

**THE SAGE
DICTIONARY OF
CRIMINOLOGY**

FOURTH EDITION

**EUGENE McLAUGHLIN
JOHN MUNCIE**



**THE SAGE
DICTIONARY OF
CRIMINOLOGY**

Sara Miller McCune founded SAGE Publishing in 1965 to support the dissemination of usable knowledge and educate a global community. SAGE publishes more than 1000 journals and over 800 new books each year, spanning a wide range of subject areas. Our growing selection of library products includes archives, data, case studies and video. SAGE remains majority owned by our founder and after her lifetime will become owned by a charitable trust that secures the company's continued independence.

Los Angeles | London | New Delhi | Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne

THE SAGE DICTIONARY OF CRIMINOLOGY

FOURTH EDITION

EUGENE McLAUGHLIN
JOHN MUNCIE

 SAGE

Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne

SAGE Publications Ltd
1 Oliver's Yard
55 City Road
London EC1Y 1SP

SAGE Publications Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320
SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd

B 1/1 1 Mohan Cooperative Industrial Area
Mathura Road
New Delhi 110 044

SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte Ltd.
3 Church Street
#10-04 Samsung Hub
Singapore 049483

Editor: Natalie Aguilera
Editorial assistant: Eve Williams
Production editor: Sarah Cooke
Marketing manager: Susheel Gokarakonda
Cover design: Stephanie Guyaz
Typeset by: C&M Digitals (P) Ltd, Chennai, India
Printed in the UK

© The Editors and Contributors 2019

First edition published 2001
Second edition published 2006
Third edition published 2013

This fourth edition published 2019

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, this publication may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form, or by any means, only with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction, in accordance with the terms of licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018956798

British Library Cataloguing in Publication data

A catalogue record for this book is available from
the British Library

ISBN 978-1-5264-3671-9
ISBN 978-1-5264-3672-6 (pbk)

At SAGE we take sustainability seriously. Most of our products are printed in the UK using responsibly sourced papers and boards. When we print overseas we ensure sustainable papers are used as measured by the PREPS grading system. We undertake an annual audit to monitor our sustainability.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-------|
| <i>List of Contributors</i> | vi |
| <i>List of Entries</i> | x |
| <i>Preface to the Fourth Edition</i> | xv |
| <i>Editors' Introduction</i> | xvi |
| The SAGE Dictionary of Criminology A-Z | 1-590 |

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

EDITORS

Eugene McLaughlin, City, University of London, UK
John Muncie, The Open University, Milton Keynes, UK

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

Eve Williams and Delayna Spencer, Sage Publications, UK (4th edition)
Sarah-Jane Boyd, Sage Publications, UK (3rd edition)
Pauline Hetherington, The Open University, UK (1st and 2nd editions)
Sue Lacey, The Open University, UK (1st edition)

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

Pat Carlen, University of Leicester, UK
Stuart Henry, San Diego State University, USA
Tony Jefferson, University of Keele, UK
Victor Jupp, formerly University of Northumbria, UK
Pat O'Malley, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia
Joe Sim, Liverpool John Moores University, UK
Elizabeth Stanko, Royal Holloway, University of London, UK
René van Swaaningen, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands

AUTHORS

Katja Franko Aas, Oslo University, Norway
Robert Agnew, Emory University, Atlanta, USA
Peter B. Ainsworth, formerly University of Manchester, UK
Bruce Arrigo, University of North Carolina, USA

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Gregg Barak, Eastern Michigan University, USA
Piers Beirne, University of Southern Maine, USA
Ben Bowling, Kings College London, UK
Trevor Bradley, Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand
David Brown, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
Sheila Brown, formerly University of Sheffield, UK
Eamonn Carrabine, Essex University, UK
Stephen Case, University of Loughborough, UK
Geertrui Cazaux, formerly University of Southern Maine, USA
Kathryn Chadwick, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK
Janet Chan, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
John Clarke, The Open University, UK
Roy Coleman, University of Liverpool, UK
Iain Crow, formerly University of Sheffield, UK
Chris Cunneen, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
Kathleen Daly, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia
Julia Davidson, University of East London, London, UK
Deborah H. Drake, The Open University, UK
Anna Duncan, formerly Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand
Adam Edwards, Cardiff University, Wales, UK
Paul Ekblom, University of the Arts, London, UK
Clive Emsley, The Open University, UK
Jeff Ferrell, Texas Christian University, USA
Matthew Follett, formerly University of Brighton, UK
Alan France, University of Auckland, New Zealand
Loraine Gelsthorpe, University of Cambridge, UK
Lieve Gies, University of Leicester, UK
Peter Gill, formerly Liverpool John Moores University, UK
Barry Goldson, University of Liverpool, UK
David Goyes, University of Oslo, Norway
David Greenberg, New York University, USA
Chris Greer, City, University of London, UK
Nic Groombridge, University of South Wales, UK
Ben Gunn, formerly HMP Erlestoke, UK
Willem de Haan, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Kevin Haines, University of Trinidad and Tobago, Trinidad
Simon Hallsworth, University of Suffolk, UK
Lynn Hancock, University of Liverpool, UK
Keith Hayward, University of Copenhagen, Denmark
Frances Heidensohn, London School of Economics, UK
Stuart Henry, San Diego State University, USA
Paddy Hillyard, formerly Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK
Clive Hollin, University of Leicester, UK
Ross Homel, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia
Tim Hope, formerly Salford University, UK
Barbara Hudson, formerly University of Central Lancashire, UK
Gordon Hughes, Cardiff University, Wales, UK
Mark Israel, University of Western Australia, Australia
Ruth Jamieson, formerly Queen's University, Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK
Tony Jefferson, Keele University, UK

Yvonne Jewkes, University of Bath, UK
Victor Jupp, formerly University of Northumbria, UK
Roger Kernsmith, Eastern Michigan University, USA
John Kerr, University of Roehampton, London, UK
Gloria Laycock, University College London, UK
Maggy Lee, University of Hong Kong, China
Travis Linnemann, Eastern Kentucky University, USA
Ronnie Lippens, Keele University, UK
Shadd Maruna, Queen's University, Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK
Roger Matthews, University of Kent, UK
Eugene McLaughlin, City, University of London, UK
Dragan Milovanovic, Northeastern Illinois University, USA
James Morgan, London Metropolitan University, UK
Wayne Morrison, Queen Mary and Westfield College, London, UK
Lyria Bennett Moses, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
John Muncie, The Open University, UK
Karim Murji, University of West London, UK
David Nelken, University of Macerata, Italy
Mike Nellis, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland, UK
Pat O'Malley, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia
Emma J. Palmer, University of Leicester, UK
Ken Pease, formerly University of Huddersfield, UK
Hal Pepinsky, Indiana University, USA
Graham Pike, The Open University, UK
Sophie Pike, University of South Wales, UK
Mike Presdee, formerly University of Kent, UK
Jill Radford, formerly University of Teesside, UK
Lorraine Radford, University of Central Lancashire, UK
Joseph Rankin, Eastern Michigan University, USA
Roger Sapsford, University of Aberdeen, Scotland, UK
Esther Saraga, formerly The Open University, UK
Phil Scraton, Queen's University, Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK
James Sheptycki, York University, Canada
Michael Shiner, London School of Economics, UK
Joe Sim, Liverpool John Moores University, UK
Nigel South, University of Essex, UK
Richard Sparks, University of Edinburgh, Scotland, UK
Peter Squires, University of Brighton, UK
Elizabeth Stanko, Royal Holloway, University of London, UK
Colin Sumner, formerly University of Cork, Ireland
Maggie Sumner, formerly Westminster University, London, UK
René van Swaaningen, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands
Charles R. Tittle, North Carolina State University, USA
Steve Tombs, The Open University, UK
Kyle Treiber, University of Cambridge, UK
Tonia Tzannetakis, formerly University of Athens, Greece
Claire Valier, formerly Birkbeck, University of London, UK
Barry Vaughan, Department of the Taoiseach, Dublin, Ireland
Sirpa Virta, Tampere University, Finland
Alison Wakefield, Portsmouth University, UK

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Stephen Wakeman, Liverpool John Moores University, UK
Sandra Walklate, University of Liverpool, UK
Dave Wall, University of Leeds, UK
Reece Walters, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia
Craig Webber, University of Southampton, UK
Louise Westmarland, The Open University, UK
Rob White, University of Tasmania, Australia
David Whyte, University of Liverpool, UK
Anna Williams, University of Huddersfield, UK
Chris A. Williams, The Open University, UK
David Wilson, Birmingham City University, UK
Anne Worrall, Keele University, UK
Tanya Wyatt, University of Northumbria, UK
Enzo Yaksic, Northeastern University, Boston, USA
Majid Yar, Lancaster University, UK
Jock Young, formerly John Jay College of Criminal Justice, New York, USA

LIST OF ENTRIES

A

Abolition
Abolitionism
Action Research
Actuarialism
Administrative Criminology
Aetiology
Anarchist Criminology
Animal Abuse
Anomie
Anti-Social Behaviour
Appreciative Criminology
Art Crime
Authoritarian Populism
Autoethnography

B

Behaviour Modification
Behaviourism
Bifurcation
Big Data
Biological Criminology
Biopiracy
Birmingham 'School'
'Broken Windows'

C

Capital Punishment
Carceral Society
Carnival (of Crime)
Causation
Chaos Theory
Chicago School of Sociology
Child Abuse
Classicism
Coercive Control
Cognitive-Behavioural Theory

Cognitive-Behavioural Therapy
Cohort Studies
Communitarianism
Community Corrections
Community Crime Prevention
Community Justice
Community Policing
Community Safety
Community Sentences
Comparative Criminology and Criminal
Justice
Comparative Method
COMPSTAT
Conditioning
Conflict Theory
Conformity
Constitutive Criminology
Containment Theory
Control Balance Theory
Control Theory
Convict Criminology
Corporate Crime
Correlational Analysis
Crime
Crime Control Model
Crime Mapping
Crime News
Crime Prevention
Crime Reduction
Crime Science
Crimes Against Humanity
Criminal Careers
Criminal Justice
Criminalization
Crimmigration
Critical Criminology
Critical Research

LIST OF ENTRIES

Cross-Sectional Design
Cultural Criminology
Cyber-Bullying
Cybercrime
Cybersecurity

D

Decarceration
Deconstruction
Decriminalization
Defensible Space
Defiance Theory
Delinquency
Demonization
Denial
Desistance
Determinism
Deterrence
Developmental Criminology
Deviance
Deviancy Amplification
Differential Association
Differential Reinforcement
Disassociation
Discourse Analysis
Discretion
Discrimination
Disparity
Displacement
Dispositional Theories
Disproportionality
Dispute Settlement
Diversion
Documentary Analysis
Domestic Violence
Drift
Due Process Model

E

Eco-Crime
Ecocide
Edgework
Electronic Monitoring
Emergency Legislation
Emotions (of Crime)
Environmental Criminologies
Ethnic Cleansing
Ethnography
Eugenics

Evaluation Research
Experimental Criminology
Experiments
Extraterritorial Law Enforcement
Extroversion/Introversion

F

Family Crime
Fear of Crime
Feminist Criminologies
Feminist Research
Focus Groups
Folk Devil
Forensic Anthropology
Forensic Psychology
Free Will
Functionalism

G

Gangs
Gated Communities
Genetics
Genocide
Geographies of Crime
Global Criminology
Globalization
Governance
Governmentality
Green Criminology

H

Habitus
Hate Crime
Hedonism
Hegemonic Masculinity
Hegemony
Hidden Crime
Historical Methods
Homicide
Human Rights
Human Trafficking

I

Incapacitation
Incarceration
Indigenous Criminology
Individual Positivism
Informal Justice
Institutional Racism

Integrative Criminology
Interactionism
Intersectionality

J

Just Deserts
Justice
Justice Reinvestment
Juvenile Justice

L

Labelling
Left Idealism
Left Realism
Liberal Feminism
Life Course Theories of Crime
Longitudinal Study

M

Managerialism
Marxist Criminologies
Masculinities
Mass Murder
Mediation
Mentoring
Moral Economy
Moral Panic
Multi-Agency Crime
 Prevention
Multivariate Analysis

N

Narrative Criminology
Natural Justice
Neo-Conservative Criminology
Neoliberalism
Net Widening
Neutralization (Techniques of)
New Criminology
New Deviancy Theory
Newsmaking Criminology

O

Obedience (Crimes of)
Offender Profiling
Official Criminal Statistics
Opportunity Theory
Organized Crime

P

Panopticism
Participant Observation
Pathology
Peacemaking Criminology
Penal Populism
Penality
Penology
Personal Safety
Personality Theory
Police Bias
Policing
Policy Transfer
Political Crime
Popular Criminology
Popular Justice
Positivism
Post-Colonial Criminology
Post-Structuralism
Postmodernism
Praxis
Prediction Studies
Predictive Policing
Primary Deviation
Primitive Rebellion
Private Policing
Privatization
Probation
Problem-Oriented Policing
Proportionality
Psychoanalytic Criminology
Psychopathy
Public Criminology
Public Opinion
Public Safety
Punishment
Punitiveness

Q

Quantum Holographic Criminology
Queer Theory

R

Racial Profiling
Racialization
Radical Criminologies
Radical Feminism
Radical Non-Intervention

LIST OF ENTRIES

Rational Choice Theory
Realist Criminologies
Reassurance Policing
Recidivism
Redress
Reflexivity
Regulation
Regulatory Agencies
Rehabilitation
Reintegrative Shaming
Relative Deprivation
Reparation
Repeat Victimization
Replacement Discourse
Research Ethics
Responsibilization
Restitution
Restorative Justice
Retribution
Right Realism
Risk
Risk Factor Research
Routine Activity Theory

S

Sampling
Scapegoating
Secondary Deviation
Security
Self-Policing
Self-Reports
Serial Homicide
Sex Crime
Sexuality
Shaming
Signal Crime
Situational Crime Prevention
Social Censure
Social Constructionism
Social Control
Social Control Theory
Social Crime Prevention
Social Defence Theory
Social Disorganization
Social Ecology
Social Exclusion
Social Harm
Social Justice

Social Learning Theory
Social Media
Social Reaction
Social Survey
Socio-Biology
Sociological Positivism
Somatotyping
Sports Criminology
State (The)
State Crime
Status Frustration
Stereotyping
Stigma
Strain Theory
Structuration
Structured Interviews
Subculture
Surveillance
Symbolic Interactionism

T

Target Hardening
Terrorism
Time Series Design
Tolerance
Torture
Transnational Crime
Transnational Organized
 Crime
Transnational Policing
Treatment Model
Triangulation
Trolling

U

Underclass
Urban Security
Utilitarianism

V

Victim Surveys
Victimization
Victimless Crime
Victimology
Vigilantism
Violence
Virtual Criminology
Visual Criminology

W

War Crimes
'What Works'
White Collar Crime
Wildlife Crime

Y

Youth Justice

Z

Zemiology
Zero Tolerance
Zonal Theory

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION

When compiling the first edition in 2000 the editors were supported by an international advisory board with representatives from the USA, Canada and the Netherlands as well as the UK. They provided invaluable advice in drawing up an initial list of cross-referencing concepts and terms that define and shape criminological perspectives and modes of inquiry internationally. The advisory board worked with us to identify the names of specialist academics world-wide. As a result the dictionary has been immeasurably enhanced by contributions from criminological researchers and authors, of whom many are the leading scholars in their field. For this fourth edition, in line with previous editions, we have been greatly assisted by much welcomed critical feedback from enthusiastic advisors and reviewers who have revealed to us the dictionary's major strengths and weaknesses. We hope that this invaluable advice from our criminology colleagues will continue. This edition has been updated throughout and is now considerably enhanced with the addition of new entries covering such diverse (and previously omitted) topics as big data, cyber security, wildlife crime, crimmigration, penal populism, serial homicide and neoliberalism as well as a discussion of emergent perspectives such as popular criminology and narrative criminology. With now more than 350 entries written by over 120 academics and practitioners from across Europe, the USA, Canada, China, Australia and New Zealand, we have once more attempted to reflect the divergent, cosmopolitan interests of all those who lay claim to the vibrant and rapidly expanding subject matter of criminology.

A work of this nature has once more been a necessarily lengthy and complex exercise in collaboration, collation, formatting, timetabling and processing. A special and immense debt of gratitude is owed to Sue Lacey and Pauline Hetherington of the Social Policy and Criminology Department at the Open University for their formidable administrative and secretarial skills that made the first and second editions possible. This administrative responsibility was ably taken on by Sarah-Jane Boyd at Sage Publications for the third edition and by Eve Williams at Sage Publications for this fourth edition. Needless to say without this level of professional support the dictionary would not have come to fruition at all. Last but not least we again express sincere thanks to Gillian Stern for championing the idea of an analytical dictionary in the first place and to Miranda Nunhofer, Caroline Porter and Natalie Aguilera at Sage for their unfailing support, assistance and care over the past 20 years for this ongoing project. Without the enthusiastic support of Sage this academic endeavour would not be possible.

Finally we dedicate this edition to those authors who are sadly no longer with us – Victor Jupp, Jock Young, Barbara Hudson and Mike Presdee. Hopefully this dictionary can act as a lasting memorial to those who gave so much not only to this project but also to the criminological imagination.

EM/JM

September 2018

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION

The SAGE Dictionary of Criminology explores the categories of thought, methods and practices that are central to contemporary criminological scholarship. Unlike many other dictionaries or encyclopaedias in this area, its starting point is not to elucidate particular legal powers or criminal justice procedures but to unravel issues of theoretical and conceptual complexity.

The dictionary was constructed on the principle that criminology's intellectual boundaries are not set in stone. Criminology is a contested, interdisciplinary, intersectional enterprise marked by diverse origins, constant incursion, interactions, deviations and transgressions. Competing theoretical perspectives meet and sometimes they are able to understand each other, while at other times they appear not to share any common discourse. There is, therefore, no one definition of 'criminology' to be found in this dictionary, rather a multitude of argumentative perspectives which in themselves often depend and draw upon knowledges and concerns generated from elsewhere. As a result the dictionary deliberately includes entries that depart from traditional agendas, transgress conventional boundaries and suggest new points of formation and avenues for cross-discipline development. Many of the entries will be of vital importance in understanding criminology in terms of what it is intellectually struggling to become. A canonical closure or discursive unification of criminology, or indeed a move 'beyond criminology', is no more possible in the twenty-first century than it was at the beginning of the twentieth century. The digital revolution in information exchange and the unprecedented mobility of ideas rule out both disciplinary parochialism and the assertion of authoritative positions. This is what will give criminology its intellectual vitality and ensure that the field of criminological studies remains animated and relevant for future generations of students.

