



**Acts of Terrorism as crime;
Criminology and Social Policy
in Context of Disciplines ;The Cousins.**

By ;

Dr.Wael Sultan (Editor, Author)

Ass. Prof. / Fadi Muhammad .

Head of fields social work - College social work - Beni-Suef University.

Ass. Prof. / Abdel Nabi Khater - Head of fields social work

- The Higher Institute of Social work in Cairo.

General Dr. Fawzy Abu Talib

- Ministry of Interior





Abstract:

Carson McCullers(1917-1967) is an acclaimed American

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank The spirit of My professors; prof. Nemat Eldemerdash. prof. Kamal Agha and prof. Ahmed Olaa the dean of The Higher Institute of Social Work in Cairo and his Agent my Loyal friend prof. Mohamed Mahmud for supporting me through my research.

Abstract

Some have questioned whether one can speak of Terrorism Studies as a single field. The study of terrorism can indeed be approached from different disciplines such as criminology, political science, war and peace studies, communication studies or religious studies; as a consequence, one can interpret terrorism in different frameworks: acts of terrorism as crime; acts of terrorism as politics; acts of terrorism as warfare; acts of terrorism as communication; acts of terrorism as religious crusade/jihad. These are, as it were, five conceptual lenses through which we can look at terrorism. All of these ‘frames’ are useful to understand better some aspects of some forms of terrorism. Yet it would be wrong to single out any one of these frameworks and claim that it is the ‘right’ one. They are not mutually exclusive. An act of terrorist violence can be criminal and political at the same time, making it a political crime or a criminal offence with political repercussions. that reflecting the evolution of the field of Terrorism Studies and Outline some of the developments in the field of Terrorism Studies. Criminology and social policy share a common focus of concern and strategy of inquiry. Both disciplines concern themselves with ‘action’ rather than ‘thought. To explore the relationship between criminology and social policy further, it is worthwhile to compare the outlook of two founders. Leon Radzinowicz in criminology and Richard Titmuss in social policy have had great influence on their respective disciplines The role of



criminologists in a welfare state is complicated. Some argue criminologists should join their cousins in social policy in building and strengthening the welfare state. Others insist that criminologists should engage the role of outside provocateur; external critics who challenge the government to do something more or something else. These arguments reflect differing beliefs about the value of social-science knowledge and political strategies for bringing about social change. This study attempts to investigate and analyse both disciplines by demonstrating the similarities and differences between Criminology and Social Policy. this dissertation aims to explore the relationship between them and its impact on studying acts of terrorism as crime . At the end of the study , Pro: and Con: .

Key words: Terrorism - Crime – Criminology - Social Policy .

Methodology

Methodology can be understood, in a limited sense, to mean the various kinds of methods used for gathering data. The method used in this research project is qualitative research which is defined as ‘an inductive view of the relationship between theory and research, whereby the former is generated out of the latter. To generate theory analysis of ‘words’ rather than numbers to provide effective qualitative research, however to ensure research is correct, information obtained needs to be credible. So, there was an importance of promoting the aims of research, such as knowledge, truth, and avoidance of error. prohibitions against fabricating, falsifying, or misrepresenting research data promote the truth and avoid error’ allowing for credible research to be obtained.

Acts of Terrorism as crime

Terror is a natural phenomenon; terrorism is the conscious exploitation of it. Terrorism is coercive, designed to manipulate



the will of its victims and its larger audience. The great degree of fear is generated by the crime's very nature, by the manner of its perpetration, or by its senselessness, wantonness, or callous indifference to human life. This terrible fear is the source of the .^(v)terrorist's power and communicates his challenge to society.

'Terror' is, first of all, a state of mind characterized by intense fear of a threatening danger on an individual level and by a climate of fear on the collective level. 'Terrorism', on the other hand, is an activity, method or tactic which, as a psychological ^(v)outcome, aims to produce 'terror'.

Let us begin by looking at some recent changes. In the 1990s, Bruce Hoffman and others have, for instance, observed a especially ^(r)substantial rise of religiously motivated terrorism, after clerics managed to seize power in Iran in the 1979.

A terrorist, on the other hand, is usually not uniformed (unless he wears the uniform of his opponent as a ruse) and hides his weapons. Guerrilla fighters and soldiers act in situations of armed conflict. Terrorists, on the other hand, often act in peacetime, outside zones of conflict although they might also act in a situation of (quasi-)occupation. All three – soldiers, guerrillas and terrorists – use violence, but the first two groups target only armed security forces, although they might hit civilians by mistake or, under military necessity, are prepared to risk considerable 'collateral damage' among civilian facilities and populations. Terrorists, on the other hand, target unarmed civilians and Non-combatants deliberately to produce shock and

[□] U.S. National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Report of the Task Force on Disorders and Terrorism. Washington, DC: GPO, 1976, p. 3.□

[□] Alex P. Schmid, Political Terrorism: A Research Guide to Concepts, Theories, Databases and Literature. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1984, pp. 64–72.□

[□] Bruce Hoffman, 'Terrorism and WMD: Some Preliminary Hypotheses'. Nonproliferation Review, 4(3), Spring–Summer 1997, p. 48.□



awe. In war, much of their behaviour would constitute war crimes. In peacetime, it constitutes gross violations of human ⁽¹⁾rights and serious crimes.

However, this does not exclude the possibility that terrorists also occasionally (if they are not suicidal or when the odds are not overwhelmingly against them) attack armed forces in ambushes and hitand- run operations. On those occasions, they are, however, not ‘terrorists’ but ‘guerrilla fighters’, ‘partisans’, ‘insurgents’, ‘rebels’, ‘enemy combatants’, etc. Yet when the basic distinction between attacks on armed and unarmed people is dropped, a group that disregards it is likely to be qualified as terrorist only. Al-Qaeda’s leader, Osama bin Laden, has taken such a position when he said, ‘We do not have to differentiate between military or civilian. As far as we are concerned, they ⁽²⁾[the Americans] are all targets.

