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| **Situational Crime Prevention: Ron Clarke (1992)**  He says it must be aimed at;   * Specific crimes * Altering immediate environment of crimes * Increase risk of committing them * E.g. Target hardening (locking doors etc.), CCTV, Security guards) * “Rational choice theory” – making criminals weigh up pros and cons * Clarke describes it as “Reducing opportunities for crime” * Contrasts with “Root causes” theory where we must change socialisation patterns - Clarke argues it doesn’t offer realistic solution   **Displacement**  One Criticism of situational crime prevention is that they do not reduce crime they displace it.  For example, Chaiken et al (1974) found that a crackdown on subway robberies in New York merely displaced them to the street above.  The forms of displacement include   * Spatial – moving elsewhere to commit the crime * Temporal – commiting it a different time * Target – choosing a different victim * Tactical – using a different method * Functional – commiting a different type of crime   Evaluation  It works to some extent at reducing certain types of crime  It focuses on opportunistic street crime rather than White Collar, Corporate or State Crime  It ignores the root causes of crime, such as poverty or poor communication  **Environmental crime prevention**   * This approach is based on James Wilson and George Kelling’s (1982) article, *Broken Windows.* The phrase ‘broken windows’ to stand for all the various signs of disorder and a lack of concern for others in some neighbourhoods. They argue that leaving broken windows unrepaired, tolerating deviance send the sign that nobody cares. * Their solution to this issue was zero tolerance policing, using a twofold strategy. Firstly, an *environmental improvement strategy*; any broken window must be repaired immediately otherwise others in the neighbourhood will follow. Secondly, police must adopt the *zero tolerance strategy*. Instead of merely reacting to crime, they must proactively tackle even the slightest sign of disorder.   ***The evidence:***   * Zero tolerance policing was adopted in New York (where Kelling was an adviser to the police). For example, there was a crackdown on violent and property crimes, leading to a significant drop in crime in the city. However, this may have been a result from the 7,000 extra NYPD officers and there was a general decline in crime rate across major US cities.   **Social and Community Crime Prevention**   * Strategies place emphasis firmly on the potential offender and their social context * Aim is to remove conditions that predispose indiviudals to crime * Long-term strategies – tackling root cause rather than removing opportunities * Example of this is the Perry Pre-School Project in Ypsilanti, Michigan; project for disadvantaged black children. 3-4 year olds offered a 2 year intellectual enrichment programme. By age 40 they had fewer lifetime arrests for violent crime, property crime and drugs and more had graduated from high school and had a job than those in a matched control group. For every dollar spent on the programme, $17 were saved on welfare, prison and other costs.   **What is missing?**   * Other approaches take for granted the nature and the definition of crime. They focus on low-levels of crimes and often ignore crimes of the powerful and environmental crimes. The current definition of ‘crime problem’ shows the priorities of politicians and agencies. * **Whyte** conducted a survey of 26 crimes and agencies area partnerships in the North West of England to discover crime strategies targets. However, the crime reduction strategies focused on crimes such as vehicle crime, drug related crime and domestic violence. The strategies fail to recognise other crimes such as green crimes, even though the North West has one of the most heavily concentrated sites of chemical production in Europe.   **Surveillance**   * Surveillance in modern society involves the use of technology e.g. CCTV cameras, biometric scanning, automated number plate recognition (ANPR), electronic tagging and use of databases to collect all of the information. * Some of the data out there may be used for crime and disorder control, and to control the behaviour of workers and consumers.   **Foucalt: Birth of the Prison**   * ***Soverign Power*** was typical of the period before the 19th century, when the monarch had absolute power over people and their bodies. Control was asserted by inflicting disfiguring, visible punishment on the body (e.g. branding or limb amputation). Punishment was a brutal, emotional spectacle, such as public execution. * ***Disciplinary Power*** becomes dominant from the 19th century. In this form of control, a new system of discipline seeks to govern not just the body, but the mind or ‘soul’. It does so through surveillance. * Foucalt rejects the view that civilisation and humane socieities are the reason for the disappearance of brutal bodily punishment; instead he says it is simply because surveillance is a more efficient ‘technology or power’ i.e. a more effective way of controlling people * The Panopticon: prisoner is visible to guards from own cell, but guards aren’t always visibile to prisoners so they don’t know if they *are* being watched, but they do know they *might* be being watched so they behave at all times. So, surveillance turns to ***self-surveillance*** which turns to ***self-discipline***. * Disciplinary power therefor seeks to monitor and eventually rehabilitate an individual. Foucalt argues that the social sciences and professions such as psychologists were born at the same time as the modern prison. These experts are important. * ***‘The Dispersal of Discipline’ –*** other examples of institutions where disciplinary power is used are mental asylums, barracks, factories, workhouses and schools. Non-prison-based social control practices such as community service orders also apread into other institutions and wider society where professionals such as teachers, social workers and psychiatrists exercise surveillance over the population. Foucalt states that the disciplinary power has now dispersed throughout society.   **Criticisms of Foucalt**   * ☺ Foucalt’s work has stimulated reserahc into surveillance and discipkinary power – especially into an ‘electronic Panopticon’ that uses modern technology to monitor us. * ☹ the shift from soverign power and corporal punishment to disciplinary power and imprisonment is less clear than he suggests. He is also accused of wrongly assuming that the expressive (emotional) aspects of punishment disappear in modern society. * ☹ exaggerates the extent of control – Goffman (1982) shows how some inmates of prisons and mental hospitals resist controls. * ☹ CCTV cameras are not always effective in preventing crime – Norris (2012) reviewed dozens of studies worldwide and found that while CCTV reduced crimes in car parks, it had little to no effect on other crime. * ☹ Feminists criticise CCTV as an extension of the ‘male gaze’ – while it renders women more visible to the voyeurism of the male camera operator, it does not make them more secure.   **Surveillance theories since Foucault:**  **Synoptic Surveillance:**   * Mathiesen (1997) argues Foucault’s account of surveillance only tells half the story when applied to today’s society (Foucault’s view is dated). He argues there is an increase in surveillance from below (those who have less authority are able to use surveillance) as well as top-down, centralised surveillance. Mathiesen calls this ‘*Synoption’*- where everybody watches everybody. * Similarly, widespread camera ownership means ordinary citizens may now be able to ‘control the controllers’ e.g. recording the police forces wrong doings. * For example, Thompson (2000) argues that powerful groups such as politicians now fear the media’s surveillance of them may uncover damaging information about them, and this acts as a form of social control.   **Surveillant assemblages:**   * Haggerty and Ericson (2000) argue, surveillance technologies now involve the manipulation of virtual objects in cyberspace rather than physical space. * There is now an important trend towards combining different technologies. For example, CCTV footage can be analysed using facial recognition software. They call this ‘*surveillant assemblages’*. They suggest that we are moving towards a world in which data from different technologies can be combined to create a sort of ‘data double’ of the individual.   **Actuarial Justice and Risk Management:**  Feeley & Simon (1994) argue that a new ‘technology of power’ is emerging throughout the justice system. However, it is different to Foucault’s disciplinary power in 3 ways:-   * Focuses on group rather than individuals * Interested in preventing people from offending, not rehabilitating offenders * Uses calculation of risk known as ‘actuarial analysis’ – this calculates the statistical risk of particular events happening to particular groups e.g. young drivers’ risk of having an accident   These ideas can be used in surveillance and crime control. For instance, in airports security screening checks are based on known offender ‘risk factors’ by using information about themselves (e.g. gender, ethnicity etc...) which then can be profiled and given a risk score (if risk score high more likely be questioned etc..)  The aim of surveillance is to predict and prevent future offending. Feeley & Simon believe that this surveillance does prevent offending by applying surveillance techniques to’ identify, classify and manage groups by levels of dangerousness’. Therefore, actuarial justice is known as damage limitation strategy to reduce crime by using statistical information to pick out likely offenders.  **Social Sorting and Categorical Suspicion:**  David Lyon (2012) purpose of ‘social sorting’ is to be able to categories people so they can be treated differently to the levels of risk they pose. An effect of this is to place an entire social ground under categorical suspicion (Gary T. Marx -1988) this is where people are placed under suspicion of wrongdoing as they have associated with a certain group or category. For example, Lewis (2010) found that the West Midlands policetried to introduce a counter-terrorism scheme to surround mainly two Muslims suburbs of Birmingham with about 150 ANPR cameras; as result this placed the whole community under suspicion.  But, one problem with actuarial justice is the danger of a self-fulfilling prophecy. For example, profile of typical offenders is gathered from O.C.S; and these typical show of young black inner-city males groups most likely to carry a weapon. The police are more likely to stop and search them. In turn this causes more black male offenders to be caught, convicted and end up in O.C.S  Labelling and surveillance –  Ditton et al (1999) found that in one major city centre CCTV was able to zoom onto vehicles tax discs from hundreds of metres away to see whether tax had expired or not. But, the System’s manager did not think this was suitable way to sue the technology so the motorists’ offences were left unchecked. In contrast to this, research found that CCTV operators make discriminatory judgments about who could be potential ‘suspects’ and causing them to focus on them more than others. Norris and Armstrong (1999) found that there is a ‘massively disproportionate targeting’ of young black males for no other reason than their membership of that particular social group.  These judgements are based on ‘typifications’ or stereotypical beliefs held by those operating surveillance systems about who are likely offenders. Once again these beliefs can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy where criminalisation of some groups (e.g. black males) are increased as they are more likely to be found offending, whereas the criminalisation if others (e.g. motorists) is lessened as their offences are ignored. Once again these beliefs can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy where criminalisation of some groups (e.g. black males) are increased as they are more likely to be found offending, whereas the criminalisation if others (e.g. motorists) is lessened as their offences are ignored. | One measure that many believe to be effective in crime prevention is punishment. Even though punishment involved deliberately inflicting harm, two main justification have been offered for it:  **Reduction-** It prevents future crime. This is done through:  •Deterrence- punishing the individual discourages them from future offending. ‘Making an example of them’ may also serve as a deterrent to the public at large. (An example of this is Margaret Thatcher’s ‘short, sharp shock’ regime in young offenders, 1980s.)  •Rehabilitation- idea that punishment can be used to reform or change offenders so they no longer offend. Rehab policies include providing education and training for prisoners so they can ‘earn an honest living.’ (Anger management courses for those that are violent.  •Incapacitation- use of punishment to remove the offender’s capacity to offend again. Policies in different societies have included imprisonment, execution, cutting off of hands and chemical castration. (Incapacitation is increasing popular with Politian’s with Americas ‘three strikes and you’re out’ policy. Where a third minor offence can lead to a length prison sentence)  This type of punishment is an ‘instrumental one’ where punishment is a means to an end. i.e. crime reduction  **Retribution-** ‘paying back.’ It is a justification for punishment crimes that have already been committed, rather than actually preventing future crimes. It is based on the idea that offenders deserve to be punished and that society should take their revenge on the offender for breaching its moral code. (This is an expressive, rather than an instrumental view of punishment- it expresses societies outrage.  Sociological perspectives on punishment- Sociologists are interested in the relationship between punishment and society, that why they ask questions about its functions, and why it varies over time, and how it relates to the society in which it is found.  **Durkheim: A Functionalist Perspective**  Durkheim (1893) argues that the function of punishment is to uphold social solidarity while reinforcing shared values. Punishment expresses society's emotions of moral outrage at the offence. Through rituals of order, society's shared values are reaffirmed and members come to feel a sense of moral unity.  ***Two types of justice***:  Within different societies, punishment functions to uphold social solidarity in different ways. Durkheim identified that there are two types of justice.  *Retributive justice* - in society there is little specialisation, and solidarity between individuals is based on their similarity to one another. This produces a strong collective conscience. Punishment is severe and cruel, and it's motivation is purely expressive.  *Restitutive justice* - aims to restore things to how they were before the offence. Solidarity is based on the resulting interdependence between individuals. Crime damages this interdependence, so it's necessary to repair the damage. Motivation is instrumental, to restore society's equilibrium. Even in modern society, punishment still has an expressive relevant because it expresses collective emotions.  In reality, traditional societies often have restitutive rather than retributive justice as Durkheim thought. For example, blood feuds (clan members) are often settled by payment of compensation rather than execution.  **Marxism: Capitalism and Punishment**  Punishment is prominent within class society, according to Marxist, where ruling class exploits the subordinate class to serve their interests and to maintain social order. Punishment (an RSA) is used as a means of defending property from the lower classes.  Rusche and Kirchheimer state that punishment in society depends on economic base, and each society has its own penal system depending on its type. For example; money fines are impossible without a money economy. “Under Capitalism, imprisonment becomes the dominant form of punishment.” Melossi and Pavarini see this imprisonment as a reflection of the relations of production; you serve ‘time’, just as you are paid for it. Additionally factories have similar discipline to prisons, though this is outdated in contemporary Britain. Along with many other forms of punishment, up until the 18th century, such as; execution, banishment and corporal punishment.  Today however imprisonment is the worst punishment, though not an effective rehabilitator and often blamed for making bad people worse. Politicians, such as New Labour, call for tougher sentences and imprisonment for petty offenders; this is defined as ‘populist punitiveness’. This has caused a record number of people in prisons, the most in Western Europe (147 of every 100,000 are in prison.) This makes prisons overcrowded and lacking in food, education and sanitation.  **The Era of Mass Incarceration?**  David Garland (2001) says that the USA (and to lesser extent, the UK) is moving into an era of mass incarceration.  From the 1970s, numbers of American inmates in state or federal prisons have been rapidly increasing;  •In 1972 - There were 200,000 inmates.  •Now – There is 1.5 million in prisoners like Rakers Island and 700,000 in local jails.  •Now - 5 million Americans are under the supervision of the criminal justice system (about 3% of the adult population which is three times then the European rate of imprisonment).  Garland argues that the reason for the mass incarceration is the growing politicisation of crime control. For most of the last century, there was a consensus which Garland calls ‘penal welfarism’ – the idea that punishment should reintegrate offenders into society.  Since the 1970s, movement towards ‘Tough on crime’ policies has led to rising numbers in prisons;  •Rise in females convicted of violent crime (despite lack of evidence if they are committing more offences).  •‘War on drugs’ – Simon (2001) drugs are so widespread, the supply of arrestable and impressionable offenders is ‘limitless’.  **Trancarceration**  Movement towards Trancarceration – the idea that individuals become locked into a cycle of control, shifting between different carceral agencies during their lives e.g. someone brought up in care, then to young offenders, then to adult prison and mental hospitals.  Trancarceration, seen by some sociologist, is a product of blurring the boundaries between criminal justice system and welfare agencies e.g. social services are increasingly being given a crime control role (working with police).  **Alternatives to Prison**  •Previously, a major goal of how to deal with young offenders was ‘diversion’ – diverting contact from the criminal justice system in order to prevent the risk of a self-fulfilling prophecy and turning them into serious criminals.  •Instead non-custodial, community based controls such as probation were used – focusing on welfare and treatment.  •This has grown in recent years and includes: curfews, community service orders, treatment orders and electronic tagging. Despite this the amount in custody, particularly young offenders has been rising steadily.  •Stanley Cohen follows Foucault’s ideas and argues the growth of community controls has simply cast the net of control over people; the increased range of sanctions available enables control to penetrate more deeply into society.  •It is argued community control drives young people into the criminal justice system, e.g. police use ASBOs as a way of fast-tracking young offenders into custodial sentences. |
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