The rationale of the dictionary can best be explained by way of a detailing of its scope and structure. In compiling this dictionary every effort has been made to ensure that it is broadly representative and inclusive in tone, reflecting the global field of criminology in its eclectic, diverse and expansive dimensions. Though these appear in alphabetical order the choice of entries has been guided by four organizing principles. Each entry is:

- a major theoretical position;
- an essential theoretical concept;
- a central criminological method; or
- a core criminal justice philosophy or practice.

Each entry is also central to the field, acting either as an intellectual anchor or as an emergent thematic in the shifting and expanding field of criminological studies. As a result the dictionary offers a conceptual map of criminological perspectives, their diverse frames of reference, distinctive approaches and expansive modes of analysis.

In addition it aims throughout to be global and deliberately avoids legal terms and cases which are specific to particular criminal justice jurisdictions. For the same reason it also

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION

deliberately avoids some legally defined criminal acts – such as theft, burglary, and so on – but does include those 'crimes' which are either emergent – such as cybercrime and wildlife crime – or those with a wider theoretical resonance – such as corporate crime, hate crime, sexual violence and so on.

In selecting these entries we have been particularly concerned to help students 'think criminologically', utilizing key concepts, methods and practices that complement as well as supplement the learning materials already used in criminology and related courses. It is designed as an interactive learning resource for students in the fields of criminology, criminal justice studies, the sociology of crime and deviance, socio-legal studies, jurisprudence, criminal law studies, social policy, youth studies and social work.

To ensure accessibility each entry starts with a short statement or *definition* which sets out the basic parameters of the concept itself. From that point onward any comparability with an orthodox dictionary ends. The section that follows – *distinctive features* – is more encyclopaedic in style and allows for some detailed comment on the concept's origins, development and general significance. Throughout we have encouraged authors to reflect critically and freely on criminology's historical knowledge base and on potential future developments. A final section – *evaluation* – has also been included for all of those concepts considered to have the greatest theoretical weight and lasting legacy. This allows for an initial considered and critical assessment of how particular theoretical positions have been or can be debated, challenged and reworked.

Each entry is then also cross-referenced with other *associated concepts* in the dictionary in order to facilitate a broader and in-depth study. Finally each entry concludes with a list of selected *key readings* to reinforce the aim of the dictionary as a learning resource to be built upon by the reader.

All of these features are designed to facilitate the dictionary's use as a *study guide* for introductory courses in the field, as a *source of reference* for advanced study, as a *supplement* to established textbooks and as a *reference guide* to the specialized language of theoretical and conceptual criminology. Patient reading will uncover the full range of connections to be made across the entries and their associated concepts.

The idea for this dictionary originated during a series of conversations between ourselves and Gillian Stern, then Commissioning Editor for Criminology at Sage, in London and Milton Keynes in the late 1990s. The overwhelmingly positive response to the first three editions inspired us to continue with our project of mapping the expansive and diverse concerns of criminology and to make these concerns accessible to as wide a range of different audiences as possible. We continue to view this dictionary as part of an ongoing dialogue with/in criminology and this fourth edition continues to expand upon the range of theoretical perspectives, concepts, methodologies and emergent issues which underlie the importance of both a theory-led and globally oriented criminology. To this end we welcome feedback as well as any possible future contributions to what must be, by necessity, a project that will always remain 'unfinished'.

Eugene McLaughlin

John Muncie

2018

A

ABOLITION

DEFINITION

In criminology and criminal justice, the term 'abolition' refers to the attempt to do away with punitive responses to criminalized problems. It is the first step in the abolitionist strategy, followed by a plea for dispute settlement, redress and social justice. In more general terms it refers to the abolition of state (supported) institutions which are no longer felt to be legitimate. Historically, the term has been used in the fight against slavery, torture, prostitution, capital punishment and prison.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

Though the literal meaning of the verb 'to abolish' suggests differently, penal abolition should not be interpreted in absolute terms. Abolitionists do not argue that the police or courts should be abolished. The point is that crime is not to be set apart from other, non-criminalized, social problems and that the social exclusion of 'culprits' seldom solves problems. Instead, crime problems should be treated in the specific context in which they emerge and reactions should be oriented towards reintegration rather than exclusion. Neither do abolitionists argue against social control in general terms. It is indeed hard to imagine social coexistence without any form of social control. The problem is the top-down, repressive, punitive and inflexible character of formal social control systems.

It is these specific characteristics of penal control which are to be abolished (Bianchi and van Swaaningen, 1986).

Abolitionists question the ethical calibre of a state that intentionally and systematically inflicts pain upon other people. They point out that, because generally accepted goals of general and special prevention cannot be supported with empirical data, the credibility of the whole penal rationale is at stake. Depenalization (pushing back the punitive character of social reactions) and decriminalization (against the labelling of social problems as crimes) are the central strategies of abolition. Stan Cohen (1988) has identified five other 'destructuring moves' which are part of the politics of abolition: decarceration (away from prison), diversion (away from the institution), decategorization (away from offender typologies), delegalization (away from the state) and deprofessionalization (away from the expert). In a next, positive or reconstructive phase, a distinction is made between abolitionism as a way of thinking (an alternative way of understanding the problem of crime and punishment) and as a way of acting (a radical approach to penal reform).

In their attempts at depenalization, abolitionists first pointed their arrows at the prison system. This struggle has its roots in prisoners' movements or a religiously inspired penal lobby (Mathiesen, 1974; van Swaaningen, 1997). During the early 1980s, the attention shifted to the pros and cons of non-custodial measures as alternatives to prison. Warnings against the net-widening effects

were contrasted with their potential value in the attrition of the penal system. The recognition that sanctioning modalities at the end of the penal chain does not change its punitive, excluding character focused attention on the diversion of cases in preliminary phases, with the aim of preventing the stigmatizing effects of both trial and punishment. This phase was followed by the advocacy of a whole alternative procedural rationale, in which non-punitive responses to social problems were promoted, including forms of social crime prevention designed to address the structural contexts of crime (de Haan, 1990).

Notably, Nils Christie's and Louk Hulsman's abolitionist perspectives contain many implicit references to Habermas's idea of the 'colonization of the lifeworld'. The 'decolonization' of criminal justice's 'system rationality' is another object of abolition. Though the tension Habermas observes between systems and lifeworlds does not lead him directly to a rejection of the criminal justice system, he does argue against the degeneration of criminal justice into a state instrument of crime control in which the critical dimension of power is ignored. Thus, penal instrumentalism is another object of abolition which can be derived from Habermas.

A further aim of abolition is related to the constitution of moral discourse. In Western, neoliberal societies, values like care and empathy are delegated to the private sphere and are thereby excluded from public, or political, ethics. These latter ethics are dominated by abstract, so-called 'masculine' notions such as rights, duties and respect, which outrule more subjective, contextually determined 'feminine' notions such as care and empathy. The dominance of abstract approaches of rights results in a morality that is oriented towards a generalized other, whereas a feminist approach is oriented towards a concrete other. Thus, abolitionism also implies the abolition of the 'masculine', individualistic, neo-liberal values upon which our penal systems are built (van Swaaningen, 1989).

Associated Concepts: abolitionism, community justice, critical criminology, decarceration, deconstruction, redress, the state

KEY READINGS

- Bianchi, H. and van Swaaningen, R. (eds) (1986) *Abolitionism: Towards a Non-Repressive Approach to Crime*. Amsterdam: Free University Press.
- Brown, M. and Schept, J. (2016) 'New abolition, criminology and critical carceral studies', *Punishment and Society*, 19 (4): 440-462.
- Cohen, S. (1988) *Against Criminology*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- de Haan, W. (1990) *The Politics of Redress: Crime, Punishment and Penal Abolition*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Mathiesen, T. (1974) *The Politics of Abolition*. London: Martin Robertson.
- van Swaaningen, R. (1989) 'Feminism and abolitionism as critiques of criminology', *International Journal for the Sociology of Law*, 17 (3): 287-306.
- van Swaaningen, R. (1997) *Critical Criminology - Visions From Europe*. London: Sage.

ABOLITIONISM

DEFINITION

A critical academic and political perspective which maintains that prisons, and other state institutions, support a deeply divided, unequal, capitalist social order. Prisons exercise discretionary power to punish, terrorize and traumatize prisoners. They do not fulfil any of their stated goals, for example, they do not deter, nor do they rehabilitate. Prisons, in their present form, should be abolished and their abolition should be tied to a radical transformation in the power structure of capitalist societies. Abolitionists contend that this utopian transformation should be based on the principle of *social*

justice which would replace the current system which is based on delivering *criminal injustice*.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

Abolitionism emerged from the radical, dissenting social movements of the late 1960s. For first generation abolitionists like Thomas Mathiesen, prisons punished the poor, powerless and marginalized, reinforced dominant state and media ideologies around crime and distracted attention away from crimes of the powerful.

Through the process of criminalization, prisoners are disproportionately drawn from the bottom rung of grossly unequal capitalist societies which are deeply divided along the fault lines of social class, gender, 'race', age, sexuality and ability/disability. Abolitionism is built on rigorous, academic scholarship which, in combination with community-based, political activism, is designed to abolish the criminal *injustice* system that currently prevails. It is based on a politics of inclusion which recognizes the destructive capacities of the prison experience – as the appalling levels of self-harm and self-inflicted deaths indicate – and listens to the voice of the 'estranged other' namely, prisoners themselves (Scott, 2013).

Liberal reforms, supported by liberal academics, simply reinforce and bolster the prevailing system of penal power, thus perpetuating the brutalizing, punitive and degrading regimes in which prisoners are confined. In contrast, abolitionists support 'negative reforms' which are designed to undermine the 'fiasco' that was the modern prison leading to their eventual abolition (Mathiesen, 2000: 26).

Abolitionism's key demands include: closing prisons and stopping prison building; democratizing the legal system and radically transforming sentencing policy; rejecting narrow, legalistic definitions of crime and embracing a wider, social harm perspective; developing radical, well-funded alternatives to custody; and embedding structures of democratic accountability within a radically transformed social order.

In Europe, second generation abolitionists – neo-abolitionists – accepted the foundational principles of first generation abolitionists like Mathiesen, Nils Christie, Herman Bianchi and Louk Hulsman. Early British neo-abolitionists such as Jill Box-Grainger, Mick Ryan, Tony Ward, Barbara Hudson and Joe Sim, also advocated developing a 'criminology from below' (Sim et al., 1987: 7) which utilised 'a complex set of competing, contradictory and oppositional discourses', while 'providing support on the ground for the confined and their families' thereby challenging 'the hegemony around prison that has united states servants, traditional reform groups and many academics on the same pragmatic and ideological terrain' (Sim, 1994: 275–6).

EVALUATION

In the twenty-first century, abolitionism continues to ask a number of key questions: does the prison provide the answer to conventional crime, does it reduce victimization and does it offer public protection in the widest sense? For abolitionists, the answer to all three questions is a categorical no. This position is particularly evident with respect to women's prisons, the vast majority of which could be abolished without crime rising or public protection being compromised (Carlen, 1990).

In America, the community-based activism of the abolitionist group *Critical Resistance* is based around rejecting the prison in favour of a social response to crime built on individual and community needs and social equality:

Critical Resistance seeks to build an international movement to end the Prison Industrial Complex [PIC] by challenging the belief that caging and controlling people makes us safe. We believe that basic necessities such as food, shelter, and freedom are what really make our communities secure. As such, our work is part of global struggles against inequality and powerlessness. The success of the movement requires that it reflect communities most affected by the PIC. Because we seek to abolish the PIC, we cannot support any work that extends its life or scope. (<http://criticalresistance.org/>)

Contemporary abolitionism faces a number of challenges 'in the context of the brutal consolidation of neoliberalism, the profound economic crisis that has gripped the neo-liberal project and the terror and trauma induced by the toxic drumbeat of austerity whose corrosive impact on the poor and the powerless has been profound' (Ryan and Sim, 2016: 722). These challenges include: the punitive inter-relationship between the prison and the welfare state; the authoritarian and violent nature of state institutions; the privatization of punishment and the self-serving defence of the prison articulated by state servants, politicians and private companies, namely that it can be a site of rehabilitation, in spite of the overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Additionally, there is also the issue of 'carceral expansion' and the emergence of new sites of punishment such as immigration detention centres which means that abolitionists need to think about 'what is to be abolished' and 'carceral abolition' (Piche and Larsen, 2010: 392).

Michelle Brown and Judah Schept have also called for the development of 'critical carceral studies', linked to developing an 'abolitionist praxis' which would involve thinking about the meaning of safety in the twenty-first century:

Safety ... is not simply about those who have harmed or been harmed, but a movement beyond disciplinary neoliberal frames of responsibility and internalisation to community and state accountability, a kind of insurrectionary safety ... operating within an abolitionist habitus ... How can we organise our communities to be safe? What should we do when various kinds of harm, with different kinds of needs, occur? What are the collective ways and forums in which we can pursue this work? (Brown and Schept, 2016: 10, 15, 16)

Criticisms of abolitionism have come from those who, like abolitionists, would position themselves on the critical wing of criminology. Left realists have caricatured and criticized abolitionists for their idealism, for their 'anarcho communist position' and for their preoccupation 'with abolishing or minimizing state intervention rather than attempting to make it more effective,

responsive and accountable' (Matthews, cited in Sim, 1994: 265).

Abolitionists would reject this caricature and would argue that, *more*, not less idealism is required if radical penal and social change is to happen (Scott, 2013, 2018). They would also point to the hegemonic impact of abolitionist thought on penal policy. In England and Wales, through the interventions of charities like INQUEST – some of whose founding members, former chairs and current trustees were part of the original abolitionist movement in the 1970s and 1980s – the issues of self-harm and self-inflicted deaths in custody, and the devastating traumas experienced by the families of the deceased, have significantly impacted liberal reform groups by pulling them onto a more critical terrain. INQUEST has also influenced the nature and direction of a number of state inquiries into prisons whose recommendations for change have been clearly influenced by abolitionism (Sim, 2009, 2018).

Feminist writers have also rightly asked how are women to be protected from sexual violence, and the depredations of violent men, if prisons are abolished? Abolitionism would maintain that violence against women is a major, social issue. However, imprisoning violent men within prisons as they currently exist can often mean detaining them in institutions where the toxic culture of masculinity is likely to reinforce misogynist views around male power and the degradation of women. Therefore, the hyper-masculinized nature of the prison, the wider, sexist, culture which objectifies women, and which equates heterosexuality with the exercise of patriarchal power, need to be radically transformed if violence against women is to be eradicated (Sim, 2009).

The idea that prison protects the wider society through incapacitating dangerous individuals is contested by abolitionists. Who defines what is dangerous? What is the relationship between dangerousness and social harm? Different forms of behaviour can have immense implications for individual and group safety but are rarely, if ever, labelled dangerous. Rates of deaths at work, which

are much higher than conventional murder rates, and which are often caused by the non-implementation of health and safety laws, are an example of this critique of conventional definitions of dangerousness (Tombs and Whyte, 2007).

Angela Davis has noted that while the European abolitionist tradition has offered many important insights into the nature of the prison, 'there is no sustained analysis of the part antiracism might play in the theory and practice of abolitionism' (1998: 102–3). This is particularly important because, globally, prisons contain disproportionate numbers of black and minority ethnic people. The USA provides a brutal and stark example of the relationship between racist criminal justice practices and the disproportionate punishment of African-Americans.

Davis also argues for the introduction *not* of liberal alternatives but 'abolitionist alternatives' which would connect to wider social changes built around a demilitarized education system, free health care for all, replacing the retribution and vengeance in the criminal justice system with reparation and reconciliation and confronting structural issues around racism, male power, homophobia and the class system (Davis, 2003: 105–7). If implemented, these individual and structural changes would fulfil the utopian goal to which abolitionism is ethically and politically committed, namely building a world free of the stain and pain of imprisonment.

JOE SIM

Associated Concepts: abolition, carceral society, critical criminology, hegemony, left idealism, praxis, social harm, social justice, the state

KEY READINGS

Carlen, P. (1990) *Alternatives to Women's Imprisonment*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Brown, M. and Schept, J. (2016) 'New abolition, criminology and a critical carceral

studies', *Punishment and Society*, 19 (4): 440–462.

Davis, A. (1998) 'Racialized punishment and prison abolition', in J. James (ed.), *The Angela Y. Davis Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 96–107.

Davis, A. (2003) *Are Prisons Obsolete?* New York: Seven Stories Press.

Mathiesen, T. (2000) *Prison on Trial* (2nd edn). Winchester: Waterside Press.

Piche, J. and Larsen, M. (2010) 'The moving targets of penal abolitionism: ICOPA, past, present and future', *Criminal Justice Review: Issues in Criminal, Social and Restorative Justices*, 13 (4): 391–410.

Ryan, M. and Sim, J. (2016) 'Campaigning for and campaigning against prisons: Excavating and reaffirming the case for prison abolition', in Y. Jewkes, J. Bennett and B. Crewe (eds), *Handbook on Prisons* (2nd edn). London: Routledge.

Scott, D. (2013) 'Visualising an abolitionist real utopia: Principles, policy and praxis', in M. Malloch and W. Munro (eds), *Crime, Critique and Utopia*. London: Palgrave.

Scott, D. (2016) 'Hearing the voice of the Estranged Other: An abolitionist ethical hermeneutics', *Kriminologisches Journal*, 48 (3): 184–201.

Scott, D. (2018) *Against Imprisonment: An Anthology of Abolitionist Essays*. Hook: Waterside Press.

Sim, J. (1994) 'The abolitionist approach: A British perspective', in A. Duff, S. Marshall, R.E. Dobash and R.P. Dobash (eds), *Penal Theory and Practice: Tradition and Innovation in Criminal Justice*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Sim, J. (2009) *Punishment and Prisons: Power and the Carceral State*. London: Sage.

Sim, J. (2018) 'We are all (neo) liberals now: Reform and the prison crisis in England and Wales', *Justice, Power and Resistance*, 2 (1): 165–188.

