**LECTURE 1: INTRO TO DEVIANCE**

* highly contested / congested space
  + everyone has a perspective on crime
  + influence of social convention (this knowledge that operates on you most of the time)
* social convention
  + subject ourselves to governance of rules unreflexively (just follow)
  + (1) Tradition – religion plays a big role in offering a big role in offering a definition of crime and deviance
    - 18th century to 19th century – move away from powers of religion and towards using scientific methodologies
    - Till early last year, church of England viewed homosexuality as a demonic phenomenon
      * subjected to conversion therapy – put forward as extremely dehumanizing
      * ritual – almost like exorcism
      * the British state recently criminalized conversion therapy – subject to full weight of law
  + (2) Authority – political discourse
    - social, economic and cultural power
    - e.g. despite numerous individuals dying from shooting incidents, guns / rifles are still not criminalized
      * NRA resisting, right wing politicians, ultra-nationalists support right to carry arms
    - totalitarian / less liberal regimes
    - e.g. HK situation – degeneration of the usage of the term “rioters”
      * “peaceful protesters” 🡪 “rioters” 🡪 “violent rioters” 🡪 “terrorists”
      * semantics that accompany these definitions
  + (3) Common experiences
    - becomes part of our essential “reality”, becomes our “truth”
    - narratives that stem from political offices / powerful individuals / communities that yield much economical, social and cultural power
    - collective experiences
    - if we subscribe to racist stereotypes / assumptions / prejudices 🡪 institutionalized racism at work
    - stereotypes enjoy a much longer shelf life than narratives
    - Elliot & Reid (2019) – the mind is colonized, “controlling images”
      * influences the way we see things, how we deal with members of a certain community
      * talks about long reach of criminalization (how black mothers develop strategies and inculcate them in their children to avoid being shot by police)
      * deals with structural (systemic, systematic) issue – there is a pattern as constituting this structural problem
      * **“controlling images”** are widespread, pervades all segments of our community (e.g. myth / notion of black criminality is circulated, perpetuated towards society and all institutions collude with one another to portray a particular representation / image of the criminal, delinquent)
  + (4) Media – major institution as the biggest culprits
    - sponsor a certain image of the criminal / deviant
    - in Hollywood, African Americans, Hispanics are often represented as criminogenic
    - naturalizes 🡪 claim biological superiority 🡪 basis of racism, legitimizes genocide
    - e.g. Lion King: “accent” – hyenas voices are highly ethnically coded (like African American), Pride rock 🡪 Trump Tower, rest of animals 🡪 society
      * how it separates saint from the sinner
    - 1967 Jeremy Skolnick – justice without trial
      * introduced concept of “symbolic assailant”
      * police / judge etc (law enforcers) subscribe to an image that certain individuals are likely to be criminals – racial minorities and indigenous populations are disproportionately represented in the criminal justice system / incarcerated
* complexities of social life cannot be reduced to a few pointers (cannot be captured in powerpoint slides)
  + for every narrative, there would be a counternarrative
  + life is a lot more contested and controversial than it appears
* use theories as a tool to make sense of what is going on in our society
  + empirical research (study and make sense of phenomenon)
  + established ideas may be outdated – theories need to be modified, creatively adapted
  + need empirical data to dismiss theories (... no longer applicable)

Structure of module:

* theoretical: criminology (longer history) and sociology of deviance
  + **classical** criminology
  + **positivist** criminology
    - strong element of ensuring that human species could be categorized, classified (for governance)
  + colonial criminology (beko ??? agozeno???)
    - what we considered to be crime – often a **product** of **Western thought & colonialism**
    - greatest crime: **colonialism** and **imperialism** – most violent episodes of human history (darkest periods)
      * **genocide** was **institutionalized** during these periods
      * much of contemporary problems we are faced with (especially in Asia) – eg. Rohingya crisis, stateless people, Pakistan VS India, civil and tribal wars, problems in the Middle East could be traced to colonialism and imperialism
      * genocide is rooted in the colonists’ intention to conquer
      * e.g. British came to Australia - Indigenous Australians: aboriginals (Terra Nullius – latin term used to describe them) considered to be part and parcel of the floral and fauna of the land, devoid of humanity (would not have any qualms of eradicating them)
      * tendency to reduce SOME (not all) human beings to a biologically inferior position – basis of institutionalized racism at work
  + how science can become instruments of **social control**, **power** and **domination**, **oppression of the masses**
* ideas about crime and deviance evolved over time
* each theory begins with a set of theoretical / philosophical assumptions about society
  + speaks about historical context of the time it was established in (not abstract principles, born out of its own social, cultural context)
* methodology
  + framework to guides social scientists to collect and analyse empirical data
  + **method** as **subset** of methodology
    - instrument / vehicle to which empirical data is collected
  + need to adhere to a scientific methodology
  + easy to fall back out on moral outrage in explaining crime / deviance
    - cling onto traditions, reproduce authoritative discourses as a way to make sense of why (community of) individuals have come to deviate from social norms
    - underlying structures of phenomenon speak about how a society organizes a certain way of how we think about XXX being a criminal
* Crime – violation of legal norms (state-sanctioned laws)



* + State will intervene, punish you officially
* Deviance – violation of social norms



* + invite negative sanctioning on the part of social audience



* + subject to social ostracism
* what separates crime and deviance is



* + chronology



* + historicity



* + through an act of parliament 🡪 criminalized



* + interacting relationship btwn the two



* semantics
  + white nationalists / supremacists 🡪 almost legitimizes their use of violence
  + x3 more responsible for deaths / damage
  + contributes to sustaining our reality (statistics creates reality 🡪 we subscribe to reality 🡪 perpetuate ideology, statistics)

**LECTURE 2:**

* function of police
  + police patrols – justified on grounds that it helps to deter crime
  + why individuals call the police?
    - 7% constitute crime-related issues (SG)
    - bulk are service related, nuisance calls
  + why is the police organization continue to present itself as a law-and-order organization?
* problems of data: scientific convention
  + how scientists would differ from how they offer an explanation for why individuals depart from established norms and values
  + such work cannot be easily dismissed – they go through the rigorous process of analyzing and collecting data
  + they do speak from different theoretical standpoints – trained under different disciplinary instructions
    - every discipline / scholarly perspective comes with …
      * assumption of how society is
      * assumes a particular set of intellectual premises
    - whose perspective should prevail when it comes to …
      * analyzing criminal behaviour
      * offering solutions to solve crime and deviance in our society?
    - what constitutes evidence?
  + what is the nature of crime and deviance?
    - only 5% are solved forensically?
  + sociological perspective
    - critical perspective – often leads to a deconstructionist treatment of crime and deviance
    - questioning attitude
    - seek to contextualize the criminals and their behaviour – need to have an engagement with history, structure and culture with the institutional processes at work
    - entail a broader engagement – not just about the deviant, but also very much about the society
      * individual in focus is not abstracted / decontextualized from their society
      * put against larger context (historical, structural)
      * structure – social class, race, ethnicity, gender, age, sexuality
* social control
  + flip side of social deviance – twin concepts
  + induce conformity
    - conformity might bring about social deviance
  + Park + Burgess (1928) – all social problems turn out finally to be problems of social control
* sociological enquiry humanizes the deviant
  + understand / unpack the biography of that individual
  + need to contextualize crime and deviance – understanding that person’s location in society
  + David Matza (1963) – deviants are human actors (did not vilify deviants) whose subjectivities are to be appreciated, not necessarily corrected
  + understand why a particular individual has come to commit a crime
  + standpoints we take as sociologists
    - do we seek to correct deviants or have a better understanding of deviants?
    - where should we start making sense of why an individual had deviated from norms, violated community expectations?
    - do we have a moral, professional code?
  + resocializing 🡪 able to conform to societal expectations
* **normative** school of thought **(functionalism / sociological positivism)** 1893-1960
  + societal institutions are organized in a way that produces deviance
  + conservative stance
  + addresses the question of why indivdiuals commit crime and deviance (criminal motivation)
  + obsession with WHY
  + social deviance is the starting point (it exists, by product of society) 🡪 social control employed 🡪 achieve social order
  + conformity in society is representative of social order
  + when crime happens, social control is enhanced / expanded
* **constructionist** school of thought **(labelling tradition / symbolic interactionist / social reactionist perspective)** 1960 onwards
  + relationship between is never in equilibrium
  + it is social control that manufactures / creates social deviance
  + social order is always elusive – we can never arrive at social order
    - everytime we introduce new norms, new laws, we create new forms of deviance and crimes
  + thus deviance is socially constructed
* each theory is also a reflection of a climate in which it has been produced (social and political)
* inquiry into crime and deviance
  + theoretical and methodological issues (do invite controversy)
    - where to look for an answer – three perspectives
      * (1) psychological / psychiatric approach – look into the brain
        + tend to subscribe to the idea that deviant behaviour is a form of **dysfunction**, abnormality, language of illnesses and pathology
        + criminal whose mind is assumed to be diseased
        + dysfunctionality

**cognitive** – “diseased”, mental illness, **impulsivity** (associated with lacking social control – individualized by saying they lack self-control), **short-run hedonism** (inability to postpone gratification)

**developmental** – problematic past experiences might come back to affect your orientation for adversary (e.g. suffered from child abuse 🡪 become violent abuser when grown), correlation between traumatic experiences and being an offender (not deterministic / causal)

usually we see **criminal and victim as binary** – but now criminals could be victims themselves

strong social dimension

* + - * (2) physiological and biological approach
        + explaining behaviour of addicted individuals – professionals often invoke this perspective
        + so important to explaining rape behaviours (recent 10 years) 🡪 chemical castration as a criminal justice response
        + explain juvenile delinquency – why do they cause most problems when they are teenagers (puberty! transition!)
        + lacks a context
      * (3) sociological approach
        + larger, patriarchal context – cultural, social context in which both the offender and victim find themselves in

e.g. rape can also be used as an instrument of social control and domination, symbol of oppression – conquer others, almost institutionalized (Susan Brown Miller’s work)

* + - * + understands and seeks to provide an important context to the relationship between the individual and their community / society

important component of sociological imagination (C. W. Mills)

contextualise biography of person being studied

bringing in history

* parentification – kids who are forced to grow up early, thrust into assuming parental roles, looking after other siblings / family members
  + find themselves in the company of adults
  + become vulnerable to victimization (used as drug mules, get abused sexually)
  + these interactions are confined to certain neighbourhoods – speaks about the socio-economic profile of these neighbourhoods

