



# **URBAN CRIME PREVENTION, SURVEILLANCE, AND RESTORATIVE JUSTICE**

Effects of Social Technologies

EDITED BY

**Paul Knepper   Jonathan Doak   Joanna Shapland**



CRC Press  
Taylor & Francis Group

# **URBAN CRIME PREVENTION, SURVEILLANCE, AND RESTORATIVE JUSTICE**

---

**Effects of Social Technologies**

---

EDITED BY

**Paul Knepper   Jonathan Doak   Joanna Shapland**



**CRC Press**

Taylor & Francis Group

Boca Raton   London   New York

---

CRC Press is an imprint of the  
Taylor & Francis Group, an **informa** business

CRC Press  
Taylor & Francis Group  
6000 Broken Sound Parkway NW, Suite 300  
Boca Raton, FL 33487-2742

© 2009 by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC  
CRC Press is an imprint of Taylor & Francis Group, an Informa business

No claim to original U.S. Government works  
Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper  
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

International Standard Book Number-13: 978-1-4200-8437-5 (Softcover)

This book contains information obtained from authentic and highly regarded sources. Reasonable efforts have been made to publish reliable data and information, but the author and publisher cannot assume responsibility for the validity of all materials or the consequences of their use. The authors and publishers have attempted to trace the copyright holders of all material reproduced in this publication and apologize to copyright holders if permission to publish in this form has not been obtained. If any copyright material has not been acknowledged please write and let us know so we may rectify in any future reprint.

Except as permitted under U.S. Copyright Law, no part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced, transmitted, or utilized in any form by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying, microfilming, and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the publishers.

For permission to photocopy or use material electronically from this work, please access [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com) (<http://www.copyright.com/>) or contact the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (CCC), 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400. CCC is a not-for-profit organization that provides licenses and registration for a variety of users. For organizations that have been granted a photocopy license by the CCC, a separate system of payment has been arranged.

**Trademark Notice:** Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

---

#### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

---

Urban crime prevention, surveillance, and restorative justice : effects of social technologies / author/editor(s), Paul Knepper, Jonathan Doak, and Joanna Shapland.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4200-8437-5

1. Crime prevention. 2. Restorative justice. 3. Electronics in crime prevention.

4. Electronic surveillance--Social aspects. 5. Social control. 6. Criminology. I. Knepper, Paul. II. Doak, Jonathan. III. Shapland, Joanna, 1950-

HV7431.U73 2009

364.4--dc22

2008030572

---

Visit the Taylor & Francis Web site at  
<http://www.taylorandfrancis.com>

and the CRC Press Web site at  
<http://www.crcpress.com>

---

# Preface

---

The chapters in this volume began as papers presented at the conference “Celebrating 30 Years of Criminology at the University of Sheffield,” which took place in September 2006. The occasion brought together current staff and students, former staff, alumni, and friends of the Centre for Criminological Research (CCR). The 30-year period in the conference title marked the establishment of the Centre, but the tradition of criminology at Sheffield actually began a decade or so earlier.

Criminology emerged from within the Faculty of Law, which was organized shortly after the formation of the university. As constituted under the Royal Charter of 1905, the University of Sheffield had four faculties (applied science, arts, pure science, and medicine). The Faculty of Law was added in 1909 when the Privy Council approved the establishment of a professor and two lecturers in law. For many years, the character of the law faculty remained local, consistent with the prewar pattern of the university and other provincial law departments. The number of law students remained small, as did the number of full-time staff; the course in law included a number of staff who combined law teaching with the practice of law. In the decades after the war, the Department of Law expanded under the administration of Roy Marshall. Marshall recruited several members of staff, including John Wood and David McClean, who took an interest in criminology. John Wood had practiced criminal law and was interested in the working of courts and criminal procedures. He coauthored with David McClean a book about the practice of criminal law entitled *Criminal Justice and the Treatment of the Offender* (1969).