Another phenomenon was frequently warned about is a trend towards ‘cyber-terrorism’. While there has been plenty of cyber-crime (e.g. identity theft on the internet, fraud, hacking) and even an occasional case of cyber-murder (like changing, via the internet, a hospital pharmacy’s prescription for a patient, who, as a consequence, died from an overdose), cyber-terrorism has, to my knowledge, not yet occurred (depending, of course, on how This raises the ⁽³⁾one wishes to define ‘cyber’ and ‘terrorism’). issue of how narrow or broad the definition of terrorism should be. Also not yet occurred to the terrorists themselves. An example is ‘agro-terrorism’ – attacks on the human food chain at source

[1] Sherman, D.J. and Nardin, T. (eds), *Terror, Culture, Politics: Rethinking 9/11*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006, p. 190.□

[2] The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States, 9/11 Report. New York: the NYT edition, 2004, p. 72..□

[3] Brown, L.V., *Cyberterrorism and Computer Attacks*, New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2006, p. 12.□



Using broad (and changing) definitions of ‘terrorism’ has been a constant problem in the field of Terrorism Studies. The broader the concept of terrorism is made, the greater the chance that different people will be talking about different things when they ⁽¹⁾use the term ‘terrorism’ .

As a tactic, method or form of direct action, terrorism can be used by a very diverse group of actors. It is useful to be reminded here of some of the diversity of terrorist actors. A basic typology revolutionary left-wing and anarchist ⁽²⁾ of terrorism is as follows: groups; vigilante and paramilitary death squads; state or state-sponsored terrorists; criminal organizations employing terrorist tactics; single-issue groups; psychologically disturbed individuals and copycat terrorists; ‘lone wolf’ and ‘leaderless resistance’ terrorists. religious and millenarian groups; ethno-nationalist, separatist and irredentist groups; racist and right-wing groups.

Add to this diversity of actors the diversity of motives and combine them, and one begins to realize the complexity of the terrorist phenomenon that calls for explanations. Some of the ⁽³⁾principal motivations of terrorists are as follows: :

propaganda/attention- or recognition-seeking: propaganda of the deed; provocation of counter-measures/overreaction; disruption, e.g. of a peace process or of a regime’s economic sources of income; seeking martyrdom: performing suicide operations as an example for others to emulate; morale building: demonstrating to terrorists’ constituency an image of strength; elimination of opposing forces (e.g. by a surgical strike ‘at the heart of the

⁽¹⁾Arblaster, ‘Terrorism: Myths, Meaning and Morals’. Political Studies, 25(3), September 1977, pp. 414, 421 □

⁽²⁾Rafhaeli, N., ‘Financing of Terrorism: Sources, Methods and Channels’. Terrorism and Political Violence, 15(4), Winter 2003, pp. 59–82 .□

⁽³⁾Honderich, T., After the Terror. Oxford: Edinburgh University Press, 2003, p. 59 .□



extortion of money to finance a campaign of violence. ⁽¹⁾ state²); : revenge: historically, retaliation has been a powerful motive for terrorists; intimidation and disorientation: wearing down the morale of an opponent; demands: political blackmail to obtain concessions (‘fulfil our demands, or else . . .’).

If one adds to these (non-exhaustive) lists of perpetrator types and underlying motives some of the instruments in the terrorist toolbox, the task of explaining terrorism becomes even more ⁽⁴⁾challenging.

The following are some major tactics from the terrorists’ hostage taking in combination with site occupation ^(r) toolkit: for coercive bargaining; hijacking or skyjacking for political blackmail; assassination of high-level public figures to terrorize other public figures; arson or firebombing of iconic objects in the opponent’s camp; focused or indiscriminate assaults on people in public spaces; bombings, e.g. car or truck bombings; disappearances (kidnapping + torture + murder); beheadings in front of a rolling camcorder for broadcasting; torture for intimidation; suicide- or kamikaze-type human bomb attacks; mass poisoning; use of unconventional ⁽⁴⁾large-scale massacres; weapons (CBRN). distribution of death lists of persons to be killed; punishment, e.g. through mutilation such as cutting off hands; mass rape for the humiliation of males in the opposite camp; kidnapping of people for ransom or political concessions.

⁽¹⁾Costigan, S.S. and Gold, D. (eds), *Terrornomics*. Oxford: Ashgate, 2007 , p. 34 .□

⁽²⁾Netzley, P.D., *Greenhaven Encyclopedia of Terrorism*. Garmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven Press, 2007, p. 119 .□

⁽³⁾Tilly, C., ‘Terror, Terrorism, Terrorists’. *Sociological Theory*, 22(1), March 2004, pp. 5–13 .□

⁽⁴⁾Waldron, J., ‘Terrorism and the Uses of Terror’. *Journal of Ethics*, 8(1), March 2004, pp. 5–35 .□



In short: terrorism is complex and wide enough which is why it^(v) is often treated as a field of studies in its own right.

Some have questioned whether one can speak of Terrorism Studies as a single field. The study of terrorism can indeed be approached from different disciplines such as criminology, political science, war and peace studies, communication studies or religious studies; as a consequence, one can interpret terrorism in different frameworks: acts of terrorism as crime; acts of terrorism as politics; acts of terrorism as warfare; acts of terrorism as communication; acts of terrorism as religious^(v) crusade/jihad.

These are, as it were, five conceptual lenses through which we can look at terrorism. All of these 'frames' are useful to understand better some aspects of some forms of terrorism. Yet it would be wrong to single out any one of these frameworks and claim that it is the 'right' one. They are not mutually exclusive, either. An act of terrorist violence can be criminal and political at the same time, making it a political crime or a criminal offence^(v) with political repercussions.

These five frameworks are not exhaustive; there are other conceptual lenses. One can, for instance, also explore terrorism in a framework of (social) psychology. This is especially appropriate when one is dealing with 'lone wolf' terrorists. This approach is also germane when it comes to the study of victims of terrorism. The psychological dimension – which overlaps with

□ Mike Maguire, Rod Morgan and Robert Reiner (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Crime*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997, , p.73.and in Charles Webel and Johan Galtung (eds), *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*. London: Routledge, 2007 . , p. 83.□

□ Alex P. Schmid, 'Frameworks for Conceptualizing Terrorism'. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 2004, pp. 197-221.□

□ Silke, A., 'The Devil You Know: Continuing Problems with Research on Terrorism'. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 2001, pp. 1-14.□



the communication dimension but also touches on the religious dimension – might bring us closer to a better understanding of some of the root causes of terrorism (e.g. humiliation resulting in ⁽¹⁾revenge) .

The literature on terrorism has, strangely enough, not focused So, ⁽²⁾very much on an analysis of ‘terror’ as a state of mind. Every student of terrorism tends to approach the subject with a certain ideological baggage and/or has a preferred interpretation ⁽³⁾framework.

As in the case of research on organized crime or torture, some methods of study are clearly inappropriate (e.g. a preferred approach of anthropologists: participatory observation), and others are very risky (such as interviewing terrorists in the field).If looking at the theories used by our respondents to study ⁽⁴⁾terrorism, it becomes clear that there is again great variety.