Sim, J., Scraton, P. and Gordon, P. (1987) 'Introduction: Crime, the state and critical analysis', in P. Scraton (ed.), *Law, Order and the Authoritarian State*. Milton Keynes: The Open University Press, pp. 1–73.

Tombs, S. and Whyte, D. (2007) *Safety Crime*. Cullompton: Willan.

WEBSITES

The websites for Critical Resistance and INQUEST below contain some excellent material on campaigns around prisons in general and deaths in custody in particular:

<http://criticalresistance.org/>
inquest.org.uk

ACTION RESEARCH

DEFINITION

A form of research, often evaluative in nature, which has the intention of influencing the future direction of practice and policy.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

The origins of action research are generally traced to the work of Kurt Lewin (1943), who envisaged that social research should seek to address certain goals. In many forms of enquiry the researcher seeks to distance him- or herself from the topic being researched and from the parties to social action. The action researcher, in contrast, enters into a dialogue with the parties to social action, transmitting results at certain points during the investigation so that the parties involved can make changes to the ways in which they are proceeding and sometimes to the aims they are seeking to achieve. The consequences of these changes are then studied in turn and further feedback and change may take place in an iterative process. Such a process can also have consequences for the research design and methods originally adopted by the researcher(s), which may have to change in order to accommodate new developments in social action. Action research is therefore a dynamic model of research which requires time for reflection and review.

Action research has been used in community-based initiatives, such as community development projects and crime prevention programmes, in order to inform the future

progress of social intervention. An example of action research in practice can be found in an evaluation of a domestic violence project where 'regular feedback was given to the project in order that this could inform subsequent developments'. Here the difficulties of achieving 'longer term reflections and change' when beset by shorter term 'operational' issues were noted (Kelly, 1999).

EVALUATION

Action research has also been employed where participants and researchers share a commitment to achieving a particular end, such as anti-racist action, feminist approaches to working and the pursuit of human rights (see for example Mies, 1993). Action research raises questions about the extent to which the researcher can remain aloof and detached from social action; the researcher may be regarded more as an actor with a particular set of skills and experience. Action research can also have the aim of empowering participants in social action. This may be achieved by enabling participants to have more control over their lives and communities, or by increasing the research skills of participants so that they have a greater ability to monitor, evaluate and reflect on their activities themselves, or both of the foregoing. One such development has been the attempt to empower user interests in public service evaluations. 'User' research has a 'commitment to changing the balance of power between those who provide and those who receive services', with the interests of service users being enhanced through the research process (Barnes, 1993).

IAIN CROW

Associated Concepts: evaluation research, praxis, reflexivity

KEY READINGS

Barnes, M. (1993) 'Introducing new stakeholders: User and researcher interests

in evaluative research – a discussion of methods used to evaluate the Birmingham Community Care Special Action Project', *Policy and Politics*, 21 (1): 47–58.

Brydon-Miller, M., Greenwood, D. and Maguire, P. (2003) 'Why action research?', *Action Research*, 1(1): 9–28.

Everitt, A. and Hardiker, P. (1996) *Evaluating for Good Practice*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Greenwood, D.J. and Levin, M. (1998) *Introduction to Action Research: Social Research for Social Change*. London: Sage.

Kelly, L. (1999) *Domestic Violence Matters: An Evaluation of a Development Project*. Home Office Research Study No. 193, Research, Development and Statistics Directorate. London: HMSO.

Lewin, K. (1943) 'Forces behind food habits and methods of change', *Bulletin of the National Research Council*, 108: 35–65.

Mies, M. (1993) 'Towards a methodology for feminist research', in M. Hammersley (ed.), *Social Research: Philosophy, Politics and Practice*. London: Sage.

ACTUARIALISM

DEFINITION

Refers to the suite of risk calculation techniques that underpin correctional policies.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

Actuarialism remains most closely associated with the 'new penology' writings of US criminologists Malcolm M. Feeley and Jonathan Simon. The term 'new penology' had been floating around American criminal justice circles for several years before Feeley and Simon finally pulled the various components together. They argue that in response to the need for more accountability and rationality a radical shift took place in correctional policy in the USA during the 1980s. The old rehabilitative rationales for the correctional system were replaced by the actuarial

language of probabilistic calculations and statistical distributions that were applicable to populations. Rather than concentrating on individuals, the system shifted towards identifying, targeting and managing specific offender categories and sub-populations. Offender management is to be realized through the application of increasingly sophisticated risk assessment technologies and practices. This shift also enabled the system to construct its own measures of success and failure and to predict its own needs. In many respects Feeley and Simon viewed actuarialism as both the logical consequence of the original utilitarian penal reform project and a radical departure in that the system had moved beyond any commitment to reform or rehabilitation. The correctional system under actuarialism becomes a hyper-rational processing system that fulfils the mandate it has been given. For them actuarialism logically connected with neoliberal socio-economic policies which produced surplus populations that had to be contained and controlled. In the UK actuarialism is most closely associated with the work of the probation service, whose professional task has been re-oriented towards risk assessment of the likelihood of re-offending and identifying and managing the threat posed by dangerous offenders, such as sex offenders, to the public. However, it has also extended its reach into predictive policing strategies. In so doing it offers the possibility of a pre-emptive 'public protection' criminal justice paradigm.

EUGENE McLAUGHLIN

Associated Concepts: managerialism, prediction studies, rational choice theory, risk, risk factor research, situational crime prevention

KEY READINGS

Feeley, M. and Simon, J. (1992) 'The new penology: Notes on the emerging strategy of corrections and its implications', *Criminology*, 30 (4): 452–474.

Harcourt, B. (2007) *Against Prediction: Profiling, Policing and Punishment in the Actuarial Age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kemshall, H. and McCartan, K. (eds) (2017) *Contemporary Sex Offender Risk Management, Volume II: Responses*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

O'Malley, P. (2010) *Crime and Risk*. London: Sage.

Simon, J. (2009) *Governing through Crime: How the War on Crime Transformed American Democracy and Created a Culture of Fear*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Simon, J. and Feeley, M. (1995) 'True crime: The new penology and public discourse on crime', in T. Blomberg and S. Cohen (eds), *Punishment and Social Control*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

for their research to be applied to aid policy development and decision making; their support for rational choice or 'opportunity' approaches to specific offenders and specific offences; their advocacy of 'what we know' and 'what works' criminal justice policies; their proposing modesty and realism in making claims about what can be achieved; and their being either employed within the criminal justice system or acting as paid advisers to criminal justice officials.

For Jock Young, the work of James Q. Wilson (in the USA) and Ronald V. Clarke (in the UK) has been vital to the emergence of a fully fledged administrative criminology. Administrative criminology's starting point is that despite the massive investment in welfare in the 1960s and a sustained period of prosperity, crime rates escalated to unprecedented levels in many Western societies. Wilson took this startling fact as proof that social democratic theorizing on the causes of and solutions to crime was seriously flawed. He argued that it was time to go back to basics on criminal justice policy. Criminologists should concentrate their efforts on producing policies that addressed what the public was afraid of, namely 'predatory' street crimes such as muggings, assaults, robberies, burglaries and so on, that were carried out by strangers. Crime reduction rather than social engineering should be the focus of criminal justice policies. The benefit of engaging in focused research and evaluated pilot studies was to produce rigorous knowledge and avoid costly mistakes. Scepticism about the role of the criminal justice system in crime control also meant that policy makers needed to think about how to integrate practical crime control into other aspects of public policy.

In the UK Clarke, a senior researcher at the Home Office, reached similar conclusions to Wilson and began to formulate an approach to 'commonplace crime' that was not hindered by what he viewed as the limitations of mainstream criminological theorizing, particularly its failure to develop realistic and practical policy recommendations. From Clarke's perspective, criminal justice policy makers cannot do much about the desire of

ADMINISTRATIVE CRIMINOLOGY

DEFINITION

A term coined by Jock Young in the 1980s to refer to the reconstitution of establishment criminology in the UK and USA in the aftermath of the demise of positivist-inspired correctionalist theory and practice and the emergence of radical criminology. Administrative criminology concentrates on the nature of the criminal event and the setting in which it occurs and assumes that offenders are rational actors who will attempt to weigh up the potential costs and benefits of their actions. The goal of administrative criminology is to make crime less attractive to offenders.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

The term 'administrative criminology' encompasses a large number of writers from a variety of academic backgrounds involved in a wide range of research sites. They are united by their acceptance of dominant definitions of what constitutes the problem of crime; their lack of interest in the social causes of crime; their further acceptance of the need

AETIOLOGY

some young men to become involved in delinquency and criminal activity. However, most offenders are involved in a rational choice structuring process that consists of evaluating the perceived risks in the commission of a particular offence, the rewards that are likely to be realized, and the skills and resources required to execute a criminal act successfully. As a consequence, criminal justice policy makers should concentrate their efforts on reducing the physical opportunities for offending and increasing the chances of offenders being caught and punished. This focus on how a criminal's decision making in a given situation is influenced by her/his perception of risk, effort and reward led to the development of a suite of opportunity reduction techniques to increase the effort associated with committing a crime; multiply the risks of crime; reduce the rewards of crime; and remove the excuses for crime. The techniques and strategies chosen must be appropriate to the specifics of the crime committed and their setting.

EVALUATION

Such situational crime prevention policy initiatives lend themselves to evaluation for effectiveness and this has enabled administrative criminologists to develop evidence-based, problem-solving approaches to crime reduction. Administrative criminology's other concern is to reorganize the state's crime control efforts in order to make these as efficient, effective and focused as possible. It has no particular sentimental attachment to the criminal justice system and is willing to advocate managerialization, actuarialization and privatization. Administrative criminologists have become increasingly sophisticated in formulating and defending their pre-emptive perspective, going so far as to present 'opportunity' as a 'root cause' of crime.

EUGENE McLAUGHLIN

Associated Concepts: actuarialism, crime science, experimental criminology, managerialism,

opportunity theory, public criminology, rational choice theory, routine activity theory, situational crime prevention

KEY READINGS

- Clarke, R.V. (ed.) (1997) *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*, 2nd edn. New York: Harrow and Heston.
- Felson, M. and Clarke, R.V. (1998) *Opportunity Makes the Thief: Practical Theory for Crime Prevention* (Police Research Group Paper 98). London: The Home Office.
- Hough, M. (2014) 'Confessions of a recovering "administrative criminologist": Jock Young, quantitative research and policy research', *Crime, Media and Culture*, 10 (3): 215–226.
- Mayhew, P. (2016) 'In defence of administrative criminology', *Crime Science: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 5(7): 1–10
- Newman, G., Clarke, R.V. and Shoham, S. (eds) (1997) *Rational Choice and Situational Crime Prevention*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Sherman, L., Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D., Eck, J., Reuter, P. and Bushway, S. (1997) *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising: A Report to The United States Congress*. Available at: www.ncjrs.org/works/index.htm.
- Wilson, J.Q. (1983) *Thinking about Crime*. New York: Basic Books.

AETIOLOGY

See: *Causation*

ANARCHIST CRIMINOLOGY

DEFINITION

Anarchism is one of the most difficult political ideologies to conceptualize and define, primarily because there is no single anarchist ideology and because of the degree of misrepresentation by its political opponents.

It is a meeting place for a bewildering number of philosophies, belief systems and practices and originated as a reaction to the emergence of the nation state and capitalism in the nineteenth century. Anarchists are united, first and foremost, by a belief that the state is coercive, punitive, exploitative, corrupting and destructive. Alternative forms of mutual aid and voluntary organization that are non-authoritarian, non-coercive, non-hierarchical, functionally specific and decentralized are advocated.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

A number of specifically anarchist principles have been developed from the work of Max Stirner (1806–56), Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809–65), Mikhail Bakunin (1814–76), Peter Kropotkin (1842–1921) and Emma Goldman (1869–1940). In general these principles do not conceive of a disorderly or chaotic society, rather a more expansive form of social order without the state. This social order will maximize individual freedoms and encourage voluntary association and self-regulation. A broad spectrum of anarchist thought also wishes to replace monopoly forms of capitalism and private property with collectivist forms of ownership. According to sympathetic criminologists such as Jeff Ferrell, there cannot be a fully fledged anarchist criminology because this would be a contradiction in terms. However, Peter Kropotkin's writings on law and state authority still stand as a key reference point for any emergent anarchist criminology. Kropotkin argues that law is useless and harmful, sustaining mass criminality and generating social pathologies. Laws protecting private property and the interests of the state are responsible for generating between two-thirds and three-quarters of all crime. The body of criminal law that is geared towards the punishment and prevention of 'crime' does not prevent crime and degrades society because it fosters the worst human instincts and obedience to the status quo and bolsters state domination.

Kropotkin insists that the majority of crime will disappear the day private property

ceases to exist and human need and cooperation rather than profits and competition become the organizing principle of social life. Alternative forms of social solidarity and inclusive notions of social justice, rather than state-run systems of criminal justice and the fictional 'rule of law', can contain anti-social behaviour. Here, there are obvious links to the core principles underpinning abolitionism, left idealism and peacemaking criminologies.

Anarchists would deny that their vision relies on disorder, violence and lawlessness. However, the belief that anarchism originates in everyday struggle rather than abstract theorizing leads to the advocacy of direct or creative action and 'propaganda by deed'. The resultant protest and resistance tactics and set-piece confrontations which are vital to the renewal of theory and practice bring anarchist groups into confrontation with the forces of law and order and they thus risk potential criminalization. It is in this moment that the stereotypical representation of the nihilistic anarchist is conjured up in the news media.

EVALUATION

Anarchist theory provides criminologists with:

- an uncompromising critique of law, power and the state;
- the promise of un-coercive social relationships;
- the possibility of alternative forms of dispute settlement and harm reduction;
- a form of political intervention that may be appropriate to an increasingly complex and fragmented world where conventional forms of politics are becoming increasingly redundant;
- the basis to develop both libertarian and communitarian criminologies.

Jeff Ferrell (1995: 106) sums up the possibilities of anarchist criminology:

At its best, anarchism and the process of justice that flows from it constitute a sort of dance that we make up as we go along, an emerging swirl of ambiguity, uncertainty, and pleasure. Once

you dive into the dance, there are no guarantees – only the complex rhythms of human interaction and the steps that you and others invent in response. So, if you want certainty or authority, you might want to sit this one out. As for the rest of us: start the music.

EUGENE McLAUGHLIN

Associated Concepts: abolitionism, left idealism, peacemaking criminology, the state

KEY READINGS

- Chomsky, N. (2014) *On Anarchism*. New York: Penguin.
- Ferrell, J. (1995) 'Anarchy against the discipline', *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture*, 3 (4): 86–106.
- Ferrell, J. (1999) 'Anarchist criminology and social justice', in B.A. Arrigo (ed.), *Social Justice/Criminal Justice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Kropotkin, P. (2014) 'Law and authority', in E. McLaughlin and J. Muncie (eds), *Criminological Perspectives: Essential Readings*. London: Sage.
- Tiftt, L.L. (1979) 'The coming re-definitions of crime: An anarchist perspective', *Social Problems*, 26: 392–402.

ANIMAL ABUSE

DEFINITION

Any act that contributes to the pain, suffering or unnatural death of an animal or otherwise threatens its welfare. Animal abuse may be physical, psychological or emotional; may involve active maltreatment or passive neglect or omission; and may be direct or indirect, intentional or unintentional.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

Species-specific indicators indicate the impact on the psychological and physical welfare of animals. Specific health, physiological,

ethological and production indicators (when the animals are incorporated in production processes, e.g. animal husbandry) can be determined, from which a violation of animals' welfare can be assessed. Reduced life expectancy, impaired growth, impaired reproduction, body damage, disease, immunosuppression, adrenal activity, behaviour anomalies and self-narcotization are indicators of poor welfare. Welfare thus depends not solely on an animal's subjective experiences. Although poor welfare and suffering often occur together, suffering is no prerequisite for poor welfare. When an act or omission entails negative effects on an animal's welfare – to be assessed using these species-specific indicators – it can be classified as animal abuse. But scientific uncertainty about many aspects of animals' mental state or emotional life requires the use of a precautionary principle: an act should be regarded as animal abuse if we are unsure if it has a detrimental effect on the welfare of an animal. Following the descriptions of 'battered child syndrome' and 'battered woman syndrome', attempts should also be made to identify the clinical signs and pathology of physical abuse of companion animals, as specified in 'battered pet syndrome'.

EVALUATION

The apparent importance of animal abuse has recently been highlighted through its complex relationship with child abuse and domestic violence (Lockwood and Ascione, 1998). One line of research has examined the supposed links between animal abuse and other expressions of family violence, for example, child abuse and woman abuse. It has been found that several forms of violence often co-exist with different categories of victim. The presence of animal abuse might indicate that other family members are also potential victims; acknowledging this connection can help in the prevention of human interpersonal violence. Other research has examined the correlation between animal abuse committed by children and the development of aggressive or violent behaviour at later stages in life.

Here, it has been found that children abusing animals are more likely subsequently to exhibit aggressive and violent tendencies towards humans. Animal abuse in childhood is thus seen to signify a need for interventions by a variety of social and human service agencies.

The importance of detecting and preventing animal abuse has tended to become a justifiable and legitimate field of research, action and intervention, precisely because of its connection with expressions of human interpersonal violence. However, this is an anthropocentric or speciesist approach to animal abuse. Several philosophers have established the moral significance of animals in their own right. Because animals are sentient living beings, with interests and desires, and are 'subjects-of-a-life', they are taken into the circle of moral consideration (Regan and Singer, 1989). Speciesism thus stands for a prejudice or biased attitude favouring the interests of the members of one's own species against those of members of other species. As with other systems of discrimination like racism and sexism, speciesism rests on the domination and subordination of others, here solely based on the fact that animals are not human (Adams and Donovan, 1995). A non-speciesist and more sensitive definition of animal abuse focuses on the interests of animals and the consequences of animal abuse for their welfare (Beirne, 1995; Cazaux, 1999). It rests not on an exhaustive enumeration of possibly abusive acts or omissions (e.g., burning, poisoning, assault, neglect, etc.) but on the effects of practices on animals' physical and psychological welfare.