**LECTURE 3**

* sociology should move beyond the individual
  + bringing in structure, institutions and culture into the analysis
  + individual should be contextualized
* lamented that sociologist do not go enough in soci of deviance
  + fundamental limitation in role of sociologists – end up studying the most powerless and marginalized members of the society
  + thus titled “poverty of sociology”
  + lack of access
    - harder to study corporate crimes, politicians indulging in corrupt practices
* physiological approach
  + aggression said to have its roots in physiology
  + fish oil used to decrease aggression (ref to newspaper clippings)
* prison institution
  + hypermasculine, exaggerated / toxic masculinity
  + performance of violence is a resource / coping strategy to dealing with
  + one of the most totalitarian institutions – every aspect of life is taken control by the institution
  + all social institutions (e.g. schools and universities) sit along that **carceral continuum**
  + engenders violence – transform the most peace-loving person to one who is able to use violence / threat of violence to surviving prisons
* somatology
  + study of body parts and how they are linked to criminology / forms of crime
  + (1) mesomorph – big, burly ones (violent crimes)
  + (2) endomorph – short, rounded ones (commercial crimes)
  + (3) ectomorph – tall, thin ones (substance abusers)
* these approaches therefore put forth a social control option
  + body becomes site of intervention, control, treatment and increasing surveillance
  + through manipulation of body and subjecting criminal deviant body to control
  + recommend structural changes to solve these issues
* sociologists are not sought after when it comes to offering solutions
  + to deal with violence, we also need to look at the cultural systems that support such violent behaviour
  + rethinking and rewriting structural relations with society takes time
  + e.g. more CCTVs around campus (to deal with sexual harassment cases) – more physical solutions than structural
* what should be the unit of analysis? (what makes an act criminal? what makes a condition deviant?)
  + Act?
  + Actor?
  + Context in which the act and actor exist?
  + e.g. murder – taking away one’s life
    - act in itself may not be criminal
      * unarmed black people shot by police
      * striking miners gunned down in South Africa – began from a dispute over wages
  + grey areas when state agent has come to discharge lethal force on an unarmed force
    - act is a function of police deviance?
    - institutional response to dealing with certain segments of the population?
    - not a bad apple situation – has happened time and time again
    - act is the same – act itself may not intrinsically be criminal
      * what gives the act the character of criminality is the context in which the act has taken place
      * highly contingent on who the actor was
  + essence of the argument – there is **nothing immutable** about crime or deviance (nothing is intrinsically deviant)
    - they are **socially constructed and sustained** in certain historical periods
    - state is involved in taking away one’s lives
      * when the law itself provides that opportunity to do so – death penalty (sanctions it, supports it)
* is crime a **structural** problem?
  + pattern to crime? (ofc)
    - has to be understood along the lines of **social class**, race, gender etc
    - why do most of the offenders come from the most deprived and disadvantaged backgrounds?
      * relationship between being poor / marginalized and being involved in crime / criminality
      * relationship between race and crime
      * interacting effects between class and race
    - why is there a peak of crime when you enter teenage hood?
      * not just biological reasons – strong social dimension
    - use the language of disproportionality
      * always measured against group’s representation in national demography (c.f. their representation in the prison population)



* + - * **global** truth – racial minorities and indigenous populations are **disproportionately represented** in the criminal justice system (every stage of the criminal justice process – search, courthouse, prison)



* + - * + e.g. African-Americans (US)– 12% of national population, 40% of all arrests, 50% of prison population, 50% on death row



* + - * + e.g. Indians (Malaysia) – 10% of national population, 60% of penal / institutionalized population, 75% of gang representation



* + - * + e.g. rapes in India (40,000 daily) – take into account caste system and religion
    - strong predictive factor
  + pattern to victimization?
* 1960s – sociology took a sharp turn with onset of labellists
  + dimensions of structure and social institution
  + crime has a lot to do with policing
    - differential policing due to controlling images – polices have been socialized to think of the black man as a criminal
  + social control agents themselves have come to compound the problem
* is there a need for grand theory of crime? or do we need specific theories to explain specific types of crimes? (theoretical issue)
  + Hershey and Godfredson – all got to do with social control (dinstinguish themselves from positivist way of looking at crime)
* can criminology theories born in the West explain crimes in the Asian context?
  + ethnocentrism, euro-centric standpoint – influence the way we conceptualize and treat certain conditions as deviant behavior?
* is crime / deviance a historical problem?
  + think in terms of time & space
  + yes! for the simple reason that they are social constructs – what is criminal / deviant today may not necessarily be so in the years to come
  + time – structural dimension
    - Emile Durkheim – mechanical solidarity 🡪 organic solidarity (organization of industrial society)
    - 4th industrial revolution
    - times have changed 🡪 new crimes / old crimes to be expressed through new technological means (e.g. cybercrimes)
    - e.g. SG laws criminalise prostitution but administratively, prostitution is permitted
* sociological approach
  + more macro, structural and institutional perspective
  + individual is ALWAYS brought into question and contextualized
  + always contextualize sociologically, even if using other approaches (biological, psychological etc)
    - social dimensions hamper their ability to make wise decisions (for impoverished families)
    - prolonged exposure to poverty affects their decision-making abilities
* **universalism** VS **relativism**
* criminology
  + classical criminology (Beccaria)
    - work published in 18th century – Crime and Punishment (1764)
    - important departure from how crime was previously thought of / criminal was conceived as (demonic) – society responded to problem of crime with such moral outrage
    - enlightenment – there has to be a scientific explanation for deviants
    - provided for an effective justice system
    - utilitarian theorist – thinking of the best / most effective ways of dealing with crime
    - all theories will often begin with a philosophical question and set of philosophical assumptions
    - did not have a good impression of humanity
  + positivist criminology (Lombroso)

**LECTURE 4**

* utilitarian – one who is concerned with devising most efficacious frame …
* social contract
  + (2) social contract with the ‘sovereign’ – could be a charismatic leader, traditional, wise person, government of the day
    - give up rights to ‘sovereign’ in EXCHANGE for a good life (protect our self-interest)
  + driven by selfishness, by the need to self-preserve
  + vigilantism / taking issues into own hands – theoretically possible, but will mess up social order
    - thus one complains to the ‘sovereign’ to resolve issue
  + respecting rules (e.g. law-abiding) 🡪 rewarded
  + not following rules / challenged the ‘sovereign’ 🡪 punishment / social contract collapses (how societies degenerate)
    - sovereign invoke threat of punishment to get you to comply
  + degree of state intervention in personal affairs – e.g. marriage license, divorce
* for the social contract / sovereign to be credible / respected / legitimate / effective
  + sovereign must have **access** to a **system** of **laws and punishment**
* Hong Kong case study
  + not just social contract that binds citizenry together, but the relationship that the ‘sovereign’ has had with the citizenry is under a great deal of stress
  + ‘sovereign’ has become / perceived to be illegitimate 🡪 negatively impact social contract
  + breakdown in law and order
    - restoration 🡪 may require new social contract / new ‘sovereign’ to replace illegitimate one
* (1764) Crime & Punishment – Cesare Beccaria
  + Solid blueprint as to how societies should be kept together
  + Notion that individuals are, by nature selfish 🡪 in order to have good control over human nature, we need to have a powerful sovereign
    - Singapore’s political elites have such a conception
    - emphasis on a need to have **robust / efficient criminal justice system** to keep a lid on human nature
      * stability, predictability & certainty 🡪 attracts investors 🡪 drives capitalism
    - e.g. Religious Harmony Act – give sovereign lots of power
* implications
  + (1) social contract provides basis of modernity
    - spells out the conditions necessary for good life
    - law – one of the most sophisticated instruments / engines of social control
      * from cradle to grave – you are governed by law in an extremely robust fashion
      * basis that provides the social contract
  + (2) utilitarian theorist – most effective & efficient system of governance
    - punishment needs to be **prompt** and **immediate**
      * **association** between **crime** and **punishment** would stay in person’s consciousness
    - punishment should be **certain**
      * certainty (not necessarily severity) serve as a **better** **deterrent**
      * tell the would-be offender, better don’t do it – internalization / communication: better deterrent
      * e.g. 15g of pure heroine (drug trafficking) 🡪 death penalty
        + but some people still do it
        + moment that you entertain the possibility that you will not be caught 🡪 law loses the deterrent value
        + law needs to be communicated and certain
      * idea of deterrence goes along the concept of **rationality**
        + assumes that (would-be) offenders are rational beings
        + maximizes pleasure, minimizes pain
        + only rational person will have the capacity to process the consequences of crime

prison conditions – inflicts great deal of suffering and pain

you want to make the life of convicted person miserable 🡪 wouldn’t want to come back to the system