Now, How can one study terrorism when it often accompanies other forms of political violence, including insurgencies and war – not to mention other, less violent or not violent forms of political communications, both persuasive and coercive? Clearly, it should not be studied in isolation. The answers of our expert respondents might give us some clues. In the following, they provide us with a long research agenda, with much less overlap than one would expect. In the following two lists, I divide their answers into items related to terrorism and counter-terrorism

⁽¹⁾Silke, A. (ed.), *Research on Terrorism: Trends, Achievements and Failures*. London: Frank Cass, 2004, pp. 111–141.□

⁽²⁾Richard L. Gregory (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to the Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987, p. 770□

⁽³⁾A.P. Schmid and J. de Graaf, *Violence as Communication: Insurgent Terrorism and the Western News Media*. London: Sage, 1982., p.43.□

⁽⁴⁾Earl Conteh-Morgan in his book *Collective Political Violence: An Introduction to the Theories and Cases of Violent Conflicts*. New York: Routledge, 2004, p. 8 .□



The following are their responses to the question ⁽¹⁾ respectively.
 ‘Where do you see the main research priorities in the field of political terrorism?’

Factors influencing terrorist groups’ willingness to escalate the better understanding of ⁽²⁾level and scope of violence;
 better ⁽³⁾connections between terrorism and the media;
 understanding of the role of the internet in the development of ⁽⁴⁾ the link between terrorism and insurgency; ⁽⁵⁾terrorism;
 linkages and similarities between transnational organized crime discovering how real is the threat of ⁽⁶⁾and terrorist groups;
 terrorism and failed, failing or ⁽⁷⁾cyberterrorism;
⁽⁸⁾ outside sponsoring or support;⁽⁹⁾transitional/developing states;
⁽¹⁰⁾ funding and financing of terrorism by using NGOs or charities;

□ Gordon, A., ‘The Peripheral Terrorism Literature: Bringing It Closer to the Core’. *Scientometrics*, March 2005, pp. 403 – 414.□

□ Combs, C. and Slann, M., *Encyclopedia of Terrorism*. New York: Checkmark Books, 2003, p. 316.□

□ Combs Linden, E.V. (ed.), *Focus on Terrorism*, vol. 1. New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2002, p. 77.□

□ Laqueur, W., *No End to War: Terrorism in the 21st Century*. New York: Continuum, 2004, p. 91.□

□ Kushner, H.W., *Encyclopedia of Terrorism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2003, p. 411.□

□ Schmid, A.P. and Jongman, A.J., *Political Terrorism: A New Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Data Bases, Theories and Literature*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1988, p. 76.□

□ Harmon, C.C., *Terrorism Today*. London: Routledge, 2007, p. 5.□

□ F. Shanty (ed.), *Encyclopedia of World Terrorism*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2002, p. 82.□

□ Tishkov, V., *Chechnya: Life in a War-Torn Society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004, p. 1.□

□□ Keeley, R.V., ‘Trying to Define Terrorism’. *Middle East Policy*, 9(1), March 2002, pp. 33–39.□



de-radicalization – under what ⁽ⁱ⁾ measuring the costs of terrorism. circumstances and through what set of actions by authorities, ^(r) affected communities, etc. do terrorist campaigns end?; research, preferably comparative, into the justification and legitimization of terrorism in various conflicts, ideologies, the problem of political ^(r) religions and communities; transformation of armed movements that have used terrorist means and their integration in the context of stabilization or the ^(o) ideologies and structures of terrorist groups;^(t) peace process; analysing and critiquing the ideologies and doctrines that are used to recruit and issue articulated and well-researched counter-^(v) analysis of terrorist social networks;⁽ⁱ⁾ arguments; understanding how individuals make the decision to leave understanding innovation in terrorist tactics, targets, ^(h) terrorism;

[□] Sandler, T. and Enders, W., *The Political Economy of Terrorism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, p. 21. [□]

[□] Eban Kaplan, 'Terrorists and the internet'. Council Foreign Relations, 8 January 2004, at www.cfr.org/publication/100005/terrorists_and_the_internet.html. [□]

[□] Fletcher, G.P., 'The Indefinable Concept of Terrorism'. *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, 4(5), November 2006, pp. 894–911. [□]

[□] Weinberg, L. and Pedahzur, A., *Political Parties and Terrorist Groups*. New York: Routledge, 2003, p. 8. [□]

[□] Glynn, S., 'Deconstructing Terrorism'. *Philosophical Forum*, 36(1), March 2005, pp. 113–128. [□]

[□] Senechal de la Roche, R., 'Toward a Scientific Theory of Terrorism'. *Sociological Theory*, 22(1), March 2004, pp. 1–4. [□]

[□] Grob-Fitzgibbon, B., 'What Is Terrorism? Redefining a Phenomenon in Times of War'. *Peace and Change*, 30(2), April 2005, pp. 231–246. [□]

[□] Max Taylor and John Horgan (eds), *The Future of Terrorism*. London: Frank Class, 1999, p. 2. [□]



in explaining terrorism as violence vis-⁽¹⁾ strategies and weapons;
 in creating a comprehensive ^(v) à-vis other forms of violence;
 the ^(r) database that covers all violent incidents by country;
 definition of terrorism as a basic tool of international
 understanding the fundamental causes of ^(t) cooperation;
 determination of the factors leading individuals or ^(e) terrorism;
 identifying the genesis of terrorist ^(v) groups to become terrorists;
 group emergence and decline database, cross-^(v) campaigns;
 identifying (early-warning) ^(a) national, longitudinal database;
^(a) indicators for the emergence of radicalization processes;
 examining the ⁽¹⁾ finding out how and why terrorism ends;

□ Neumann, P.R. and Smith, M.L.R., *The Strategy of Terrorism*. London: Routledge, 2007, p. 113. □

□ Ruby, C.L., 'The Definition of Terrorism'. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 2(1), December 2002, pp. 9–14. □

□ Crenshaw, M. and Pimlott, J. (eds), *Encyclopedia of World Terrorism*, 5 vols. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1997, p. 101. □

□ Boaz Ganor, 'Terrorism: No Prohibition without definition' (7 October 2001). Available at <http://www.ict.org.il/articles/articledet.cfm?articleid=393> □

□ Symeonidou-Kastanidou, E., 'Defining Terrorism'. *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*, 12(1), 2004, pp. 14–35. □

□ Enders, W. and Sandler, T., *The Political Economy of Terrorism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, p. 22. □

□ Linden, E.V. (ed.), *Handbook on Terrorism: A CD-ROM Presentation*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2006, p. 164. □

□ Crenshaw, M. (ed.), *Terrorism in Context*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995, p. 7. □

□ Malthaner, S. and Waldmann, P., 'Terrorism in Germany: Old and New Problems'. In M. van Leeuwen (ed.), *Confronting Terrorism*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 2003, p. 55. □

□ Louise Richardson, 'Terrorists as Transnational Actors'. In Max Taylor and Horgan (eds), *The Future*

□ □ Louise Richardson, 'Terrorists as Transnational Actors'. In Max Taylor and Horgan (eds), *The Future*



the ⁽¹⁾ why there is a seemingly endless supply of suicide terrorists;
⁽²⁾ roots of popular support to terrorist groups .