Henceforth, this definition of animal abuse invalidates the distinction between animal cruelty and animal abuse. The effects of abuse on animals' welfare are independent of offenders' sadistic, malicious or benign propensities. Nor should the definition of animal abuse include the anthropocentric phraseology 'unnecessary suffering' – often inscribed in animal welfare laws – since this lends legitimacy to animal suffering that is deemed necessary for economic, political or scientific reasons. For example, from a non-speciesist

viewpoint, bestiality is not an offence of decadence or sexual indecency but, because of its similarity to the sexual assault of women and children, it should be called 'an interspecies sexual assault' (Beirne, 1997).

Animal abuse refers not only to individual cases of socially unacceptable practices, such as the abuse of companion animals, but also to several institutionalized systems founded on the exploitation and subordination of animals which are by many viewed as socially acceptable. These include the abuse of animals in agriculture, hunting, fishing, trapping, entertainment and sports, and in experimental research.

What is classified as animal abuse is thus independent of human intention or ignorance, socially sanctioned or socially rejected norms, and labels of necessary or unnecessary suffering. It is also independent of whether the animal victim is categorized as a companion animal, a wild animal, livestock, or an experimental animal, and covers both single and repeated or institutionalized incidents of animal abuse.

GEERTRUI CAZAUX AND PIERS BEIRNE

Associated Concepts: green criminology, hidden crime, violence, wildlife crime

KEY READINGS

- Adams, C.J. and Donovan, J. (eds) (1995) *Animals and Women*. London: Duke University Press.
- Beirne, P. (1995) 'The use and abuse of animals in criminology: A brief history and current review', *Social Justice*, 22 (1): 5–31.
- Beirne, P. (1997) 'Rethinking bestiality: Towards a concept of interspecies sexual assault', *Theoretical Criminology*, 1 (3): 317–340.
- Cazaux, G. (1999) 'Beauty and the Beast: Animal abuse from a non-speciesist criminological perspective', *Crime, Law & Social Change*, 31 (2): 105–125.
- Lockwood, R. and Ascione, F.R. (eds) (1998) *Cruelty to Animals and Interpersonal*

Violence. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.

Maier, J., Pierpoint, H. and Beirne, P. (eds) (2017) *The Palgrave International Handbook of Animal Abuse Studies*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Regan, T. and Singer, P. (eds) (1989) *Animal Rights and Human Obligations*. London: Prentice-Hall.

ANOMIE

DEFINITION

A state of ethical normlessness or deregulation, pertaining to either an individual or a society. This lack of normative regulation leaves individuals without adequate ethical guidance as to their conduct and undercuts social integration.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

Anomie is one of the foundational concepts of modern criminological thought. Its prominence in American theorizing (where it forms the basis of 'strain' theory) is largely due to the interpretation given to anomie in the work of Robert Merton. His 1938 article 'Social structure and anomie' has proven to be one of the most influential articles in the history of sociology. Whilst Merton's theory is now seen as reductionist and somewhat mechanistic in the view it offers of human agency, fertile ground can still be found in Durkheim's original late nineteenth-century formulation of anomie. This is largely due to the scope of his questioning. Along with some fellow Europeans (i.e., Marx, Nietzsche and Weber), Durkheim was concerned with grappling with the new problems of modernity and sought to identify the key features underlying social change. With modernity human desires and passions seemed freer and the pace of change was dramatic: how then was 'social solidarity' or social cohesion possible? Durkheim did not pose the question

so much in terms of 'What are the forces driving us apart?', rather he asked: 'What is it that keeps us together? How is society itself possible? What are the roles and "functions" of humans and social institutions? And how are we to learn about it in order that we may adapt to change?'

Durkheim locates the driving force of modernity in the twin factors of the division of labour and the freeing of desire. Society is to be conceived as a 'moral milieu' which positions and constitutes the individual. Individuals experience social reality through their differential positioning in the social division of labour. Humans are motivated by the pursuit of pleasure and the satisfaction of desire and they attain happiness when their possibilities for satisfying desire are not at odds with the social realities of the division of labour. But what happens when the cultural regulation of desire breaks down and desire is released as a mobile, infinite capacity transcending the limitations on satisfaction inherent in any division of labour?

In his doctoral thesis, first published in 1893, Durkheim argued that the consequences of anomie, or the failure of moral regulation, were clear in

the continually recurring conflicts and disorders of every kind, of which the economic world offers so sorry a spectacle. For, since nothing restrains the forces present from reacting together, or prescribes limits to them that they are obliged to respect, they tend to grow beyond all bounds, each clashing with the other, each warding off and weakening the other ... Men's passions are stayed only by a moral presence they respect. If all authority of this kind is lacking, it is the law of the strongest that rules, and a state of warfare, either latent or acute, is necessarily endemic. (Durkheim, 1984: xxxii–xxxiii)

Durkheim thus explicitly reverses Hobbes's picture of 'the war of all against all' inherent in the state of nature. Whereas for Hobbes this was the purely natural or pre-social state, which humans overcome by creating a powerful sovereign to lay down definitions of meaning (laws) and enforce obedience, Durkheim places this state of social war and crime as a product of society, a result of the

breakdown of moral regulation. Modernity is characterized by increasing individualism, by an autonomy of thought and action, but this autonomy is dependent upon greater interdependency in the division of labour and increased complexity within the collective consciousness: 'liberty itself is the product of regulation'. The task for 'advanced societies' was to achieve a balance between the functions of the division of labour, law and culture, 'the conditions that dominate social evolution'. With the old certainties disappearing, the individual finds him- or herself without a secure footing in reality, and anomie threatens. In times of economic crisis, either dramatic increases in prosperity or disasters, anomie may become the normal state of being:

greed is aroused without knowing where to find its ultimate foothold. Nothing can calm it, since its goal is far beyond all it can attain. Reality seems valueless by comparison with the dreams of fevered imaginations; reality is therefore abandoned, but so too is possibility when it in turn becomes reality: A thirst for novelties, unfamiliar pleasures, nameless sensations, all of which lose their savour once known. (Durkheim, 1984: 254)

So what was the solution to this state of anomie? While Durkheim personally argued that the solution to the normative deregulation causing anomie could not be the imposition of normative restructuring through violence and the manipulation of cultural symbols – the solution that both fascism and state Stalinism were later to offer – he bequeathed few theoretical tools for integrating studies of culture, class and perceptions of social 'reality'. The understanding of anomie which was to be developed within criminology was constrained by its centrality to the middle range theorizing of Robert Merton (1938).

Writing shortly after the social democratic compromise of the 'new deal', Merton identified the key cultural message of modernist American culture as the 'success' goal, in particular 'money-success'. A 'strain to anomie' resulted from a disjuncture between cultural goals and legitimate means of achievement.

Specifically, the new technologies of advertising put forward a cultural goal of economic affluence and social ascent, but individuals, differentially positioned in the social structure, understood that the institutionally available means may or may not enable personal success. Whilst the majority of Americans may 'conform' others might 'innovate' – by accepting the cultural goal but rejecting the institutionally available means. Particularly for those located in the lower reaches of the social structure, crime could therefore be a reaching for the American dream, albeit sought through illegitimate channels. Merton's theory was further developed with the 'differential opportunity' theorizing of Cloward and Ohlin (1960), and anomie has proved a fertile, if somewhat elusive, concept to build upon, recently informing Agnew's (1992) 'positive' strain theory.

EVALUATION

Merton's theory struck a deep chord with many. It seemed to offer a way of constraining crime by improving the legitimate life chances of those who otherwise may make the choice to innovate deviantly. However, the positivist tendencies of American sociology meant that any concept that was difficult to operationalize into survey questions or mathematically inscribable data remained elusive rather than accepted and always open to the charge of weak sociology.

Anomie is thus a highly suggestive concept, but one that is difficult to operationalize. What are we to make of this? Perhaps the intellectual history of anomie reflects the impossibility of achieving a 'transparent' sociology, capturing the true 'experience' of the subject. Durkheimian sociology had a normative element; it was for modern society to arrive at a state of scientific self-consciousness. This would aid the creation of moral individualism in that mankind would attain an objective knowledge of how things stood, of the functional interdependency of all upon all. But this dream of happiness as attunement to our shared knowledge of the state of reality has been undercut by the

relentless division of labour, by 'reality' in 'late-modern' 'Western' societies being characterized by oscillation, plurality and perspectivism, rather than stability. The technological intensification of cultural reproduction – via the advent of generalized communication, the mass media, the Internet – gives us a sea of information, rendering 'our' experience communicable to a trans-local set of 'fellow-feelers' while appearing inconsistent and superficial to our 'others'. Few would see the function of modern 'art' as to offer representations of the 'absolute' or gateways into the eternal truths of the human condition; rather it is designed to 'shock' or draw the observer into the experience of ambiguity and ambivalence. Within criminology, understanding anomie offered the hope that criminological theorists could demonstrate particular policy recommendations, namely that crime could be averted by reconciling the means available to agents through the goals offered by culture. If agents could be assured that they could achieve the cultural goals through legitimate or 'normal' means (education, employment, etc.), then the strain to deviance would lessen. But in the globalized capitalism of the late-modern condition, at least within Western societies, multiple goals and fractured and overlapping identities appear the norm. The very concept of deviance loses its grip. Moreover, the range of candidates available as cultural goals, not just consumerism but the enhancement of power or the creation of personal identity as a life choice, renders the technological fix of adjusting 'means to ends' a mirage. The concept of anomie may take on the role of an existential prop – never quite fitting within any criminological theory, but always hinting at something of fundamental importance in the human condition.

WAYNE MORRISON

Associated Concepts: differential association, functionalism, relative deprivation, social control theory, strain theory, subculture

KEY READINGS

- Agnew, R. (1992) 'Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency', *Criminology*, 30 (1): 47–87.
- Cloward, R. and Ohlin, L. (1960) *Delinquency and Opportunity*. New York: The Free Press.
- Downes, D., Rock, P., and McLaughlin, E. (2016) 'Anomie and Strain Theory', in D. Downes, P. Rock and E. McLaughlin, *Understanding Deviance: A Guide to the Sociology of Crime and Rule Breaking* (7th edn). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1970) *Suicide* (trans. S.A. Solovay and J.H. Mueller, ed. G.E.G. Catlin). New York: The Free Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1984) *The Division of Labour in Society* (trans. W.D. Halls). Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Merton, R.K. (1938) 'Social structure and anomie', *American Sociological Review*, 3: 672–682.

ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

DEFINITION

The concept of Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) arose, particularly in Britain, as the response to a perceived 'enforcement deficit' concerning low level, but persistent, social disorder and incivility, often involving young people (Campbell, 2002), while removing what were seen to be, certain obstacles (including evidential thresholds) to conventional prosecution. The 1998 Crime and Disorder Act established a hybrid range of new orders, of which the ASBO (similar to an injunction) gained most notoriety (Squires, 2008), combining both civil and criminal powers to open up a streamlined intervention process for police and partner agencies (Crawford, 2009). Since their introduction in 1998, ASB powers have been significantly altered and most recently in the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

The 2014 legislation defined ASB in the following terms: it comprises conduct which has caused, or is likely to cause, 'harassment, alarm and distress to any person', or conduct capable of causing nuisance or annoyance to a person in relation to that person's residence or other 'housing related nuisance or annoyance'. Agencies empowered to act in respect of claims of ASB are identified as local authorities, housing agencies and the police. While the 2014 legislation offered a more focussed conception of ASB, and more clearly specified powers, the concept also had a rather broader history (see below).

At the end of World War II, Hermann Mannheim (1946) introduced a conception of ASB, seeing it as a series of harms perpetrated against the community and contrary to the spirit and purposes of social reconstruction. He specifically referred to 'profiteering' and the non-payment of taxes, not simply the breach of criminal laws. In due course, mainstream criminology rather declined this more radical and expansive agenda but now seems more willing to pick up the issue. Compared with today's conception of ASB, however, Mannheim's notion raised two key issues. First, at times of rapid social change (post-war Britain and contemporary modernity) it may be necessary to assert the values of community and social inclusion more forcefully. However, secondly, and somewhat contrary to much of the popular debate about ASB problems (Bottoms, 2006), 'anti-social behaviour' is not necessarily the exclusive preserve of the poorest or the young.

By the late 2010s the ASB issue no longer occupied the same profile as it had a decade previous. A Home Office Strategic Plan, covering the years 2004–2008, had described it as the 'number one concern' of the British people, with Michael Tonry (2004) even arguing that the Blair Government had virtually 'invented' the concept. The priority afforded to ASB confirmed a perception that tough new enforcement powers were needed to address this uniquely late-modern problem. Yet the problems referred to – youths hanging

about causing trouble, noise, vandalism and graffiti, and drunkenness – suggest very much older and more familiar concerns. Where ASB is concerned, questions of *perception* are especially important (Millie, 2008). Initially, rather few other countries prioritised ASB in the manner of Britain and, even here, the definition of ASB remained contested and, in the eyes of many, legally quite imprecise. It is important, however, not to restrict the significance of ASB to the ASBO itself, a particular enforcement tactic (especially as this was formally abolished in 2014). In a wider sense, ASB is seen as inextricably bound up with New Labour's politics of crime and disorder and the strategies of governance emerging therefrom.

The recent history of the concept can be traced back to Wilson and Kelling's influential 'broken windows' article (1982) where the concept of 'incivilities' was originally employed to describe a range of offensive and disorderly behaviours and conflicting relationships in fractured and deprived communities. Implicit in this analysis was often an association between such degraded behaviours and an 'underclass' way of life. These understandings of the problem in 'high crime/sink estate' areas corresponded closely to the developing urban management and community crime prevention agendas in the UK. The residualization of social housing typically made problems even more acute. Crime and harassment compounded problems of housing management. This housing management focus has remained a key aspect of ASB – media horror stories about 'neighbours from hell' are not uncommon – combining with a populist discourse reflected in what came to be known as media 'poverty porn' reflected in broadcast TV programmes such as *The Scheme* (BBC Scotland, 2010) and *Benefits Street* (Channel 4, 2014).

Most often ASB was seen as related to the (pre-)delinquent activities of young people. Youth, therefore, represents a prominent strand in the contemporary discourse of ASB (Squires and Stephen, 2005). This was especially well reflected in the declared intention to 'break the links between anti-social

behaviour and crime' and the extension of 'Acceptable Behaviour Contracts' to children as young as eight. Curfews and Dispersal Orders (to disperse congregations of young people causing alarm and distress in residential areas) were also introduced. The promise of quicker and easier enforcement undoubtedly has an appeal to police and complainants alike but misgivings have been voiced about the increasingly discretionary enforcement that may result. For example, the police have always 'moved on' young people causing a perceived nuisance, so Dispersal Orders represent the formalization and realignment of the law around existing police practices. Anti-social behaviour, therefore, understood as a kind of pre-delinquent nuisance, was central to the emerging new youth justice strategy which prioritised early interventions designed to 'nip crime in the bud'.

The conservative-led coalition government (2010–2015) announced an intention to reform the ASB legislation in part to centre ASB interventions upon protecting communities and more effectively supporting vulnerable victims. In part this was in reaction to the Pilkington case (2007) where the mother of a disabled daughter had killed herself and her daughter following months of harassment during which 33 calls to the police had failed to secure an appropriate response. A second aspect of the ASB reforms introduced in 2014 involved the 'community trigger' (or ASB Case Review), a mechanism whereby police and/or local authorities were obliged to respond if three or more complaints or several persons raised similar local concerns during, for instance, a six-month period.

Other wide-ranging changes brought about in 2014 included the abolition of the free standing ASBO (which had been a source of some controversy and debate) and the reformulation of the Criminal Behaviour Order (replacing the ASBO on conviction) in respect of persistent offending, breach of which, by adults, could result in a 5-year custodial sentence. Dispersal orders, injunctions (including the gang injunctions – tagged as 'Gangbos') and closure notices were retained while a new 'Public Space Protection Order' (PSPO)

was added. PSPOs applied to defined geographical areas and were designed to prevent activities such as public drinking, but controversy has arisen in respect of PSPOs intended to prevent protest and other political activities.

EVALUATION

Viewing ASB as a form of pre-delinquency connects to a much older conception of anti-social behaviour which has now been largely sidelined in favour of the more explicitly enforcement-based approach of today. This older perspective, originally developed in the USA in the late 1940s, focused upon the identification of behavioural and personality disorders in childhood, and centred on a broadly conceived conception of 'antisocial personality disorder' used to predict future delinquency. This conception of psycho-social pathology requiring welfare and treatment interventions no longer commands such mainstream attention today even though there is strong evidence of the prevalence of behavioural and personality disorders (such as ADHD) amongst young offender groups and now a renewed interest in early intervention strategies as exemplified in the UK's Troubled Families Programme and 'Gang Violence' strategies.

In either case both early intervention and streamlined, bespoke 'two-step' (Simester and Von Hirsch, 2008) enforcement processes gave rise to concerns about 'net-widening' (Austin and Krisberg, 1981). Effectively, rather than severing connections between youthful delinquency and later criminal careers, early interventions *make* connections between ASB and later criminality. Intervening early to 'nip crime in the bud' invariably intensifies the processes of scrutiny and surveillance to which young people are subjected. In this light, a second feature of the new ASB procedures concerns the multiplication of layers of intervention and enforcement, also including benefit sanctions and welfare conditionality, the 'troubled families' programme, the hybridization of civil/criminal enforcement methods, a

surveillance 'explosion' and new collective-responsibility gang initiatives (such as Operation Shield and 'joint-enterprise' prosecutions) through which a multi-level governance of crime, marginality and disorder is now delivered. A wide range of pre-criminal or 'precautionary' interventions and behaviour compliance now comprise the new regime of anti-social behaviour controls, although described as 'preventive justice' by Ashworth and Zedner (2014).

PETER SQUIRES

Associated Concepts: 'broken windows', community safety, deviance, gangs, juvenile justice, net widening, zero tolerance

KEY READINGS

Ashworth, A. and Zedner, L. (2014) *Preventive Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Austin, J. and Krisberg, B. (1981) 'Wider, stronger and different nets: The dialectics of criminal justice reform', *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 18 (1): 165–196.

Bottoms, A.E. (2006) 'Incivilities, offence and social order in residential communities', in A. von Hirsch and A.P. Simester (eds), *Incivilities: Regulating Offensive Behaviour*. Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Campbell, S. (2002) *A Review of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders*, Home Office Research Study 236. London: HMSO.