In the 1960s, within the context of university expansion across the United Kingdom generally, the University of Sheffield outlined a strategy for “growth point” subjects. Wood suggested criminology and the university agreed; the administration created a lectureship and research assistantship in criminology. In 1968, Anthony Bottoms was appointed to the lectureship, making him the first specialist lecturer in criminology at Sheffield, and John Baldwin received the assistantship. Bottoms initiated what would become an established practice, that of using the city as a site for research. The Sheffield Study on Urban Social Structure and Crime represented the first study of urban crime in a British city to include all the major council estates and it was probably the largest study of urban crime patterns since the Chicago

studies. This study became *The Urban Criminal*, by Baldwin and Bottoms. Rob Mawby, who succeeded Baldwin in the assistantship in 1972, worked on a crime survey in the city, one of the first of such surveys conducted in the United Kingdom. His book, *Policing the City* (1979)—the second to appear from the Sheffield crime survey—became one of the most important studies in the debate about police-generated crime statistics. Mawby also produced an early evaluation of situational crime prevention involving vandalism of telephone kiosks in Sheffield's city center.

Criminology remained a growth point for most of the 1970s. Two new lectureships were approved, and these were filled by Ian Taylor and Paul Wiles. Ian Taylor was one of the “anarchist, irreverent” sociologists interested in the study of social deviance. Although *The New Criminology* (1973), co authored with Paul Walton and Jock Young, was written over the course of more than 2 years, and much of it before Taylor arrived in Sheffield, the preface suggests the book “would never have emerged” without meetings among the authors at Sheffield's Broomhill Tavern. Taylor also completed a PhD at Sheffield, some of the material of which became *Law and Order: Arguments for Socialism* (1981). In 1971, the Criminology Unit initiated a graduate course in criminology within the LLM curriculum, and a year later, established the MA in criminological studies. Colin Sumner was one of the first students to complete the course.

The opening of the Centre for Criminological Studies in 1976 signified the status of criminology within the university. When the Centre opened, it represented the third such center for research and teaching in criminology at British universities. The first, the Institute of Criminology at the University of Cambridge, opened in 1959, and the second, the Department of Criminology at the University of Edinburgh, opened in 1974. To mark the occasion of the inauguration of the Sheffield Centre, the criminologists at Sheffield welcomed Nils Christie from the University of Oslo. He received an honorary degree of doctor of laws and gave the foundation lecture entitled “Conflicts as Property: Societies Described through Their Types of Crime Control.” Stan Cohen celebrates this event as an important moment in the rejection of “correctionalism” within British criminology. In the first chapter of *Against Criminology*, Cohen writes: “When the Norwegian sociologist Nils Christie, a leading criminologist and abolitionist, was invited to receive an honorary degree from the University of Sheffield and open its Centre of Criminology, he began his speech by saying that our proper role should be to close, not to open, such centres.” Christie's lecture, published in the *British Journal of Criminology* (1977), has become one of the most widely cited in criminology.

Four years later, the Centre became the Centre for Criminological and Socio-Legal Studies, directed by Norman Lewis. The staff established an MA in sociolegal studies as a parallel to the MA in criminological studies, and the MA in criminological studies was (a few years later) discontinued in favor

of the MA in sociolegal studies. This configuration was meant to support research by specialists in criminology as well as encourage empirical research into the legal system on the part of the law faculty. The center brought together “criminologists, penologists, public lawyers, sociologists of law and experts in research methodology.” In 1983, Sheffield had a chair in criminology and some nine lecturers, research fellows, and other full-time staff conducting criminological research. In an article describing “Criminological Research in Great Britain” to appear in *Crime and Justice* that year, John Croft explained the “identifiable concentration is to be found in institutes, centers, or departments in...Cambridge, Edinburgh, London, Oxford and Sheffield.”

