

PART ONE

INTRODUCTION

Core areas:

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 How to use this book
- 1.3 Why use this book?
- 1.4 Criminology essentials: thinking like a criminologist
- 1.5 What is crime?
- 1.6 Perspectives on crime
- 1.7 Categorizing criminological theory

1.1 INTRODUCTION

When I first encountered criminology, I was keen to know more about what the subject involved. My introduction to criminology came in the form of a fairly complicated textbook that had been recommended by a tutor, which I purchased before the first term of my degree. As I tried to comprehend what was contained within its pages, I found myself gripped by a strange feeling of dread. I had never counted myself amongst the most successful or gifted students, and can acknowledge now, with perhaps less shame or guilt than I felt then, that I struggled to understand the subject. I can empathise with the difficulties that those new to this subject can encounter.

Criminology can be a complicated subject, and it is not made any more simple by the complex terminology that is used in the subject, the variety and size of the subject area. This book was first written as an attempt to help those

2 Criminology: The essentials

looking for a simple overview that will help them to get familiar with the discipline. It was originally published as a course companion for Sage, and I was really pleased that a number of students and academics told me that it had proved useful in making the subject slightly easier to navigate. In this expanded and substantially revised edition I have sought to stay true to the original aim of making complicated concepts understandable, and if it manages that it will hopefully be of some use. I have, however, received feedback about omissions from the previous attempt, and so have included new sections and expanded parts of the text. The aim of this text remains the same: to assist those new to the discipline who are unsure of the subject and who are looking to understand the basics of criminology get to grips with some of the core issues – the ‘essential’ basics of the subject.

It is not intended to replace textbooks, journals and more specialist texts. It aims to make the initial stages of the journey in studying criminology a little less complex, introducing the theories and terms that are common to criminology, and doing so in a way that will benefit the average reader without much previous knowledge. If those new to the discipline can make use of this book in the initial stages of study then it has served its purpose well.



The new and revised edition of this book is now also accompanied by a companion website, which is accessible at www.sagepub.co.uk/treadwell. The website, which contains resources for both lecturing staff and tutors and undergraduates, intends to complement and build on the material presented here. For example, students will find additional readings which underpin the core curriculum as outlined in the book, while lecturers adopting the book as essential recommended reading can access material and information that can be incorporated into lecture slides or module guides, which develop the themes of the book.

1.2 HOW TO USE THIS BOOK

The key to success in any criminology course is not simply to learn and use academic language. Nor is it simply to understand ‘core’ theories, although knowing the terms and concepts that mark out ‘academic criminology’ from everyday debates about crime and criminal justice is certainly part of the journey. This book will give you hints and tips about how to understand and use criminological theory, and how to apply and critique this theory when you encounter debates upon crime, criminality and the criminal justice system.

This book has been designed firstly as an introduction. Thereafter it will provide you with a guide that you can use as a reference point (to works that

you should then read yourself). You should use Part 2 of this book to give you an overview of topic areas that you are likely to encounter, and build on what you find. Although there are summaries of the works of leading criminologists in textbooks, nothing can replace the knowledge that you will gain from making yourself familiar with the original works.

To that end you should not simply passively read the references here, but make use of them. In the first instance, having read a chapter you can then use the references in the text to inform your reading and look at the subjects in more detail. When you find references in the text you can trace these to the bibliography at the back of the book. Once you have the full reference for a book that you think will be useful to you try to trace the text. You can do this in several ways. The first stop should be your university library, but you can also use the internet and local bookstores to try and find a text. It is important that you do not come to rely upon one book, but instead learn how to direct your reading towards other relevant sources and material.

1.3 WHY USE THIS BOOK?

This book is also intended to help you to monitor your progress as you develop in your study. Progress will be made through reading and gaining insight, but it is also likely that you will have to prove your knowledge, and often this will require that you produce some form of written assessment. For that reason this book also contains sample questions. You can always use these as practice for the real thing; and practice will make you better.

The unique feature of this book is that it contains two sections (Parts 2 and 3) that complement and support one another and, if used in conjunction, should assist you in becoming a more informed and competent student. Part 2 provides an examination of 'over-arching' criminological theories (that is, those theories that inform 'academic' criminology and that criminologists use to support the arguments that they make) which are combined with more general discussions in the field. It is hoped that encountering both the theory and practice of academic criminology will help you to develop a more comprehensive knowledge of the subject. I will restate the point here that academic criminology and the theory that we use is never separate from what happens in the 'real world' of practice, and students should know not only about theory, but also about practices in 'the real world' of crime and the criminal justice system.