Crawford, A. (2009) 'Governing through anti-social behaviour: Regulatory challenges to criminal justice', *British Journal of Criminology*, 49 (1): 810–831.

Mannheim, H. (1946) *Criminal Justice and Social Reconstruction*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Millie, A. (2008) 'Anti-social behaviour, behavioural expectations and an urban aesthetic', *British Journal of Criminology*, 48 (1): 379–394.

Simester, A.P. and Von Hirsch, A. (2008) 'Regulating offensive conduct through two-step provisions', in A. von Hirsch and

A.P. Simester (eds), *Incivilities: Regulating Offensive Behaviour*. Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Squires, P. (ed.) (2008) *ASBO Nation: The Criminalisation of Nuisance*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Squires, P. and Stephen, D. (2005) *Rougher Justice: Young People and Anti-Social Behaviour*. Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Tonry, M. (2004) *Punishment and Politics: Evidence and Emulation in the Making of English Crime Control Policy*. Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Wilson, J. and Kelling, F. (1982) 'Broken windows – the Police and neighbourhood safety', *Atlantic Monthly*, 249(3): 29–38.

APPRECIATIVE CRIMINOLOGY

DEFINITION

An approach that seeks to understand and appreciate the social world from the point of view of the individual, or category of individual, with particular reference to crime and deviance.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

The designation 'appreciative criminology' owes much to use of the term 'appreciative studies' by Matza (1969) to refer to specific studies of deviant subcultures such as those of the hobo, the juvenile gang and the drug-taker. Such studies are characterized by observing, sometimes by participation, the social world of deviants with a view to producing an appreciative account of the deviant's own story in his or her own terms. Theoretically, appreciative criminology is influenced by the interactionist perspective which developed in social psychology and sociology in the 1930s and which received further impetus in the 1960s and 1970s, for example in connection with new deviancy theory. Interactionism offers an alternative to positivist ways of thinking about crime and criminality. Amongst other things, positivism

started from assumptions such as: there are categories of individuals who are criminal and who have characteristics which clearly distinguish them from non-criminals; the explanations for criminality lie in individual pathologies; such pathologies are the causes and determinants of criminality. Instead, interactionism offers a framework which emphasizes human choice and free will rather than determinism; a view of crime and deviance as something which is generated in interactions rather than as a characteristic of individual backgrounds; and an assumption that social action and the social world are flexible, changing and dynamic rather than fixed, objective and external. Above all, appreciative studies took from interactionism the notion that there can be a variability of meanings in social contexts and in society in general, rather than consensus. The aim of appreciative studies was, and is, to describe, understand and appreciate the social meanings and interpretations which categories of individuals attribute to events, contexts and others' actions. Such studies are epitomized in the title of Howard Parker's (1974) book *View from the Boys*, a study of male juvenile gangs in Liverpool based on the perspectives of the gang members themselves.

Methodologically, appreciative studies have been influenced by the ethnographic tradition in social research. Ethnography, which literally means description ('graphy') of cultures ('ethno'), has its roots in social anthropology and the study of pre-industrial societies. Subsequently it has been adapted to the examination of subcultures in complex society. Ethnography has a number of methodological commitments which make it especially appropriate to appreciative studies of deviant subcultures using an interactionist framework. First, there is a commitment to studying the social world from the point of view of the individuals being studied. Second, it is assumed that there can be a multiplicity of perspectives rather than just one, and also that each is equally valid for the people who hold them. Third, social perspectives (and the social meanings, definitions, labels and stereotypes which comprise them) cannot be

separated from social interactions. Therefore, particular attention should be paid to the ways in which people interact in specific social contexts. Fourth, there is a belief that such observation should be naturalistic; that is, individuals should be studied behaving as they would normally and naturally do so. It is for this reason that ethnographers often rely on participant observation although that is not the only form of data collection used.

The Chicago School of Sociology of the 1920s and 1930s was a source of classic appreciative studies. Researchers adapted some of the techniques of social anthropologists to study the subcultures of crime within their city (in addition to using a statistical analysis of crime rates to map zones of the city). They produced books with titles such as *The Jack Roller* (Shaw, 1930), *The Hobo* (Anderson, 1923) and *The Gang* (Thrasher, 1927). There was particular emphasis on the transitional zone of the city with indicators of social disorganization such as a high turnover of population, poor housing and a high incidence of crime.

Appreciative studies captured the culture of crime in this zone and also the mechanisms by which this culture was transmitted. In doing so, the Chicago sociologists emphasized the distinctiveness of the deviant subcultures and their separation from mainstream society. In the 1960s and 1970s there was a resurgence of ethnographic studies, linked to an interactionist framework, but with a particular slant towards the process of labelling. For example, Howard Becker's (1963) study of marijuana smokers was influential in generating a greater concern with the ways deviant and non-deviant worlds meet and interact rather than with their separation. This was part of the emergence of labelling theory as a radical response to the predominance of positivist conventional criminology. Becker was not interested in asking questions about the causes of smoking marijuana; instead he focused on the question of how and why marijuana users come to be defined and labelled as deviant. This involved looking at interactions between the would-be deviant and the agencies of social control.

EVALUATION

The critiques that can be levelled at appreciative criminology are those which, in terms of theory, can be levelled at interactionism, and which, in terms of methodology, can be directed at ethnography. For example, explanations of crime and deviance that are grounded in interactions in small-scale contexts run the risk of neglecting wider social structural dimensions of power, inequality and oppression (although for some a synthesis based on theorizing at different levels is feasible). Methodologically, ethnographic studies endure the criticisms that they lack generalizability to wider contexts and – being reliant on the deviants themselves for data – are not scientific or objective. There is also the possibility that taking an appreciative stance is synonymous with glorifying the criminal. This does not find sympathy with those who emphasize the need to face up to the reality of crime and the consequences of it for victims.

Such criticisms apart, appreciative studies have provided a rich vein within criminology and have also described and explained criminal and deviant subcultures which would not otherwise have been made visible by other theoretical and methodological approaches.

VICTOR JUPP

Associated Concepts: Chicago School of Sociology, cultural criminology, ethnography, interactionism, labelling, new deviancy theory, participant observation, subculture

KEY READINGS

- Anderson, N. (1923) *The Hobo: The Sociology of the Homeless Man*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, H. (1963) *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: The Free Press.
- Matza, D. (1969) *Becoming Deviant*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Parker, H. (1974) *View from the Boys*. Newton Abbot: David and Charles.

Robinson, G., Priede, C., Farrall, S., Shapland, J. and McNeill, F. (2013) 'Doing "strengths-based" research: Appreciative Inquiry in a probation setting', *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 13 (1): 3–20.

Shaw, C.R. (1930) *The Jack Roller*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thrasher, P.M. (1927) *The Gang*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

ART CRIME

DEFINITION

As with the art world, art crime is difficult to define. Comprising numerous illicit activities and grey areas of the law, it involves criminal acts that range from theft (including looting), damage (including iconoclasm), deception (fakes, forgeries, fraud and ransom) and trafficking, to graffiti.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

Lacking regulation, the art world is fluid and its organizational basis creates the flows that help amplify it into one of immense value. Globally, the cultural economy and heritage are characterized by huge worldwide sales and very large visitor numbers for art displays. In London alone, ten art museums have more than a million visitors annually.

A lack of evidence means that the often-regurgitated figure that globally art crime is worth billions of pounds should be treated with caution as it is very difficult to substantiate. For example, in the UK, it is extremely hard to verify the actual extent of art theft because it is recorded under the wider categorization of property crime. Large figures serve to highlight the crime, but they also confuse our understanding as they bring together numbers from disparate types of art crime. However, in spite of contentious figures and a lack of empirical evidence, it is clear that globally day-to-day criminal acts are endemic and involve huge sums. Various types of people participate in art crime, such

as insiders, conmen, art connoisseurs, the psychologically challenged, the politically motivated, opportunists, organized criminals, governments, the military and artists. Though the disparate types of art crime pose very different challenges, the threat usually centres on money. The transnational nature of the crime is highlighted by the fact that much stolen art passes through the hands of criminal gangs in countries other than from where the art was stolen. This is significant because criminals are using art, antiques and antiquities to fund crime internationally.

Encapsulating the challenges faced by modern securitization and policing networks, art crime requires specialization, expertise and resources. These frequently violent crimes are often met by a lack of public police attention. With a few exceptions (such as Italy and France), in most countries it is a marginalized area of public policing. For example, in the UK, the Metropolitan Police Service's Art and Antiques Unit, in spite of a history of success, lacks staff and only has jurisdiction over London.

The prevention and detection of art crime have a complex matrix of security providers. As with many spaces in modern society, within the locations where art is displayed or stored, it is often private security technical staff that 'do' this security inside 'security bubbles'. In some large cities (particularly capitals), this security can be 'public' owing to the large amount of state run locations that own and display art. Overall, a range of people will be involved in the securitization and policing of art, including onsite security personnel (and other staff), art installers, transportation companies, the owners, government agencies (including ministries of culture and customs), the public police, private detectives, private security companies and consultancies, lawyers, the insurance industry, surveyors and loss adjusters working for insurance companies, databases and Interpol.

EVALUATION

While researching art crime in 1994, Conklin found very little social scientific research and

relied largely on media sources. However, there is now more available criminological literature; with looting and the entrance of stolen objects into the art/antiquity market the most researched area. Research from the legal perspective also provides a valuable source of information, particularly as different legal systems (e.g., in the UK and USA compared to France and Italy) affect policing and security measures owing to differing ownership laws concerning good-faith purchases.

Criminologists have a crucial role both in broadening our general understanding of different art crimes and in undertaking specific policy-based research. But how art crime is understood poses difficult questions. For example, the ownership or provenance of a work of art can be contentious. An artwork might also have an elaborate history that is linked either directly or indirectly with crime; from being originally looted or stolen from another location, involved as a fake or forgery, or the victim of damage, turning up in a drug deal, to being part of a 'reward' that is uncomfortably close to a ransom. The grey area of the art world is exemplified by some looted art and antiquities now being viewed as licit, and also by the ways that pieces are 'authenticated' by the art world (Bowman, 2008). Furthermore, an artwork, such as a graffiti mural, can start life as a crime but then be protected or sold to general acclaim. To achieve a proper understanding of art crimes, the different types must not be amalgamated together as they pose very different challenges.

The large emphasis on risk management and the prevention of crime by security and policing nodes, particularly insurance companies, shows that the preventative measures can be more important than either recovery or the criminal involved. Among these are situational crime prevention (especially the use of technology), environmental design, the use of databases, documenting the objects, and buyers being self-responsible. This highlights the cross-disciplinary nature of research into these crimes, with criminology, law, archaeology,

architecture and geography all being involved. However, in spite of the preventative measures, many locations are still vulnerable to crimes involving fakes, forgeries and criminal damage, and also to different types of theft (such as looting where the technological advances coupled with the economic hardships of some people in the source countries make the crime attractive, even if those committing the original crime are ultimately being exploited: see Bowman, 2008 and important research by Trafficking Culture researchers such as Brodie, Davis, Mackenzie, Tsirogiannis, and Yates [www.traffickingculture.org]).

With the transnationality of many art crimes and securitization and policing having to involve a range of agencies both nationally and internationally, the crucial question is less about who is best suited to undertake the security, and more about how different people (with their range of motivations and interests) can work together to produce the most effective preventative security (as well as investigations and recoveries), and, crucially in neoliberal terms, one by which they all benefit. The insurance companies are central to the security terrain. Fluidity in the art world creates profits, and insurance is the driving force behind institutions taking 'risks' such as putting on blockbuster exhibitions with loans of artworks moving around the world (even after previous thefts during loans) and handling the security of this art. The ownership of huge amounts of art by states also means that governments can be very involved as well. In the UK, while not purchasing insurance, the state follows a similar model both for creating flows of art (with the consequent 'risk') and for securing its art and that which is deemed to be shown in the public interest.

Different criminological theories have been used to try and understand art crime. For example, the basic features of Routine Activity theory exist in many art crimes. This reflects a crime science focus; however, it is important not to ignore the criminality aspects, particularly those concerning the people who perpetrate the different stages of the crimes. Other theories include flag effect,

nodal governance, situational crime prevention, cognitive mapping theory, differential association and techniques of neutralization (see Kerr, 2015 and many significant publications in www.traffickingculture.org)

Art is one of the few remaining unregulated fields and is also a world that has problems dealing with thieves within it. The contemporary relevance of different art crimes to criminology is clear. Its fluid threat, exemplified by the theft of sculptures when prices for certain metals rise, encapsulates the challenges posed by profit-driven criminals and transnational crime to the locations in which art is kept and, also, to the many varied public sector and private agencies and stakeholders involved in the securitization and policing of art around the world.

JOHN KERR

Associated Concepts: corporate crime, globalization, hidden crime, opportunity theory, organized crime, routine activity theory, transnational crime

KEY READINGS

- Bowman, B.A. (2008) 'Transnational crimes against culture: Looting at archaeological sites and "grey" market in antiquities', *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 24 (3): 225–242.
- Chappell, D. and Hufnagel, S. (eds) (2014) *Contemporary Perspectives on the Detection, Investigation and Prosecution of Art Crime: Australasian, European and North American Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Charney, N. (ed.) (2016) *Art Crime: Terrorists, Tomb Raiders, Forgers and Thieves*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Conklin, J. (1994) *Art Crime*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Kerr, J. (2015) *The Securitization and Policing of Art Theft: The Case of London*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Kila, J. and Balcells, M. (eds) (2014) *Cultural Property Crimes: An Overview and Analysis on Contemporary Perspectives and Trends*. Leiden: Brill.

Manacorda, S. and Chappell, D. (eds) (2011) *Crime in the Art and Antiquities World: Illegal Trafficking in Cultural Property*. New York: Springer.

WEBSITES

www.traffickingculture.org - many important publications by researchers such as Brodie, Davis, Mackenzie, Tsirogiannis and Yates

AUTHORITARIAN POPULISM

DEFINITION

Conceptualized as an essential aspect of how social democratic states and their institutions respond to crises within advanced capitalist political economies, authoritarian populism explains how increasingly repressive punitive laws and sanctions gain popular legitimacy. This mobilization of state power aims to manage consent, organize regulation and secure hegemony through an increasingly authoritarian political agenda derived from political disaffection and discontent. It reaffirms reactive and reactionary discourses established around the 'collapse' of democracy, the 'breakdown' in law and order, the 'militancy' of the unions, the 'decline' in moral values and so on. These discourses are exploited through political and media 'campaigns', thus generating 'moral panics' within popular discourse and social reaction.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

Basing his analysis on the proposition that 'state-monopolized physical violence permanently underlies the techniques of power and mechanisms of consent' within Western capitalist democracies, Poulantzas (2013: 81) claimed that during the 1970s a new *form* of state had emerged: 'authoritarian statism ... intensified state control over every sphere of socio-economic life *combined with* radical decline of the institutions of

political democracy and with draconian and multiform curtailment of so-called "formal" liberties' (2013: 203-4). Repressive measures depended on the actual exercise of state-sanctioned violence and, significantly, on its internationalization through ideological acceptance or, for those who opposed the rise of authoritarianism, through *mechanisms of fear*.

For Stuart Hall, Poulantzas had made a defining contribution to the critical analysis of 'exceptional shifts' towards authoritarianism within Western social democracies. Yet he also considered that Poulantzas had misinterpreted the strategy of anti-statism prevalent within the radical right - a strategy representing itself as anti-statist to win popular support while disguising the reality of refining state centralism. More significantly, Poulantzas had neglected the purposeful and orchestrated construction and manipulation of popular consent. Herein lay the essence of Hall's claim for authoritarian populism: 'harness[ing] ... support [of] some popular discontents, neutraliz[ing] opposing forces, disaggregat[ing] the opposition and incorporat[ing] *some* strategic elements of popular opinion into its own hegemonic project' (Hall, 1985: 118).

Hall's response to, and development of, Poulantzas's thesis emerged during the 1970s from his work with colleagues at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Birmingham, UK. In their exhaustive analysis of the 'crisis' in the UK political economy, Hall et al. (1978: 303) identified 'deep structural shifts' resulting in 'the extension of the law and the courts at the level of political management of conflict and the class struggle'. As the state had become increasingly interventionist within the economy, establishing the foundation for capitalist reconstruction through the libertarianism of the 'free-market', it became both necessary and 'legitimate' for 'public opinion to be actively recruited in an open and explicit fashion in favour of the "strong state" ... [characterized as] the ebb and flow of authoritarian populism in defence of social discipline' (2013: 304-5).

For Hall et al. (1978: 317-20) the 'crisis' was 'policed' through the gradual development of

legitimate coercion. It comprised four distinct elements: a crisis of and for British capitalism; a crisis of the 'relations of social forces' derived in the economic crisis; a crisis of the state in mobilizing popular consent for potentially unpopular socio-economic strategies; a crisis in political legitimacy, in social authority, in hegemony; and the imposition of 'social authority' and societal discipline. The authors identified the collapse of post-war social-democratic consensus and the consolidation of New Right ideology as a fundamental shift in the balance of social forces – from consent to coercion – inherent within social democracies; a shift they characterized as the emergence of an exceptional form of the capitalist state.

Further expanding the thesis, Hall (1979: 19) proposed that the 'language of law and order is sustained by moralisms ... where the great syntax of "good" versus "evil", of civilized and uncivilized standards, of the choice between anarchy and order constantly divides the world up and classifies it into its appointed stations'. By appealing to 'inherent' social values and evoking an overarching moral imperative, law and order rhetoric appealed to a collective common sense, 'welding people to that "need for authority" ... so significant for the Right in the construction of consent to its authoritarian programme'. Populism, however, was not simply a 'rhetorical device': it operated on 'genuine contradictions' and reflected a 'rational and material core' (1979: 20).

Hall (1980: 3) considered the 'drive' towards a 'more disciplinary, authoritarian kind of society' to be 'no short-term affair'. It embodied a 'regression to a stone-age morality' promoted by politicians, together with, in popular discourse, 'a blind spasm of control: the feeling that the *only* remedy for a society which is declared to be "ungovernable" is the imposition of order, through a disciplinary use of law by the state'. Thus, the 'shift "from above" [was] pioneered by, harnessed to and, to some extent, legitimated by a popular groundswell below', a populism exemplified by 'a sequence of "moral panic"' (Hall, 1985: 116).