considered to be rational

* + (3) proportionality
    - **punishment** should be **proportionate** to the **harm** caused by their crime
    - Beccarie was not a methodologist – he was a philosopher
      * it is a philosophy that should guide collective sentiments
    - bereft of any empirical evidence – no science in this
      * methodological problem
      * how do we measure harm? what kind of harm are we talking about? (physical, emotional, psychological?)
* vigilantism
  + punished (e.g. person slapping Amos Yee)
  + moral or otherwise 🡪 undermines authority and legitimacy of the ‘sovereign’
    - contributes to success of Singapore’s justice system
    - only the state can discharge violence 🡪 nobody else can
    - this is the blueprint
* Cesare Lombroso (medical doctor) and Positivist Criminology
  + ideas were directly antithetical to Beccarie
  + interested in
    - physiology –
    - physiognomy – study of facial types
      * chin receding / excessively long
      * chin short and fat
      * protruding forehead
      * length of arms – short / excessively long 🡪 “apes”
  + The Criminal Man / The Delinquent Man (1876)
    - definitive / unproblematic idea of who the criminal was
    - inspired by above 2 disciplines
    - famous for sponsoring the notion of the “born criminal” / who the likely criminal would be
  + founder of positivist criminology
  + saw criminal person as an **atavistic** being
    - criminals were individuals who were not as evolved – throwback to earlier stages of the human evolution
    - characteristic of degeneracy
  + criminals are seeds of bad nature – designed by nature to be criminals
    - prostitutes display more anomalies / regressive characteristics
    - how a gendered profession is premised as having a biological basis
    - early positivist saw sexuality as a biological, physiological trait
  + investigate deviance in plants and animals
    - “crime in the animal world”
    - obsessed with
  + born that way / designed by nature 🡪 is there any point in rehabilitating them
    - 1876 – what you need to do is to train a group of individuals with key observation skills 🡪 walk with a checklist of certain physical characteristics 🡪 round them up and destroy them
    - this is how death penalty entered the regime
    - we have grown a lot more civilized and methodological since then but … (ref to (2) below
* implications
  + (1) modern psychology & psychiatry
    - Foucault talks about the “psy” sciences
    - intellectual roots in the Lombrosian project (seeks to use the body as a site of intervention / pathologize individuals)
      * notion of the diseased body
      * pathology
      * notion of retrogression and degeneracy
      * body offers to be a site of treatment, control and surveillance
      * criminals were bad seeds of nature 🡪 seeds are to be located in the body and rectified / corrected
  + (2) penal response
    - going for long-term imprisonment = incapacitation (incapacitate function)
      * warehousing – completely different from deterrence logic
  + (3) medicine
    - offers itself as a dispassionate science – very neutral, objective
    - as an instrument / institutional of social control to decide if an individual is criminal or not
    - preventative discourse that comes with it – can be done in an apolitical way
    - when experts claim that I can get into the head of someone – it is dangerous logic
    - would contribute to an expansion of social control
      * innocuous – don’t feel the effect, but slowly legitimate behaviours are criminalized (medical basis to it)
      * expanding definitions of what is normal and not
      * danger is one would be sucked into such a system – once such a label is imposed on others (presumably, the less powerful members of communities) 🡪 trigger self-fulfilling prophecy
      * when these labels / constructs are being applied 🡪 risk of behaviours being medicalized or even criminalized
  + (4) increasing medicalization 🡪 **individualization** 
    - focus is on the individual – being the site of intervention / medical treatment
    - when criminality is individualized, fail to recognize / identify the exterior causes of crime (social / structural issues)
      * **depoliticize** the issue of crime and deviance
      * takes away the questions that sociologists are most concerned about – issues of class, race, gender, sexuality, religion, geography, nationality, history, institutional
      * no longer need to look at issues of discrimination / structural marginalization / social exclusion / history of colonialism
      * no need to ask serious questions of rebuilding / reviving communities, or creating opportunities for marginalized communities (forget that … is **ingrained** in **social structure**?)
    - RNR – risk needs responsibility Model
  + (5) **racialization**
    - facial / physical features identified to be “born criminal” – Lombroso was studying the slaves transported from Africa to Europe

**LECTURE 5**

* depraved humanity
  + idea that someone is born with criminologic tendencies and propensities
* Lombroso (1976) – medical doctor
  + inspired by physiology
  + looked at physical traits to see how certain individuals may gravitate towards criminality
  + absurd notions
    - obsession over female criminality seems to be archaic and redundant
    - plant and animal deviance
  + much of modern preventative discourse could be traced to intellectual roots of Lombroso
    - seeds of criminality are to be found within the individual
    - individualize problem of crime
* medicalization
  + deviant is someone who is deficient, diseased
  + effectively depoliticize issue of crime
    - no longer need to look at social causes of crime
    - no longer need to appreciate sociological causes of crime
    - e.g. social exclusionary practices, discrimination, need to redistribute resources and opportunities, rebuilding communities
* sociological approach
  + not necessarily criminal policies, but social policies to solve crime
* danger of using science
  + articulation that study of crime is objective and neutral, dispassionate
  + study of science is NOT always neutral and objective
    - provides a cover for individuals who are concerned
  + medicine as an instrument & institution of social control (last 10-15 years)
    - doctors and psychiatrist to offer an authoritative opinion
    - Fuko? – “psy sciences”
      * (1) net-widening 🡪 expansion of social control
        + business of identifying problematic individuals and criminals
        + unintended consequences may arise from our enthusiasm of dealing with problems of communities
        + defining “would-be” criminals is theoretically and ethically problematic
        + frequent use of the term “at-risk”
        + such work should be done in a destigmatized way – if not, quite inadvertently, we might trigger a self-fulfilling prophecy
        + label successfully applied onto individual 🡪 individual would move on to organize their life according to label imposed
      * (2) net-strengthening 🡪 intensification of social control
      * (3) repressive social control measures
        + Dr Samuel Cartwright (1851) – “Report on the Diseases and Physical Peculiarities of the Negro Race”

article appeared in New Orleans Medical and Surgical Journal

acclaimed for discovering a diseased called “drapetomania”

irrational desire to run away (Negro slaves had the tendency to run away from their slave owners)

premise was that negroes were biologically / organically inferior to whites

drapetomania – irrational desire to run away (Negro slaves had the tendency to run away from their slave owners)

a therapeutic necessity and a medical responsibility on the part of the white slave owners to whip negroes wanting to run away

* + (1) once you think that criminals are organically different 🡪 scientifically differentiated from others
    - no qualms of using oppressive and repressive methods (e.g. genocide)
  + (2) wipes out the context in which the analysis has been orchestrated / staged
  + (3) once diseases are defined and published in the books, it is extremely difficult to get rid of it
  + (4) keeps status quo, advances interests of certain groups
* obsession with the “physical”
  + race as the focus of control by institutions
    - phenotypical characteristics
    - race as a concept raised by colonialism and imperialism
  + racialization – how we explain certain communities’ propensity to commit crime
    - adverse repercussions on coloured communities
    - how do we deal with individuals / communities who are identified as **criminogenic?**
    - stop-and search practices by police
      * disproportionately target certain communities
  + use of racial stereotypes
    - reduce complexities of social life to intelligible terms
    - helps one to make sense more easily
* sociology – critique on classical and positivist criminology
  + Singapore has aligned itself very closely with the inspiration of these two schools of thought
* Durkheim’s works



* + The Division of Labour 1893



* + The Roots of the Sociological Method 1895
    - sociology must undertake an objective, scientific approach 🡪 sociology statistics would then become social facts
  + Suicide 1897
    - macro, structural influence that is often not taken into consideration
    - situate the individuals in the context of society
  + move away from positivist influence 🡪 idea of society as a living organism
    - concepts of **pathology** and **normality**
      * pervasiveness / otherwise of particular social phenomena in societies of similar complexities
      * NOT on the individual but on the society
      * departure from how predecessors perceived crime – crime is a normal phenomenon
  + **normality** 
    - crime exists in all known societies
      * part of everyday structure and consciousness 🡪 it must be normal
    - crime contributes to conditions necessary for group life
    - functionality of crime
      * promotes social solidarity
        + good to have an “average” level of crime – society dictates this average
        + excessive crime – shows that we are excessively tolerant / lenient towards violators
        + excessive censure of crime 🡪 social disorder
        + coming together of mainstream society to condemn the person who had flouted / transgressed societal norms and values
        + crime & deviance serves as a moral marker of society

moral boundary that separates unacceptability from the norm

* + - * + we react against the crime and criminal 🡪 sharpen moral sentiments 🡪 sponsor moral outrage

collective norms are strengthened

values are integrated and reinforced

moral contours of society are reaffirmed

role of media / newspapers in highlighting moral contours

* + - * + a lot of euphoria over crime & criminals – we create a spectacle out of it

commitment to maintaining moral boundaries

open court 🡪 get a sense of morality

cases get published in the papers 🡪 condemnation 🡪 mobilizes the collective norms

public executions

* + - * contributes to social change / registers social progress
        + need to think outside of the box
        + forms the basis of social innovation
        + SG – hires foreign talent for top positions of corporations
* Durkheim’s focus (sociological positivism, normative school)
  + concerned with social solidarity
    - need to maintain collective consciousness
  + concerned with problems facing modern society (pre-industrial 🡪 industrial)
  + how societies undergoing transition created problems for maintaining social solidarity
  + problems of social order – preoccupation of all major sociologists
  + crime as a social construction
* “society of saints”
  + perfect, exemplary individuals – crime is unknown
  + Durkheim was worried that even minor transgressions will incur very heavy, draconian penalties
  + full of law-abiding citizens 🡪 signify lack of progress
    - experience social stagnation
    - committed to equilibrium / status quo
    - social progress VS social stability
  + lack an idea of what is right and wrong / acceptable and unacceptable

**LECTURE 6: DURKHEIM**

* normality of crime
* functionality of crime
  + how it contributes to social solidarity
  + serves as a moral marker in society
    - every time we react against crime / criminal 🡪 excellent opportunity for society to mobilize collective citizens and reinforce collective norms
  + celebrate criminality (develop a certain kind of fetishism over crime)
  + reinforce conventionality
    - two sides of the same coin – not a marginalized phenomenon.
      * conformity and criminality are inseparable
      * through celebration of criminality 🡪 opportunity to reinforce conventionality
  + forms basis of social change
    - deviance = group of individuals who are willing to think outside the box
      * challenge the limits of conventionality
      * not allowing society to remain stagnant
    - without crime / deviance 🡪 opportunity cost to conformity = progress & innovation
      * SG – low crime rate, highly-disciplined society
        + costs (politically, economically, socially, culturally – appetite for embracing social and moral diversity)
        + religious harmony act, fake news
        + state and society extremely cautious about change
        + e.g. Yale-NUS: Resistance and Dissent program suspended
* society of saints
  + neither desirable nor possible
  + society will move on and create new forms of crime / deviance by shifting moral boundaries
* modern, industrial societies
* Anomie theory
  + **anomie** – state of **moral deregulation**
    - individual and society find themselves being insufficiently regulated by societal / normative institutions
    - represents a philosophical critique of modern, industrial capitalist societies
      * modern societies creating an insatiable desire for material consumption
  + Division of Labour (1893) \*very important work
    - referred to the pathological state of economy



* + - * “how sphere of collective life which has been freed from moderating action of moral regulation”
    - industrialization had occurred so quickly 🡪 outstripped capacity of existing institutions to govern the economic affairs of state and society



* + - * certain sectors of economy had largely been allowed to manifest without governance / control 🡪 labour exploitation, cut throat competition
      * 🡪 capitalism to exploit society
  + Hobbes: “latent or active, state of war is necessarily chronic” .. “each individual find himself in a state of war with every other”
    - perspective of human nature
  + Suicide (1897)
    - how individuals become vulnerable to obsession with material consumption
    - ‘illness of infinite aspiration’