4 Criminology: The essentials

Part 3 has been designed to assist you in developing and sharpening the range of study skills that are necessary for studying criminology and is best used in conjunction with Part 2. It is intended to assist you in developing your skills so that you get the best from your reading, and it will assist you in developing a wide range of skills. However, these skills and your ability will only be fully rounded if you combine them with the academic knowledge and understanding that come from engaging and practising criminology, and therefore the aim is for Parts 2 and 3 to support each other and be used in conjunction.

However, most importantly this book should not be read passively, but should help you ask questions. A common complaint I hear from academic colleagues and tutors (particularly when it comes to students producing written work for assessments) is that students do not analyse, but simply describe, and this often is the basis for students getting low marks. However, I do not think academics always make it clear what they want from students. When you come to study a subject at undergraduate level, you are not just learning about the topic, the facts, dates, key names and developments as it were that mark out the knowledge contours of the discipline you are studying, because undergraduate study is also intended to develop analytic and critical thinking skills. This means that beyond learning the core facts, you are also being asked to critically consider and appraise the claims made by the theorists, academic 'experts', official bodies, journalists and others whose arguments you have encountered, asking yourself if the basis of these claims is sound, and whether they apply or are relevant to the situation you are examining. It is not enough, however, simply to include references to authors and summaries of their criticisms (though showing an engagement with the subject matter and wider reading is important and you must do this). If this is all you do, then you may be demonstrating knowledge and understanding, but you are still being descriptive. It is *you* who must be critical, basing your judgments, for example, on your own knowledge and observations, and on a balanced reading and overview of what other people have written.

Therefore, if there is one overriding piece of advice I would give to new students it is read a lot, but secondly, always do your reading and research in a critical manner – don't take everything at face value, and don't always believe everything you read.

In this book, I have attempted to highlight areas for you to consider, sometimes giving practical advice or making an important point or question for you to reflect upon. These features are intended to stimulate you and cause you to question the assertions and arguments that criminologists make; and

therefore to help you develop 'critical thinking'. However, with that point in mind it is worth reiterating that it is not just the essential study skills and theoretical knowledge that are required to pass a criminology course, your hard work is undeniably the most important component.

1.4 CRIMINOLOGY ESSENTIALS: THINKING LIKE A CRIMINOLOGIST

Before we go any further, I want to begin with a consideration of criminology as an academic discipline. More specifically, ask yourself the question, 'what is meant by the term criminology?' It is a good question, and it has to be said that there is not a single accepted point of view in answer to it. As an area of academic study, criminology is an emerging discipline (there is no consensus about its origin). However, it developed into a separate academic subject from the early to mid-twentieth century.

Criminology is often held to be the scientific study of crime (though not all criminologists support such claims to scientific status – see below). As a subject, criminology tends to look at issues such as the nature, causes, extent and control of criminal behaviour, both individually and as encountered in society more generally. As an academic subject, criminology is interdisciplinary, drawing especially upon a range of subjects, most notably sociology (particularly what has been called the sociology of deviance), psychology and psychiatry, legal studies and law, economics and political studies.

Yet many people have views and opinions on crime. Indeed it can seem that crime is always in the news, and how to control it is a matter of intense political and public debate. Even so, many people are not well informed about crime and justice. The issues are complex – whether measuring crime or dealing with its reality, issues are often far from simple. Many crimes go unreported and unrecorded, and keeping track of people's 'criminal careers' or criminal behaviour is difficult, by virtue of the obvious fact that crime is very often a covert activity. Finding out what works in reducing crime – and what doesn't – requires careful and thorough research, and is often contradictory to what people believe, as is the reality of much crime.

Commonsense approaches do not always hold merit. For example, many people suggest that long custodial sentences should be given to criminals because they have a deterrent effect on those who are likely to commit offences, as well as on the offenders themselves. However, criminologists have shown that for potential offenders, it is the increased likelihood of being

6 Criminology: The essentials

caught and convicted that has the greater impact on crime rates. This is but one example of how the reality as borne out in empirical research might counter the intuitive, commonsense position that many people adopt.

