, utilitarian, tension-reduction model (as in low self control theory), sensual compulsions and
meaningful seductions (as in Katz' seductions of crime theory), and the situational ethics of attribution theory (as in some developmental and interactionist theories). *Hedonism, of course, has been the dominant epistemology in criminology, and it has some merit, but criminology needs more than another revised utilitarianism, or form of hedonism. Sentience does not imply hedonism. Learning theory, for example, could easily benefit from a look at possible altruistic centers in the brain, and intelligence theories should really look at different kinds of intelligence. Sensuality may also be Important, and this seems to be what some feminists are getting at. Sensuality directs our attention to the foreground rather than background of the actor. Too often, however, when we study sensuality, we stick with a Marxian social psychology, a theology of good and evil or collapse into that form of cognitive reductionism called phenomenology. Again, we need an epistemology that not only tells us what we know, but provides some moral guidance. Moral relativism and situational morality should be unacceptable in criminology.

The Importance of Epistemology

The basic epistemological problem for criminology is voluntarism vs. determinism, or the free will vs. determinism debate. This is represented in most textbooks by the classical and positive schools, and it is what has separated criminology from law, since law is based on the assumption of voluntarism and science is based on the assumption of determinism. The tension is so bad in criminology that students are often exposed to images of the criminal that vary between romanticized "Robin Hoods" redistributing wealth and compulsive mesomorphs with a "monkey on their back." Nor is the problem confined to criminology. Law has its own problems. Any scientific jurisprudence would create anomalous states between freedom and responsibility, with civil law taking up the slack. To keep down on the growth of civil law, we've created a relatively unscientific criminal law that presumes intent in the form of free will. Hobbes once pointed out that "To omit responsibility is the definition of sin." What is needed is something along the lines of a multidimensional epistemology that recognizes the compatibility of free will and necessity, and probably draws upon the concepts of Intuition, counter-Intuition, epiphenomenalism, and analytic realism (like Whitehead's philosophy). In the early 20th Century or the law's feeble grasp on concepts like nexus). Person's unique approach to the mind-body problem may also be useful. At the risk of showing ridiculous, let me try to illustrate how a multidimensional epistemology would work. Free will would be seen as sometimes coming from outside the actor instead of always inside the actor. Determinism could be seen as sometimes coming from inside the actor. Such an epistemology can be combined with situational or sensualistic assumptions, and points of contact, or interpenetration, would get at the warp and woof of social life.

THE NATURE OF HUMAN NATURE

Another task for integrated criminology is to address the question of what human nature is really like. The task is not so much to explain human nature nor is it an atomicistic exercise at outlining parts of the self, like psychology is so happy to keep on doing. Instead, criminologists ask the question "how can an individual be both cause and consequence of society," and indeed, this is a sociological question going all the way back to Comte. Criminologists are intimately engaged in the study of reciprocal effects. The core content areas of criminology such as aggression and conformity, or violence and nonviolence, have been usurped by other disciplines, but it is up to criminology to shed light on the whole "homo duplex" or "homo hominum lupus" question. Sociologists only theorize about it, but criminologists are tasked with the responsibility for testing it.

There may be no such thing as a "personality" and some criminologists, such as Hirschi & Gottfredson have suggested that the term "disposition" may be a much better term. The persistence of the personality notion probably derives from the influence of Freud on criminology, and it may be time to abandon Freud. But there is another tradition in social psychology, the social structure and personality approach, which provides ideas consistent with what criminologists mean by disposition. Personality no longer means a stable set of propensities. Dispositions refer to motivational urges against societal pressures. The idea of urges at the personality level is isomorphic with what some call "selfishness" at the macro-level. Both terms capture the reciprocal process of being both product and producer as well as incorporate human diversity. Integrated theory may want to usurp the social structure and personality approach. To some extent, this is done with character studies, identity theories, and life
events models, but some better points of entry are possible. In any event, criminologists who write criminological theory need to stop ending their discussions with the beginnings of an implicit social psychology.

THE PROBLEM OF ORDER (CONSENSUS-CONFLICT)

As Akers and others have repeatedly pointed out, a major problem in criminology is the consensus-conflict debate, and the best that can be concluded is that all theories are partly correct, partly wrong, and none wholly adequate. In one sense, the problem of order exists at the presuppositional level, and doesn't really matter, but in another sense, it is vitally important because it is concerned with the notions of concentricity and equifinality of social control. In other words, we will never have a rational system of punishment until we resolve this problem.

The functionalist legacy has left the indelible idea that disapproved behavior plays a major part in social order. Newer conceptions of deviance have emphasized social control as a causative variable. The consensus-conflict debate today concentrates on the control side, with deviance, crime, and craziness being little more than residual categories of a focus on deterrence and punishment. Typologies of control need to be more than simple dichotomies of coercive-noncoercive, formal-informal, official-unofficial. They need to get back to the classic problem of order which informed formulated social control in the first place as relatively spontaneous and invisible. For the very reason that social forces may be invisible, it may be preferable that integrated criminology follow an order rather than conflict perspective. A completely ordered society exists only hypothetically, and consensus is mostly a compromise between discordant values such as liberty and responsibility or individualism and collectivism. The concept of boundaries best captures this vital balance, and far too many conflict approaches ignore this.

THE PROBLEM OF AGENCY (STRUCTURE-PROCESS)

Human behavior is a continuous flow of conduct. It is not a process that we type into series of acts. What integrates society does not have to be the same thing that socializes people. An image of hyperactive humans desperately seeking socialization is not realistic when actors are conceived of as ever a process and never a product. Structure logically precedes action, and there are limits to the 'morphogenetic tendency' where roles are created out of 'as if' behavior which is periodically appraised in negotiation, compromise, and bargaining. These interactions are what others have referred to as feedback loops or the influence of reference groups, the latter being a good example of both input and output loops in the study of human agency. Whether the output are subcultures or the input is the residual effect of deterrence, feedback loops are institutional mechanisms of human agency that generate both old and new (negative and positive) forms of human behavior which theoretically sequence with historical circumstances and situational strains. Norms and roles only specify a range of acceptable behavior, and integrated criminology should be sensitive to the processual nature of simultaneity.

In many ways, the structure-process debate is an argument over rationality. It is a fact that individuals have motivations and people do seem to choose favorable alternatives while avoiding unfavorable ones. However, there are two basic problems with this conception of rationality. One, there are distinct limits to the capacities of human beings to be forever calculating and maximizing. Actors will do well to reach a level of satisfying, a strategy of allowing certain things to run routinely. Two, there is the problem of incommensurability. How are different rewards and costs to be measured on an equivalent scale? Most theorists in criminology have resorted to a cognitive solution at the expense of affect and emotion which are wrongly perceived as nonrational components. What is lacking in this approach is adequate treatment of emotion, the reasons why people would not seek their best advantage. It has little to do with sensation effects and more to do with the action propensities of emotion. A theory of general and specific emotion is lacking, although some scholars regard fear, hate, happiness, and sadness as primary and cross-cultural. Others call socially constructed feelings as "sentiments," but the point is I don't believe we should water down the importance of emotions. The empirical problem is how primary emotions link with ideas in evaluations, expectations, beliefs, and motivations, which in psychology is referred to as the attitude-behavior controversy. Integrated criminology should be sensitive to these links since
they are precisely the methods people use to cope with an overwhelming, complex number of objects and mutual incommensurability. The more neutral emotions, in particular, need investigation.