* + - * characterized by weariness, disillusionment, disturbance, agitation and discontent
      * Durkheim sees these individuals as a candidate for ending one’s life
* how does someone find themselves in a state of anomie?
  + individual’s conception of happiness
    - desires – ok! good!
      * important to recognize the possibility of achieving those desires
        + harmonious relationship
        + maintaining balance between desires and ability to achieve
      * presumption that it is not part of the human condition to impose self-restraint
        + humans are incapable of regulating one’s own desires
        + look to society to regulate our societies

religion



law



family

community

* + - normative institutions
      * conduct their work from a normative standpoint
      * normative prescriptions and restrictions are clear
      * notion of moral boundaries is clear, serve as moral marker
        + come to be accepted, legitimate
        + in times of rapid social change 🡪 unclear, ambiguous

people ambivalent towards existence of certain norms in society

e.g. transition of societies from a pre-industrial to industrial stage

* transition from mechanical solidarity (MS) 🡪 organic solidarity (OS)
  + **mechanical** solidarity – emblematic of **pre-industrial** societies
    - **few differences** among its members, **uniform consciousness**
  + anomie – **evolutionary transitional period** between MS and OS (peak)
    - state of moral deregulation
    - so important to recognize ability to having those desires fulfilled
      * in periods of dramatic, rapid change (massive structural changes) 🡪 all social institutions had to be part of this evolutionary process
      * in this messiness, the normative prescriptions become unclear
        + existing moral, normative institutions become less efficacious
        + moral institutions (of social control) become outdated / irrelevant as societies evolve towards OS

lacking and lagging behind changes

* + - individual tends to lose balance (during periods of change)
      * have desires but not thinking through if desires could be fulfilled / met in reality
      * society itself is undergoing massive structural change 🡪 cannot maintain social equilibrium (ambiguous and unclear)
      * exceed capacity of individual to fulfil their own desires
      * “inextinguishable thirst is constantly renewed torture ... to pursue a goal which is by definition unattainable is to condemn oneself to a state of perpetual unhappiness”
      * 🡪 becomes melancholic
* etiology (causes) of crime
  + structural (causation of anomie)
    - located problem of crime in structural changes (transition from MS 🡪 OS)
  + social-psychological implications of structural changes
    - how individual responds to social change
      * i.e. absence of social control
      * individual always looks towards external regulating forces to govern their conduct
      * we react to presence / absence of social control
    - society provides the lid on own’s desires
      * individual always looks towards external regulating forces to govern their conduct
      * when lid is not properly closed 🡪 unleashed desires (self-destructive)
      * individual is free from moderating influence of society 🡪 begin to react and respond in the absence / diminishing capacity of existing institutions
      * challenge – how to bring back that social control, social order (normative obsession)
* societies are in a constant state of change / flux
  + Durkheim was writing in 19th century – obsessed with industrialization
  + but right now, we are talking about **4th Industrialization** (technological)
    - important structural changes of our time! (pernicious, lasting)
      * increasing technocratization
      * globalization
      * extremely provincial 🡪 rise of right-wing politics (more divisive), quite antithetical to globalization
      * capitalism
      * massive urbanization
      * rise of social media 🡪 what is happening elsewhere instantaneously reaches you
    - social control functions 🡪 challenges to norms / laws
      * recent years, 5 challenges to institutional laws
      * alternative conceptions of family
      * even use of PMDs have become a national debate
      * national jurisdictions have no clue how to govern cryptocurrency
    - material desires are policed
      * e.g. car loans, HDB allocations, credit bureau
      * not part of human condition to impose self-restraint
      * have to look outwards to regulating force 🡪 guide and regulate desires
    - social life become very much anonymized in HDBs
      * nostalgia / yearning for “kampung” life
* crux of Durkheim’s thesis – diminishing capacity of social control and moral institutions
  + (1) structural changes
  + 🡪 (2) insatiable desires
  + 🡪 (3) vulnerable to committing crime & deviance

**Lecture 7: Robert Merton**

* **Durkheim** (founder of sociology deviance) – offer a **positivist** **appraisal** of the role crime and deviance play in society (1893,1895,1897)
  + how crime and deviance may lead to social change, contribute to social stability
  + conceptualization of **anomie** (seen through into the 20th century)
    - defined as being in a state of **moral deregulation**
    - individual in society is insufficiently regulated by the **social control and moral institutions** 
      * results of **diminished efficacy of institutions** governing individual’s conduct and desires
      * **normative limits** of what is attainable and what is not, line that separates what is acceptable and what is not, gets **blurred** (normative restrictions and prescriptions)
      * 🡪 leads to stage of individual **contend** with **insatiable desires** (pursue an **unattainable goal**) – constantly renewed torture, condemn oneself to a state of **perpetual unhappiness**
      * pushes individual to committing crime, homicide, and at times, suicide
      * fundamental take – it is not human nature to impose self-control 🡪 we look to society to control our desires
    - saw anomie as the **transitional, evolutionary period** between **MS** and **OS**
    - anomie as a result of structural changes
  + critique of modern societies
    - appraisal of transition from pre-industrial to industrial society
      * moral deregulation as a result of structural changes
      * moral institutions weakened as a result
    - moral evaluation of the perils of modern, industrial, capitalist societies
    - anomie as a modern disease
* Robert Merton (1938)
  + took on / borrowed the concept of anomie in the context of American society
    - critical historical period – Great Depression of the 1930s
  + reworked the sequence leading to crime and deviance
    - insatiable desires serve as a starting point – stimulus for this comes from the ethos of capitalism
      * push someone to anomie
    - **insatiable desires 🡪 anomie 🡪 crime and deviance**
  + offered a slightly **different definition** of **anomie**
    - refers to the **structural disjunction** between the **internalization of cultural goals** (monetary success, material standing) and the **availability of institutionalized means** (legitimate, society-sanctioned institutions) to achieve those cultural goals
    - unintended consequence of constant emphasis on social aspiration and mass material consumption within the American culture
    - internalization through **socialization** – family, school, state narratives – to appreciate what success means in society
    - institutionalized means – **education**, **work**, government & politics, marriage & kinship (inheritance)
      * education – social leveler?
        + availability, accessibility, affordability
    - (1) put forth a **social class perspective** – speaks about the **position** of individual and communities in the **social structure** 🡪 determines their **proximity to institutionalized means** 
      * thought about unequal distribution of opportunities – certain segments do not have access to basic institutions that will help them level up in society
  + **American** societies in the **1920/30s** after the first war
    - always seen as a **land of opportunities** – still holds a lot of truth in today’s context
    - great American Dream
      * but for many – that became a nightmare
      * promotes a **materialist culture** where success = money (capitalist society)
        + evaluated in terms of material standing
      * **disjunction –** not all communities are able to participate in the legitimate aspects of economy
  + (2) saw society as **criminogenic** (crime-causing)
    - society seemed to **induce desires**, creating **social appetite** for **material mass consumption**
    - caught in this **paradox** – by **conforming** to societal norms (internalizing norms of material success) 🡪 we have gotten ourselves into **criminality**
      * can NEVER be resolved – there will always be **dropouts** of the **conventional society** (those who have “failed” in society and whose aspirations are unmet)
      * documenting how failed and unmet aspirations 🡪 criminal / deviant motivations
  + (3) huge policy implications
    - redistribution of opportunities to help the lower working-class
    - e.g. government making pre-school more accessible, education is being made more available
    - e.g. in 2002, group of youth social workers who found out that 1 out of 4 children in a certain neighbourhood were not in school
      * not a representative study, it was a purposeful study
      * 2003 🡪 government introduced the Compulsory Education Act
        + mandated that every child needs to be registered in school and remain in school at least for the first 6 years
  + internalize but do not have access 🡪 **status frustration**
    - experience a great deal of **“strain”**
    - view Merton’s theory of anomieasthe **strain theory of crime**
      * due to structural disjunction in which many are caught in

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Modes of Adaptation | Cultural Goals | Institutionalized Means |
| **Conformity**  (how conventional members of society cope with anomie) | + | + |
| **Innovation**  (those who want to be successful materially, but do not play by the rules of conventional society – deviant / criminal methods 🡪 rich) | + | - |
| **Ritualism**  (reject cultural goals but goes through the motions, everyday perils) | - | + |
| **Retreatism**  (drop-outs of society) | - | - |
| **Rebellion**  (seek to reject cultural goals, reject institutionalized means 🡪 have a new system of cultural goals and institutionalized means) | -  + | -  + |

+ = adhere to // - = rejection of

* innovation
  + explains all crimes / deviant acts that have a strong economic motive
    - street crimes (robbery, theft)
    - white-collar crimes
  + Jock Young (1990) – introduced 2 concepts
    - absolute deprivation – street crimes
    - relative deprivation (think that you do not have enough) – white-collar crimes
  + Alexandra Liazos
* ritualism
  + not a criminal category, but a deviant one
    - violation of societal / community norms 🡪 subject to ridicule / ostracization
  + experience **lateral mobility** (stay at a particular level throughout their particular biography)
    - e.g. low-end of gig economy: grab delivery / drivers
      * not protected by insurance
      * are they able to cope with demands of today’s society?
* retreatism
  + says a lot about marginalization
    - social –
    - structural –
  + unintended consequence of capitalism
    - constant stress on social aspiration
    - subscription to notion of material success
  + petty criminals, drunkards, vagrants and vagabonds
  + **chronic** **recidivists** (re-offenders) – spent big portion of their lives in prison / institutions
    - **“re-integration”** – **misleading** premise (assumption they were already once integrated)
      * fact is that many of them would have been on the **margins of society** already 🡪 commit crime 🡪 prisons 🡪 return to margins of society
      * **institutionalization** – keeping someone in an institution, after a certain stage / time 🡪 **imperatives** of the institution takes over
        + longer you are in an institution 🡪 more difficult it will be when you return to society
        + **PARADOX**: grow comfortable with being told what to do – **takes away autonomy** and yet, it expects you to carry on with your own life upon release

basic needs are met, told what to do

* + - * + Erving Goffman – described institutionalization as **“civil death”**
* rebellion
  + Marxists, revolutionarists, politicians (?), gangs
* carceral continuum (Foucault)
  + schools 🡪 prisons
  + institutionalization – don’t know you are being subject to the effects of institutionalization till you are very deep into it

Week 8

Robert Merton (1938)