This list is long but, despite partial overlap, it is useful to present a broad range of suggestions for further research on terrorism. The second list, focusing on counter-terrorism, is just as long. It summarizes responses to the question ‘Where do you see the main research priorities in the field of political terrorism, its ⁽³⁾ prevention and counter-measures against terrorism?’

What is interesting is that the suggestions focus very much on non-state terrorism, as if state (or regime) terrorism were a thing of the past. Also strange is the absence of concern for victim issues. Yet despite such limitations and a predominantly Western ⁽⁴⁾ focus, these are very useful suggestions.

However, many of these topics will be hard to investigate, especially if the researcher has access only to open sources. This brings us to the question of how to study clandestine actors working from the underground or secret government locations. There is a distinction between ‘not violent’ and ‘non-violent’. The latter refers to a specific form of persuasive and coercive influencing of an opponent and third parties to a conflict as practised by Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King and others.

of Terrorism. London: Frank Cass, 1999, p. 2. □

□ Gunaratna, R., *The Changing Face of Terrorism*. Singapore: Eastern University Press, 2004, p. 41. □

□ Malthaner, S. and Waldmann, P., ‘Terrorism in Germany: Old and New Problems’. In M. van Leeuwen (ed.), *Confronting Terrorism*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 2003, p. 93. □

□ Schmid, A.P., ‘Terrorism: The Definitional Problem’. *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law*, 2004, pp. 375–419. □

□ Govier, T., *A Delicate Balance: What Philosophy Can Tell Us about Terrorism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2004, p. 18. □



The former merely refers to an absence of overt violence in
(^v) political activities.

If compare this list with the answers we received when we put the same question, ‘Which

conceptual questions on terrorism are, in your view, not yet adequately solved?’, to experts in 1986, we find that some of the problems have remained more or less the same – unresolved or still disputed despite a quarter-century of thinking on these issues. To varying degrees, this refers to conceptual issues such as: the boundaries between terrorism and other forms of political violence; whether government terrorism and resistance terrorism are part of the same phenomenon; the relationship between guerrilla warfare and terrorism; the problem of value judgements in determining which acts of political violence are legitimate or patriotic and which are terroristic; the relationship between terrorism as a concept and terrorism as a phenomenon; the
(^v) relationship between crime and terrorism.

Criminology and Social Policy

Ordinarily, criminology and social policy are thought of as separate disciplines. But during the past decade or so, a combined course of study has become available at British This raises the question of what these two (^v) universities. disciplines are about: how they are alike, where they differ.

(□) Cf. Andrew Silke (ed.), *Research on Terrorism: Trends, Achievements and Failures*. London: Frank Cass, 2004. p. 3. □

(□) A.P. Schmid et al., *Political Terrorism*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1988, pp. 29–31. □

(□) J.B.S. Hardman, ‘Terrorism’. In *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 14. New York: Macmillan, 1936, pp. 575–576. □



Criminology and social policy share a common focus of concern and strategy of inquiry. Both disciplines concern themselves with ⁽¹⁾ ‘action’ rather than ‘thought’ .

The term ‘social policy’ also refers to the policies themselves, that is, an arena of public policy concerning social welfare. (And when this term appears in the chapters to follow, it almost ⁽²⁾ always has this meaning.) Policy areas typically referred to as comprising social policy include social security; unemployment . While these ⁽³⁾ insurance, housing, health, education and family areas do not cover the widest range of social policy, they are consistent with the vision of the welfare state supplied by William Beveridge in 1942. The Beveridge Report called for an attack on the ‘five giant evils’ of want, disease, ignorance, ⁽⁴⁾ squalor, and idleness.

During the 1940s, legislation laid the foundations of the post-war welfare state but this area has since been incorporated into the welfare state. As an academic discipline, criminology is linked . The ⁽⁵⁾ with the Lombrosian project and the governmental project. Lombrosian project refers to Cesare Lombroso’s effort in the late nineteenth century to explain the difference between criminals and non-criminals. While he failed in his specific programme, he did manage to popularise criminology as the scientific study of

⁽¹⁾ Halsey, A.H. , A History of Sociology in Britain. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, p. 3.□

⁽²⁾ Peace, Robin , ‘Social Exclusion: A Concept in Need of Definition?’, Social Policy Journal of New Zealand , 2001, p. 16.□

⁽³⁾ Boutellier, Hans , ‘The Convergence of Social Policy and Criminal Justice’, European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research , 2001, p. 361.□

⁽⁴⁾ Bernburg, Jon , ‘Anomie, Social Change and Crime: A Theoretical Examination of Institutional-anomie Theory’, British Journal of Sociology , 2002, p. 42.□

⁽⁵⁾ Garland, David (2002) ‘Of Crimes and Criminals: The Development of Criminology in Britain’, in Mike Maguire, Rod Morgan and Robert Reiner (eds) The Oxford Handbook of Criminology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, p. 14.□



The governmental project, developed ⁽¹⁾ criminal behaviour. several decades later, began with efforts to generate a practical knowledge for more efficient management of police and prisons.

But in Britain, historically speaking, criminology did not ⁽²⁾ extend from Lombroso. The first university lectures in criminology were given in Birmingham in the 1920s by prison ⁽³⁾ medical officers to postgraduate students in Medici.

Criminology did not really become institutionalised in Britain until the years after the Second World War. Hermann Mannheim, a legal scholar and refugee from Hitler's Germany, offered the first sustained introduction to criminology in his lectures in the Department of Sociology during the 1930s. Mannheim became a Reader in Criminology at the LSE in 1946, the first senior post in ⁽⁴⁾ the subject established at a British university.

Social policy began with 'the social question' which had to do with explaining why poverty persisted in a time of advancing ⁽⁵⁾ prosperity.