A CALL FOR FUTURISTIC CRIMINOLOGY

There is a need for something called futuroist criminology, which is similar, but not quite the same as newsmaking criminology. It is a fact that old myths are frequently replaced by new myths. But it is also a fact that sophisticated criminals will use criminological theory as excuses for misbehavior. Rather than being behind them as a think tank for development of their motivational systems, it is preferable to be one step ahead, and incorporate "criminological vision" into our theories. A "criminological vision" is not incompatible with efforts toward a more egalitarian society nor with a critique of political economy. All criminologists wish for a restructuring of the competitive environment so that no human life is diminished. A futuroist criminology might include what critical criminologists have for years said about the "politicalization" of criminality. The nexus between criminologists and criminals deserves reconsideration. Criminals already have a futuroist criminology. Criminologists need to be studying iconoclastic crime, or alienated, symbolic acts so diffuse in their methods that they defy explanation. Old theories are frequently overtaken by the rush of history. Today, law is not so much violated as ignored. Theories that do not yet exist can be brought into reality if integrated criminology includes a futuroist component by extrapolating scenarios about criminal behavior that has not yet happened. This is the realm of comparative criminology, and it is perhaps the most difficult area to integrate because of culture-boundness. The hard work today is not the search for master trends, but the delineation of different paths, nonexistent at present, that different peoples can possibly take with different forms of capitalist, continental, Islamic, and broken-up socialist law. What may be needed is a law

PATTERNS AND TRENDS IN VIOLENT CRIME

Wicked people exist, character is more often wicked than errant. (James Q. Wilson)

Just as there are many different types and kinds of violence, there are many different criminological explanations of violence. Siegel (2004) documents eight different explanations (personal traits, ineffective families, substance abuse, human instincts, regional values, cultural values, gangs, and firearm availability). It is customary to distinguish between instrumental (an attempt to improve one's financial or social position) and expressive (an attempt to vent rage, anger, or frustration) violence. It may be that humans are hard-wired to admire, mimic, or be violent, but biologists are continually telling us that there is no inborn tendency for violence, and anthropologists also tell us that history is replete with stories of peace-loving, matrilineal tribes. However, psychological and sociological perspectives have the most to say about the causes of criminal violence as it exists today. In this lecture, we'll consider some types of violent criminal behavior -- homicide, assault, rape, and abuse. We'll examine some known facts and particulars about these crimes (patterns and trends), and take a look at some theoretical ideas in criminology. The purpose is to see the "big picture" rather than document numbers.

HOMICIDE AND ASSAULT

The unlawful killing of a human being by another with malice aforethought constitutes homicide. First degree homicide requires premeditation (cold-blooded planning), and second degree homicide requires malice aforethought (a desire to kill). Manslaughter lacks the requirement of malice aforethought, and felony murder lacks both premeditation and malice aforethought. Voluntary manslaughter is still intentional, but the circumstances make it less than blameworthy. Involuntary manslaughter is death that results from negligence or recklessness. Excusable homicide results from accident or misfortune, and justifiable homicide results from noble motive or legally recognized demands. If the victim does not die, the crime is defined as some type of aggravated assault.

Over time, homicide rates have held the promise of going down, that is, there is a long-term downward trend, but good years are often followed by bad years. Except for an unusual surge in the late Sixties (25,000) and an unusual decline in the late Nineties (16,000), most of the recent decades of the twentieth century were
characterized by 20,000 homicides a year. Fluctuations from year to year tend to be little more than 5% up or down either way. The patterns for aggravated assault are quite different. Aggravated assault is the intentional causing of bodily harm with or without a deadly weapon, or the attempt or threat thereof. Aggravated assault is distinguished from simple assault where the physical injury is, or could be, relatively minor. Official crime statistics don’t track simple assaults because they just involve fights or brawls in which there’s a black eye or chipped tooth, and when criminologists talk about assaults, they’re usually talking about aggravated assaults. Assaults have been increasing steadily over the last 100 years. Currently, the assault rate runs at a little over 1 million per year, but fluctuations can be severe, as much as up or down 35% per year. The most frequent weapons used are blunt objects (36%), hands, fists, or feet (28%), guns (18%), and knives (17%). The overwhelming majority of offenders are males between the ages of 15 and 34 years of age, and alcohol consumption is typically related to the offense.

The highest homicide rates have consistently been found in third world countries (Rehev 1990). This has led many theorists to speculate that homicide has something to do with inequality, perhaps the sense of desperation that comes from living in poverty and disorganization, or perhaps the sense of relative deprivation that occurs for some groups when elites are living in prosperity. In developed countries, such as the United States, the highest homicide rates have consistently been found in the South. This is called the Southernness hypothesis in criminology, which involves the study of many factors, such as climate, culture, and gun ownership (which is high in the South). The linkages between guns and alcohol and violent crime are undeniable as lethality factors, as is the quality of medical care. Assaults, for example (where the victim survives) tend to be concentrated in Western states. In the United States, criminal violence is also strongly associated with big cities, and where there are large concentrations of African-Americans. It’s hard to ignore the sex (male), age (under 25), race (African American), and residential (urban) correlates of criminal violence, since well over half (and nearly three-quarters) of violent offenders are characterized by this demographic profile (Miethe & McCorkle 1998), which is also known in criminology as the subculture of violence hypothesis. In rank order, cities like New Orleans, Washington, St. Louis, Detroit, Atlanta, Birmingham, Chicago, Miami, Dallas, Los Angeles, and New York have homicide rates that are frequently five times the national average of 8.2 per 100,000 population. Cities like Little Rock and San Bernardino have the highest rates of aggravated assault.

FBI crime reports indicate the vast majority of homicides involve acquaintances or relatives (75%) rather than strangers (25%). A similar pattern holds true for assaults acquaintances or relatives (60%) versus strangers (40%). In recent years, however, stranger violence is increasing, as are drive-bys, serial, and mass murder. Homicide is mostly an intra-racial event since 95% of the time, offender and victim are of the same race (Decker 1993). NCVS data indicate both homicides and assaults most frequently occur on Saturday nights between the hours of 8 p.m. and 2 a.m. Slightly more crimes are committed during the warmest months (July and August) and during December (especially for homicide, robbery, and burglary).

In 1958, criminologist Marvin Wolfgang coined the term ‘victim precipitation’ to describe where the victim is the first to begin the interplay of criminal violence (by drawing a gun or striking the first blow). Subsequent criminologists have followed up on this idea by describing the typical “character contest” that occur in a typical interchange between offender, victim, and sometimes an audience. David Luckenbill’s (1977) model of five stages is the most well-known of these, as follows:

- the victim makes what the offender perceives as a threatening move, gesture, or remark
- the offender clarifies or interprets the meaning of the threat by making inquiries as to what the victim meant by asking the victim or bystanders
- the offender then retaliates with a verbal or physical challenge
- the victim then retaliates with increased hostility
- a battle ensues, and either victim or offender is left dead or dying

RAPE AND SEXUAL OFFENSES
The phrase "sexual assault" best describes all the legal categories for sexual offenses, which range from forcible rape (unlawful sexual knowledge by force without consent) to a variety of other sexual activities, including molestation and exhibitionism. Virtually all criminologists regard rape as a crime of violence rather than sexual offense, but rape can also be committed by economic (marital rape) and social (date rape) coercion. Statutory (teen) rape can also occur without force and with consent. Molestation (of a child) can range from mild fondling to sodomy. Exhibitionism can range from rubbing up against a person to 'flashing' one's lack of underclothes. The thing they have in common is the mixture of a sexual urge with the desire to dominate, pursue, capture, pressure, castrate, bully, seduce, or 'persuade' another person to come around to 'their' way of thinking — that it is the offender's right to hunt and hound their prey (Box 1983). These vile predators firmly believe their victims will eventually come around to believing that satisfaction of their pleasure is also their victim's pleasure. The consensus of most experts is that, in 80 to 85 percent of all rape cases, the victim knows the defendant, and this is the factor that makes this an under-reported crime.