Any balanced strategy to control crime needs to be underpinned by a proper understanding of the underlying social, cultural and economic causes of crime (making the case for social sciences). Yet one concept missing from the above list is politics, and today, crime is inherently and almost necessarily a political issue. When I encourage students to think about crime, somewhat mantra-like, I recite one of my favourite sound-bites: 'crime does not take place in a void, but in a context that is always influenced by social, economic, cultural and political factors'. It is appreciating that context, and what it is at any given moment, or historically, that is core to beginning to 'think like a criminologist' and move from everyday conversations about crime to a position more in keeping with the social sciences.

Areas of research in criminology are diverse, but can be said to include the incidence, types, causes and consequences of crime, as well as social and governmental policy and regulation, social control practices and reaction to crime. Some academics suggest the term *criminology* was first used by French anthropologist Paul Topinard in 1879; others suggest it was properly coined in 1885, by Italian law professor Raffaele Garofalo, as *criminologia*.

What is criminology?

Criminologists are interested in crime and the way in which societies deal with crime. However, many people will comment on crime and criminals, and have opinions on the way in which criminals are or should be treated.

Criminology therefore can be regarded as involving a more 'academic' consideration of crime.

Some academics believe that criminology should seek to be 'scientific' or 'empirically grounded' (meaning based upon fact, observation or experience rather than upon a theory alone).

Whether criminology is a science in its own right is contested; whilst some academics have suggested that criminology is the 'scientific' study of crime, not all criminologists would support that view.

Criminology is a multi-disciplinary subject.

Criminology contains arguments derived from philosophy, psychology, sociology, medicine, law, architecture, geography and biology, to name but a few.

Some academics believe that criminology is set apart from other subjects such as sociology because it is concerned only with 'criminal' conduct that is prohibited by law. For example, David Garland (2002) has argued that criminology is detached from moral and legal arguments and sociological studies that are concerned with 'deviance' because it is concerned with crime, although his view is not always accepted.

Criminology can be considered as separate to what has been termed 'crime science', which is a discrete sub-strand of criminology that has emerged in recent years. Three features distinguish crime science from criminology: the former is uniquely focused on cutting crime; it concentrates only on the crime rather than the characteristics or motivations of criminals more broadly; and it is wholly based on 'scientific' methodology rather than drawing upon social theory.

With the above points in mind it is important that you remember that when we study crime we are not studying something that is abstract or irrelevant. It impacts upon people's lives (those people working in the criminal justice system, offenders and citizens). The work criminologists produce can give rise to or support ideas on which working policies and practices are based (even if that is not what the criminologist intended). Therefore it is perhaps important for those new to the discipline to remain aware of the fact that what we debate often describes or may directly impact upon people's lived experiences. For that reason it is worth carefully considering the terms that we use.

Garland suggests that the criminology that first emerged in the UK was developed around the institutions of control. For the first two-thirds of the twentieth century, this was fairly narrow correctionalism, with its stress on individual positivism. Then subsequently, and more recently, this has been replaced with what he terms the 'crime control complex', with its emphasis on situational crime control. It is certainly true that for the most part during that period the Home Office was the biggest employer of criminologists, and that much of the institutional academic training that developed around criminology and criminal justice was closely tied to the crime control mechanisms of the state. In the UK just 30 years ago there were no undergraduate criminology degrees, and the subject was taught exclusively at postgraduate level. It was not until the late 1980s that the subject was offered at undergraduate level.

8 Criminology: The essentials

In 1957, the then Conservative Home Secretary, R.A. (Rab) Butler, approached the London School of Economics about establishing an institute of criminology, but by 1959 the institute was established at Cambridge University, with Leon Radzinowicz becoming the first professor of criminology in Britain. Radzinowicz's brand of criminology, indeed his approach to the subject, was born of a philosophical belief that there must be a connection between criminology and criminal policy and that the study of criminology, shorn of the study of law and policy, is both arid and dangerous – and particularly dangerous when it ignores the wider questions of social and political values. It is worth remembering that many of Britain's early criminologists were all too well aware of the threat of the unchecked state, as criminologists like Radzinowicz (and his contemporaries Hermann Mannheim and Max Grunhut) were exiles from Nazi persecution in Europe.

It is perhaps therefore unsurprising that Radznowicz believed criminology must always keep in mind the liberty of the citizen. While Radzinowicz often worked with the government, he was by no means an apologist for policy with which he disagreed, and was a fierce critic of the government on occasion. He made no secret of his dislike for criminal justice policy under Thatcher in the 1980s, and often expressed his opposition to official policy, criticising for example the privatisation of the prisons and dangerous offender legislation.