* etiology of crime (investigating what causes crime)
  + how individuals deal / cope with the structural gap between availability of institutionalized means and internalization of cultural norms
* class analysis
  + accessibility to opportunities
    - how one’s location in the social structure will influence one’s proximity to accessing opportunities
  + appreciating inequities that often are built into the social structure
* unmet / failed aspirations
  + unequal / uneven distribution of legitimate opportunities in our society
* blocked opportunities
  + may come in the form of discrimination (implicit / explicit)
    - internalized cultural goals of success but not able to access resources
    - e.g. in the workplace, market
* paradox between conformity and criminality (to be deconstructed / unpacked)
  + how conformity to societal norms and goals might bring about problems of criminality
  + pushes certain individuals / communities to the margins of society
* e.g. blanket ban on PMDs
  + yes, it is in public interest
  + there is hundreds and thousands of individuals dependent on PMDs for their livelihood (food delivery business)
  + that is taken away from them 🡪 would they be able to carry on with their occupational activities? 🡪 how to cope with that?
* modes of adaptations (refer to last week’s table)
  + conformists
  + ritualists
  + etc.
* opened up horizons of sociologists 🡪 went on to offer a more class-based assessment of why certain communities / individuals are a lot more prone to crime and deviance
  + policies – equalizing opportunities, addressing problem of social mobility
* using his theory to make sense of religious cults / religious-inspired terrorist organizations
* limitations
  + (1) predict too little white-collar crime, too much of working-class crimes
    - by virtue of the fact that he has adopted a social class analysis of crime (structural feature of his theory)
    - those at the bottom of the social structure will face the greatest “strain” to deviate from the norm
      * deprived of opportunities, have great difficulties accessing societal resources and opportunities
    - perpetuate the sociological study of deviance (nut, sluts, perverts by Liazos)
    - **REBUTTAL**: mode of adaptations – **innovation** – does include white-collar, corporate crimes
  + (2) too deterministic
    - individuals who experience anomie (structural disjunction) would eventually deviate from the norm / societal expectations
      * we all do experience anomie from time to time, find ourselves being not able to access opportunities / experience failed or unmet aspirations
      * that experiencing of anomie does not necessarily 🡪 adoption of modes of adaptations (innovation, ritualist, retreatists, rebellion)
        + there are certain protective mechanisms that prevent us from deviating – **social “brakes” / social control**

may entertain the motivation / urge, have the propensity to commit crime, but don’t do so

Hirschi’s Theory

(1) attachment

emotional attachment with significant others (who offer themselves as role models)

(2) involvement

conventional activities – school (CCAs – offer distractions, opportunities for involvement) / religion 🡪 develop material / emotional attachment with SOs

(3) commitment

creating social stakes in society 🡪 person would think about it and convince themselves out of that motivation to commit crime

e.g. “who’s going to pay my XX loans?”

(4) belief

in the goodness of law

socialization / inculcation of good values that will prevent you from committing crime / deviant acts

* + - * + Travis Hirschi (1969) – The Causes of Delinquency

why people do conform to rules and regulations

* + - * + Gottfredson & Hirschi (1990) – A General Theory of Crime **(readings)**

we will be in a state of anomie most of the time

but not everyone ends up as a deviant / criminal

MORAL VALUES / God? / fear of getting caught by police

* + - Hirschi’s theory speaks overwhelmingly to the middle-class / mainstream individuals
      * only middle-class would worry about what to lose
      * fades away as the person finds himself in the prison for a very long time
        + cognitive dissonance between the narrative and experiences of this individual
      * if person has existing orientation against law, you cannot instill (4)
    - these four features / mechanisms can be seen in another social unit – gang
    - Everitt Hughs – gangs as “bastard institutions” / illegitimate entities
      * serves the same functions as any conventional institutions would
  + (3) modes of adaptation – too individualistic



* + - response to anomie too atomized?
      * do individuals solve their structural problem of anomie individually?



* + (4) ignored / obscured / overlook the **historical time period / lag** between experiencing anomie and becoming a criminal / deviant



* + - takes a while for one to learn the tricks of the trade / become a competent criminal / efficient deviant
    - assumes its almost immediate that a person becomes a criminal deviant upon experiencing anomie – in reality, not the case
      * they would have been **exposed** to a **value system**, to the competencies that will enable that person to become a competent criminal / deviant
      * **socialized** the individual experiencing anomie to learning the tricks of the trade

Edwin Sutherland

* **differential association**
  + this learning is so important for the criminal / deviant to see through the acts of criminality competently – important requirement to understand the criminal biographies
  + how does this learning take place?
    - in a context of a group / intimate settings
      * through a process of constant communication and interaction
* studied in the Chicago School
* crime & deviance as a manifestation of “social disorganization”
  + poverty 🡪 class 🡪 community 🡪 wider sociological ecology
  + however, not all poor people / working class people end up committing crime
    - got to do with **networks**, **associations (peer groupings)**
    - who you mix around with / have as a role model / kind of support to learning how to be a criminal, it matters
* cultural transmission of criminal values and norms
* inter-generational and intra-generational criminality
* **8 points of differential association** / learning 🡪 used to make sense of other theories
  + (1) criminal behaviour is **learned**
  + (2) criminal behaviour is learned in **interaction** with other persons in a process of **communication**
  + (3) most of this learning happens in **intimate personal groups**
  + (4) learning criminal behaviours involves both
    - learning **techniques** of crime
    - acquiring appropriate **attitudes**, **motives**, **neutralizations** and **rationalizations**
      * adopting a system that supports your criminal deviations
  + (5) acquiring appropriate criminal attitudes requires **negative evaluation of law**
  + (6) become delinquent because of **excess of negative attitudes** to the law over positive ones
    - principle of differential association
  + (7) differential associations may **vary** in terms of
    - Time
    - Significance
    - Commitment
  + (8) process of learning criminal behaviour – **similar** to all **other kinds of learning**
* prison = university of crime
  + high concentration of criminality
    - more seasoned prisoners would contaminate others (take on the role of professors)
    - inculcate criminal values and norms
  + prisoners socialized into a prison culture 🡪 posing challenges to the prisoner administration
* Merton & Sutherland: if want to have a conforming individual 🡪 create conventional role models / activities 🡪 person would grow to abide conventional expectations
  + modes of adaptation (Merton) + collective response (Sutherland) + learning (Sutherland) + values (Sutherland) = **subculture (coined by Albert Cohen, 1955)**
    - a subculture denotes a collective response to anomie, not an individualized, atomized response as put forth by Merton
    - learning done in the presence of a collective – person exposed to a body of knowledge and values that would reinforce a particular way that the person sees the social world
      * techniques of neutralization
* Albert Cohen – The Delinquent Boys
  + offer the authoritative referencing on all works of gangs
  + explores what is so attractive about being in gangs & why are working class boys attracted to gangs?
  + disagrees with Merton’s theory (too simplistic and rough)
    - the paradigm was a little too mechanical – about + and – (doesn’t really work in reality)
    - deviance is **not** an **abrupt transition** between different permutations of goals and means – it is a **process** that has its seeds in **the legitimate institutions of the school**
  + fundamental critique of the conventional society, of the school system
    - fascist? protects the 20% who does well, who goes on to govern institutions
    - what makes people drop out / persevere or be resilient in these institutions?
      * speaks to lived experiences

Robert Park

* armchair sociologist would not be good

Week 9:

* subcultures (Albert Cohen)
  + why is it that working-class boys find gang membership an attractive endeavor?
  + explicitly adopted **social class analysis**
  + response to theoretical shortcomings of Robert Merton’s and Edwin Sutherland’s theory
    - Merton
      * adopted concept of **anomie** 🡪 who took from Durkheim
        + state of moral deregulation
      * adopted **modes of adaptation**
    - Sutherland
      * adopted concept of **collective response**
      * adopted the concept of how criminal behaviour is **learnt** **behaviour**
    - 🡪 in effect all this = subculture
  + by definition, subculture is a **deviant phenomenon**
    - always understood **in relation** to **mainstream / dominant culture** (it’s a binary)
    - whenever the dominant culture **poses contradictions / imperfections** to the population 🡪 subculture comes into play / forms
      * e.g. pursuit of material wealth – not everyone has the resources / privilege to do so
      * **sources** of contradictions (especially in a diverse / plural society)
        + inequality (**social class**)

position in the social structure creates tensions / contradictions & imperfections

**working class members** move away from mainstream, dominant spaces to form a subculture

* + - * + **religion**

when mainstream institutionalized religion doesn’t satisfy / speak to lived experiences / one’s orientations 🡪 break-away 🡪 ISIS-inspired organizations / extremism (tendency to form cults)

* + - * + **age**
        + **race / ethnicity**
        + **gender**
    - contradictions and imperfections are found / experienced in the **context** of **schools (institution)**
      * **middle-class institution**, staffed by middle-class teachers, run along **middle-class values and goals**, children are taught to **aspire for these goals / values** **irrespective of their class**
      * **common uniform yardstick** used to evaluate all children (middle-class inspired)
        + **“middle-class standards / measuring rod”**
        + assumes diverse range of manifestations

curriculum

teachers’ expectations of children

way we respond to learning gaps

* + - * other children experience **status frustration, stigmatization**, **marginalization** within middle-class institution
        + leads to them dropping out 🡪 **overturn** the **middle-class value system** / de-emphasize the middle class emphasis on certain goals 🡪 form / join subculture
  + subculture is an alternative social system – not mainstream
    - own value and meaning systems
    - illegitimate (side of) society
    - formed in response to contradictions & imperfections in conventional institutions
  + gangs = **empirical manifest** of the social construct of ‘**subculture’**
    - provides substantive notion of what a subculture is and how subcultures might manifest
    - genesis of gang membership is to be found in the school system
  + **lived experiences** of working-class children & members
    - often struggle to cope with demands of the school institution
    - speaks to the notion of **socialization**
      * how socialization practices are a **product** of your **class position**
      * substantively different from middle-class counterparts
      * affects other social differentials
        + parenting – child-rearing practices
        + academic success
      * **concerted cultivation** (Annette Lareau)
        + middle-class kids are raised in a way that provides them with skills & resources necessary to remain in the middle class
      * working class socialization is insufficient, inadequate
    - when they move into schools 🡪 find **structural incompatibilities** between their **growing up / experiences** as a working-class kid and the types of **expectations** they need to fulfil in the **school system**
      * creates negative experience in the school system 🡪 dropping out of the most conventional institution
  + **middle-class socialization** orchestrated around these values
    - and this content is what is expected in school
      * e.g. individual responsibility
      * academic achievement
      * rationality in time budgeting
      * good manners, sociability
      * control of aggression
      * constructive use of leisure time
      * respect for other people’s property
    - this emphasis is not found in working-class socialization
      * structurally, does not equip them with the skills and resources to attain these goals and values
  + “Learning to Labour” (Paul Willis) – week 5 SC3204 reading
    - address why working-class kids end up doing working class jobs
    - many of them found school to be irrelevant – very comfortable with getting working class jobs
    - how certain individuals / communities are **structurally entrapped**, unable to move out of that poverty cycle 🡪 **intergenerational deprivation**
  + **deviance** is a **process,** not an abrupt transition between different goals and means
    - critique of Merton’s theory
    - about class experiences, status frustration, dropping out of school institutions, joining gangs, being comfortable with joining subculture
    - **progressive involvement / commitment** to & **movement among social roles** 🡪 out of which, a deviant identity is finally established
    - response to the structural conditions / contingencies that deliquents face and need to overcome
  + risk assessment / profiling instrument in the 1990s by social workers, counsellers and those who carry out interventionist work
    - very black-and-white (YES/NO)
    - new ways of classifying and addressing risk has assumed sophisticated forms (but object remains – the need to manage and predict risk is a modern-day obsession)
      * Risk, Needs, Responsibility model (R&R?)
      * Risk tool to analyze juvenile and elderly offenders
    - **risk-averse mode** 🡪 work of profilers and predicts become more important
  + such classification **🡪** trigger / sponsor self-fulfilling prophecy
    - leads to **marginalization, stigmatization, exclusionary practices**
    - **redefining meritocracy –** national concern, changing narratives
      * “problem with a single**-**dimensional definitional of meritocracy”
      * “dismantle meritocracy? No, create opportunities for all, for every stage of life”
      * “meritocracy and its toll on our students”
        + Merton’s theory at work