As psychologically intriguing as the study of sexual offending is, the fact is we aren't really sure whether known sex offenders are similar to those who go undetected. This is a consequence of the low reporting rate for sexual assaults. Victims only report a small fraction of offenses for many reasons. It was a private matter; "didn't think anything could be done"; or "afraid of reprisal from offender." It seems reasonable to assert that what we do know is based on socially inert or careless offenders. Over time, rape rates have fluctuated wildly, but there is a long-term upward trend. Periods with low rates include the 1930s and 1950s. Every other decade has seen high rates, with the most dramatic increases from 1965 to 1995. Currently, about 450,000 rapes or attempted rapes occur every year in America, and the figures for sex offenses (other than prostitution) are about two to three times higher than that. These high official figures mean the United States has the highest sex offense rates in the world. Rwanda is the only other country to come close, and the U.S. is still four times higher than it.

As with homicide and assault, rape is more likely to be committed by someone the victim knows. It is also an intra-racial crime, 54% of the time involving whites, 45% of the time involving African Americans, and 1% of the time involving other races. Males account for 99% of arrestees, and the 1% of females convicted of rape only play an accomplice role. Females take a more active role in 10% of other sex offenses, such as molestation and exhibitionism. There is a trimodal age distribution of sex offenders: one group being young (age 15-19) and involved more in gang rapes; a second group being the same as murderers (age 20-24) and involved in "classic" forcible rapes; and a third group being older (age 25-29) and involved in molestation and exhibitionism. Most sexual offenses occur during summer months (July and August) between the hours of 6 p.m. and midnight on weekends. Weapons are rarely involved, only about 10% of the time.

Unlike homicide and assault, rape and sexual offending occur mostly in medium sized cities, followed by rural areas, and then only thirdly in metropolitan areas. Sex crimes have some interesting geography. Cities with populations of 250,000, 350,000, or 450,000, like Des Moines, Kansas City, and Milwaukee (a Midwestern pattern), tend to have the highest rape rates, and then in their suburbs, and then only if the area has a large number of renter-occupied dwellings. Such areas also typically have a high percentage of one-parent, female-headed households, high unemployment, and high divorce rates. Such patterns have suggested to many criminologists that gender inequality plays an important role with sex crime rates (Schwendtiger & Schwendtiger 1983). Controversy exists over the role of prostitution (sexual permissiveness) in creating a climate conducive to sexual offending. The link between pornography and sex crime has been extensively studied, and the consensus of experts is that any linkage is absent or weak (Reiss & Roth 1993). There is, however, strong evidence to suggest that anywhere from 40 to 80 percent of sex offenders suffer from some sort of antisocial personality disorder (Prettly & Quinsey 1988).

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND ABUSE
Along with murder and rape, a variety of other violent behaviors go on inside families and between close acquaintances like girlfriends and boyfriends. Wife beating (also called domestic, or intimate, violence) is perhaps the most common form of interpersonal harm. There are, however, seven ways to inflict harm on a spouse or acquaintance (1) physically; (2) sexually; (3) verbally; (4) psychologically; (5) spiritually; (6) economically; and (7) socially. Every year, approximately 1.8 million women are treated in hospital emergency rooms for physical injuries suffered at the hands of a spouse, ex-spouse, current boyfriend, or ex-boyfriend (Straus et al. 1980). Time magazine once reported in 1983 that 6 million wives are abused every year. The number of actual, unreported cases may be four to five times higher. Some estimates of domestic violence are as high as 66% of all relationships. Less than one in ten cases get reported to police. No one good source of estimated numbers is available.

In point of fact, it is impossible to accurately measure the amount of domestic violence and abuse. There are few agreed-upon definitions, attitudes vary, and it was not that long ago when society tolerated it. Pennsylvania, for example, had a law up until the 1970s that only prohibited husbands from beating their wives after 10 pm. and on Sundays. The phrase "rule of thumb" also comes from English common law which allowed a man to beat his wife with a stick as long as it was no thicker than his thumb. What we do know is that wife beating is an escalating, serial offense. The offender starts off slapping, shoving, and pushing (stays or moves onto a different relationship), escalates to hitting, burning, and slapping (stays or moves onto a different relationship), and then escalates to shooting and beating to death. Many victims tend to stay in these relationships, being passive and nonassertive, fulfilling their feminine role demurely, being sexually 'giving' when their husbands are drunk, and never saying any public word about being beaten.

Lower class sex role socialization has been suggested as a cause by many researchers (Hamburger & Renzetti 1996). Among the lower classes, there is presumably a myth among men that women sometimes enjoy the attention of a beating, and an equally ridiculous belief among women that they should stand by their men, no matter what. Pregnant women tend to be particular targets 40% of the time, and younger women more likely become victims than older women. Race and ethnicity tend to be only minimally related to the phenomenon. The greatest risk is posed by former partners after the couple has split up, although stressful holidays (like Christmas) and Super Bowl Sundays tend to be risky periods for couples who are still together. Among offenders, a history of alcoholism, economic insecurity, and sometimes involvement in athletics (the Super Jock syndrome) and the military tend to be correlates. In criminology, there is the cycle of violence thesis used to explain the escalation patterns of repeat victimization, and the Intergenerational thesis used to explain the one-third of offenders who learned how to become abusers by growing up in a family where they witnessed abuse.

Family violence also takes the forms of child abuse, sibling abuse, and elder abuse. In any given year, 20% of children are assaulted by one of their parents by kicking or punching. Gallup polls regularly indicate that at least 5% of parents believe it is all right to punch their children. The rates of infanticide are increasing. Each year, an estimated 20,000 children die at the hands of their parents or primary caregivers. Mothers, rather than fathers, tend to be more involved in the abuse of children, but child abuse wasn't really "discovered" until 1962 by pediatric radiologists, and since then, we have found that about 50% of it is at the hands of mothers and 50% of it is at the hands of fathers. Incest, however, is predominately a father-daughter affair 70% of the time. Some estimates put the amount of sexual abuse of children at 1.3 million a year. Physical abuse of children increases the odds of future delinquency or adult criminality by 40% (Widom 1992), and sexual abuse of children has been linked in some studies to future acts of prostitution. Sibling abuse is widely tolerated as normal behavior, and there are no known estimates of its prevalence. It is estimated that one million elderly people (over age 65) are abused every year, primarily by their spouses 60% of the time. Men are the most common victims of elder abuse. Depression and paranoia tend to be common among domestic violence offenders, but these could easily be the consequences of an incident rather than the cause.
While most of the crimes above are typically committed by young, male, lower class African Americans with drug, alcohol, and economic problems, there are other crimes, equally if not more violent, committed by whites, other minorities, and successful people. Drunk driving, for example, kills more Americans yearly (25,000) than are killed by homicide, and drunk driving is primarily a crime by whites. It has been estimated that on weekends, about 12% (one in eight) drivers on road are legally drunk (8% on weekdays). Traffic accidents are the primary cause of death for people between 6 and 28 years of age, and 50% of lethal vehicle crashes are alcohol-related. There are many controversies regarding drunk driving. Many criminology justice studies have shown the futility of crackdowns, as nothing the police do seems to change the fact that many offenders get away with it (apprehension rates tend to be, at best, only 1 in 82 offenders, and are more typically 1 in 2000 most of the time). Many forensic science studies have questioned the wisdom of lowering BAC (blood alcohol concentration) limits, which appears to be the favorite response of lawmakers, along with stiffer penalties. Public awareness campaigns do seem to work however, and this is basically a type of offense pattern that many people just "grow out" of.