EVALUATION

The most strident critique of authoritarian populism came from Jessop et al. (1988). Concentrating on its application to the rise and consolidation of Thatcherism in the UK they argued it over-emphasized the significance of ideology and downplayed structural relations of political economy. It was too concerned with the 'relative autonomy' of language and discourse, neglected the political economy of the New Right (preferring instead to focus on its 'hegemonic project') and 'generate[d] an excessive concern with the mass media and ideological production at the expense of political and economic organization ...' (1988: 73). They rejected the idea that Thatcherism had secured hegemony and achieved a new expression of collective 'common-sense'; the New Right had neither a broad consensus nor political legitimacy for its objectives. Further, Hall was criticized for idealizing the gains of post-war social democracy and for failing to address the political economic determinants of global economic restructuring.

The ensuing debate was severe. Hall denied that authoritarian populism had been conceived as a *comprehensive* analysis of Thatcherism. It was 'preposterous' to claim that he had suggested that Thatcherism had secured hegemony. Rather, it constituted a politics, shared by Western capitalist states and hegemonic in 'conception and project', whose 'dominance' had become 'self-evident' by the mid-1980s (Hall, 1985: 119). Returning to Gramsci, he concluded it was 'impossible to conceptualize or achieve' hegemony without accepting the economy as the 'decisive nucleus' around which civil society consolidated (1985: 120).

As academic hostilities cooled it became clear that conceptually the significance of authoritarian populism lay in its contribution to theorizing the political and ideological dimensions of the authoritarian shift and its populist appeal for stronger laws, imposed order and tighter discipline. What remained unexplored was the foundation of popular authoritarianism within the wider society, given – as Hall and others recognized – that

people are not mere 'dupes'. Historically, an authoritarian streak can be detected within the collective psyche which appears to transcend cultural and regional differences. Further, authoritarian responses to orchestrated moral panics, not derived in economic crises or which occur during periods of relative economic expansionism, require consideration.

Yet Hall's analysis - combining Gramsci, Laclau and Poulantzas - demonstrated that advanced capitalism is served, serviced, but rarely confronted by state institutions whose decision makers share its ends, if not always its means, via a coincidence of interests expressed in a common and dominant ideology. In its functions, the state - exemplified by the rule of law, its derivation and administration - tutors and guides the broad membership of society. State institutions are sites for the regeneration and reconstruction of ideas as well as policies. This process, sensitive to and informing of popular discourses, serves to defend the structural contradictions and inequalities of advanced capitalism whether in recession (crisis) or in growth (reconstruction). While the controversy regarding the conceptualization and application of authoritarian populism reached intensity in the late twentieth century, its relevance was re-ignited by the rise of right-wing populist political parties throughout Europe during the first two decades of the twenty-first century, the political and ideological foundations of Brexit within the UK and a clear shift towards maverick Republicanism in the USA. In this climate, authoritarian populism serves as a poignant reminder that if consensus cannot be forged, it will be forced.

PHIL SCRATON AND KATHRYN CHADWICK

Associated Concepts: criminalization, critical criminology, hegemony, moral panic, punitiveness, the state

KEY READINGS

Hall, S. (1979) 'The Great Moving Right Show', *Marxism Today*, January: 14-20.

Hall, S. (1980) *Drifting into a Law and Order Society*. London: The Cobden Trust.

Hall, S. (1985) 'Authoritarian populism: A reply to Jessop et al.', *New Left Review*, 151: 115-124.

Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J. and Roberts, B. (2013) *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State and Law and Order* (2nd edn). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jessop, B., Bennett, K., Bromley, S. and Ling, T. (1988) *Thatcherism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Poulantzas, N. (1978) *State, Power, Socialism*. London: Verso.

AUTOETHNOGRAPHY

DEFINITION

Autoethnography is a specific form of ethnographic research that focuses upon the emotional and biographic characteristics of the researcher. While it is still a somewhat marginal practice in criminology, there are small but significant numbers of autoethnographers across the social sciences and the method's popularity is growing. The diversity and plurality of works that can be considered 'autoethnographic' make providing of an authoritative definition problematic, but a useful starting point can be found in the work of Tessa Muncey who claims that autoethnography is:

a research approach that privileges the individual. It is an artistically constructed piece of prose, poetry, music or piece of artwork that attempts to portray an individual experience in a way that evokes the imagination of the reader, viewer or listener. (2010: 2)

This, in practice, means that autoethnography is fluid and really only has one defining feature - its privileging of the researcher and their role within the process of doing research. In short, autoethnography is a research technique that attempts to generate new and innovative ways of researching, theorising, and telling about things by placing the researcher at the very heart of the process.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

Issues of definition aside, it is possible to discern a number of key distinctive features from within works that can be understood as autoethnographic. The main one is a rejection of traditional social-scientific notions of 'objectivity', along with other research-related concepts such as 'reliability', 'replicability' and even 'data validity'. In short, autoethnographers do not concern themselves with such issues, instead seeking to tell stories through their research in highly stylised, emotionally resonant ways. In fact, it is even plausible to suggest that because of this rejection of standardised ideas related to social research, autoethnography should not be considered a research method in the traditional sense of the term. Rather, autoethnography might be better understood as existing as a form of 'creative non-fiction', positioned somewhere in between story-telling and social-scientific analysis. While some might not like such conceptual ambiguity, it is recognized by others as a key strength of autoethnography; if it is a research method, then it is not constrained by intellectual traditions and/or disciplinary protocols.

The above considered, it is possible to see some thematic cohesion in autoethnographic works that can serve a useful heuristic purpose here. While it might be something of an over-simplification, there are two basic forms of autoethnography: *evocative* autoethnography and *analytic* autoethnography. In the former, the autoethnographer seeks to recant an experience she has had in an emotionally resonant way in order to help others make sense of it. Analytic autoethnography is somewhat different however; here we usually see a strong commitment to the traditional ethos of realist ethnography in that this type of autoethnography is about the *social* world as much as it is the autoethnographic researcher. While this distinction is perhaps only small, it is certainly significant. The evocative autoethnographer tells individual stories of their experiences, while the analytical autoethnographer tells stories of their experiences set in the context of their (normally, but by no means exclusively) ethnographic fieldwork.

Anderson (2006) is the key architect of analytic autoethnography, and the source of the method's five 'key principles' that Wakeman (2014) builds upon to develop a specific perspective of 'autoethnographic criminology'. These principles are the core of what it means to practise analytic autoethnography, and they run as follows. Number one is 'complete member researcher' - this means that the researcher should have some form of direct or indirect participatory experience of the subject studied, either presently or in their past. Second is 'analytic reflexivity' - this means that the autoethnographer should engage in some form of self-conscious introspection, that they should be reflexive in considering themselves and their role within their studies. The third principle of analytic autoethnography is 'visibility of researcher in the text' - bluntly, the researcher's emotional self must be visible in their research. This means that the analytic reflexivity outlined above must form a core part of the research project's outputs in whatever form they take, textual or otherwise. Fourth is 'dialogue beyond the self' - this is the principle that maintains the main distinction between evocative and analytic autoethnography. In the latter, there ought to be participants in one form or another; that is, there should be some discussion/analysis of research participants other than the researcher. This point is important, and it is the reasoning underpinning Jeff Ferrell's (2012: 219) thinking when he sensibly notes: 'first an ethnographer, and only then an autoethnographer'. And then finally, the fifth principle of analytic autoethnography can be understood as 'a commitment to an analytical agenda'. In practice this means that the above together should combine to engender 'a broad set of data-transcending practices that are directed toward theoretical development, refinement, and extension' (Anderson, 2006: 387). That is, analytic autoethnography must be about generating new thinking about its subjects; it must help push theory in new and innovative directions.

In essence then, autoethnography is a diverse research practice that has at its core a set of ideals and principles for practice that concern better integrating the experiences of

the researcher and the researched in our investigations of crime, deviancy and the agencies of their control. For Wakeman (2014), it exists at the intersections of 'fieldwork', 'biography' and 'emotion'. It is more than just self-reflection; it is a method that permits and facilitates the asking of complex, critical questions about the social realm *through* the experiences of the situated self within it.

EVALUATION

Autoethnography has not evolved without attracting critical attention within criminology. There are a number of reasons for this, and they have traditionally been reduced down to the field's reticence around introspection. It is not controversial to claim that – generally speaking of course – criminologists do not like to talk about themselves and their feelings. In recent years however, there have been significant changes on this front, and the reflexive ideals of autoethnography are gaining some traction. That said, there are questions that should quite rightfully be asked of the method. Richard Sparks (2002) counsels against the 'ethically dubious' nature of some forms of self-absorbed personal reflection which can at times be of only 'peripheral relevance'. His point is that this kind of reflexive work must bring something critical to the debate to avoid accusations of narcissism and irrelevance. Jewkes (2011) makes a similar point; autoethnography ought to be treated as an 'intellectual resource' in our efforts to think progressively and differently about our subjects. The slip into simplistic personal reflection is not helpful to the field in general, and this is a key issue that would-be autoethnographers should be aware of.

Another issue related to autoethnography is researcher wellbeing. As Wakeman (2014) is at pains to point out, autoethnographers will internalise the subjects of their studies to a much greater extent than researchers using other methods/methodologies. This is unavoidable, as it is a basic requirement of good autoethnography. That said, it has the potential for discomfort at one end of the scale, and severe mental and emotional breakdown at

the other. The importance of an effective support network to autoethnographers cannot be overstated. A great paradox of a method that is effectively reducible to thinking about one's individual self a little more is just this – it is not something that should be undertaken alone. This considered, there is still ample potential here to outweigh the possible difficulties. While it is almost certainly the case that there will always be sceptics, autoethnography has the very real capability to push the field of criminology forwards in terms of its ability to generate new knowledge about crime, harm and the institutions of their control. In this respect, its place in the methodological toolkit of future-facing criminology is assured.

STEVE WAKEMAN

Associated Concepts: cultural criminology, emotions (of crime), ethnography, narrative criminology, reflexivity

KEY READINGS

- Anderson, L. (2006) 'Analytic autoethnography', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35: 373–395.
- Ferrell, J. (2012) 'Autoethnography', in D. Gadd, S. Karstedt and S.F. Messner (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Criminological Research*. London: Sage, pp. 218–230.
- Jewkes, Y. (2011) 'Autoethnography and emotion as intellectual resources: Doing prison research differently', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 18: 63–75.
- Muncey, T. (2010) *Creating Autoethnographies*. London: Sage.
- Sparks, R. (2002) 'Out of the "Digger": The warrior's honour and the guilty observer', *Ethnography*, 3: 556–581.
- Wakeman, S. (2014) 'Fieldwork, biography and emotion: Doing criminological autoethnography', *British Journal of Criminology*, 54: 705–721.
- Wakeman, S. (forthcoming, 2019) *Autoethnographic Criminology*. Abingdon: Routledge.

BEHAVIOUR MODIFICATION

DEFINITION

Early theories of learning gave rise to a range of strategies, termed behaviour modification, aimed at changing behaviour. These practical techniques were widely used with a range of groups, including offenders. As theories of learning became more sophisticated and their research base grew, so their application along with associated methods of behaviour change, developed accordingly.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

The early learning theorists maintained that behaviour is functionally related both to its setting (i.e., the antecedent conditions) and to its consequences (via reinforcement and punishment). It follows from this position that a given behaviour can be changed by modifying both the setting events and the outcomes for the behaviour.

The strategy of bringing about behavioural change through modification of the environment is called *stimulus control* and is a standard technique in behaviour modification (Martin and Pear, 2014). This strategy is evident in situational crime prevention where the aim is to reduce offending by, say, reducing opportunity or increasing the chances of detection. Similarly, behaviour change can be attempted by modifying the consequences that follow a given behaviour. There is a range of established methods that focus on control of reinforcement and punishment contingencies

to bring about behavioural change. Token economy programmes are one such method, in which optimal behaviours are strengthened by rewarding tokens or points which can later be exchanged for tangible rewards. Token economies were used in the American prison system for a period of time but were discontinued for ethical reasons.

As well as bringing about behavioural change through a modification of antecedents and consequences, the focus can be on the behaviour itself. The rationale underpinning this particular strategy is that by changing their behaviour the individual will elicit different outcomes from the environment. In turn, these new outcomes will then reinforce and strengthen the new behaviour, thereby bringing about behavioural change. Strategies that focus explicitly on overt behaviour are often termed *behaviour therapy*, although the basic theory is the same as that informing behaviour modification. In the 1970s the notion of skills training in health services was developed and quickly became widespread in the form of assertion, life and social skills training. Skills training with offenders became popular and was used with a range of types of offender, including sex offenders and violent offenders (Hollin, 1990a).

As behavioural theory developed to become social learning theory, so behaviour modification and behaviour therapy evolved into cognitive-behavioural therapy. A number of particular techniques have become associated with cognitive-behavioural practice; these techniques include self-instructional training, thought stopping, emotional control

training and problem-solving training (McMurran and McGuire, 2005; Sheldon, 1995). The method of change underpinning this approach is that by bringing about a change in internal (psychological and/or physiological) states and process, this covert change will, in turn, mediate change at an overt behavioural level. Changes in overt behaviour will then elicit new patterns of reinforcement from the environment and so maintain the behaviour change. Cognitive-behavioural methods have been widely used with offender groups and particularly with young offenders (Hollin, 1990b).

In practice, behaviour change techniques are seldom used in isolation; it is more common to see amalgams of techniques in the form of *multi-modal programmes*. Such programmes might include elements such as problem-solving skills training, social skills training and emotional control training. Given the complexity of many of the problems for which cognitive-behavioural therapy has been used, including offending, it is appropriate that change is sought by attending to a range of aspects of an individual's functioning. If the cognitive-behavioural model has several inter-related constituents, then attempts at change will be well served by attending to a range of those aspects rather than one in isolation. There are several multi-modal programmes designed for offenders, including Reasoning and Rehabilitation (Ross et al., 1988), Aggression Replacement Training (Goldstein et al., 1998), and other programmes built on the 'what works' agenda (Hollin and Palmer, 2006).

A concern with this approach lies in the abuse of behavioural methods. First, when these powerful methods are used inappropriately by untrained personnel; second, when they are used with people, such as prisoners, who are not in a position to give free consent. It is critical that organizational safeguards are in place to prevent malpractice.

CLIVE HOLLIN

Associated Concepts: cognitive-behavioural theory, conditioning, differential reinforcement,

situational crime prevention, social learning theory, 'what works'

KEY READINGS

Goldstein, A.P., Glick, B. and Gibbs, J.C. (1998) *Aggression Replacement Training: A Comprehensive Intervention for Aggressive Youth* (2nd edn). Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Hollin, C.R. (1990a) 'Social skills training with delinquents: A look at the evidence and some recommendations for practice', *British Journal of Social Work*, 20: 483-493.

Hollin, C.R. (1990b) *Cognitive-Behavioural Interventions with Young Offenders*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Hollin, C.R. and Palmer, E.J. (eds) (2006) *Offending Behaviour Programmes: Development, Application, and Controversies*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley.

Martin, G. and Pear, J. (2017) *Behaviour Modification: What It Is and How To Do It* (10th edn). Hove, East Sussex: Psychology Press.

McMurran, M. and McGuire, J. (eds) (2005) *Social Problem Solving and Offending: Evidence, Evaluation and Evolution*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley.

Ross, R.R., Fabiano, E.A. and Ewles, C.D. (1988) 'Reasoning and rehabilitation', *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 32: 29-35.

Sheldon, B. (2011) *Cognitive-Behavioural Therapy: Research, Practice and Philosophy*. London: Routledge.

BEHAVIOURISM

See: *Cognitive-Behavioural Theory; Conditioning*

BIFURCATION

DEFINITION

A concept - built on the 'just deserts' premise - which seeks to reserve incarceration solely

for those offenders who pose a risk to the community, whilst also finding community-based penalties for less serious offenders.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

Bifurcation is a reaction to at least two different forces within transnational criminal justice systems. First it is a reaction to the expansion of the penal estates of several Western democracies, which saw the prison populations of, for example, the USA quadruple between the early 1980s and the 2000s, with a corresponding growth in expenditure on maintaining the penal estate. This expansion was in turn partly a reaction to the neo-conservatism of Republicans in the USA and the Conservatives in England and Wales, the latter coming to power in 1979 and the former with the election of Ronald Reagan in 1980.

With increasing numbers of people being incarcerated, politicians came under increasing pressure to reduce the amount of money being spent on maintaining the infrastructure of the penal estate. One way of doing this was to reserve imprisonment only for those people who posed a risk to the public and to find alternative punishments for largely nonviolent offenders. By adopting this policy a government could appear to be 'tough and soft simultaneously' (Pitts, 1988: 29). This has been described as 'penal pragmatism' (Cavadino and Dignan, 1992) and further interpreted as a reaction to the 'penal crisis'.

In England and Wales bifurcation is most commonly associated with the Criminal Justice Act of 1991. In the words of the White Paper which preceded the Act – *Crime, Justice and Protecting the Public* – for most offenders imprisonment has to be justified in terms of public protection, denunciation and retribution otherwise it can be an 'expensive way of making bad people worse'. The prospects of reforming offenders are usually much better if they stay in the community, provided the public are properly protected (Home Office, 1990).

The passage of the 1991 Act did reduce the prison population significantly; it fell from

45,835 in October 1992 to 41,561 in January 1993. This downward trend continued until expansionist policies reappeared in the wake of the murder of 2-year-old James Bulger by two 10-year-olds in 1993, and the 'prison works' speech of the then Home Secretary, Michael Howard, in the same year (Wilson and Ashton, 1998).

The second force at the heart of bifurcation is the theoretical concept of just deserts. Put simply, this is a return to elements of classical criminology which suggest that 'the punishment should fit the crime'. As such, prisons should not be filled with minor property offenders – who in fact fill most prisons in Western democracies – but with offenders who pose a risk to the public, and who would be dangerous if not incarcerated. Just deserts is therefore also a recognition that prisons do not rehabilitate offenders and instead often stigmatize them, thus making it more difficult for them to reintegrate into society.