how conformity can bring about disastrous unintended consequences (criminality and deviancy)

unmet / failed aspirations

* + - * + meritocracy is an ideal, a process to achieve success

however, it can bring about a host of problems (mental health) – youth suicides, psychiatric health

status frustration and deprivation – the toll that it takes on you

* + - * “education still a social leveller but its more than grades” – by Ong Ye Kun
      * “scrap streaming in secondary schools: Louis Ng”
        + streaming – about **customization**, creating different pathways for those who might benefit from an additional year with school
        + balanced with **stigmatization** – kind of perceptions attached to kids on the academically slower pathways (NA/NT)

end point is different – unlikely to arrive at tertiary institution

* + - * goes back to 1997/8
        + how teachers in primary 1 are confronted with two extreme groups of performers
        + ministry revamped – it got to do with preschool 🡪 state’s intervention into cleaning up the preschool system
        + it is about **class** – **determines** **access** to the kind of preschool you are able to afford

**cultural, social capital** that comes with particular social positions

* + - * “should pre-schools be ‘nationalised’?”
        + as a way to equalize opportunities – gap was becoming pronounced, showing up in results and academic achievement
      * “‘risky’ to formalize preschool learning”
        + seen to interfere with the market
      * template now = MOE-run preschools (within primary schools)
        + form of nationalizing pre-schools
        + good way to equalize opportunities
      * KidStart program (20 million invested)
    - 2011 – “parents’ background the edge for students at top schools: MM” (LKY)
      * higher-educated parents ‘tend to foster better learning environment’
      * notion of **social and cultural capital** at work – mantra for many sociologists to **understand lived experiences** and **opportunities**
    - “parentocracy” – those who get ahead thanks to parents with more resources, not merit
      * strong correlation between class and academic performance
  + a lot of resources poured into strengthening families / pre-schools 🡪 equalize opportunities
    - addresses money capital
    - need to help them accumulate cultural and social capital (requires time)
      * social capital – networking
        + not just about bonding capital
        + enhancing bridging capital – through these connections, opportunities will come
      * cultural capital
        + language proficiency – developing competency takes time
    - transitional stage that we find ourselves in
  + working class kids learning to cope (with status frustration and stigmatization)
    - become rebels, **resist** middle-class values and goals
      * turn the middle-class value system **upside down / negative polarity to the respectable status system**
      * **de-emphasis** of middle-class values 🡪 develop own value system that working-class kids are most comfortable with (values and goals that are **more aligned** with their **class experiences**)
      * more achievable and attainable for working class kids
    - e.g. if lack of aggression is prized in middle-class – violence and aggression are celebrated as desired traits among working-class kids
      * performance of masculinity – exaggerated, hyper-masculinity
    - 🡪 alternative social system = gang
      * **celebration and subscription to violence** – as a way to solve and overcome many structural problems delinquents face
      * violence becomes a **status resource** in itself
      * celebration of non-conformity in itself = status resource
        + deliberately breaking rules
        + challenging authority
        + disrupting social life

**Week 10:**

* recap: subculture comes as a result of structural contradictions experienced by the lower working class
* Albert Cohen (The Delinquent Boys, 1955)
  + social class analysis
  + social class poses contradictions and imperfections to the working-class community
  + focal concern – school
    - how school became the essential source of imperfection
    - working class kids being evaluated via a middle-class standard 🡪 experience great deal of status frustration 🡪 drop out of conventional institution 🡪 finds solace in alternate system (subculture)
    - conventional institutions represent a kind of monopoly / hegemony – benchmark for society
  + subculture represents a deviant function
  + deviance is a process
    - working class citizens are ill-equipped to face the demands of the dominant culture due to lack of socialization (status frustration)
  + cumulative advantage
    - born into privileged family 🡪 cultural and social capital 🡪 allow you to navigate challenges later in life
  + subculture = alternative social system with its own distinctive set of goals, values and set of meanings
    - gangs can be seen as empirical equivalent of subculture
* Walter Miller (1958)
  + disagrees with Cohen’s conception of subculture
    - subculture may not necessarily come as a result of contradictions posed by the dominant culture
    - gang culture is simply an extension of working-class culture
      * focal concerns are not dissimilar
  + understands how a culture comes about incognizant of the structural conditions
    - subculture is a product of the interplay between culture and structure
  + 6 focal concerns of working-class culture
    - (1) **trouble**
      * life revolves around violence
      * violence is the means to resolve conflict
    - (2) demonstration of **toughness**
      * demonstrating traits and attributes of ‘manliness’ – taking on a hyper-masculinized role
      * reckless masculinity, not properly governed, exaggerated
      * through tattoos (body art) – revolved around the notions of the ‘physical’
      * VS sports and fast cars – middle class display of masculinity
    - (3) **smartness**
      * both physical attribute (need to dress up for the occasion) and being street smart (surviving the streets)
    - (4) **excitement**
      * way to compensate for their mundane, unaspiring jobs = need to search for fun, have a good enjoyment (as though there is no tomorrow)
    - (5) **autonomy**
      * resist / resent being watched & pushed around by police and other social control agents
      * way to understand the unfavourable relationship between the working class / racial minorities / poor communities and police
    - (6) strong sense of **fatalism**
      * little can be done to change life – once in a rut, always in a rut
  + working-class culture puts itself at the risk of being in trouble
* sociological significance of tattooing
  + self-inscription, has a social context and function
  + defines self against an outside world + inscribing the individual onto a social group
    - sets apart from the rest
    - also creates the platform for demonstration of social solidarity (in-group) –

forged and articulated

* + Clinton Sanders (1988)
    - both a (1) mark of disaffiliation from conventional society and (2) symbolic affirmation of personal identity and association
  + Frankie Johnson (2006)
    - “autobiographical statements”
    - “personal objects, symbolic expressions of personality, biography, interests and individual fantasies”
  + “Only God Can Judge Me” tattoo (regular prisoner?)
    - resents being evaluated / scrutinized by mortals / mainstream middle-class members who look down on his profession
    - deals with dead bodies all the time
    - centipede tattoo – secret society / gang
  + racialized tattoos (Singapore) – Indian bodies / Thaipusum
    - examples
      * “the only sweetest girl I ever kissed is another man’s wife – my mother”
      * “warrior” / “you live once, you die once, this is the way of the warrior”
      * “kiss me when I cry, bless me when I die”
      * “naughty by nature” / “bad boy”
      * “sara jumbo” – Indian prison gang
      * “law is blind” / “fuck the law”
      * “brave heart”, “death before dishonor”
      * image of native Indians
      * “anjadi” – derogatory term (a stray dog)
      * “never say regret” – fatalism
    - self-conception – see themselves as naughty, making trouble
    - perhaps to communicate their ethno-class position
    - principal of mutual reciprocity – if you are good to me, I will be good to you; but if you try to be funny, I will come after you
    - goddess is only found in the cemetery, not in mainstream institutions – in charge of the restless souls, make sure they don’t wander off
      * gangsters mainstream her
      * demonstrate fearsome and fearlessness – they see themselves in these images
* limitations / critique of Albert Cohen’s theory
  + described subculture as
    - (1) negative (negative polarity to middle class)
    - (2) malicious (activities of delinquent subculture are done on impulse, without thinking)
    - (3) non-utilitarian (does not have a function)
    - perhaps it is true of the boys whom he studied – who engage in mindless violence, create trouble just to upset authority
* Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin (1960)
  + argued that the subculture world is hugely differentiated – subcultures are diverse
    - this diversity needs to be understood in terms of one’s access to illegitimate opportunities
    - parallels that of Merton’s theory (his was about access to opportunities in legitimate societies 🡪 strain 🡪 IRRR 🡪 illegitimate society)
  + (1) **criminal** **subculture**
    - seen as the apex of the criminal hierarchy
    - pinnacle of all subcultures
    - hierarchical, organized, bureaucratic
    - (A) strong **economic motive**
    - (B) strong **adult criminal network**
      * risen up the ranks and offer themselves as successors
      * 🡪 opportunities for social mobility in an illegitimate sense
    - (C) **symbiotic** relationship with **conventional institutions**
      * contributes to the sustaining of the subculture
      * important for all organized crime
      * collusion that exists between organized crime and legitimate entities / institutions
      * e.g. HK government collude with triads to subdue protestors
      * e.g. yakuza / Japanese mafia have functional? relationship with the Japanese governor
    - e.g. AST / KST / 369 (Singapore)
  + (2) **conflict** **subculture**
    - in the illegitimate society – own notion of success (criminal subculture)
      * **must** have **access** to **learning** and **opportunity** **structures** (just as you do need access in legitimate society)
      * your **mobility** is very much **determined** by your **access**
    - not having access to criminal subculture, even though they want to make it big / rise up the ranks
      * experiencing “status frustration” / “strain” 🡪 manifests as mindless violence (unpredictable)
      * conflict-oriented – easily aggravated / fight out of boredom
      * dramatic, demonstrated masculinity
    - loosely organized
      * no well-defined leadership
      * membership is porous
      * lacking in intensity and commitment to gang
  + (3) **retreatist subculture** 
    - “**double failures / drop-outs**” – failed in both the legitimate and illegitimate society
      * do not have access nor the ambition to rise up the criminal ladder
    - individuals who experience **double marginalization**
  + similar concepts (mobility, social capital, access to opportunities, social networks and success) which exist in legitimate society also exist in illegitimate society
    - **ACCESSIBILITY**