Funded research projects in the early 1980s included studies of policing and gender. Tony Jefferson, who arrived from the University of Birmingham's Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, directed a project with Roger Grimshaw, funded by the Home Office and Cobden Trust, dealing with policing. Jefferson also directed a study with Monica Walker looking at ethnic minorities and the criminal justice system; it was funded by the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), forerunner of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). These research projects led to *Interpreting Policework* (1987) and *Controlling the Constable* (1984), both co-written with Roger Grimshaw, and *The Case Against Paramilitary Policing* (1990). Carol Smart received SSRC funding for her study of sex differences and the law, a feminist analysis of the development of family law and regulation of sexual behavior in postwar Britain. Her book, *Women, Crime and Criminology* (1976), was the first feminist critique of criminology to appear in British criminology. She submitted her research on law and reproduction of patriarchal relations for the PhD in 1983. Paul Wiles and Sue Edwards received SSRC funding for a study of the routine management of discretion in the sentencing of female offenders. Jacqueline Dunn and Paul Wiles undertook a study, with ESRC support, dealing with the transition of young women from school to the crime.

In the 1980s, the Centre welcomed American criminologist Hal Pepinsky as a visiting researcher. Pepinsky spent 6 months in 1982 gathering data about policing and crime in Sheffield and published his work in *Contemporary Crises*. A number of organizational changes occurred, leading to a new course offering and some new synergy in research. In 1984, Tony Bottoms left to become Wolfson Professor of Criminology and director of the Institute of Criminology at Cambridge. Michael Cavadino and James Dignan inherited Bottoms's teaching on penal policy and a seminar entitled “the penal crisis.” They subsequently created an undergraduate offering along similar lines, and to compensate for the lack of a suitable text, produced *The Penal System* (1992). International sales of the book prompted their most recent work on comparative penal legal systems. The joint center, amalgamating criminology and sociolegal studies, continued until 1985 when it split into the Centre for Criminological and Legal Research, directed by Paul Wiles, and the Centre for

Socio-Legal Studies, directed by Norman Lewis. The Centre for Criminological and Legal Research developed a BA (later LLB) in law and criminology.

Two years later, Sheffield hosted the first British Criminology Conference, which has now become the annual conference of the British Society of Criminology. Beginning in 1964, the Cambridge Institute of Criminology had hosted national conferences in criminology on a biennial basis. These conferences took place in Cambridge and served as a national catalyst for criminology. However, by the late 1970s, they had become less popular, and by the 1980s, had ceased altogether. Part of this reflected growing divisions within criminology. At the third Cambridge criminology conference in 1968, a group of sociologists broke away to form the National Deviancy Conference. Originally convened several times a year in cities across the United Kingdom (including Sheffield), NDC symposia attracted wide support. However, before the end of the 1970s, the original framework had disintegrated and NDC members had stopped meeting at all. It was suggested by Paul Wiles and Joanna Shapland that a new initiative was necessary to have a national meeting. Tony Bottoms was appointed to chair a working group of representatives from all the then existing criminology centers to provide an initial framework for the conferences; and Roger Hood, then president of the British Society of Criminology, was highly supportive. Sheffield agreed to host the first meeting, and the effort attracted funding from the Home Office and Scottish Office.

The British Criminology Conference took place at Tapton Hall in July 1987. Given the division of loyalties that had characterized British criminology, it was far from clear who, or whether anyone, would participate. However, the conference proved to be a great success with some 250 participants. It brought together, for the first time in a number of years, people from institutes of criminology, government research departments, and departments of sociology, law, psychology, social policy, and psychiatry. Subsequent conferences at the University of the West of England (1989), followed by York University (1991), and Cardiff University (1993), attracted even greater numbers of papers and participants; and it was recognized that the conferences needed a firmer structural footing. The conferences were adopted by the British Society of Criminology and have continued, now on an annual footing.

About this time, Paul Wiles and Tony Bottoms received Home Office funding for their study of communities and crime. This research examined the relationship between housing and crime in Sheffield and furthered research first started by Bottoms in the 1970s. It became the basis for their chapter on "environmental criminology" to appear in the *Oxford Handbook of Criminology*. Wiles later developed an interest in geographical information systems-based crime analysis and, with colleagues from Sheffield University's Department of Town and Regional Planning, published a study comparing crime patterns in Sheffield over a 30-year period from 1965. Wiles became

professor of criminology and dean of the Faculty of Law at Sheffield, before leaving (in 1999) to become chief scientific advisor to the Home Office and director of research, development and statistics.