Britain's industrial economy had made a quality of life possible for people at the end of the nineteenth century that could scarcely have been imagined in 1800. Yet it had also left many trapped in Beginning ⁽⁶⁾ demoralising poverty, particularly in the cities.

[1] Garland, David, 'The Culture of High-Crime Societies: Some Preconditions of Recent "Law and Order" Policies', *British Journal of Criminology*, 2000, p. 131. □

[2] Young, Malcolm, '*An Inside Job: Policing and Police Culture in Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991, p. 14. □

[3] Garland, David, 'British Criminology Before 1935', *British Journal of Criminology*, 1988, p. 135. □

[4] Hood, Roger, 'Hermann Mannheim and Max Grünhut : Criminological Pioneers in London and Oxford', *British Journal of Criminology*, 2004, p. 481. □

[5] Jones, Chris and Tony Novak, '*Poverty, Welfare and the Disciplinary State*. London: Routledge, 1999, p. 22. □

[6] Hale, Chris and Dima Sabbagh, 'Testing the Relationship Between Unemployment and Crime: A Methodological Comment and Empirical Analysis



before the First World War, social investigators carried out social surveys with the aim of formulating an appropriate response from ⁽¹⁾ government.

Social policy, or social administration as it was known originally, began at this time under the guise of training social workers. The universities of Liverpool, Birmingham, Manchester, and Leicester developed courses for social workers

But like ⁽²⁾ and probation officers before the Second World War. criminology, social policy did not become organised as a university discipline until later on. Richard Titmuss secured his position as Chair in Social Administration at the LSE in 1950, the first academic post in social policy. His work as a historian of the Cabinet Office, culminating in his *Problems of Social Policy* ⁽³⁾ (1950), led to his wide recognition as an expert in social policy.

To explore the relationship between criminology and social policy further, it is worthwhile to compare the outlook of two founders. Leon Radzinowicz in

criminology and Richard Titmuss in social policy have had great influence on their respective disciplines.

The problem of crime, Radzinowicz taught, was intractable. Any attempt to Isolate the cause of criminal behaviour was a wasted effort. He remained skeptical of abstract over-arching theories he considered pretentious as well as esoteric. Sociological

from England and Wales', *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* , 1991, p. 17.□

□ Wilson, William J. , 'Race, Class and Urban Poverty: A Rejoinder', *Ethnic and Racia Studies*, 2003, p. 66.□

□ Blythe, Eric , 'The Impact of the First Term of the New Labour Government on Social Work in Britain: The Interface Between Education Policy and Social Work', *British Journal of Social Work* , 2001, p. 66.□

□ Boutellier, Hans , 'The Convergence of Social Policy and Criminal Justice', *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* , 2001, p. 361.□



approaches advocating a single explanatory structure amounted to ‘unilateral approaches’ leading to conceptual cul-de-sacs. ‘The most that can be done is to throw light upon the ⁽¹⁾ combination of factors or circumstances associated with crime.

Radzinowicz pursued a multi-disciplinary criminology, a vision ⁽²⁾ expressed in the founding of the Institute of Criminology.

The Cambridge Institute received the support of Lord Butler, who had become Home Secretary in 1957. He promoted the need for teams of sociologists, statisticians, psychiatrists, and legal specialists to carry out systematic investigations into criminal behaviour with a focus on intervention and prevention.

Radzinowicz believed in the use of empirical findings in social ⁽³⁾ science as a means of bringing about humanitarian reform of criminal justice administration. He viewed criminology as a discipline that could provide a ‘rational improvement’ in the ⁽⁴⁾ government’s response to crime and criminals.

Reform of archaic practices in the punishment of criminals could only come about, he taught, by systematic research contributing to a long-term plan. Reforms should not follow swings in political expediency or popular emotion following particularly disturbing crimes. Radzinowicz was committed to British liberalism, perhaps because of his status as a European émigré. He endorsed the Howard League for Penal Reform: ‘Being British,’ Radzinowicz said, ‘it was down to earth, practical,

[1] Radzinowicz, Leon , ‘The Cambridge Institute of Criminology: Its Background and Scope. London: HMSO. ,1988, p. 95.□

[2] Taylor, Ian, Paul Walton and Jock Young ,’ The New Criminology. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. ,1973, p. 2.□

[3] Sampson, Robert and John Laub,’ Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life. London: Harvard University Press, 1993, p. 19.□

[4] Hood, Roger ,‘Criminology and Penal Policy: The Vital Role of Empirical Research’, in Anthony Bottoms and Michael Tonry (eds), Ideology, Crime and Criminal Justice. Cullompton: Willan Publishing, 2002, p. 154.□



observant, critical and yet ready to accept reasonable
(¹)compromises

Yet the connection between scientific evidence in criminology and criminal policy should not be adhered to too closely, Radzinowicz insisted. He appreciated the influence of politics, in the form of an advancing welfare state ‘with its emphasis on the protective and supportive functions of society as a whole’, which (²)he believed had a beneficial influence on criminal policy

Radzinowicz took the position that ‘the frontiers between social policy and criminal policy should not be confused or blurred’. Social welfare schemes, he explained, should be pursued as a matter of ‘natural justice, of ethics, of economic and of political expediency’ but not as a matter of crime reduction because ‘social welfare schemes may not necessarily lead to a general reduction in crime’. He denied that social welfare represented the ultimate solution to delinquency and he worried about politicians turning crime into a political problem and exaggerating their

Radzinowicz had seen how the positivism (³) power in response. that had excited him as a student of Enrico Ferri had become distorted and abused by fascist regimes in the 1930s. The response to crime should remain tempered by the rule of law. He advocated the formation of a Ministry of Social Welfare so that some of the ‘secondary responsibilities’ of the Home Office could be hived off, allowing it to fall back on ‘its fundamental (⁴)and primary responsibility for law and order.