**Week 11:**

* subcultural theory
  + conceptualization as an alternative social system
  + very thick line that exists between dominant culture and subculture
    - the moment the deviant who is faced with contradictions and imperfections 🡪 drops out of conventional society 🡪 enters subculture
  + critique
    - is subculture a construct born out of social scientists’ work – so that we could go about thinking about deviance in such binary terms?
      * construct that is imposed onto others – lends coherence to the social scientists, not deviants themselves
    - have we come to essentialize the subculture?
      * seeing them as a distinct category of individuals
    - subcultural theory has come to **essentialize** the **deviant**
* David Matza
  + these attributes (Miller’s 6 focal concerns) are not unique / exclusive to members a gang – you see it elsewhere too, even in dominant mainstream culture
  + direct criticism of subcultural theory
  + theoretical premise: no difference between deviant and mainstream member
    - * certainly nothing remarkable or pathological about deviants
  + **theory of delinquency drift (1964/1966)**
    - both subscribe to **conventional value system** and **subterranean value systems** concurrently
      * subterranean values – looking for fun and excitement (e.g. sexuality, aggressiveness)
        + want to be free from the grip of the conventional value system
      * most of the time we allow conventional values to guide our orientation, to inspire us
        + but once in a while, we move over to subterranean value system **(interludes of delinquency)**
        + often oscillate between these two value systems
        + period of **liminality** – **allowable deviance**
  + deviance / crime is ‘normal’ – but because they often have been expressed in the **most inappropriate of situations** 🡪 acquire “deviant” / “criminal” label
    - (1) social class
      * position in social structure 🡪 access to legitimate platforms for the pursuit of subterranean values
        + neutralizes **perceived** acts of deviance
      * **visibility**
        + William Chamblis – Saints and the Roughnecks
        + Saints had access to automobiles – go to next town
        + Roughnecks – often hang around at street corners
    - (2) social context
      * platform that allows for allowable deviance
      * affects how evaluators look at one’s perceived act of transgression
    - (3) social response / reactions
  + **techniques** of **neutralization**
    - neutralize / justify the criminal / deviant act
    - (1) denial of **responsibility**
    - (2) denial of **victim**
      * engage in vocabulary that attributes blame to victim
      * quite entrenched in crimes against women – especially sexual crimes
    - (3) denial of **injury**
      * no harm done
    - (4) **condemnation** of **condemners**
      * questioning moral / legal authority of those who are sanctioning the deviant / criminal conduct
      * “yes I did XXX, but I’m sure you did it too”
    - (5) appeal to **higher loyalty**
      * e.g. instances of terrorism – “did it for God”, “did it to keep society pure”
      * street level – “did it to maintain pride of gang”
    - even the most dangerous criminals who commit the most heinous of crimes has engaged in one / many of these techniques of neutralization
      * have **not abandoned conventional ideals / values**
  + leave them alone 🡪 they will settle in and out of crime 🡪 settle in conventional value system
    - however, when we sanction them 🡪 stigmatization
  + loosens the grip of normative theories 🡪 gateway to labelling tradition
    - normative / functionalist traditions – deeply entrenched, monopoly over how we think about (correcting) the deviant
      * task of sociology is to understand and explicate why the deviant has come to transgress societal norms
      * problematize criminal / deviant motivations 🡪 **disproportionately** focusing on the **deviant** **in relation to society** for answers (due to framing of theoretical questions – WHY?)
        + Emile Durkheim -
        + Robert Merton – contestation between classes, status frustration
        + Edwin Sutherland – differential association
        + Albert Cohen
        + Cloward and Ohlin – access to differential opportunities
        + not about individualizing deviants (done by positivists)
    - labellists / constructionists / social reactionists / symbolic interactionists
      * appreciate the process of **deviantization** / **criminalization**
        + through the work of **social control**
        + producedbythe **control agents / institutions**
      * questioning / critiquing social control
* labelling tradition
  + why is a person / condition deviantized? 🡪 look at social forces / historical periods
  + deviance is not an immutable category, but rather a conferred property
  + (1) why do certain individuals / acts / conditions come to be defined and labelled as “deviant” in certain historical periods?
    - nothing intrinsic about deviance, constructed through the work of social control
    - **relativity** of crime and deviance – pre-empt any attempt to universalize this phenomenon
  + (2) expanded the scope of definition of deviance
    - including people with disabilities, people of colour, etc.
    - in other words, people who are different
    - problematizes the distinction between what is different and what is deviance (often obscured in normative traditions)
      * this distinction is simply a function of **social reaction**, dependent on the **social audience**
        + social audience – critical variable 🡪 eventually decides whether any given action(s) will become a visible case of deviation
      * role of social deviance
  + through social definitions, responses and reactions 🡪 individuals acquire their “deviant-ness”
  + POWER
    - (1) micro-centeredness (everyday encounters)
      * power to judge, label, ostracize and outcast
      * meanings portrayed and imposed onto others
    - (2) macro level
      * historical
      * structural
      * social
      * cultural
      * biographical
      * institutional
    - degrees of contestations between labeler and the labelled
      * 🡪 fluidity and relativity of the concepts of deviance
      * “stigma contests”
        + moral crusaders / rule enforcers VS labelled
        + success of warding off label depends on social structural position
      * epistemological problem
        + whose side are you on? – Howard Becker

degree of identification with deviant

own positionality in studying deviance

* + moral entrepreneurs
    - source of the deviantizing process
    - their standards and rules are legitimated
    - their notion of respectability and power that is sustained and reinforced
    - work is contested when people fight against it
      * e.g. civil activism
  + way that label is applied 🡪 could lead to social exclusion and marginalization

Week 12: Labelling Tradition & Marxist Criminology

**Week 12: Labelling Tradition**

* normative / functionalist school of thought
  + 1893 – 1960s: monopolized knowledge on crime and deviance
    - 1893: Division of Labour – Emile Durkheim
      * important references to crime and deviance
    - Durkheim: anomie, deregulation
    - Merton: structural incompatibilities between working class socialization and middle- class institutions
  + address why individuals deviate from established norms & values
    - converged in problematizing deviant / criminal motivation
    - understood in terms of social structure
    - often explains that departure between social inequities and social inequalities
      * access to opportunities
      * marginalization
      * discrimination
      * structural incompatibilities in terms of class, race experiences
    - disproportionate focus on the individual
  + good foundation to appreciate subsequent theoretical work
* labelling tradition: turning point in sociology of deviance
  + reoriented focus of sociology of deviance and crime
  + due to political, social climate of the 1960s – ascendance of radicalized debates
* constructionist / symbolic interactionist / labellists
  + not just about the deviant, but underscores the importance of the **process** of deviantization / criminalization
    - process that is sponsored / castrated by social control
    - only complete with the entry of social control 🡪 social control becomes the focus
  + how social groups create deviance through **social reactions / responses & social policies** 
    - effectively **manufacture / construct / create** crime and deviance
      * e.g. ban of PMDs – criminalization of PMD users simply through act of parliament
    - **nothing** is **intrinsically** and **immutable** about crime and deviance
      * individuals and conditions acquire their deviant-ness
      * crime and deviance = a political, social, historical and cultural construct – born out of **specific historical and political contexts / circumstances**
      * not a universal phenomenon – appreciate its **relativity**
        + time
        + space
  + **expand** the **scope of definition** of what constitutes deviance
    - puts all of us at the risk of being identified / labelled as deviant (since it is relative)
    - notion of **power** is central to this
      * at micro, everyday level – power can be exercised
      * at the macro level – institutional power
    - problematize the fine distinction between difference and deviance
      * deviance – attaching a negative label to the difference
      * definition of deviance opens up to include people who look different
        + medical illnesses, disability, appearances
    - incorporates and recognizes the role of **social audience**
      * becomes the critical variable – eventually decides whether or not any given action(s) will become a visible case of deviation
    - e.g. disproportionate representation of Malays in drug statistics since the 80s (51-52%) – remarkably stable
      * CNB: only agency that releases statistics on ethnicity
      * Merton: lack of access to opportunities, dropping out of society
        + structural marginalization and incompatibilities
        + look to social structure – seek to explain inequalities and inequities that exist in social structure
      * constructionist: work of enforcement – how social control is being distributed in society
        + how enforcement practices are organized
        + how police go about stopping and searching someone on account of race
        + statistical discrimination 🡪 **differential** policing

internalization of official knowledge (stats) 🡪 guides enforcement practices

* + - * + problematizes notion of selective social control
        + how decisions to stop and search are executed at the street level
  + moral entrepreneurs (Howard Becker - “Outsider” (1963))
    - in a bit to fix the problem and deal with social concerns 🡪 tend to create more problems
    - staging moral crusades
    - rule creators – did a good job //but now: whole task is given to rule enforcers
  + have to do with prejudiced mind – social mapping has taken place
    - going for a particular geographical locale
    - guided by controlling images – images that are so deeply etched in our consciousness (we see the social world through a particular lens – it is raced, class and gendered)
  + Jerome Skolaich
    - 1986 – Justice without Trial (context of the US)
      * enforcement officers working with the image of the “symbolic assailant” in their consciousness
      * role of social audience is so critical in making the decision to involve the criminal justice system when it comes to a particular race
      * the darker your skin is 🡪 the more dangerous you will be perceived as
  + Paul Gorden
    - myth of black criminality
  + (1) role of social control needs to be problematized
    - rules need to be problematized and deconstructed
      * problematizing how rules are created and applied (when it comes to certain visible communities
    - work of moral entrepreneur needs to receive critique
      * their rules that are being applied; their standards are being legitimatized
      * their notion of respectability that is being referenced
  + line between difference and deviance is a lot more nuanced and needs to be appreciated
    - got to do with social audience
  + (2) how we deal with the deviant
    - **stigma contest** 
      * sometimes (groups of) individuals do fight back – based on their position in the social structure and ability to marshal resources to fight against institutions that are imposing the label on them
    - once the deviant label is being applied, it will set off a process
      * momentum of its own
      * label is self-fulfilling / self-reinforcing / self-propelling towards a much large process – **deviance amplification** 
        + Edwin Lemert (1972)

primary deviation – initial instance of rule breaking

🡪 incur societal penalties to punish the person

physiological

environmental

psychological

sociological

if punishment is stigmatizing / exclusionary 🡪 further primary deviation 🡪 stronger penalties & rejection 🡪 further deviation (deviant person reacts strongly to the punishment) 🡪 sever penalties / punishment 🡪 crisis point reached 🡪 individual will be **engulfed** in a **stigmatized identity** (secondary deviation)