During the 1990s, several new staff joined the Centre. Iain Crow had previously headed research at NACRO, the national organization for offender rehabilitation and crime prevention. He has pursued research on drug use, "race" and criminal justice, offenders and unemployment, and community safety. One of his evaluation research projects, completed with Tamsin Stubbing, examined Sheffield Youth Court's fast-tracking scheme for persistent offenders. Joanna Shapland moved to Sheffield after several years at the Centre of Criminological Research at Oxford and became professor of criminal justice in 1983. She is the current director of the CCR. Shapland brought the editorship of the *British Journal of Criminology* to Sheffield and, subsequently, the *International Review of Victimology*. During the 1990s, she worked on policing, crime prevention, drugs prevention, and business and crime, many of the projects involving funding from the Home Office and other sources and many being done with Paul Wiles. More recently, she has directed, beginning in 2001, an evaluation of restorative justice schemes, funded by the Home Office (now Ministry of Justice). The project evaluates three restorative justice schemes in England and Wales involving adult and juvenile offenders in the criminal justice process. Gwen Robinson came to Sheffield to work on the restorative justice research project and has since then been appointed to a senior lectureship. She has carried out research into probation, community sentences, and risk assessment.

Jason Ditton, also appointed to a chair during the 1990s, carried out one of the first empirical studies of the effect of open-street CCTV systems Britain. His research compared Glasgow and Airdrie. Ditton directed the Scottish Centre for Criminology in Glasgow and a series of research projects in conjunction with the University of the West Indies in Trinidad. Ditton's research into "fear of crime" involved a Trinidad-based, three-wave longitudinal panel survey and British-based projects focused on enabling the fear of crime questions on the British Crime Survey to measure local concerns with greater precision. Natasha Semmens, who came to Sheffield in 1998, completed postgraduate research supervised by Ditton concerning fear of crime. She joined the Faculty of Law as a lecturer and continued research in this area, specifically, into plastic card fraud and identity theft. One of the studies carried out by Semmens and Ditton assessed the seasonality of the fear of crime using street interviews conducted in Glasgow and Sheffield.

By 1999, criminologists within the law faculty initiated the MA in international criminology, reflective of Sheffield's position as an international site for research and teaching in criminology. Joanna Shapland became the UK representative on the governing council of GERN, the Groupe Européen de Recherches sur les Normativités, the leading European research network on



criminology and criminal justice. International links with the University of Leuven, the University of Ghent, and the University of Oslo produced agreements for exchange of staff and students. More recently, postgraduates at Sheffield founded the first European network for postgraduates in criminology. Jamie Waters and Matthew Hall, in conjunction with researchers at the Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research, University of Glasgow, organized the European Postgraduate and Early Stage Researchers Working Group within the European Society of Criminology. The group met for the first time at the ESC conference in Tübingen, Germany.

In 2002, Tony Bottoms and Joanna Shapland brought Sheffield into the ESRC network for research into the Social Context of Pathways in Crime. The network has undertaken research into early years factors in delinquency (London), adolescent factors (Cambridge), and young adults (Sheffield) as well as bringing together longitudinal studies under way in Chicago, Pittsburgh, Montreal, Zürich, and Tübingen. Bottoms maintained strong ties with Sheffield, and beginning in 2002, has held a visiting professorship. The Sheffield-based research involves interviews over a period of years with 113 young adult recidivist offenders.