EVALUATION

Bifurcation showed limited success in England and Wales in that the passage of the 1991 Criminal Justice Act did reduce the prison population significantly. However, it is noteworthy that this was a concept that was unable to withstand the popular 'commonsense' clamour to increase prison numbers, largely as a reaction to a tragic but atypical murder and when political expediency determined a different course of action. In short, when it was in the British government's interest to appear 'tough' on criminals as well as crime, bifurcation became politically irrelevant. The concept has however more recently resurfaced in analysis of the expansion of techniques of surveillance. Whilst the twenty-first century has witnessed an expansion of a generalised surveillance capacity, affecting all citizens, vestiges of the marking out of a 'hard core' of persistent offenders remain. The latter find themselves subject to the full panoply of proactive and intrusive surveillance techniques. Thus, 'we are witnessing both an intensification and a bifurcation of surveillance practice' (Norris, 2007).

DAVID WILSON

Associated Concepts: classicism, just deserts, neo-conservative criminology, surveillance

KEY READINGS

- Bottomley, A.K. (1980) 'The "Justice Model" in America and Britain: Development and analysis,' in A. Bottoms and R. Preston (eds), *The Coming Penal Crisis: A Criminological and Theological Exploration*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, pp. 25–52.
- Cavadino, M. and Dignan, J. (1992) *The Penal System: An Introduction*. London: Sage.
- Home Office (1990) *Crime, Justice and Protecting the Public* (CM 965). London: HMSO.
- Norris, C. (2007) 'The intensification and bifurcation of surveillance in British criminal justice policy', *European Journal of Criminal Policy Research*, 13 (1–2): 139–158.
- Pitts, J. (1988) *The Politics of Juvenile Crime*. London: Sage.
- Wilson, D. and Ashton, J. (1998) *What Everyone in Britain Should Know About Crime and Punishment*. London: Blackstone's.

BIG DATA

DEFINITION

Generally defined as data that satisfies the three Vs, Big Data is data of high volume, generated at high velocity (speed of production and processing), and with high variety (of data types and sources). However, there are different definitions (Chan and Bennett Moses, 2016), and Big Data is sometimes defined as incorporating other features such as analytic tools and algorithms, conceived as a 'new epistemological approach for making sense of the world' (Kitchin, 2014: 2) or presented as a 'cultural, technological and scholarly phenomenon' involving technology, analysis and mythology (boyd and Crawford, 2012: 263).

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

The term Big Data can have a range of meanings, ranging from the volume, velocity and variety of data systems, the analytic capability or value, a marketing label, to a socio-cultural phenomenon (see boyd and Crawford, 2012; Kitchin, 2014; Chan and Bennett Moses, 2016). Even though much has been written about how Big Data will transform society, the use of Big Data in social science in general and in criminology in particular is a relatively new trend. As Chan and Bennett Moses (2016) observe, there are two main areas where Big Data has been used for researching crime and justice: first, the use of Big Data such as social media streams as *data* in criminological research (e.g. Williams et al., 2016), and second, the use of Big Data for real-time monitoring or to make predictions that can be used for law enforcement or criminal justice purposes, such as increasing situational awareness, preventing crime and enhancing efficiency (e.g. Berk and Bleich, 2013). These categories obviously overlap, and research in the first category may be applied in the second and vice versa.

The concept of Big Data was originally used in the context of breakthroughs in solving *technical* problems. In particular, definitions such as the three Vs are based on the technical challenges historically posed in storing or analyzing large volumes of data in non-standard formats. As these technical challenges were solved, new insights were revealed. In some definitions, such as that offered by the McKinsey Global Institute, Big Data is always on the technological frontier – 'datasets whose size is beyond the ability of typical database software tools to capture, store, manage and analyze'.

One area of technical development that was closely related to the growth of Big Data as a concept is machine learning. Machine learning occurs where a computer optimizes parameters in a model drawing on data in a training set. Examples of machine learning techniques include neural networks, decision trees, random forests and Bayesian learning. While the terms are not synonymous (Big

Data refers to a collection of data; machine learning refers to a set of techniques) and not necessarily associated (Big Data can be analyzed using other kinds of techniques and machine learning can be used on collections of data that do not meet the criteria of Big Data), they are historically linked and commonly associated.

EVALUATION

While the definition of Big Data is unstable, reference to the term can be useful in describing or critiquing an approach to analysis. For example, boyd and Crawford (2012) have tried to debunk Big Data myths by exposing its misleading claims to objectivity and accuracy, the confusion of size with representativeness, and the absence of contextual information to guide interpretation and unexamined issues relating to ethics and differential access. As an *approach* to research, Big Data emphasizes correlation as a driver of knowledge-creation, instead of the conventional processes of hypothesis testing, theory-building and identification of causal mechanisms (Chan and Bennett Moses, 2016). There is a growing literature that critically examines Big Data-aligned methodologies in criminology and policing (e.g. Brayne, 2017; Moffat, 2018). In evaluating Big Data predictions, researchers should be also aware of issues such as transparency in methodology and data sources, as well as the need to separate evaluation of predictive accuracy from evaluation of effectiveness in producing intended outcomes (Bennett Moses and Chan, 2016).

In research, the term Big Data can be used as a heuristic device to investigate how research participants make sense of this concept, and how this cluster of approaches is influencing policy development, practice, research and approaches inside particular organizations. The popularity of Big Data approaches, for example, can help to explain the attraction of predictive policing and risk assessment programs for criminal justice agencies. However, it is important to bear in mind when using Big Data as a term in

research that the term has no single, clear meaning.

Terms such as Big Data may or may not be long-lived. Google trends (which captures the popularity of search terms as at the search date, here 11 April 2018) suggest that the term rose to prominence over the period 2012–2014, reaching its peak in March 2017. Because there are other terms used in practice, such as data science, data analytics, data mining, artificial intelligence, machine learning, and so forth, the term Big Data need not have any longevity. As such, the term is useful in research only so long as it is relevant in practice.

LYRIA BENNETT MOSES AND JANET CHAN

Associated Concepts: crime science, prediction studies, risk factor research, social media

KEY READINGS

- Bennett Moses, L. and Chan, J. (2016) 'Algorithmic prediction in policing: Assumptions, evaluation, and accountability', *Policing and Society*. Available at: www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10439463.2016.1253695 (accessed 8 November 2018).
- Berk, R. and Bleich, J. (2013) 'Statistical procedures for forecasting criminal behavior', *Criminology & Public Policy*, 12 (3): 513–544.
- boyd, d. and Crawford, K. (2012) 'Critical questions for Big Data: Provocations for a cultural, technological, and scholarly phenomenon', *Information, Communication and Society*, 15: 662–679.
- Brayne, S. (2017) 'Big Data surveillance: The case of policing', *American Sociological Review*, 82 (5): 977–1008.
- Chan, J. and Bennett Moses, L. (2016) 'Is Big Data challenging criminology?', *Theoretical Criminology*, 20: 21–39.
- Hannah-Moffat, K. (2018). 'Algorithmic risk governance: Big data analytics, race and information activism in criminal justice debates'. *Theoretical Criminology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480618763582>

Kitchin, R. (2014) 'Big Data, new epistemologies and paradigm shifts', *Big Data and Society*, 1: 1-12.

Williams, M.L., Burnap, P. and Sloan, L. (2016) 'Crime sensing with Big Data: The affordances and limitations of using open-source communications to estimate crime patterns', *British Journal of Criminology*, 57(2): 320-340.

BIOLOGICAL CRIMINOLOGY

DEFINITION

The basic premise of biological criminology is that certain people are born to be criminal through the inheritance of a genetic or physiological predisposition to crime. Environmental conditions are not ignored but viewed as potential triggers of the biological force. As behaviour is viewed as reflecting a pre-written, often inherited, code, criminality lies beyond individual control. Accordingly biological criminology is overwhelmingly positivist in nature.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

Early positivists such as Lombroso, Ferri and Garafalo identified the criminal in terms of physical stigmata. Physical anomalies with hereditary origins (such as large cheekbones, flat nose and thick eyebrows) were thought to mark out a criminal propensity. The notion of the criminal as defective reworks Darwin's theory of evolution. As humans develop they learn how to adapt to their environment. Those who do not are viewed as an atavistic throwback to an earlier stage of evolution as pre-social and more criminally inclined. In his later work Lombroso placed less emphasis on the atavistic nature of all criminality. By 1897 he claimed that the 'born criminal' applied to only a third of all criminals. To this he added the categories of the epileptic, the insane and the 'occasional criminal'. The latter exhibited no inbred anomalies, but turned

to crime as a result of a variety of environmental conditions. His later work also attempted to measure the effect of climate, rainfall, price of grain, banking practices, poor education and the structure of government, Church and religion on occasional criminality. However, he never totally abandoned the notion that criminals were abnormal. He never allowed for the possibility that criminality could be 'normal'.

Several attempts have subsequently been made to test biological and genetic theories. A study of 3,000 prisoners in London in the 1910s discovered high correlation between the criminality of spouses, between parents and their children and between brothers. Poverty, education and broken homes were poor correlates. It was argued that criminality was passed down through inherited genes. Accordingly, in order to reduce crime, it was increasingly recommended that people with such inherited characteristics should not be allowed to reproduce. This logic was fertile ground for the growth of *eugenics*, a doctrine concerned with 'improving' the genetic selection of the human race. Evidence from the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development established in the 1960s also continues to suggest that crime does indeed run in families. From a base of 397 families, half of all convictions were concentrated in just 23. Convictions of one family member were strongly related to convictions of each other family member. Three-quarters of convicted mothers and convicted fathers had a convicted child.

Further, more sophisticated research directed at isolating 'a genetic factor' has been carried out with twins and adoptees. These have attempted to test two key propositions:

1. That identical (monozygotic or MZ) twins have more similar behaviour patterns than fraternal (dizygotic or DZ) twins.
2. That children's behaviour is more similar to that of their biological parents than to that of their adoptive parents.

In a review of research carried out between 1929 and 1961, Mednick and Volavka (1980)

noted that, overall, 60 per cent of MZ twins shared criminal behaviour patterns compared to 30 per cent of DZ twins. More recent work has found a lower, but still significant, level of association. Christiansen's (1977) study of 3,586 twin pairs in Denmark found a 52 per cent concordance for MZ groups and a 22 per cent concordance for the DZ groups. The evidence for the genetic transmission of some behaviour patterns thus appears quite strong. However, telling criticisms have also been made of this line of research. For example, a tendency to treat identical twins more alike than fraternal twins may account for the greater concordance. Thus the connection between criminality and genetics may be made through environmental conditions, derived from the behaviour of parents or from twins' influence on each other's behaviour.

As a result, Mednick and colleagues (1987) proposed that the study of adoptions would be a better test of a relative genetic effect, particularly if it could be shown that the criminality of biological parent and child was similar even when the child had grown up in a completely different environment. Using data from over 14,000 cases of adoption in Denmark from 1924 to 1947, Mednick et al. concluded that some factor *is* transmitted by convicted parents to increase the likelihood that their children – even after adoption – will be convicted for criminal offences. As a result, this type of research continues to attract research funding and publicity. In 1994 the Centre for Social, Genetic and Development Psychiatry was established at the Maudsley Hospital in South London to examine what role genetic structures play in determining patterns of behaviour (including crime). In 1995 a major international conference was held behind closed doors to discuss the possibility of isolating a criminal gene – the basis of which rested on the study of twins and adoptees (Ciba Foundation, 1996). In one of the best-selling social science books of the decade, *The Bell Curve* (1994), Herrnstein and Murray claimed that American blacks and Latinos are disproportionately poor not because of discrimination,

but because they are less intelligent. Further, they suggested that IQ is mainly determined by inherited genes and that people with low IQ are more likely to commit crime because they lack foresight and are unable to distinguish right from wrong. Such theory indeed remains politically and popularly attractive because it seems to provide *scientific* evidence, which clearly differentiates 'us' from 'them'. If certain people are inherently 'bad' then society is absolved of all responsibility. Such reasoning is, of course, most characteristic of totalitarian regimes whether in Nazi Germany or the former USSR or in programmes of forced therapy practised in the USA.

Further research has examined the effect of a wide range of biochemical factors. These have included: hormone imbalances; testosterone, vitamin, adrenalin and blood sugar levels; allergies; slow brain-wave activity; lead pollution; epilepsy; and the operation of the autonomic nervous system. None of the research has, as yet, been able to establish any direct causal relationships. While some interesting associations have been discovered – for example between male testosterone levels and verbal aggression, between vitamin B deficiency and hyperactivity, and between stimulation of the central portion of the brain (the limbic) and impulsive violence – it remains disputed that such biological conditions will automatically generate anti-social activities, which in turn will be translated into criminality.

EVALUATION

Most critical commentaries on this work – notwithstanding the question of its ethical position – have argued that each fails to recognize the potential effect of a wide range of environmental factors. The high correlation in the criminality of family members could be explained by reference to poor schooling, inadequate diet, unemployment, common residence or cultural transmission of criminal values. In other words, criminality may not necessarily be an inherited trait, but be learned or generated by a plethora of

environmental factors. The usual comparative controls of criminal and non-criminal are doubly misleading. Offenders in custody are not representative of criminals in general, but constitute a highly selected sub-set of those apprehended, charged and convicted. Control groups of the non-criminal are almost certain to include some individuals who have committed crimes but whose actions have remained undetected. Indeed, most current research in this tradition would not claim that biological make-up *alone* can be used as a sufficient explanation of crime. The question of exactly *what* is inherited remains unanswered.

Rather, some biological factors may generate criminality, but only when they interact with certain other psychological or social factors. Whilst correlational analysis may suggest that criminality is transmitted in certain families, it is now acknowledged that it does not allow us to distinguish the relative importance of genetic and environmental factors. Characteristics that are linked to offending (e.g. intelligence, impulsivity, aggressiveness) could be genetically transmitted, but not criminality *per se*.

It is now more common to find biology considered as but one element within *multiple factor* explanations. For example, Wilson and Herrnstein (1985) argue that individuals have the free will to choose criminal actions when they believe that the rewards will outweigh any negative consequences. Such a decision (freely made) is, however, influenced by inherited constitutional factors. Low IQ, abnormal body type and an impulsive personality, it is argued, will predispose a person to make criminal decisions, but criminality is not a matter of nature versus nurture, but of nature *and* nurture. This approach is a defining characteristic of *sociobiology*, developed in the 1970s and heralded by its advocates as a way forward in unifying the social and natural sciences. Generally, it is argued that some people carry with them the potential to be violent or anti-social and that environmental conditions can sometimes trigger anti-social responses. Sociobiologists view biology, environment and

learning as mutually interdependent factors. Sociopathy may not be inherited, but a biochemical preparedness for such behaviours is present in the brain, which, if given a certain type of environment, will produce anti-social behaviour (Jeffery, 1978). Latterly, Walsh (2009: xx) has proposed the development of a *biosocial criminology* which advocates an integration of sociology and biology based on the premise that 'biological factors do not operate in an environmental vacuum and environmental factors do not operate in a biological vacuum'.

Accordingly, it is increasingly acknowledged that a biological criminology is not possible because it is scientifically unachievable to control for environmental and social influences and thus to be able to measure precisely the exact influence of a physiological, biological or genetic effect.

JOHN MUNCIE

Associated Concepts: determinism, dispositional theories, genetics, individual positivism, somatotyping

KEY READINGS

- Christiansen, K.O. (1977) 'A review of studies of criminality among twins', in S. Mednick and K.O. Christiansen (eds), *Biosocial Bases of Criminal Behaviour*. New York: Gardner.
- Ciba Foundation Symposium 194 (1996) *Genetics of Criminal and Antisocial Behaviour*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Herrnstein, R.J. and Murray, C. (1994) *The Bell Curve*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jeffery, C.R. (1978) 'Criminology as an interdisciplinary behavioural science', *Criminology*, 16 (2): 149-169.
- Mednick, S. and Volavka, J. (1980) 'Biology and crime', in N. Morris and M. Tonry (eds), *Crime and Justice*, vol. 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mednick, S.A., Gabrielli, W. and Hutchings, B. (1987) 'Genetic factors in the etiology of criminal behaviour', in S. Mednick, T. Moffit and S. Stack (eds), *The Causes of*

Crime: New Biological Approaches. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walsh, A. (2009) *Biology and Criminology: The Biosocial Synthesis*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Wilson, J.Q. and Herrnstein, R.J. (1985) *Crime and Human Nature*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

BIOPIRACY

DEFINITION

The term 'biopiracy' is used to describe the distributive, ecological, epistemological, sociological and symbolic problematic outcomes that follow from the appropriation, monopolization and patenting of biological and genetic resources by corporations (Goyes, forthcoming). These usually operate in the agrochemical and pharmaceutical sectors and employ biotechnology and patent law to assert ownership and rights to commercial development of these resources.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

The term 'biopiracy' is partly a critical response to the concept and practice of 'bioprospecting' and seems to have been first used in print by Mooney (1993). Mooney aimed to draw attention to the injustice and inequality that he alleged existed in cases in which major corporations could earn massive revenues from marketing agricultural and pharmaceutical products derived from indigenous knowledge and 'resources', while the 'source' communities lived in economic poverty, deprived of food and medicines. Mooney used biopiracy as a synonym of 'kleptomopoly' (1993: 5), with both concepts reflecting a corporate 'drive to establish exclusive monopolies over life' (Mooney, 1993: 6). The term was expanded and more widely popularised by Shiva (1997) and other writers and activists. The key question is whether or not resources for biotechnology are being fairly and legitimately obtained or

unfairly acquired or illegitimately stolen? This controversy has influenced the development and signing of conventions, treaties and protocols in national and international institutional environments. The concept of biopiracy was employed in criminological discussion in South's (2007) description of the processes by which the transnational mobility of corporations facilitates the transfer of knowledge and rights from their indigenous origins to legally protected, private and profit-oriented monopolizers of intellectual property.

Biopiracy has two distinctive features. First, the material object of concern is always a biological or genetic resource. Second, biotechnology is always involved, for example, when samples from species identified as valuable are taken to laboratories and transformed into commodities. We understand biotechnology, following the definition provided in the Convention on Biological Diversity, as 'any technological application that incorporates biological systems, living organisms, or derivatives thereof, to produce or to refine products or processes for specific use'. Usually, the processes and dynamics of biopiracy are deemed legal and legitimate by national and international legal structures.

The concept of biopiracy can be understood at three levels: the discursive, the politico-legal and the practical.