In the late 1960s a group of young academics including Stan Cohen, David Downes, Paul Rock, Ian Taylor and Jock Young established the National Deviancy Conference (NDC) which was first held in York in 1968. These academics were dissatisfied with the orthodox (and government-linked) British criminology and were influenced by American interactionist sociology. Many of the core practitioners went on to be involved with critical criminology and/or the Left Realist movement. The NDC was a radical breakaway from the Third National Conference of Teaching and Research on Criminology at the University of Cambridge, a move that Radzinowicz subsequently suggested was a deliberate slight to him. Certainly in part the break was one also born of dissatisfaction with some of the medical, legal and psychological assumptions that NDC members felt characterised orthodox 'positivist criminology' of those like Radzinowicz. The NDC sowed the seeds for a sociologically grounded criminology in the UK that was less tied to the workings of the state.

Criminology is often regarded as a social science, and it is almost always hard, and possibly impossible, for social scientific theory to remove itself from ideological considerations. This means that when you study criminology, you may not be able to be 'value free'. You may believe some things are good, right, proper or ethical, or that others are not. It is important that you consider different perspectives and look at issues in a considered way, asking probing questions about what might previously have been 'taken for granted'.

If you want to immediately see disagreement in criminology, then there is no better place to start than with the concept of crime.

1.5 WHAT IS CRIME?

It may at first seem like a simple question, but perhaps the first thing to consider for criminologists should be the question 'what is a crime?' The answer may seem simple, but in reality it is perhaps more complex than you might think.

When people talk generally about crime they often do not stop and consider what it actually is they refer to. As a criminologist, one of the first points to remember is that crime is not static or fixed, it constantly changes. Things that once were not criminalized become so, such as paedophiles 'grooming' victims on the internet, or 'stalking' a former partner. Similarly, activities which were illegal may become legal, such as consenting homosexual behaviour between men.

Crime also differs in terms of geography. What is a crime in one place may not be a crime in another, with different countries, and different parts of different countries having different laws.

Why does some behaviour become a crime, while other types of behaviour do not? Clearly we do not all have the power to make behaviours that we do not agree with criminal, nor do we have the power to remove the label 'criminal' if it has been applied to behaviours with which we agree. This power instead rests in the hands of politicians (who create the law), judges (who interpret it), and those responsible for enforcing the law. It is important to remember that such actions do not occur in a void. Public opinion undoubtedly can impact upon this process, as do other powerful groups such as the media. Therefore a key issue when we think about crime is power.

10 Criminology: The essentials

Most people would probably argue that a criminal is someone who commits a crime, or who breaks the law. However, everyone will break the law at some point in their lives, and yet, clearly most people do not think of themselves as criminals.

Technically, and legally, actions are not necessarily 'criminal' until conviction by a court of law. The problem with this, however, is that a great deal of crime will go unreported, undetected, or will not be prosecuted. For this reason the term 'criminal' is not the only one that you will encounter in criminology. The term 'deviant' is sometimes used, but rather than clarifying criminology's subject matter, this can also serve to further confuse some people.

There are identifiable differences between what we mean when we talk about crime as opposed to deviance:

- **Crime** – generally used to describe behaviour that breaks the criminal law.
- **Deviance** – describes behaviour that is statistically uncommon, marginal, and not mainstream, but may not be illegal or prohibited by law.

In reality the terms are not always used carefully and the distinction is not always apparent.

For how long should someone be considered a criminal after committing an offence? Society considers some criminal convictions in some circumstances spent after a certain amount of time, but in a wider society there are no such rules.

1.6 PERSPECTIVES ON CRIME

There is no simple answer to the question of what constitutes crime. Instead there are a range of different perspectives about what should be considered the remit or focus of criminological study. It is to these I will now turn.

THE LEGALISTIC POSITION

The legalistic position is perhaps a good starting point for considering how we define crime and what is regarded as an appropriate focus for criminological research. The legalistic position suggests that what constitutes

crime is a violation of the criminal law. It is often associated with Michael (a lawyer) and Adler (a philosopher) who believed:

The most precise and least ambiguous definition of crime is that which defines it as behavior that is prohibited by the criminal code. It follows that a criminal is a person who has behaved in some way prohibited by the criminal law. (Michael and Adler, 1933: 2)

Michael and Adler produced this definition because they believed it would allow for scientific study of crime. However, it may be naïve to assume that by using an uncomplicated definition the subject becomes simple. Crime is a social phenomenon that involves people in complex interactions. Therefore, while there have been criminologists who supported a fixed legalistic definition of crime, this trend has passed and few criminologists would now accept the argument that criminologists should uncritically accept simple violations of the law as defining what they study. However, one exception to this view is 'crime science' which tends unquestioningly to take crime as simply given and is concerned only with violations of the law.