(¹) Cottee, Simon , ‘Sir Leon’s Shadow’, *Theoretical Criminology* , 2005, p. 220.□

(²) Radzinowicz, Leon ,’ *Criminology and the Climate of Social Responsibility*. Cambridge: Heffer., 1964, p. 12.□

(³) Radzinowicz, Leon , *ibid.*1988, p. 95.□

(⁴)Radzinowicz, Leon , *ibid.* 1964, p. 24.□



Remarkably, Richard Titmuss advocated a similar understanding of social policy but disagreed with Radzinowicz about social policy and crime. He laid the foundation for the discipline of social policy with his conceptualization of ‘social accounting’, an analytical strategy for measuring the total amount of welfare. Defenders and critics of ⁽¹⁾benefits extended by government social welfare alike erred in conceptualising social welfare in terms of direct services to the poor, unemployed, ill, and so on. Workers received substantial benefits via occupational schemes providing pensions, sick pay, and housing allowances that would otherwise appear as company profits and be subject to taxation. Substantial cash benefits provided via the tax system to the advantage of the better-off should also be regarded as welfare benefit. As an academic discipline, social policy represents ‘a search for explanations of how and why state power affects the allocation of every type of financial, welfare and environmental ⁽²⁾resource

And for Titmuss, this search was multi-disciplinary. Titmuss utilised the work of historians, sociologists, anthropologists, political scientists, economists, and medical doctors to address the roles and functions of social services. One cannot find in ⁽³⁾Titmuss a consistent theoretical or political position

He did, however, reject economic imperialism, the application of economic analysis to non-market behaviour, and made strategic use of economic arguments to refute the work of the economists at London’s Institute of Economic Affairs. Titmuss avoided committing himself to any disciplinary perspective, but instead

⁽¹⁾Kincaid, Jim , ‘Richard Titmuss’, in Paul Barker (ed.) *Founders of the Welfare State*.

London: Heinemann, 1984, p. 18.□

⁽²⁾Kincaid, Jim , *ibid* , 1984, p. 117.□

⁽³⁾Kincaid, Jim , *ibid* , 1984, p. 114.□



built up a repertoire of concepts that would enable him to tackle specific problems.

Titmuss was a Social Democrat who regarded capitalism not only as economically wasteful but threatening social integration. Problems of Social Policy established in driving out altruism. two principles. First, it was necessary to help all citizens, regardless of income and social class. The exclusion of the middle classes from social benefits encouraged contempt for recipients. Second, social policy should not attempt to means-test recipients; social benefits should be extended on a universalist basis. The 'Titmuss paradigm' rather than a contingent basis expressed optimism about human nature, belief in universal services, and opposition to means testing. Essentially, Titmuss believed in the virtue of centralized state bureaucracies and the public ethos of working in them. He regarded the administration of social services as a benevolent activity.

Titmuss did not formulate a theory of crime. What he says on the subject must be pieced together from comments on the work of criminologists. Generally, he regarded crime as 'a social ill' or a 'social problem' that should be understood in relation to social activity and not individual pathology. Successive generations of social and economic upheavals stranded a portion of citizens in deprived areas of the city, a portion that turned to crime, Titmuss suggested, as the only available means of social mobility

[1] Fontaine, Philippe, 'Blood, Politics, and Social Science: Richard Titmuss and the Institute of Economic Affairs, 1957–1973', 2002, pp. 4-9.

[2] Welshman, John, 'The Unknown Titmuss', Journal of Social Policy., 2004, p. 66.

[3] Kincaid, Jim, ibid, 1984, p. 110.

[4] Walsh, Anthony and Lee Ellis, 'Political Ideology and American Criminologists' Explanations for Criminal Behaviour', The Criminologist (American Society of Criminology), 1999, p. 207.



.Crime is a social problem originating within market ⁽¹⁾ inequalities, and because social policy seeks to iron out inequalities within the market, it makes sense to rely on social policy as a means of responding to crime. Titmuss, who read Mannheim's study of delinquency in inter-war England in 1939, agreed with Mannheim about 'faulty parenting' as a causal factor. But he insisted that 'overcrowding and bad housing conditions produce social misfits, frustration, petty delinquencies, and so on. It follows that improvements in housing, by means of universal housing policy, would serve as a ^(v) delinquency reduction measure.

Pro: Criminology and Social Policy in Context of Disciplines; The Cousins.

Criminology and Social Policy begins with the premise that what appear to be problems for crime policy are actually problems for social policy and aims to think through the challenges, dilemmas,

The title ^(r) and obstacles that arise in pursuit of this premise.

refers to social policy, meaning an area of government intervention directed at improving social welfare. In nearly all ^(s) occurrences, the term social policy is used in this sense.

The larger objective here is to argue for re-thinking the question of welfarist criminology. Criminologists have tended to offer social policy as a conclusion rather than a problem statement, as a final destination rather than a point of departure. It is one thing

[1] Titmuss, Richard , 'Preface', in John Mays, *Growing Up in the City*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press., 1954, p. 1.□

[1] Welshman, John , *ibid* , 2004, p. 299.□

[1] Katherine Beckett , ' Making Crime Pay: Law and Or der in Contemporar y American Politics. Oxfor d: Oxfor d University Pr ess. 1997, p. 311.□

[1] Clarke, Ronald , 'Situational Prevention, Criminology and Social Values', in Andrew von Hirsch, David Garland and Alison Wakefield (eds) *Ethical and Social Perspectives on Situational Crime Prevention*. Oxford: Hart Publishing. 2000, p. 311.□



to follow up a critique of some aspect of criminal justice with the It is ⁽¹⁾suggestion that social policy affords a better response.

another to interrogate this conclusion, to recognize that genuine dilemmas arise in carrying it out and real harms come about in getting in wrong. The convergence of crime and social policy merits scrutiny. In the present era, the justification for more and more social welfare programmes has been stated in the language of crime reduction. and must ask whether the goals of crime reduction and poverty reduction can be successfully joined within the same institutional framework; how it is that the introduction of crime reduction as a justification for social policy ^(v)leads to better social policy.

wrote, 'is to create a ^(r)'The task', Taylor, Walton, and Young . society in which the facts of human diversity, whether personal, organic or social, are not subject to the power to criminalise'. Originally, this had been envisioned as an 'emancipatory' project derived from a worker–student alliance opposed to capitalism and the capitalist state. It reflected the idealism and utopianism that swept across universities in the years after the student revolts Utopianism made critical criminologists vulnerable to ^(t)of 1968. the charge that they were getting all dressed up with nowhere to go. Aside from 'grandiose calls for some sort of socialist reconstruction by largely unspecified means', wrote one critic, the new criminology offered 'nothing of policy or prescriptive

[1] Tony Fitzpatrick , 'New Agendas for Social Policy and Criminology: Globalization, Urbanism and the Emerging Post-Social Security State', *Social Policy and Administration*. 2001, p. 14.□

[2] Crawford, Adam , ' Crime Prevention and Community Safety. Harlow: Longman.. 1998, p. 60.□

[3] Taylor, Ian, Paul Walton and Jock Young , *The New Criminology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1973, p. 282.□

[4] Taylor, Ian , 'Crime and Social Criticism', *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice* . 1999, p. 181.□



value to contribute toward the more immediate and urgent
 It was ⁽¹⁾ debates about the nature of criminal justice in Britain'.
 all or nothing

At universities, this shift has been experienced, in symbol if not
 in substance, by the drift of students from social policy to
 criminology. Modules in criminology and social policy have
 become popular. The question before criminologists is whether to
 adopt 'contemporary idiom' in an effort to close the gap. To be
 relevant, criminologists may need to re-invent themselves, to set
 aside traditional welfare concerns and engage policymakers in
 terms established by media and politicians. This is, as Sparks
 put it, the 'challenge of our times'⁽²⁾(2002)

The relationship between criminologists and politicians has
 never been easy. Some criminologists seek to integrate
 themselves in the policymaking process; others insist
 criminologists should criticise policies from a safe distance. Four
 different roles can be identified in relation to policymaking
 which differ according to beliefs about government and science.
 (3)

Criminologists have paid some attention to the matter of how
 policies to address crime are actually made. This area of
 theorising, informed by insights from sociology, tends to
 emphasise sources of crime policy other than criminological
⁽⁴⁾ knowledge.