- Discursively, the appearance of debates about biopiracy followed the creation of the bioprospecting meta-narrative which explains and justifies the processes by which corporations or researchers use biological resources for extracting, isolating and purifying marketable products, sometimes using traditional knowledges as a point of departure. The concept of biopiracy is a discursive critical response; what bioprospecting sees as progress, biopiracy sees as theft.
- At the politico-legal level, controversy about biopiracy has been formative in leading to several key international environmental treaties such as the 1992 Rio De Janeiro Convention on Biological Diversity, the 2001 Genetic Resources

Treaty of the Food and Agriculture Programme of the United Nations, the 2002 Bonn Guidelines and the 2010 Nagoya Protocol. The biopiracy issue has also framed economic treaties like the 1994 Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, and the *sui generis* legal systems on plant varieties, such as the 1961, 1972, 1978 and 1991 Conventions of the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants.

- The practical realm encompasses actors, events and developments. The actors are divided between those who directly access biological material – ‘users’, such as corporations, research centres, governmental agencies and individual scientists – and the ‘suppliers’, who are mainly traditional and rural communities in southern nations. Rapid developments in the biosciences, enabling the coding and manipulating of genetic sequences of any living organism have been central to debate and dispute over ownership of biological materials. Biotechnologies have shifted focus from ‘species’ and ‘specimens’ to the microphysical properties of biological materials and the genetic information contained in them. The development of these techniques fits with the individualistic nature of intellectual property rights by allowing an individual actor (whether a person or corporate entity) to be identified as the innovator.

EVALUATION

Biopiracy is a term used in commentary that is critical of the activities of the biotechnology industries. Unsurprisingly, it has, in turn, been criticized as unfair, unjustifiable and potentially dangerous – as based on lies, riddled with inconsistencies, and amounting to a ‘rural legend’ or myth. More broadly, critics suggest that claims of negative consequences for traditional communities resulting from the corporate assertion of intellectual property rights (particularly patents) over plants are unproven (Svarstad, 2002) and accusations of ‘biopiracy’ are not about legality but are

merely moralistic. This argument is complemented by more specific reactions against the portrayal of biopiracy as creating injustice. For example, opponents mention that the use of natural resources by corporations and the patenting of the derived products do not deprive local communities of access to raw products for traditional medicines and food. Opponents seek also to attack the picture constructed by the biopiracy narrative, which relies on the portrayal of the global South as uniquely rich in biodiversity. Opponents say that the global South is not the only place that contains valuable active components, as ‘developed’ countries have also contributed important resources for the development of drugs from which the entire world currently benefits. These criticisms, as developed by opponents to the biopiracy meta-narrative, have been refuted by empirical studies of the consequences of biopiracy (e.g. Goyes and South, 2016), and interpreted by Wyatt and Brisman (2016) as a form of denial.

Nonetheless, current uses of the concept of biopiracy are not without problems. First, discussions of biopiracy do not always reflect societal changes of recent decades and maintain a focus on issues related to patents. This may be due to the continuing influence of work by Mooney, Shiva and others. These arguments moved knowledge and debates in this area significantly forward in innovative ways but with the legacy effect of curtailing new insights and analysis. To address this, Goyes and South (2016) have suggested that studies consider the idea of an ‘ever increasing spiral of biopiracy’ that progressively affects the lives of those in rural communities, such as afro-descendants, indigenous groups and peasants. This concept refers to the constant heightening of economic demand and intensification of commercial dynamics that lead to the appropriation of natural resources. It indicates that the main drivers of biopiracy are socially diffused processes rather than just the concrete procedure of securing patents. Biopiracy is a complex concept and subject, presenting various challenges for criminological study. For

example, some key tasks in the study of biopiracy to which criminology could contribute are: the development of structural analyses of biopiracy; the differentiation of the diverse resource and market areas in which biopiracy takes place; and the provision of more empirical proof of the harms that the biopiracy narrative draws attention to, thus combating the allegations that biopiracy is a myth.

DAVID GOYES AND NIGEL SOUTH

Associated Concepts: animal abuse, denial, ecocide, green criminology

KEY READINGS

- Goyes, D.R. (forthcoming) 'Monopolising seeds, monopolising society: A guide to contemporary criminological research on biopiracy', in A. Brisman and N. South (eds), *Routledge International Handbook of Green Criminology* (2nd edn). Oxford: Routledge.
- Goyes, D.R. and South, N. (2016) 'Land-grabs, bio-piracy and the inversion of justice in Colombia', *British Journal of Criminology*, 56 (3): 558–577.
- Mgbeoji, I. (2006) *Global Biopiracy: Patents, Plants, and Indigenous Knowledge*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Mooney, P. (1993) 'Bio-pirates patent indigenous knowledge ... and indigenous people too', *Echoes*, 4: 4–6.
- Shiva, V. (1997) *Biopiracy, the Plunder of Nature and Knowledge*. Boston: South End Press.
- South, N. (2007) 'The "corporate colonisation of nature": Bio-prospecting, bio-piracy and the development of green criminology' in P. Beirne and N. South (eds), *Issues in Green Criminology: Confronting Harms against Environments, Humanity and other Animals*. Cullompton: Willian, pp. 230–247.
- Svarstad, H. (2002) 'Analysing conservation-development discourses: The story of a biopiracy narrative', *Forum for Development Studies*, 29 (1): 63–92.
- Wyatt, T. and Brisman, A. (2016) 'The role of denial in the "theft of nature": Comparing biopiracy and climate change', *Critical Criminology*, 25 (3): 1–17.

BIRMINGHAM 'SCHOOL'

DEFINITION

Refers to work emerging from the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham (CCCS). Some of this work was particularly influential in media studies, criminology and youth studies. Whether the output described in this manner was ever coherent and systematic enough to be called a 'School' remains an open question.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies was a postgraduate research unit established at the University of Birmingham by Professor Richard Hoggart in 1964 and one which continued (in various guises) until it was closed by the University in 2002, despite a local, national and international outcry. Exploring the significance of popular cultural forms and practices, the Centre played a leading role in the creation of the new field of Cultural Studies. Its work was intellectually innovative, drawing on a range of resources including literary theory, anthropology, sociology and social history. Its practice was also innovative, as much of its research and writing was undertaken collectively in groups working on specific themes and issues. The Centre also published its work in a variety of forms: a famous series of Stencilled Papers (written by members of the subgroups) and an in-house journal (*Working Papers in Cultural Studies*) that subsequently became a series of publications with an external publisher (Hutchinson).

Identifying culture as a field for social analysis, the CCCS found itself challenging existing orientations to culture as high culture (the conventionally recognized and valorized cultural products consumed by social elites); to culture as folk or popular culture (the traditional values, practices and forms being uprooted or cast aside in processes of industrialization and urbanization); and

to culture as mass culture (the pessimistic reading of commodified or mass mediated culture dominant in the United States). Instead, the CCCS treated culture as a field of politically contested meanings in which struggles over social domination and subordination were conducted through how meanings were made, distributed and used. Cultural Studies took shape around such questions and these led to a variety of theoretical and political orientations. Across its four decades, the Centre drew on theories from European Marxism, post-structuralism, feminism, post-colonialism and psychoanalysis to explore how they would contribute to the analysis of the political significance of cultural forms, formations and practices.

Although the work of the CCCS ranged over many fields, perhaps the most salient here involved questions of youth, deviance and the mass media. Paul Willis had undertaken an ethnography of 'bikers' in Birmingham before he produced his study of working-class boys' transition from school to work that was to become one of the most famous CCCS texts. In *Learning to Labour* (1977), Willis explored the paradox by which the group that was most resistant to the formal world of schooling ('the lads') acquired in the process the cultural skills, practices and orientations that enabled their transition into waged work. The 'subcultures group' was one of the Centre's working groups during the 1970s and explored stylistically defined subcultures (Teddy Boys, Mods, Skinheads and so on), developing accounts that resisted unifying conceptions of generation or psychodynamic views of adolescence.

Instead, processes of class and generational formation were foregrounded and the Birmingham approach gave much attention to the symbolic work or signifying practices through which particular groups of young working-class men defined both themselves and their place. This influential work was published in a number of forms, most obviously as *Resistance through Rituals* (Hall and Jefferson, 1976; originally *Working Papers in*

Cultural Studies, 7/8, in 1974). The collection – and its orientation towards class cultures and youth subcultures – shaped much subsequent work in youth studies. Perhaps the most strongly semiotic version of the work on style was developed by Dick Hebdige, whose book *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (1979) explored subcultures as the site of symbolic exchanges between black and white youth.

Indeed, the original subcultures work and its predominant focus on white male working-class youth was both challenged and drawn into new directions by others working at the Centre. Gender formations were examined by Angela McRobbie (who, with Jenny Garber, had contributed the only article to identify gender dynamics and the cultural practices of young women in *Resistance through Rituals*). A number of her essays were collected together in *Feminism and Youth Culture* (1991). A second line of development followed questions of race, racial formation and the racialization of British society. Paul Gilroy's work, individually and as a member of the collective group that produced a CCCS volume called *The Empire Strikes Back* (1982), was central to the process of thinking British culture as a profoundly racialized formation. His book, *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack* (1987), inaugurated a powerful and persistent engagement with the diasporic culture of the Black Atlantic and a critical enquiry into the problems of a post-imperial British culture. As with the other studies mentioned here, Gilroy's work was influential in shaping the trajectory of Cultural Studies – both in the UK and in North America – and had an impact well beyond the field.

Finally, many of the key features of the Birmingham School's work in the 1970s came together in *Policing the Crisis* (Hall et al., 2013). This collective study focused on the claim that street crime – in the specific guise of 'mugging' – marked a social crisis, a breakdown in social order, that could only be resolved by the tougher policing and sentencing of the young men who were its perpetrators. The book moves outwards from one specific case (in

Birmingham in 1973) to examine the different contexts that came together to promote the move to a 'Law and Order Society'. These included the mass media (drawing on Stanley Cohen's work on 'folk devils and moral panics'); the role of political and juridical agents in constructing 'the mugger' as a national danger; the role of the imagery of street crime imported from the USA; and Britain's multiplying crises – economic, social, political – as it moved into a crisis of consent. Hall and his co-authors treated this as a crisis of hegemony (developing an idea by the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci) and stressed the ways in which the imagery of the British social order (and its descent into disorder) was profoundly racialized.

The book's analysis of the move towards a Law and Order Society anticipates much of the authoritarian turn in the New Right, or Thatcherite, governments of the 1980s. Stuart Hall (at that time the Director of the CCCS, and later a Professor of Sociology at The Open University) developed an analysis of Thatcherism that described it as a politics of 'authoritarian populism'. The book has since been influential in criminology, sociology and politics, as well as standing as one of the exemplary texts of Cultural Studies for the way that it developed a *conjunctural analysis* of the crisis.

EVALUATION

Cultural Studies in Birmingham has been subjected to a variety of critical evaluations. Some have been what might be called 'disciplinary' disputes, in which people in established fields (sociology, literature, history) bemoaned the lack of discipline in the approaches taken in Cultural Studies. Others have been worried by the growth and geographical dispersal of Cultural Studies as an academic field, including a concern that the British – and later American – varieties of the subject have been too dominant, producing exciting growth in counter-hegemonic regionalized approaches to the subject.

More specifically, the approaches to youth subcultures and social disorder discussed

above have provoked critical responses, ranging from challenges to an over-focus on stylistic versions of youth, to a critique of the excessive focus on class as well as the view that the idea of 'resistance' displaced attention from politics, thereby celebrating forms of socially regressive or consumption-centred behaviour. The Birmingham 'School' has been criticized both for its attachment to Marxism and for its 'Marxism-lite' – the view that it lacked a properly materialist political economy.

Despite these many critical evaluations, the work of the Birmingham Centre has proved profoundly influential both in shaping the field of Cultural Studies and in its impact on other disciplines and fields of study, the sociology of youth, media studies, (cultural and critical) criminology and social policy. Whether its members ever did agree sufficiently about the theory and practice of Cultural Studies to be called a 'School' seems doubtful.

JOHN CLARKE

Associated Concepts: authoritarian populism, critical criminology, cultural criminology, feminist criminologies, Marxist criminologies, racialization, social constructionism, subculture

KEY READINGS

- Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (1982) *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 70s Britain*. London: Hutchinson.
- Gilroy, P. (1987) *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation*. London: Hutchinson.
- Hall, S. and Jefferson, T. (eds) (2006) *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-war Britain*. London: Routledge.
- Hebdige, D. (1979) *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. London: Routledge.
- McRobbie, A. (1991) *Feminism and Youth Culture: From Jackie to Just 17*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Willis, P. (1977) *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids get Working Class Jobs*. Farnham: Ashgate.

'BROKEN WINDOWS'

DEFINITION

'Broken Windows' is arguably one of the most influential and widely cited articles in contemporary criminology. This seminal article was published originally by James Q. Wilson and George Kelling in 1982 and updated by Kelling and Coles (1996). Synthesising research findings on policing and self-proclaimed 'common sense' about law and order, Wilson and Kelling produced a working theory about the role of the police in promoting neighbourhood safety through reducing the fear of crime.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

The image of 'broken windows' is used to explain how neighbourhoods descend into incivility, disorder and criminality if attention is not paid to their maintenance. An unrepaired broken window signals to law-abiding and criminals alike that no one cares. Gradually other windows in the building will be smashed and this will reinforce the sense that the local community and the authorities have relinquished ownership and that disorder is tolerated. For them, petty disorderly acts, which are not necessarily breaches of the criminal law, trigger a chain reaction that undermines community safety and paves the way for serious criminality. If a neighbourhood or a street is perceived to be increasingly disorderly and unsafe people will modify their behaviour accordingly. Fearful of being harassed, they will avoid or withdraw from these areas or move through them as quickly as possible; meanwhile respectable residents, aware that things will deteriorate,

will move out or fortify their homes. Because only the weak and vulnerable are left behind this leaves the neighbourhood open to colonization by drug dealers, pimps and prostitutes, and other 'street criminals'. It is they who will then lay claim to ownership of the streets and will set the appropriate norms of behaviour. The human equivalents of these 'broken windows' are down and outs, rowdy teenagers and importuning beggars: 'The unchecked panhandler is, in effect, the first broken window'. Thus, policy makers should pay attention to the policing of these disorderly and disreputable individuals because it is they who will create the conditions within which more serious forms of criminality can flourish.

According to Wilson and Kelling, shifts in policing styles also leave certain neighbourhoods and streets exposed to such a chain reaction. The authors step back to ask why the public are so supportive of foot patrols even though this particular policing style has been discredited as a method of effective crime control. For them it is because foot patrolling heightens the sense of public safety and the impression of social order. Experienced foot patrol officers, with a sense of duty and an aura of authority, intuitively recognize that their primary role is 'order maintenance' and 'community safety' rather than crime fighting or law enforcement. This form of police work enables these officers to become intimately acquainted with the law-abiding and respectable as well as criminals and the disreputable. They can also notice indicators of routine normality and that which is out of the ordinary. Their task is to order social relations and activities on the streets and use their discretionary powers to regulate disorderly tendencies through a reinforcement of communal norms and informal social controls. As a consequence, the police enjoy the confidence and support of the community because they are effective in responding to and dealing with the 'quality of life' matters that exasperate people on a daily basis. In a neighbourhood where policing is defined as a collaborative effort between

patrol officers and the community, there is considerably less likelihood of disorder and incivilities going unchecked and fewer opportunities to break windows with impunity.

However, from the 1970s onwards the nature of police–community relations changed as a result of: the police claiming that the fight against high profile, serious crime was their priority; deploying officers in patrol cars; concentrating resources in high-crime areas; the bureaucratization and professionalization of police work; the emergence of a strident civil rights culture; and the decriminalization of victimless crimes. As a result police officers became more distant from local communities and less able and willing to intervene in petty ‘non-police’ matters. In neighbourhoods at risk of tipping over into disorder, ‘de-policing’ had a disastrous effect because it meant that respectable residents had no support from the authorities.

Wilson and Kelling (1982: 36) thus argued for a *return* to old-fashioned, community-oriented ‘order maintenance’ police work and to employing such methods in neighbourhoods where these would make a qualitative difference. The primary police task should be to protect areas and support communities where ‘the public order is deteriorating but not unreclaimable, where the streets are used frequently but by apprehensive people, where a window is likely to be broken at any time, and must quickly be fixed if all are not to be shattered’. It is a waste of police resources to concentrate on crime-ravaged neighbourhoods that are beyond redemption.

EVALUATION

The compelling analysis underpinning ‘Broken Windows’ fed into policy discussions about the need for new approaches to urban policing. What is significant is that it lends itself to both benign and authoritarian policy responses and mission statements. It could be argued that ‘problem-oriented policing’ strategies are premised on a similar type of understanding of the role of the police in stabilizing urban communities and how police legitimacy can be secured through responding to

community concerns about ‘quality of life issues’ and prioritizing crime prevention. However, its core argument has also been adapted to justify aggressive street policing tactics such as those practised in New York and elsewhere from the 1990s. The NYPD’s ‘zero tolerance’ crime-fighting strategy, under Commissioner Bill Bratton, returned officers to street patrolling and mandated them to target the broad spectrum of low level misconduct and widespread anti-social behaviours which made the city feel unsafe and disorderly. There is considerable disagreement over how much of the remarkable improvement in the New York crime rate, particularly the murder rate, could be attributed to the ‘broken windows’ strategy. Nevertheless, the fact remains that in 1994, Bratton’s first year as police commissioner, there were 1,561 murders and 17,422 robberies in the city. By 2014 there were 123 murders and 7,000 robberies. ‘Broken windows’ and ‘zero tolerance policing’ came under renewed focus in the fall-out from the killings of two African-American men, Eric Garner on Staten Island and Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, in 2014. The Black Lives Matters campaign directly targeted what it viewed to be the racist police practices legitimised by Broken Windows. However, what is beyond dispute is that Wilson and Kelling reopened a debate on what the core role of the police should be and how policing should be organized.

EUGENE McLAUGHLIN

Associated Concepts: anti-social behaviour, communitarianism, community policing, COMPSTAT, defensible space, problem-oriented policing, right realism, zero tolerance

KEY READINGS

- Bratton, W. with Knobler, P. (1998) *Turn-around How America's Top Cop Reversed the Crime Epidemic*. New York: Random Books.
- Fassin, D. (2013) *Enforcing Order: An Ethnography of Urban Policing*. Cambridge: Polity Press.