During that same year, the Centre for Criminological and Legal Research became the CCR. As a designated research center within the university's framework, CCR coordinates research rather than teaching in criminology. Members are drawn from various disciplines, including sociology, history, psychology, geography, forensic pathology, and health. Simon Holdaway, who had come to Sheffield as a lecturer in the Department of Sociological Studies, became the CCR's first director. During the 1980s, he directed research projects concerning the occupational culture of British police, recruitment of Black and Asian officers, race relations policy in the probation service, and resignation of Black and Asian officers from the police service. He published *Inside the British Police* (1984), *Recruiting a Multiracial Police Force* (1991), and *The Racialisation of British Policing* (1996). Holdaway also contributed to development of the BA in social policy and criminology, taught by staff from law and sociology, and establishment of a lectureship in social policy and criminology within the Department of Sociological Studies to support the course. In 2003, Clive Norris received a chair in sociology and criminology and became a deputy director of the Centre. Norris, who began his research career carrying out ethnographic study of police, has developed the sociology of surveillance. He has contributed to studies of CCTV control rooms and the "Urban Eye" project, a comparison of CCTV use in seven European cities. The *Maximum Surveillance Society*, coauthored with Gary Armstrong, appeared in 1999. Norris's work in this area brought to Sheffield a series of international conferences concerning surveillance and society. The first of these, on CCTV and Social Control, convened in 2004; it attracted

80 delegates from 16 countries, and at subsequent events in 2006 and 2008, the size of the conference continued to grow.

The Department of Sociological Studies has contributed additional expertise to Sheffield criminology. Richard Jenkins has brought his anthropological research into witchcraft prosecutions and working-class youth in the transition to adulthood to the study of crime and deviance. Alan France, a founder of Sheffield University's Centre for the Study of Youth of Youth and Childhood, codirected the ESRC-funded Longitudinal Research Network: Pathways Into and Out of Crime. Paul Knepper has written about the theory of crime prevention and carried out historical research into racialization of crime. Together with colleagues at the Institute of Forensic Studies, University of Malta, he received funding from the British Academy to study the role of the British Empire in the internationalization of crime.

Criminology at Sheffield has benefited from links with other departments as well, including the Department of History. In 2005, the CCR acquired a second deputy director: Robert Shoemaker. Shoemaker, professor of 18th-century history, specializes in the history of crime. He has directed a project, funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, with Clive Emsley (Open University) and Tim Hitchcock (University of Hertfordshire) to create an online edition of all trials at the Old Bailey from 1674 to 1913.

In 2008, the CCR has more than 30 members of academic staff, engaged in a wide variety of criminological and criminal justice research across eight departments of the University of Sheffield. It is very much an interdisciplinary research center, welcoming researchers taking different perspectives on crime, deviance, and justice. It looks forward to its next 30 years.

We would like to thank the contributors to this volume; all of us have agreed that royalties from this book are to be received by the CCR to support postgraduates in criminology. Finally we would like to thank Taylor & Francis Group. Carolyn Spence believed in our project from the beginning and Jay Margolis has seen this book through to completion.

---

# Introduction

---

## Social Technology in Criminology: The Relationship between Criminology and Social Policy

---

### Contents

Social Technology and Criminology	xv
The Knowledge Base of Criminology	xvi
Media-Based Criminology	xvii
Preoccupation with Science and Policy	xix
Knowledge for Crime Reduction	xxii
Users of Criminological Knowledge	xxiv
Rethinking the State	xxiv
Criminology and Business Trade	xxvi
The Aims of Criminology	xxviii
Working within or against Criminal Justice:	
Unintended Consequences	xxviii
Spontaneous and Planned Change	xxx
Conclusions	xxxi
References	xxxii

### Social Technology and Criminology

---

Crime prevention, surveillance, and restorative justice have transformed the response to crime in recent years. Each offers a means of responding to crime, which does not entirely rely on the traditional modes of operation of criminal justice agencies such as police and prisons. Each has brought in new kinds of workers with new skills. Each has had a significant impact in thinking about crime policy, introducing new conceptual languages and reassessing traditional aims and priorities.

Although such efforts have attracted a great deal of criminological interest, they have been discussed in separate literatures rather than as instances of a social enterprise with common features. In this chapter, we explore these three alternatives within the framework of social technology. By *social technology*, we mean coordinated action, derived from an organized field of knowledge, to achieve particular results. In bringing these three areas together, alongside further examples, within a discussion of social technology, this volume seeks to develop an understanding of the interaction between knowledge, planning, and social repercussions. This understanding provides a valuable basis for assessing proposals for social improvements related to crime.