(1) Mungham, Geoff, 'The Career of Confusion: Radical Criminology in Britain',
 in *Radical Criminology: The Coming Crisis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. 1980,p. 29.□

(2) Sparks, Richard and Tim Newburn , 'How Does Crime Policy Travel?',
Criminal Justice. 2002,p. 3.□

(3) Taylor, Claire, 'The Relationship Between Social and Self-Control: Travis
 Hirschi's Criminological Career', *Theoretical Criminology* . 2001,p. 98.□

(4) Clarke, Ronald, 'Technology, Criminology and Crime Science', *European
 Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* . 2004,p. 19.□



So, criminology must to re-invent the welfarist theme. To facilitate this, the parameters of ‘criminology and social policy’ as a field of inquiry. The discussions review staple themes; I bring together material from criminology and social policy
 (v) journals alongside evocative themes from other disciplines.

There is a nagging worry in recent years, however, that welfarist criminology may have become obsolete. In the present era, the themes familiar to academic criminology have been supplanted by political and media images advancing risk, safety, anti-social behaviour, surveillance and the like. The welfare state solution has faded in political imagination and criminologists have less influence over the policymaking process than before. The gap between what criminologists know and what policymakers do
 (v) has widened.

In sociology, the classical project has sought to build up a store of scientific knowledge of social activity. Sociologists make theory-guided conjectures about why things are as they are and Alternatively, the action (v) test them against sociological data. disciplines concentrate on the relationship between ideas and activities; they translate theories of society into programmes for solving specific social problems. If sociology aspires to grasp the social world as it is, separate from idealised conceptions of how

(□)David Garland , ‘Punishment and Welfare. Aldershot: Gower. 1985, p. 12.□

(□)Taylor, Ian , ‘The political economy of crime,’ in Mike Maguire, Rod Morgan and

Robert Reiner (eds) The Oxford Handbook of Criminology. Oxford: Oxford University Press.. 1997,p. 239.□

(□)Blair, Tony , ‘Why Crime is a Socialist Issue’, New Statesman and Society, 29 January: 1993,pp. 8–27.□



it ought to be, criminology and social policy seek to bridge
 (1) universal ideals and society's more mundane concerns.

But of course, criminology and social policy concern themselves
 with a different set of problems. Criminology deals with the:

- 1 extent and distribution of criminal conduct in society; the
- 2 history, structure and operation of the criminal justice system;
 and the
- 3 social, political, and economic influences on changing
 definitions of criminality and criminal justice practices.

Or, to put it in a sentence: 'Criminology, in its broadest sense,
 consists of our organised ways of thinking and talking about
 'Crime policy' refers to the (2) crime, criminals, and crime control.
 governmental response to crime. This includes the administration
 of criminal justice (police, criminal courts, and prisons) as well
 as broader programmes for crime reduction such as national
 strategies for crime prevention. Social policy concerns the:

- 1 role of the state in distribution of resources and opportunities
 between rich and poor, workers and dependents, old and young;
 the
- 2 apportionment of responsibilities for this distribution to
 government and other social institutions – market,
 voluntary/charity sector, family and individual; and
- 3 an understanding of the social and economic consequences of
 In a word – T.H. Marshall's – the (3) different arrangements.

(4) objective of social policy is 'welfare' .

(1) John Pratt et al. The New Punitiveness: Trends, Theories, Perspectives .
 Cullompton: Willan.. 2005,p. 11.□

(2) Garland, David and Richard Sparks , 'Criminology, Social Theory, and the
 Challenge of Our Times', British Journal of Criminology . 2000, p. 40.□

(3) Halsey., ibid , 2004, p. 10.□



What specialists in social policy have to say about crime and criminal justice. it does not offer a critique of crime policies

Instead, the focus is on social ^(v) from social policy perspectives. policy as a response to crime. Why do criminologists believe that social policy presents a better response to crime than criminal justice policy? What do criminologists have to say about major social policy areas – housing, health, education, and so on? Are criminologists right to make crime reduction a goal of social ^(v) policy?

Conclusion

The role of criminologists in a welfare state is complicated. Some argue criminologists should join their cousins in social policy in building and strengthening the welfare state. Others insist that criminologists should engage the role of outsideprovocateur; external critics who challenge the government to do something more or something else. These arguments reflect differing beliefs about the value of social-science knowledge and political strategies for bringing about social change

Con: Criminology as a pseudo-science and a neglected source of wisdom.

Returning to the three views of criminology held by criminologists themselves, the first has been clearly expressed by Michel Foucault; not a criminologist, of course, but a major influence on the recent development of the subject. In an

^(□)Hill, Michael , ‘Understanding Social Policy (3rd edn). Oxford: Blackwell. 1988, p. 2.□

^(□)Cook, Dee ,’ Criminal and Social Justice. London: Sage.. 2006,p. 6.□

^(□)Sparks Crawford, Adam ,‘Why British Criminologists Lose Their Critical Faculties upon Crossing the Channel: Some Thoughts on Comparative Criminology from an Empirical Investigation in France and England’, Social Work in Europe . 2000,p. 26.□



interview which has been much cited, not least by criminologists, presumably in a mood of self-laceration,

Foucault asked:

Have you ever read any criminological texts? They are staggering. And I say this out of astonishment, not aggressiveness, because I fail to comprehend how the discourse of criminology has been able to go on at this level ... One has the impression that it is of such utility, is needed so urgently and rendered so vital for the working of the system, that it does not even need to seek a theoretical justification for itself, or even ^(v) simply a coherent framework. It is entirely utilitarian.