SOCIAL CONFLICT

Sociologist Thorsten Sellin challenged the legalistic position. He argued that, as 'scientists' criminologists should not be constrained simply by legal codes:

The unqualified acceptance of the legal definitions of the basic units or elements of criminological inquiry violates a fundamental criterion of science. The scientist must have freedom to define his own terms, based on the intrinsic character of his material and designating properties in that material which are assumed to be universal. (Sellin, 1938: 31)

Sellin believed that in a healthy, homogeneous society, laws were based upon rules of normal behaviour. People largely did not break society's laws because those laws reflected their views. To simplify what was essentially an extremely sophisticated argument, Sellin believed that the core component in crime is conflict between cultures. Crime is more complex than simply the act of breaking the legal code and arises out of competing interests

12 Criminology: The essentials

between groups in society. Therefore understanding these conflicts of interest rather than unquestioningly accepting that crime is a violation of law was essential.

COMPETING GROUP INTERESTS

George Vold's (1958) work could be regarded as building on Sellin's arguments. Vold differed from Sellin in that he was influenced by the idea that the criminal law does not always reflect the values of the society. He sought to explain why laws were made and whose interests they represented. Vold examined conflict between interest groups in the same culture. He suggested that people come together united by particular interests, and the desire to see those interests represented. He suggested that when two groups had conflicting interests, they might be able to agree a compromise position, but alternatively one side might be able to exert greater influence and be able to gain the state's support, which might then lead to legislation against the other.

Vold's concept is interesting as clearly powerful interest groups are heard more than the 'average man or woman' on the street and may have a greater influence on those with political power. However, this does not account for criminal behaviour that does not arise from group interests.

CRIME EXISTS TO PROTECT THE RULING CLASS

William Chambliss's (1978) views are extremely radical and based upon Marxist theory. Chambliss contended that acts defined as criminal existed to protect the ruling economic class. Crime served to reduce surplus labour, whilst providing jobs for some people in the criminal justice system. More importantly, crime, for the working class, was a smoke-screen. It focused their attention on the criminal actions of some within their own class, diverting attention away from the exploitation they were subjected to at the hands of the capitalist system.

In *The Social Reality of Crime* (1970), Richard Quinney, an American writer, updated the views of Chambliss, arguing that the criminal law protects powerful interest groups. Quinney asserted that neither individuals nor their behaviour are inherently criminal. He suggested that the powerful

decide on prohibited aspects of behaviour, which becomes a 'social reality' that people accept. Initially concerned, like Sellin and Vold, with societal 'conflict', Quinney moved towards a more radical standpoint and argued (like Chambliss) that the criminal justice system was a powerful tool for ensuring that power remained in the hands of the elite.

CRIME AS A SOCIAL HARM AND 'ZEMIOLOGY'

In his work *White Collar Crime* (1949) American sociologist Edwin Sutherland offered a definition of crime that had not previously been considered in academic debate.

In *White Collar Crime* Sutherland suggested that many of the crimes involving business people were not dealt with by criminal law but by regulatory and civil law, despite the fact that they caused harm to society (social harm). He argued that in order to avoid class bias within criminology, crime should be expanded to include any act causing social harm that was prohibited by any law (not necessarily just criminal law).

One objector to this approach was Paul Tappan (1947) who argued that it would be wrong to label any person or organization as criminal if they had not been found guilty of a criminal offence. Tappan argued that it is important that the presumption should always be that people are innocent until proven guilty. More recently, and more controversially, the notion of crime as a social harm has been further extended.

In *Order, Law and Crime* (1985), Michalowski argued that any act, even if it is legal, should be considered criminal if it causes something he calls 'analogous social injury' (by this he essentially means any form of social harm). This reasoning could, for example, lead to tobacco firms being held responsible for all the deaths caused by smoking.

More recently this view has been taken up by those keen to move criminology away from a simplistic focus on crime, such as Paddy Hillyard and colleagues. These academics have spearheaded a movement called zemiology (Hillyard et al., 2004).