Occupational and corporate crime can result in violence, and there are many, many different definitions of occupational and corporate crime. Occupational crime (also sometimes called white collar crime) is crime committed through opportunity created in the course of a legal occupation. White collar crime involving big corporations (also called corporate crime) causes somewhere between 30,000 and 55,000 deaths a year, primarily through faulty consumer products, pollution, radioactivity, and toxic waste dumping. Also every year, there are 100,000 deaths from work-related accidents, many of those resulting from unsafe working conditions in the workplace, and directly connectable to at least the negligence or recklessness of supervisors.

Corporate crime can be quite harmful, as the 1977 Ford Pinto case revealed. These cars burst into flames with the slightest rear end collision. Executives at Ford Motor calculated it was less costly to pay off each of the 180 burn deaths with $200,000 payments and then to spend $137 million recalling all the defective cars to replace an $11 part. Such logic is standard business practice. Some professional crime can be considered violent. Physicians, for example, perform an estimated two million unnecessary surgeries a year, fleecing the victims, insurance companies, and taxpayers. Government crime can also be quite violent when it fails to protect, say, the 41% of Americans who have no health insurance, neglects its homeless population, allows police brutality, or uses its own citizens as guinea pigs in experiments.

Organized crime is the hardest type of violent crime to define, but it tends to be crime that has no ideology (it's all about money and power), is hierarchical or quasi-bureaucratic (with a leadership structure, rules and regulations, and division of labor), self-perpetuating (it persists through time), and aims toward monopoly (domination of a city, city section, or entire industry). Over time, organized crime tends to captivate 5% of a nation's economy (40% in Russia), and is quite lethal in its methods for coming to power. Controversies exist in criminology over exactly how "organized" is organized crime, the role of kinship ties, the role of a common ethnic heritage, and what is the best way to fight it.
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Patterns and Trends in Property Crime

Good, even though it's sometimes sidetracked, always – repeat, always – triumphs over evil. (Batman)
Money is the root of all evil, so they say, and greed may very well be an elemental component of the human condition. Whether or not we agree with the idea that wants are unlimited, money buys happiness. Obtaining money dishonestly often brings quicker happiness. Although violence can be done for financial gain, money is more commonly pursued non-violently. This lecture is about non-violent, dishonest ways to make money. Over time, and throughout every society, property crime has far outnumbered violent crime. Below, we consider some of these property or economic crimes -- robbery, motor vehicle theft, burglary, larceny, and white collar crime. We examine known facts and particulars about these crimes (patterns and trends), and take a look at related theoretical ideas in criminology. The purpose is to see the “big picture” rather than document numbers.

**ROBBERY**

Robbery is technically a hybrid crime that is both violent and property-oriented, although many criminologists would classify it as more of a violent crime. Robbery involves the taking of goods, money, or something of value by force or threat of force, or by instilling fear in the victim. Robbery usually involves some form of physical confrontation, and for this reason, some criminologists use the term mugging to describe events that are more violent than property-driven. However, most robbers only resort to violence when the victim refuses to cooperate, resists, or from the robber’s point of view, needs to be reminded how serious the situation is. Some robbers certainly experience a thrill from the confrontation and making people obey, but the primary motivation and payoff is money. Tremendous variety exists in the *modus operandi* for robbery (also called stickup).

There are two types of stickups: personal robbery and institutional robbery, the former taking place at streets or residences, and the latter taking place at commercial or financial establishments. Some personal robbery, such as pick pocketing and purse snatching, are considered larcenies rather than robberies because the moment of confrontation is less forceful. There are two ways to conduct a stickup, armed or unarm, the latter referred to as strong arm robbery. Konkin’s (1972) typology of robbers includes: (1) professionals; (2) opportunists; (3) addicts; and (4) alcoholics.

The most common type of robber is the opportunist, who frequently works in a group, but never plans more than an hour in advance. Armed robbery is the most common type, but unarm robbers (usually addicts and alcoholics) are far more likely to injure their victims. According to UCR data, the average payoff from all types of robbery is $900. Larger payoffs involve armored cars or banks. The typical robbery (60% of the time) involves an 18-24 year old black male holding up an older white male (inter-racial stranger crime pattern) on the street with a gun and getting away with $100 or less. More inmates are serving time (20 years or more) in U.S. prisons for this offense than any other crime. Roughly 33% of the time, the victim sustains an injury, and about 8% of the time, a homicide results, but victim resistance has variable effect, sometimes scaring away the offender (Feeney & Weir 1975).

Robbery rates have dramatic fluctuations. In the U.S., they were rather low from 1930 to 1965, then skyrocketed to about 600,000 a year where fluctuations of 100,000 more or less a year are common. Countries with the highest robbery rates, besides the U.S. which leads the world in this respect, are Chile, Colombia, Venezuela, Canada, Spain, France, and Ireland. There may be nothing inherent in urbanization that drives robbery rates (Japan, for example, has low rates), but robbery in the U.S. is indeed a big city crime, with the nation’s 50 largest cities (mostly in the Northeast, like New York City, Newark, and Baltimore) accounting for over 60% of the robbery rate (Cook 1983). Robbery predominately involves males, as women are involved only 10% of the time (Miller 1998). Criminologists have found that besides having few job skills and a decent education, most robbers suffer from low self esteem, susceptibility to peer pressure, and weak social bonds (Wright & Decker 1997). Further, far less than half of robbers are committed out of economic necessity. For more common, the need for money is related to a hedonistic lifestyle. Robbers typically have extensive criminal histories (Gabor et al. 1987).
Home invasion is a variation of robbery and burglary that accounts for 11% of all robbery, and rising. Typically, the offender uses a disguise or ruse to enter the home, and the victim is blindfolded, bound, and gagged. Sexual assault and/or injuries occur in a small number of cases. The profile of a home invader is the same as for robbery, but it is less likely to be a stranger crime.

Carjacking is a variation of robbery and vehicle theft (some criminologists argue that it's the most serious form of motor vehicle theft) which accounts for 2% of all motor vehicle theft, and rising. Some 35,000 carjackings occur annually, mostly at night. Many victims escape injury, but some offenders can be quite evil. In 1992, for example, offenders forced a woman to watch as they threw her 2-year-old child, car seat and all, out from a moving vehicle. About 80% of the time, the victim is forced out of the car at gunpoint, and about 20% of the time, the victim is abducted and later dumped. The profile of a home invader is the same as for robbery, but the injury rate is higher.

**MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT**

Auto theft is the most frequently reported crime in America, occurring about 1.7 million times a year. There has always been a high rate of it, peaking in 1990, and slightly decreasing since. It might make sense to talk about this offense category as 'auto crime' since some states classify auto theft as larceny, and only stealing parts from a car is usually classified as theft. 20% of the time, auto theft involves trucks, motorcycles, or other moving vehicles. There is a 62% recovery rate for stolen vehicles (Schmalleger 2002). This crime occurs more often in Western big cities like Los Angeles (the exception being Miami, with the highest auto theft rate in the world) than anywhere else, and more frequently in the summer months of July and August. All European countries have as serious an auto crime problem as the United States.