The argument is that it must be because criminology is useful to criminal justice practitioners, and especially to judges, that it has been able to survive while failing to develop and delivering little or nothing of scientific value. Judges, Foucault suggests, need the pseudo-scientific language of criminology in order to justify and legitimate their decisions; punishment is no longer a justification in itself.

has shown, there are several problems with ^(v) As Garland (1992) Foucault's argument, at least as applied to criminology written in English. Firstly, it fails to recognise the sheer diversity of criminology, and the extent to which much of it has moved away from the 'normalising', correctional stance which characterised its early development.

Secondly, this diversity, a sign perhaps of intellectual richness rather than impoverishment, is what accounts for its lack of a single coherent framework, and the same lack could be identified in sociology and perhaps even in psychology. Thirdly, Foucault

[□]Foucault, M. ,'Prison Talk', in C. Gordon (ed.) Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, New York, Pantheon. 1980, p. 48.□

[□]Garland, D. , 'Criminological Knowledge and its Relation to Power: Aldershot, Gower. 1992.□



seems to exaggerate the utility of criminology in penological . The recent trend both in Britain and the United States ⁽¹⁾ practice has been in the opposite direction: the 1991 Criminal Justice Act, for example, leaves only a little space for the traditional criminological task of 'rehabilitation' in its sentencing framework, whose main emphasis is on ensuring that offenders get their 'just deserts'. The pre-criminological aim of retributive justice has been firmly reasserted in legislation.

As this book will show, the definition of criminology which Foucault seems to have had in mind is a very narrow one; in effect, criminology is reduced to abnormal clinical psychology and forensic psychiatry.

While this may fit the academic division of labour in France, which retains a sharp distinction between 'criminology' (still with , ⁽²⁾strong clinical links) and the sociology of deviance and control it seriously distorts the image of criminology in Britain and other Anglophone countries.

The same distortion appears, more puzzlingly, in some British write of the ⁽³⁾ work. For example, Hester and Eglin (1992) 'correctional, consensual and causal orthodoxy' of 'cause and cure' criminology, in arguing for their 'subversive', sceptical alternative, in which crime is only of interest 'in so far as it provides a pretext for asking sociological questions

(1) Foucault, M. 'Genealogy and Criminology Today', British Journal of Criminology, vol. 32, 1979. p. 403. □

(2) Garland, D., *ibid*, 1992, p. 11. □

(3) Hester, S. and Eglin, P. 'A Sociology of Crime, London, Routledge. 1992. □



rather than those motivated by a concern to "do something about . This strongly suggests that the authors have not been to a ⁽¹⁾"it" conference of criminologists recently; it also entails a view of the proper object of sociological study which risks leaving sociologists with no one to talk to except each other, by treating crime as a sociological rather than a social problem. Their view is that we should ask questions about the social construction of crime as a problem, rather than assuming that it really is a problem, and for real people, which we might be interested in doing something about. Now clearly scepticism is a virtue in criminology: we ought to ask why and how, at certain times, social phenomena get defined as social problems, and look critically "at the processes by which, for example, police resources come to be targeted against particular groups, such as 'lager louts', teenage 'joyriders', or young black men. But to refuse to accept, on principle, that crime problems are real is liable to produce a certain unreality in the language in which they are discussed: it becomes remote, irrelevant to everyday concerns, almost a private language, which makes sense only to ⁽²⁾other sociological insiders, as Wittgenstein (1969)

noted was the case with philosophy: I am sitting with a philosopher in the garden; he says again and again 'I know that's a tree', pointing to a tree that is near us. Someone else arrives and hears this, and I tell them: 'This fellow isn't insane. We are only ⁽³⁾doing philosophy'

It would be inconvenient to have to explain that we were not insane, but only doing sociology, every time we discussed crime problems with a non-sociologist (a victim, for instance).

⁽¹⁾Hester, S. and Eglin, P. , *ibid* , 1992, p.3.□

⁽²⁾Wittgenstein, L. ‘ *On Certainty*, Oxford, Blackwell.1969.

⁽³⁾Wittgenstein, L. , *ibid* , 1980, p. 467.□



The second position is that criminology is of little or no practical use, but that it would be nice if it were. This view is characteristic of much recent British 'mainstream' criminology (if there still is a mainstream).

emphasise difficulties ⁽¹⁾For example, Downes and Rock (1988) of communication between criminologists and policy-makers which tend to limit the practical influence of academic research. They mention problems of role-definition (the academic may not see it as part of his or her role to influence policy; may actively resist the idea that it should be; or may lack time, energy or aptitude); of translatability (sociological concerns are not always easily reinterpreted in terms of the practical interests of policy-makers); and of salience (the chances of research having an effect on policy depend not just, or even mainly, on its inherent worth or potential usefulness, but on how well it fits in with existing policy preoccupations, political agendas or spending plans). But that 'all theories of deviance have ⁽²⁾Downes and Rock also note implications for social policy', even if these are not immediately apparent; and Rock, in his studies of the success of victim support movements in gaining government support in Canada ⁽³⁾and England and Wales (Rock, 1986, 1990),

has shown that in the right climate research can have a direct impact on policy.

Despite their scepticism, Downes and Rock provide a quite impressive list of policy initiatives which have been grounded in research, such as the American 'Mobilisation for Youth' and

⁽¹⁾Downes, D. and Rock, P. 'Understanding Deviance: A Guide to the Sociology of Crime and Rule-breaking (2nd edn), Oxford, Clarendon Press.1988.□

⁽²⁾Downes, D. and Rock, P., *ibid* , 1988, p. 294.□

⁽³⁾Rock, P. 'A View from the Shadows, Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1986 , Rock, P. 'Helping Victims of Crime: The Home Office and the Rise of Victim Support in England and Wales, Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1990.□



'Headstart' programmes of the 1960s, and American and British attempts, influenced by the labelling perspective, to divert and decarcerate young offenders (Downes and Rock are unjustifiably pessimistic about the British experience of this, of which more

Where they are certainly right is in stressing that 'A ⁽¹⁾ later).
theory of social problems should be complemented by a theory of policy process. Otherwise, the casting of a theory into the world ^(v)is naive' .

Without much optimism, they conclude that monitoring and evaluation should be more routinely built into policy innovation, and that the time-scale for experimental projects should be increased, to give them a chance to show long-term results: for example, the successes of the Headstart programme of compensatory education would have remained invisible without long-term evaluation.

⁽¹⁾Downes, D. and Rock, P., *ibid* , 1988, pp. 79-84.□

^(v)Downes, D. and Rock, P., *ibid* , 1988, p. 326.□