Zemiology is the study of social harm rather than crime and gets its name from the Greek word *zemia*, meaning harm. It originated as a critique of criminology and the notion of crime. In contrast with 'individual-based harms' such as theft, the notion of social harm or social injury incorporates harms caused by nation states and corporations. These ideas have received increased

14 Criminology: The essentials

attention from critical academics such as neo-Marxists and feminists in the last decade. Indeed zemiologists would argue for example that a narrow focus on crime excludes a focus on more serious harms. Many incidents which cause serious harm are either not part of the criminal law or, if they could be dealt with by it, are either ignored or handled without resort to it. The undue attention given to events which are defined as crimes distracts attention from more serious harm, such as pollution or poverty. Indeed zemiology shows that criminalization and punishment can inflict social harms, and argues that the criminal justice system has many stages which can inflict pain in a discrete manner: defining, classifying, broadcasting, disposing and punishing the offender. Furthermore, these processes create wider social problems and social harms, which can bear little or no relationship to the initial crime and cause excessive social harm and suffering disproportionate to the original harm that was caused by the crime. For example, jailing an individual for personal drug possession may lead to loss of jobs, family problems and a lack of employment opportunity in the future, in effect doing more harm than good. Therefore some zemiologists question the harmful practices of the administration of criminal justice.

CRIME AS THE VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The key proponents of this argument are Herman and Julia Schwendinger (1970).

Their approach argues that all humans have certain natural rights, such as, right to life, liberty, good health, freedom of movement, happiness, etc. According to this perspective, criminology should be the study of the violation of human rights. This, they argue, provides a more objective unit of study than that provided by the legalistic position on crime. This perspective also allows for states and governments to be judged to be criminal. They asked:

Isn't it time to raise serious questions about the assumptions underlying the definition of the field of criminology, when a man who steals a paltry sum can be called a criminal while agents of the State can, with impunity, legally reward men who destroy food so that price levels can be maintained whilst a sizable portion of the population suffers from malnutrition? (Schwendinger and Schwendinger, 1970: 137)

However, this approach does not solve all problems regarding definitions. Do people all around the world agree on what human rights people are entitled to? Is there a consensus on what constitutes a right? Their argument requires people to accept that a consensus can be reached.

CRIME AS A SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION

The concept of crime as a social construction is one that suggests that crime is decided by society. Society makes the laws that regulate individuals' behaviour, and so society determines what is considered criminal and what is lawful.

Those who see crime as a social construction suggest that deviance 'is in the eyes of the beholder'. In other words, there is nothing inherently criminal about a certain act. Therefore it would follow that the focus of criminology should be how and why some acts become criminal and others do not. The vital questions for those who see crime as a social construction is, 'in whose interest was it that a certain act was criminalized?'

The most frequently cited work of relevance that argues that crime is a social construction is that of Howard Becker, who argued that 'social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance' (Becker, 1963: 8). This is one of the most used quotes in criminology.

More recently the socially constructed nature of crime is recognised, for example, by those of a cultural criminological persuasion. Similarly, those of a critical persuasion continue to highlight how the contemporary social construction of crime often locates the most serious crimes at the bottom of the social strata, while failing to see the 'criminality' of expense-swindling politicians, corporate crooks, reckless bankers, profit-chasing entrepreneurs whose behaviour may be little formally criminalized. Indeed, while this may be changing in the wake of the global financial crisis, it remains a most pertinent point that the legal status of a behaviour – and whether that behaviour is defined as a crime – lies not in the content of the behaviour itself but in the social responses to and the social and moral standing of the offenders and the victims.

In criminology it is important that the use of the terms 'crime' and 'criminal' must be carefully considered. Who and what is considered criminal is a complex debate without easy answers. If you understand this you have moved away from commonsense and opinion-based arguments about crime to a point where you think more carefully. In doing this you are beginning to think like a criminologist!

1.7 CATEGORISING CRIMINOLOGICAL THEORY

In reading Part 2 of this book you will be exposed to a wide array of criminological theory and theorists. It is at this point, however, that I advise you to read this part with caution, and to bear in mind that the terms we use to make sense of different theories will vary. So, for example, one theory may be known by a number of different names. In addition, some criminologists over time have aligned themselves with various different theoretical perspectives.

You should also be careful to try to avoid associating criminologists with specific theories. It is always worth remembering the words of one of Britain's most prominent criminologists, Sir Leon Radzinowicz, who suggested that 'the tendency amongst a number of criminologists to attach labels to each other is rather widespread, though by no means always fair or correct' (Radzinowicz, 1999: 198). Try to look at criminological writing with an open mind and see how theory is used in it, but don't assume that the author necessarily subscribes to a specific theoretical position.