People steal cars for four reasons: (1) joyriding; (2) transportation need; (3) commission of other crime; and (4) profit (McCleary et. al. 1977). The two predominant groups are joyriders and profit seekers, which produce a bimodal distribution of offenders. About 45% of offenders are joyriders who are typically 16 year old white males (50% of the time) who steal a Firebird, Camaro, or Corvette to drive around till it runs out of gas. Another 40% of offenders are profit seekers who are predominantly black or Latino (50% of the time), in their twenties, and steal Mercedes, BMWs, Cadillacs, or Jaguars to export to foreign markets (places like Canada, Mexico, and Venezuela are known transshipment points for stolen American cars). Other groups are heavily involved in the theft of parts, which according to US News and World Report, makes up 40% of the stolen car business today. Stolen air bags fetch anywhere from $100 to $600, and certain German-made auto accessories are valuable. Car parts are worth much more sold separately than whole vehicles. A so-called "chop shop" will pay anywhere from $400 to $600 per stolen car to the thieves. The dismantlers who work in the chop shop are usually paid about $1,800 a day. The illegal parts market depends on the existence of unscrupulous auto part store owners and organizers of swap meets.

One particularly well-organized activity is called the "buy back" or "strip and run" scheme. Here, the car is stripped for parts on the street, leaving only the frame. The stolen parts are kept in private storage by the thieves. The police impound the frame, and the insurance company declares it a total loss. The police impound lot then sells the worthless frame to a salvage company for a couple of dollars. The thieves then go the salvage company and buy the frame, and reassemble the car. In this way, the reassembled car can be legally sold because all the title transfers have been legitimate.

Auto crime follows a stranger crime pattern. Offenders have extensive criminal histories and high recidivism rates. For juveniles, it's usually their first felony after a series of status offenses, although there's no evidence auto thieves escalate into more serious criminals. Both juveniles and professionals always work in groups, and peer pressure or the desire to impress may be precipitating factors. Drug and alcohol use is common, and BJS reports some 60% of arrested car thieves test positive for drugs.
BURGLARY

Burglary is the breaking and entering of any dwelling with the intent to commit a felony. Burglary is a crime of stealth, a victim-avoiding crime, and it is usually carried out after some attempt at careful planning and target selection. Most (60%) residential burglaries are carried out during the daytime at pre- or post-lunch hours, and most (60%) commercial burglaries are carried out during nighttime. A significant number of burglaries are reported at unknown times of occurrence. Nighttime residential burglaries where the victims are home and asleep is estimated at 13% of the time, and a smaller percentage involves thrill seekers who like to wake their victims in order to physically or sexually abuse them. As with robbers, burglars do not appear motivated by economic necessity, but instead by the need to support a lavish lifestyle (Wright & Decker 1997). Ethnographic research indicates burglars experience an exhilaration or thrill once inside a dwelling (Cromwell et al., 1991), and other research maintains they sometimes drop clues in a desire to get caught, get a sexual thrill from the voyeurism involved, and have a need to unbalance or defecate on the floor out of excitement or to show their spite for the victim (Schaefer & Revitch 1999).

Burglary rates have gone up steadily, peaking in 1980, and gone down steadily since. There are approximately 4 million burglaries a year in America, and declining. Metropolitan cities, mainly in the Midwest, like Chicago, tend to have the highest burglary rates, and all European countries, including Canada, have high burglary rates. Areas with ethnic diversity have the highest rates. As is the case with robbery, burglary tends to be a crime of youthfulness. The typical burglar is a male, equally likely to be white, black, or Latino, under the age of 25, under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time of offense, comes from a lower or working class background, and has an extensive criminal history. More than any other type of criminal, burglars are more likely to be rectalists, and regard the average five year prison sentence as the cost of doing business. The typical burglar is also usually a robber, assaulter, thief, or drug dealer (Miethe & McConkie 1998). The average payoff from a residential burglary is $1000.

There are three types of burglars: (1) low level amateurs, usually spur of the moment juveniles; (2) mid level professionals, older, drug addicted; and lacking the connections to be large scale and (3) high level professionals, who work in groups that come together for a specific, high payoff job (Maguire 1982). The vast majority of burglars (70%) are amateur or mid level opportunists who have only done rudimentary planning. A few professionals may travel great distances to carry out the crime, but most burglars, like robbers and reptists, prey upon their local neighborhoods. Burglars travel about 1.6 miles from their residence, robbers travel about 2.1 miles, and reptists travel about 12 miles (Rhodes & Conley 1981). Areas near railroad tracks, parks, or other non-roadway escape routes tend to be victimization areas. The motives for burglary tend to fall into three categories which, in order of being the most frequent, are: (1) to keep the party going (money from the crime is used to purchase drugs, usually cocaine); (2) to keep up appearances (money is used to buy expensive clothes, jewelry, or status items); and (3) to keep things together (money is used for living expenses, food, shelter, or child support).

Shoplifting is a variation and alternative to burglary (some criminologists classify it as a form of larceny) which is quite attractive to beginners and ex-burglars. It is also more likely to involve females (75% of the time) as offenders (compared to the 10% involved in burglary). There is a tendency for whites to be involved in shoplifting as much as blacks. There are three kinds of shoplifters: (1) soft-core, for which it is usually their first arrest, the item is for personal use, and they don't consider themselves criminals; (2) hard-core, who also steal items for personal use, but do so regularly and will admit to a criminal habit; and (3) professionals, who make up no more than 5% of all shoplifters, and work in teams, travelling from city to city with lookout and "booster" bags or clothing with deep pockets.
Recieving stolen property is another crime of theft intimately connected to burglary. Only professional burglars know where to find and how to use a professional fence, so most burglars use flea markets, auctions, pawn shops, or somebody they know who needs or wants an item.

LARCENY

Larceny (also called larceny/theft) is the unlawful taking of property, or the constructive possession of property, from another person for personal gain. Any property is covered, from physical objects like a wallet found in a bathroom to unreturned tools borrowed from a neighbor to Intellectual property plagiarized off the Internet. Larceny is a crime of opportunity, and the most frequent property offense in America. Any locale can be the setting for larceny, but schools, college campuses, offices, warehouses, parking lots, and household yards are particularly vulnerable to having stuff 'walk off', such as computers, laboratory Instruments, office equipment, bicycles, barbecue grills, and the contents of vehicles. According to UCR data, the most frequent acts involve stealing items from unlocked vehicles, stores, and office buildings. The average payoff is an item worth $500. Larceny is similar (but separate) to fraud offenses, which include telemarketing gimmicks, charity scams, con games, and some types of computer crime. Organized crime is also relevant in this context, although extortion and bribery are more heavily involved. Criminologists sometimes refer to larceny as occasional crime, conventional crime, professional crime, occupational crime, or organizational crime.

Offenders who commit larceny represent a variety of types, from part time, infrequent offenders (occasional property criminals) to fairly persistent semiprofessionals (Conventional property criminals). In the occasional category, Hagan (1998) includes shoplifters, vandals, people who steal items from vehicles, and those who forge or write worthless checks. (Note: the FBI counts shoplifting under larceny, although as noted above, it has more in common with burglary; and the FBI doesn't count con games or worthless checks as larceny). In the conventional category, Hagan (1998) includes some types of burglary, fencing stolen property, and arson. All races, ages, genders, and social classes are represented in larceny. Most criminologists agree that occasional offenders grow out of their criminal behavior by their mid-twenties, while conventional offenders do not.