**master status**: becomes defining / chief attribute of the individual – every **other identity** becomes **subordinate**

master status is deeply entrenched and institutionalized

extremely difficult for individual to come out of it – trapped in stigmatized identity

stigma lowers self-confidence, brutalizes self-esteem

* + - 3 ways to punish an offender
      * (1) **retributive / punitive** 
        + imposes / brings about **social exclusion**

banishment, imprisonment

* + - * + Garfinkel: how we have **institutionalized status degradation ceremonies**

person labelled as deviant is subject to these ceremonies

assigned a new role – label redefines one’s role in society

* + - * + marshaling of resources to sanction 🡪 stigmatizing / shaming
      * (2) “reintegrative shaming” – John Braithwaite
        + punish the person, but not so punitively that one renders the person to the margins of society
        + e.g. Yellow Ribbon project
      * (3) alternative narrative
        + Crime and the Community – Frank Tannenbaum (1938)

harder they work to reform the evil, the greater the evil grows under their hands 🡪 brings out the bad behaviour that it would suppress

quite inadvertently, you will amplify the deviance you seek to suppress

refusal to dramatize the evil – less said about it, the better; the more said about something else, still better

* + - * + not to persistently / constantly reference to a person’s past behaviour as it creates social and psychological stumbling blocks for social reintergration

talk about something else

* + - * + e.g. Yellow Ribbon Project – ‘normalisation’

normalization needs to be nuanced and sensitively handled – do away the difference / stigmatization

how normalization – if taken a little too far / too intense – can backfire

accentuate and amplify the deviance you seek to suppress in the first place

* + - * + e.g. dining behind bars

played on the institutional context in which individuals are being caged

extremely degrading process – when prisoners are kept in cells, caged, and every aspect of prisoner life is governed by the institution

bringing privileged people into the prison context while prisoners cook for them – and they make donations

well-intentioned, but to make a glory out of dining behind bars – disconcerting

* + paved way for Marxist criminology

**Week 13: Marxist Criminology**

* recap & link:
  + close affinity between labelling tradition and sociology of deviance as a whole
    - both strongly undergirded the notion that crime is a political and social construct
  + classical criminology (Beccaria) & positivist criminology (Lombroso) – appreciate how these two forms of criminology have come to impact the way we think about criminals
  + labelling tradition that radically re-oriented the focus of the sociology of deviance – provide fundamental critique of the institutions in society
    - this excitement and radicalism in ideas and practices that invited Marxist criminologists to expand the boundaries of these ideas
* Marxist criminology
  + subscribe to the idea that crime is a social and political construct
  + also argue that crime and deviance are an ideological construction on the part of the capitalist institutions and state
  + labelling tradition – too micro-oriented, captured the essence & configurations of power, but has not gone that far to talk about the role of the state and its institutions in the production of crime
  + capitalistic society itself is criminogenic, it is crime-causing
    - crime is institutionalized in the capitalist society, not as a pathological phenomenon
    - as a rational response to the social inequalities and exploitation produced by the capitalist mode of production
    - poverty and exploitation (associated with the capitalism system) induces criminal motivations, create the conditions for crime and deviance
  + took issue with the Mertonian paradigm
    - modes of adaptation are akin to pulling a jackpot machine
    - did not tell us who is getting the profits (benefits out of this “machine”) and who has come to place the “machine” there in the first place
      * need to appreciate the context of a capitalist system
  + inspiration from Karl Marx’s theory of capitalist development
    - **most important aspect** of human being’s social life lay in the **material basis** of that life
    - saw **human beings as producers** and the **form** which this production took would have a **wide influence** on many other aspects of their **social life** (including legal and political institutions + ideas & beliefs which members of a society in a particular historical period held)
    - important to look at people as they actually live in society
      * economic and material base of society
    - **organization of production**
      * (1) **forces of production** – raw materials, tools, technical knowledge, human labour
      * (2) **social relations of production** – distribution / possession of the means of production (e.g. land & machinery that are necessary to produce things)
      * (1) + (2) = mode of production
    - each stage in historical process was characterized by a particular mode of production
      * on this base, every other aspect (legal, political, welfare, religious institutions etc.) of society was constructed
      * **not** **determined** by this base, but material base certainly **set limits** to what could possibly develop
    - **economic structure** of society = **‘real basis’** which **influenced** the character and content of **‘superstructure’** of society
      * ‘superstructure’ = legal, welfare, religious & political institutions
      * law reflected the mode of production as it was in the particular historical stage
        + the law would be a lot of concerned with land ownership and agricultural production during feudal mode
        + but in capitalist society, the law is a lot more concerned with the protection of private property
    - transition from feudal mode of production (land ownership & agricultural production) 🡪 capitalist mode of production (ownership of factories, machinery and production of goods)
      * transition transformed egalitarian nature of relationships
      * efficient technologies developed 🡪 societies become stratified into two major groups (development of **social classes**)
        + those who own means of production
        + those who did not
      * owners and non-owners would have completely opposed interests
    - **classes** are always **defined** in relation to **mode of production** and always defined in **pairs** (binary)
      * capitalists (bourgeoise) and workers (proletariat) // landlord and tenant // lender and borrower
      * hence, social class is **not** an **attribute** of an individual, but **defines** a **position** in an **economic relationship**
    - deviance is an ideological construct because one cannot make sense of it without referencing the capitalist system
      * 1970s and 1980s – radical thought about crime & deviance
        + fundamental **critique** of **social control (law)** in a capitalist society
        + social control no longer arose as needs of all society or contribute to the good of all – rather it **benefitted** the **bourgeoise more** than the proletariats
        + **preserved** the **social relations of production**
      * necessary to take into account how modern societies are so much **class-based** and how social control **protected** the interests of economic and ruling elites in society
  + ideas about crime and deviance correspond to the **smooth functioning** of the **capitalist system** – located in the **overall system of economic relationship**
    - those who resist and disrupt the inequalities that derived from the dominant economic mode – those who question the capitalist system, speaks against exploitation, poverty and deprivation generated by the capitalist system are the **targets of social control** 
      * they are **sanctioned the most**
    - understand why something (category of person / type of behaviour) is defined as crime / deviant – must locate that something
    - law as an instrument of social control – protects the status quo / the establishment (fundamentally conservative)
      * benefit the material interests of the economic / ruling elites
      * e.g. HK police (articulated, projected as a ‘neutral’ agent, governing responsible for law and order) is also seen as an instrument of oppression and social control by the capitalist state to subordinate those who are questioning the social inequalities of capitalism and inequities in social structure
      * need to pay attention to semantics and how definitions have been changed (sponsored and sustained by the state such that the status quo could come about)
  + Otwin Marenin
    - policemen 🡪 general order – benefits all members of the society
      * “law and order” rhetoric sponsored by the state
      * while we seek to maintain general order, social divisions, stratifications (class, race, gender, sexualities) / **hierarchies** of society are being reproduced as well
    - e.g. issuance of parking tickets (routine, mundane jobs)
    - policeman’s role is **not only** **maintaining of general order**, but also involved in **class repression (maintaining stratified order)** as well
    - police are the only ones who can intervene because they are backed by power
      * can exercise coercive force institutionally, therefore legitimate
  + ideological side to law
    - in our consciousness, we would usually think about street crimes and hardly about suite-crimes
    - “Panama Leaks” – escaping the taxation system by parking money in offshore banks (~25 trillion dollars)
    - product of our “**consciousness**” – through circulating a particular ideology / belief 🡪 we have come to be completely absorbed by it that we can’t think of an alternative, not able to identify white-collar crimes as dangerous / things that we are fearful of
    - the power of ideology to divert our attention from the most dangerous crimes
  + Reiman
    - “rich gets richer, poor gets prison”
    - by focusing on individual criminals – criminal justice system diverts attention away from the irrationalities and injustices of our social and economic institutions
    - by focusing on poor criminals, the criminal justice system diverts attention away from the rich and powerful who must profit from our social and economic institutions
  + inspiration from Friedrich Engels (Marx’s collaborator)
    - in a capitalist society marked by contradictions, exploitation, inequalities, deprivation (also moral) – crime is seen to be a **rational response**
    - asked to look after the factories his father owned
      * saw that workers were working in such a dehumanized state
      * human beings are basically an extension of the machines they operated on
    - sexual aggression, despair, alcoholism (crime) – symptoms of a capitalist society, manifestations of an exploitative society
    - any society is materially depriving must face with the consequence of dealing with crime – crime is a rational response to structural exploitation
    - crime is a form of rebellion – this capacity to rebel is the **only human capacity / quality left** in these **dehumanized workers** 
      * the only way to bring about new order is to revolutionize
* state’s response to Marxist criminology
  + sponsored a new type of criminology – **administrative criminology** (technocratic criminology) coined by Ronald Clarke
    - birthplace – home office of the British government (1980s)
    - move away from looking at social causes of crime – lost sociology in it
    - “social classes” manipulates the social & physical environment to deter & prevent the occurrence of crime
    - Look at prevention instead of motivation (not interested in the biographies)
  + e.g. surveillance glasses, data analysis – inspired by administrative criminology
    - all about prevention and deterrence ‘
    - technologies of social control have evolved
  + (1) theoretical thrust (maybe) from classical criminology – assumption that the individual is free-willed in committing crime
  + (2) not just about physical barriers, borrowing expertise from the positivists (psy-scientists)
    - predictive technologies
    - profiling, classifying, categorization
    - “risk” assessment
  + expansion of social control grown over the years, proliferation of the physical measures and intellectual agenda that leeched onto identification of problem populations
* luxury / privilege of sociology
  + contextualise and make sensing of it – connect personal to the professional
  + going beyond the obvious
  + personal in the process will become political
* exam: 2 questions
  + 1 compulsory question – will pertain to something general, theoretical
    - can always marshal the readings and takeaway from projects / lectures
    - be critical
    - should never be a zookeeper of deviance – don’t treat each theory in a discrete way
    - appreciate the interconnectedness between theories / perspectives (can bring in other theories and perspectives when asked about one theory)
  + 2nd question: 3 choose 1
  + make sure address all the parts.
  + Average of 3, max 4 pages for each question? – BE CONCISE AND SUCCINT

92729106 – if really desperate