At least 8 million larcenies are committed every year in the United States, and it is not only the most frequent crime in America, but the fastest growing. It has always been high and rising, although there was an unusual decline in the Nineties. So-called "sticky fingers" are prevalent in any nation around the world. Piffering (shoplifting from your own employer), for example, follows such a universal trend in that it can be safely said internal theft outnumbers external theft by a ratio of five to one (Parker 1977). No matter where you go, vandalism (most often involving graffiti) is also widespread against schools, parks, libraries, public transportation facilities, public telephones, traffic equipment, and public housing. Vandalism best illustrates that part of the definition of larceny where the constructive possession (enjoyment) of property is affected. Bad check writing was first studied by Lemert (1958), who distinguished between naive check forgers and systematic check forgers. The newbie, or amateur type was found to be most common. Correlates and possible causes of naive check forgery includes middle class background, underemployment, divorce, alcoholism, educational difficulties, and a consistent knack for being in financial crisis.

Regardless of the form that larceny takes, offenders tend to work alone, and few of them identify with, or associate with, the criminal element. Persistent offenders can be found in their thirties, forties, fifties, or even old age. Not enough research has been done on these offenders, and it would be interesting to know their feelings of remorse (if any), as well as any feelings of glee at having gotten away with something.

ARSON
Arson is the willful or malicious burning of the property of another, and clearly a property crime, among other things. It is primarily a big-city crime, although it does occur in rural areas a bit. The most common targets are homes, factories, or warehouses (44%), followed by mobile structures such as trailers, mobile homes, or motor vehicles (33%), followed by crops, forests, or rural areas (25%). Controversy exists over the motives for arson, but it is believed the most common motives may be revenge and vandalism. Arson can also be committed to conceal another crime, for profit (insurance company fraud), pyromania, excitement, and during a riot. Fire departments, not the police, are in charge of determining if an arson has occurred. Numbers to measure the amount of arson in the world today are notoriously unreliable. Arson can also be a violent crime (felony murder) if someone dies during the blaze.

**WHITE COLLAR CRIME**

Siegel (2004) defines white collar crime as “illegal activities of people and institutions whose acknowledged purpose is profit through legitimate business transactions.” To make it simple, white collar crime is larceny committed by a respectable, legitimate enterprise which is not set up to go out of business like an ordinary fraud or con game. White collar crime involves embezzlement, forgery, or fraud committed in the course of normal business practice, but is highly unethical and violates accepted accounting principles or the public trust. Like the crime of conspiracy, deception and cover up are the hallmarks of white collar crime. Sometimes the offender is a government official. Criminologists who work in this area sometimes approach white collar crime as the study of business crime, corporate crime, suite crime, crime at the top, elite crime, state crime, political crime, or governmental crime.

When Sutherland (1940) first coined the term white collar crime, he only meant to say poor people are not the only ones to commit crime. The color of the collar doesn’t mean anything. It could be blue-collar or pink-collar crime. The Ederhert (1970) typology includes (1) crimes against government by public officials; (2) crimes against government by private citizens; (3) crimes against businesses; (4) crimes against investors; (5) crimes against consumers; (6) crimes against employees; and (7) crimes affecting public health. The Green (1990) typology includes: (1) crimes for the benefit of one’s employer; (2) crimes by government officials; (2) crimes by professionals in the course of doing business; and (4) crimes by individuals in the course of their occupation.

There is no uniform white collar crime reporting system. The FBI only tracks crime data on embezzlement and fraud, so the best estimates are that 18,000 arrests for white collar crimes occur each year. The number of investigations far exceed that number, however. It appears prosecutions for crimes against consumers take priority over crimes against business and government. Offenders typically believe that whatever they’ve done is not wrong, and is an expected entitlement or fringe benefit of their positions of power. Most research suggests that firms with declining profitability or budget cuts are more likely to break the law (Coleman 1994). Other research indicates that firms in highly regulated and volatile markets (like pharmaceuticals or petroleum) are more likely to break the law (Albanese 1995).

The typical white collar criminal is a white, middle class, educated male around 29 years of age (70% of the time) with no previous criminal history and no involvement in drug or alcohol abuse (Melote & McCorkle 1998). Their offenses are characterized by sophisticated planning, and they have carefully considered lessons learned from the extensive histories most corporations have of regulatory violations. Most offenders prefer to work alone, except where the cooperation of others is needed. Almost all criminological theories (strain, learning, control, conflict, and neutralization) have been applied to white collar crime. The economic costs of white collar crime are staggering, running well into several billions a year. Perhaps more importantly, economic crime erodes public confidence.

**INTERNET RESOURCES**
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PATTERNS AND TRENDS IN PUBLIC ORDER CRIME

Ain’t nobody’s business but your own. (Peter McWilliams)

Public order crimes are known by a variety of names — consensual crime, victimless vice, crimes without victims, or victimless crime. In fact, Siegel (2004) defines both public order crime AND victimless crime as “crime which involves acts that interfere with the operations of society and the ability of people to function efficiently.” This definition aside, the term public order, meaning public (more) order has become favored in recent years, and the term victimless is mostly out of favor because the discovery of secondary victims (family, friends, and acquaintances) has led to recognition of victimlessness as a myth. The field of criminology has gone through at least three stages of controversy: (1) a period around 1930–1960 when the debate was over the functions of deviance (Davis 1937; Coser 1962); (2) a period around 1960–1980 when the debate was over harm to self versus harm to society (Becker 1963; MacNemare & Karmen 1983); and (3) the period from about 1990 on, which has involved trying to sort out the many links between sex, drugs, alcohol, and crime (Krohn et al. 1997). There is also the legalization, or decriminalization, debate which draws some criminological attention.

The major crimes that are usually analyzed in the public order category include (in no particular order): prostitution, deviant sex (paraphilias), precocious sex (underage sex), homosexuality, pornography, alcoholism, liquor law violations (underage drinking), driving while intoxicated, disorderly conduct, public drunkenness, drug offenses (opiates, heroin, cocaine, crack, meth, marijuana), and cigarette smoking. There are a number of other crimes and deviant acts, such as vagrancy, panhandling, homelessness, helmet and seat belt violations, gambling, abortion, suicide, and witchcraft that are not fully discussed here for sake of brevity.

As before, we’ll examine some known facts and particulars about these crimes (patterns and trends), and take a look at some criminological ideas about them. The purpose is to see the “big picture” rather than document numbers. For organizational purposes, we’ll arrange our discussion around sex-related and substance-related offenses, which subsume almost everything among the major public order crimes. One commonality, however, is that criminalization has produced more by way of creating profit than shaping demand. Profit is what attracts unscrupulous people. Profit is what corrupts the system. Profit is what takes money away from the tax base for community services. Profit is what enables vice and organized crime to extend its control. Regulation and treatment are much more cost-effective than using the criminal justice system to handle public order problems.

There are some 5 million arrests for public order crime every year, the most frequent ones being drug offenses, driving while intoxicated, disorderly conduct, public drunkenness, liquor law violations, and prostitution. Despite a skyrocketing drug offense rate, the overall substance-related offense rate has been declining in recent years. The sex-related offense rate has been consistently stable for decades. Both sex- and substance-related crime rates are higher in the Northeastern and Western states, although for some liquor offenses (like underage drinking and public drunkenness), the Midwest and South have far higher rates. Sex-related offenses are higher in urban areas, and substance-related offenses are somewhat higher in rural areas. Except for prostitution, males comprise 90% of all public order offenders. Except for driving while intoxicated (predominately committed by whites), African Americans account for slightly more than half of public order offenders. The peak
age for a drug offender is 18, age 25 for driving while intoxicated, and age 33 for sex-related offenses like prostitution (Miethe & McCorkle 1998).

**SEX-RELATED OFFENSES**

*(Prostitution, deviant sex (paraphilias), precocious sex (underage sex), homosexuality, pornography)*

Sexual pleasures contain a undeniable forbidden fruit factor, enhanced by the fact that many interests, predilections, preferences, and compulsions are moralized or criminalized. Prostitution (also known as sex work, the game, or the life) can be straight or gay, male or female, traditional or deviant. The vast majority of prostitutes (90%) are twenty- or thirty-something females, providing straight traditional sex (feetie, coltus) by working in streets (20%), massage parlors (25%), brothels (15%), bars (15%), hotels (10%), or as call girls (15%). Male prostitutes (chicken hawks) are usually homosexual, extremely younger (age 14–15) than females, and there are some 10,000 of them in New York City alone. There an estimated 300,000 to 500,000 full time prostitutes in America working an average of seven days straight with a week or two off in-between. Some 90,000 arrests for prostitution are made every year, with about 1200 of these arrests being minor females under the age of 18 (some as young as age 9). Slightly less than half of all prostitutes have pimp who serves as managers that expect $1500 per day from each of the 5–7 workers in his "stable", but most prostitutes have a "man" (husband or lover) who is always close by, shares in the proceeds, and provides individual protection. Pimps are the ones who usually recruit newcomers into the life. Johns, or customers, are arrested at a lesser rate than prostitutes, and generally consist of men with emotional problems. Like most criminal careers, age at onset (precocious sex at an early age) is the best predictor of seriousness and persistence, and almost all sex offenders have been sexually active as early as age 8 (although some pedophiles regard "eight as too late"). It is an axiom in criminal justice work that where you find prostitutes, you'll find all sorts of other crime.

The paraphilies are not so much oriented toward sex (homosexual or heterosexual) as they are to the stimulation one receives from contact with youthfulness (pedophilia), certain nonhuman objects (fetishism), humiliation or pain (sadomasochism), and watching (voyeurism) or being watched (exhibitionism). I have written elsewhere about fairly harmless fetishes and the more harmful ones and how they can serve as springboards to more serious criminal involvement. Pedophilia is probably the most studdied paraphilia in criminology, and some research has indicated more than 20% of adult males report sexual attraction to children (Smith & Eldred 1996). Like for many sex offenses, alcohol plays two well-established disinhibition roles: getting the courage up, and drowning the shame. It has been estimated that there are some 100,000 child prostitutes working in America.

Homosexuality is the world's oldest deviance, but tolerance and constitutional protections have been gained in recent years. Homosexuals, like most minority groups, suffer the pains of stigma and stereotype for the faults of a few members. Their overall culture of secrecy (closet homosexuality) probably creates more problems than it's worth, however. It sets up a situation for blackmail and a marketplace atmosphere of clubs and parks where anonymity breeds abuse. Other contributions of homosexuality to crime have been documented elsewhere (Russo & Humphreys 1983). Ironically, homosexuality effectively functions as an attractor to crime against it (gay-bashing) in what criminologists call derivative deviance (Harry 1982).

Pornography is a multi-billion dollar enterprise that controls about 30% of entertainment markets. Extensive controversy exists over whether pornography causes crime. Some criminologists (van den Haag 1969) and at least one blue-ribbon task force (Meese Commission 1986) have found it a direct cause of violence against women. Other research (Donnerstein et. al. 1987) has found it depends heavily upon duration of exposure, and does not cause predispositions, but strengthens already pre-existing predispositions. Nobody disputes the dangers of child pornography, however. Studies by Burgess et.al. (1984) have exposed at least three types of sex rings (solo, impromptu, syndicated) and uncovered a pattern of serious adult criminality (erson and violence) among children exploited in pornography.
The connections between sex and crime can be looked at two ways. Sex can either be seen as a cause of crime, or sexual offending can be seen as the cause of other crime. Most essays on the subject never get past the first way of looking at it, and include the usual tried of broken home factors (absent father, sexual or physical abuse; runaway) that lead someone to become a sexual offender later in life. This generally leads to a portrayal of the offender as a victim, not a victimizer (MacNamara & Kemen 1983). It is a perfectly acceptable approach in victimology, but more useful, criminological analysis involves the study of ways sex offenders commit other harms (the logical, temporal sequence). Here's a list of some of those harms (Sternberg 1983):

- sex offenders often rob, steal, or swindle their customers
- sex offenders frequently try to extort or blackmail their customers
- sex offenders often illegal carry weapons (to protect themselves)
- sex offenders are frequently involved in drug abuse or alcoholism
- sex offenders contribute to the transmission of venereal disease
- sex offenders sometimes beat, torture, or kill their customers
- sex offenders exploit vulnerable, emotionally disturbed customers
- sex offenders help deplete family incomes
- sex offenders contribute to shallow family relationships
- sex offenders cause incredible anguish within their own families
- sex offenders contribute to relative deprivation (something for nothing)
- sex offenders sometimes assault other sex offenders (out of competition)
- sex offenders make it uncomfortable for traditional people to walk the street
- sex offenders expose neighborhood children to deviant lifestyles
- sex offenders contribute to noise pollution and traffic problems (cruising Johns)
- sex offenders demoralize the work ethic
- sex offenders undermine the cause of gender equality

To some extent, stalking can be considered as a crime falling into the sex-related, public order category. It is perhaps the most forgotten crime, and occurs so often, and is so misunderstood, that it is hard to find good, quality research material on it. About 87% of the time, the stalker is a male, and usually an ex-spouse, ex-partner, or ex-date, and the typical pattern is that they follow their victims, spy on them, appear near their home, place of work, or place of recreation. About 50% of the time, the male stalker will initiate a letter-writing campaign or telephone-calling spree. When the stalker is a female (about 13% of the time), letter-writing is much more common than telephone-calling. The phone calling can be quite persistent, sometimes adding up to about 50 calls a day. Repeated e-mails are a version of this, but do not exhaust all the possibilities inherent in the offense variety known as cyber-stalking. There is quite a bit of criminal justice literature on stalking and cyber-stalking, but most of it tends to just be complaints about the inadequacy of civil protection orders. In-depth analyses of the psyche of stalkers are nowhere to be found.

SUBSTANCE-RELATED OFFENSES
(alcoholism, underage drinking, DUI, disorderly conduct, public drunkenness, drugs, smoking)

About 14 million people (one in every 13 adults) are alcoholic, mostly men between the ages of 18-29. Alcohol is a major cause of mortality, morbidity, injury, and accident. It is involved in at least half of all homicides (perpetrator or victim), 53% of all traffic fatalities, 64% of fires and burns, 48% of hypothermia and frostbite, and about 20% of completed suicides. Injuries resulting from alcohol involvement are the fourth leading cause of death. In criminology, there are well-established links between alcohol and crime. Further, alcoholism tends to be a co-occurring illness with that catch-all diagnosis for criminality called antisocial personality disorder. Alcoholism creates victims all around the offender, even among those who care about them.
There are few determinants of crime stronger than those related to alcohol and drugs. More than 1.1 million annual arrests for illicit drug violations, almost 1.4 million arrests for driving while intoxicated, 480,000 arrests for liquor law violations, and 704,000 arrests for drunkenness come to a total of 4.3 million arrests for alcohol and other drug crimes, that total accounts for over one-third of all arrests in America. Alcohol is a key factor in up to 68% of manslaughters, 62% of assaults, 54% of murders and attempted murders, 42% of rapes, 48% of robberies, 44% of burglaries, 66% of property crime overall, and 64% of child abuse and neglect. Regular users of alcohol and drugs function at 67% of their capacity, have high rates of absenteeism (35 missed work days a year), are 5 times more likely to file a Workman’s Comp claim, and 7 times more likely to have wages garnished.

Neither the UCR nor the NCWS is well suited to measure the relationships between drugs, alcohol, and crime. Most experts obtain data from one of the following sources: the Monitoring the Future study (MTF), the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse (NHSDA), the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring program (ADAM), the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONCDP), and the Drug Abuse Warning Network (DAWN).

The U.S. Department of Justice conservatively reports that alcohol and drugs are a definite factor in crime 40% of the time, yet others report that alcohol and drugs are a proven factor at least 80% of the time. The following table from Bolenko (1998) illustrates this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Prison Inmates who are Substance-Involved Offenders</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Jail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ever used illegal drugs regularly</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever in treatment for alcohol abuse</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever convicted of Driving While Intoxicated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever convicted of a drug law violation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever committed a crime to get money for drugs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Influence of drugs/alcohol at time of offense</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance-Involved Offenders (Percent who fit into at least one of the above categories)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With drunk driving, there are drunk drivers and there are hardcore drunk drivers. The hardcore group is involved in 58% of alcohol-related fatalities, and is defined as: (1) driving with a BAC level of .15 or more; (2) having more than one drunk driving arrest; and (3) being highly resistant to changing their behavior in spite of previous punishment, education, treatment, or public disdain.

Public drunkenness laws are essentially the same as laws on disorderly conduct and disturbing the peace. Offenders typically consist of what are called problem drinkers, or inebriates, and they make up over half of all misdemeanor arrests and jail admissions. Depending upon jurisdiction, they have crossed the line on dietary or social custom.

With drugs, the most interesting theoretical questions revolve around what is called the enslavement versus escalation hypotheses in criminology. This involves whether drugs addict, or enslave, individuals enough to make them think about committing a crime they would otherwise never think of, or whether drugs merely enhance, or escalate, pre-existing criminal tendencies. There is an abundance of research to be found on the role of drugs in the beginning, middle, and desistance phases of criminal careers, with the so-called marrying effect a strong
desistence factor. There also appears to be an inordinate amount of interest in documenting the age at onset, and in particular, using indicators to document usage and availability in schools.

Cigarette smoking is the most recent entry into the reach of criminology. About 25% of Americans smoke regularly, and the pattern of addiction is quite similar to drugs such as heroin and cocaine. In 1998, tobacco companies agreed to pay a $206 billion settlement with 46 states that admitted civil wrongdoing. The government subsequently failed by a 4-5 Supreme Court vote to have nicotine added as a dangerous drug (which would have required licensing or prescription to purchase cigarettes).

The drug distribution system is the most complex and complicated thing on the planet, crossing five continents, and unprecedented in its economic might. Economically, it's what probably holds the world together more than the official financial markets. Billions of real dollars exchange hands every day. The major parties in this vast network are as follows:

- **growers** - who plant, nurture, and harvest the plants that drugs come from
- **manufacturers** - who convert the raw materials into precursor or finished products
- **importers** - who devise the plans for shipments to destinations
- **smugglers** - who arrange and operate the aircraft, ships, or vehicles for transport
- **body packers** - who carry the drugs on or inside their person
- **traffickers** - who carry the drugs in their luggage, clothing, belongings, or property
- **distributors** - who deal in multi-pound lots of the drug
- **dealers** - who deal in smaller lots of the drug
- **consumers** - who demand and use the drug and sometimes deal

**THE LEGALIZATION DEBATE**

Lifting the ban on marijuana has been the number one issue in the legalization debate. The pro-legalization movement is primarily funded by billionaire philanthropists such as George Soros (financial speculator), Peter Lewis (retired CEO of Progressive Insurance), and John Sperling (founder of the University of Phoenix). The anti-legalization movement is headed by whomever the President appoints as the Drug Czar (currently John Walters) who runs the office of ONDCP. The American public, in poll after poll, show that citizens want to keep marijuana illegal, but don't want the laws strictly enforced. For example, Time/CNN polls indicate that 80% of American approve of medical marijuana, and 75% think small-time recreational users should get off with a fine. NORML maintains a nice map detailing a state-by-state guide to drug laws. Since 2003, about eight (8) states have legalized medicinal marijuana, and about five states have reduced the penalties for small-time consumption down to nothing. The Supreme Court ruled in **U.S. v. Oakland Cannabis Buyers Coop** (2001) that federal drug laws trump state drug laws, so if a state legalizes marijuana, federal authorities can still come in and make arrests. In 2003, however, the Supreme Court ruled that doctors cannot be punished for recommending medical marijuana. In some ways, the medical marijuana sub-movement is a ruse to get marijuana legalized more freely for everyone, but in other ways, there are really sick people who need the drug. The following insert contains some known medical facts about marijuana:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDICAL/MEDICINAL PROPERTIES OF MARIJUANA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People who argue they need marijuana claim it numbs pain, relieves the eye pressure of glaucoma, calms muscle spasms, and helps them get the munchies so they don't waste away from AIDS. The actual medical research is quite controversial, and depends upon how you interpret the results. Earleywine (2002) and others have chronicled these controversies, and the media jumps on any new article that comes out of a medical research journal. Pro-legalization advocates claim the government sabotages the medical research. Scientific researchers claim the results show marijuana is both good and bad. There are about 65 different psychoactive substances, besides THC, in marijuana, so the research is far from over.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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is pretty exhausting. To summarize, the drug has not been shown to reduce pain or nausea. As a
painkiller or analgesic, marijuana does little more than a placebo. As an aid to nausea or the problem of
keeping food down, there are no known appetite enhancement effects of the drug, and the so-called
“munchies” appear to be subcultural in origin. However, no one has ever died from smoking marijuana
although a couple of cases are known where blood flow to the limbs became so bad amputation was
needed, nor does the drug produce cancers, brain tumors, chromosome damage, lower IQ, or sexual
infertility. On the other hand, there is evidence that the drug is addictive and produces withdrawal
states among heavy users and about 10% of recreational users.

During the 1980s and 1990s, doctors in the U.S. used to prescribe a drug called dronabinol (synthetic THC),
but users claimed it works too slow since it’s taken as a pill and doesn’t help as much as smoked marijuana. In
Great Britain, a pharmaceutical company known as GW Pharmaceuticals has produced a mouth spray which is
intended to avoid the lung damage that comes from smoking anything. Marijuana is more irritating to the lungs
because it contains 50% more tar than tobacco, and has a greater harmful effect on the upper airways (sinuses
and larynx). Clinically speaking, what remains important is the effect on mood, judgment, and behavior. While there
seems to be no lowered IQ or impulsivity effects, there are indeed negative effects on learning, time perception,
and short-term memory. There is a need for incorporating these known effects into theories about marijuana-
induced crime.