To put the matter in a different way, the study of social technology in criminology has to do with the ethics of criminology. All of the major academic societies of criminology have adopted codes of ethics for researchers, but these refer to the production of knowledge rather than its use in society. There is a difference, as Shapland (2000) explained in her keynote address to the British Society of Criminology, between ethics in criminology and the ethics of criminology. Ethics *in* criminology has to do with adhering to protocols for the conduct of research; the relationship to research subjects, means of gathering data, and so on. The ethics *of* criminology has to do with the use of this knowledge in society; the relationship between criminologists and policymakers and the use of research as a basis for policymaking. Our discussion contributes to ongoing debates about the relationship between Anglo-American criminology and public policy concerning crime (Brownstein, 2007; Chancer & McLaughlin, 2007; Greenberg, 2006; LaFree, 2007; Tonry, 2004; Walters, 2004; Zedner & Ashworth, 2003).

In this introductory chapter, we will pursue the meaning of social technology. Specifically, we will explore each aspect: the knowledge base of criminology, the users of criminological knowledge, and the purpose to which this knowledge is put. We discuss the ethics of criminology from a combined discussion of crime prevention, surveillance, and restorative justice; and particularly, from drawing on the chapters in this book.

## **The Knowledge Base of Criminology**

---

Criminology has traditionally drawn upon many disciplines, including law, sociology, and psychology. Many have argued about whether it can be taken to comprise a field of study separate from other social sciences (Newburn, 2007; Rock, 2007). However, there is clearly now a set of accepted discourses, findings, and theories that is intended primarily to bear upon crime, criminalization, deviance, and criminal justice. In this sense, criminology is an “organized field of knowledge.” Within that field, the most important themes have been

science—in its broadest sense of organized knowledge—and social—that crime, and so on, cannot be understood without taking on board not just elements at the individual level but also those of groups and of society. Dedication to the idea of systematic acquisition of knowledge, rather than ideology or a retreat to armchair philosophy, has characterized criminology—or at least academic criminology.

## **Media-Based Criminology**

Academic criminology, however, is not the only source, or even sometimes the most highly regarded source, of knowledge about crime. Garland and Sparks (2000) propose that there are three sources of knowledge about crime, or three sites for the production of criminology. These are (1) the university, with social science and scholarly language; (2) the government and practice of control and criminal justice; and (3) popular culture, filtered through the media and including political rhetoric. This conception of three criminologies—academic, media-based, and governmental—provides a useful way of thinking about the current state of affairs.

After the Second World War, academic criminology enjoyed preeminence. National governments and international organizations solicited the advice of social science researchers and established institutes of criminology. The Cambridge Institute of Criminology opened in the 1950s, along with institutes at the University of California at Berkeley (1950), Melbourne University (1951), the University of Oslo (1954), and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (1959). However, in recent years, the balance of power has shifted. Beginning in about 1970 or so, academic criminology lost ground to media-based criminology. As television became a central institution of modern life, popular knowledge replaced academic advice in the policy imagination. During the past 30 years, the presentation of crime across media formats, including television news, drama series, reality television, and feature films, has reinforced a curiously singular message: crime is a feature of modern life, for reasons that cannot be grasped; and government by itself cannot protect the public (Cavender, 2004).

It has become common for criminologists to lament the gap between what academic criminology feels it knows and what politicians do. As Garland and Sparks (2001) put it: “in the 1990s, as criminology flourishes in the academy, its influence in national penal policy appears to be diminishing.” Radzinowicz (1999) pointed to this problem in his reflections on the growth of criminology as an academic field during the past half century. Beginning from its base at Cambridge, London School of Economics, and Oxford in the 1950s and 1960s, academic criminology expanded from the 1970s to the extent that virtually all British universities today offer some sort of course. Despite the success of criminology at universities, and the production of

criminological knowledge through research, politicians and policymakers seem increasingly to rely on media-based imagery and politicized vocabularies in fashioning the government's response. "What I find particularly disturbing is the gap between 'criminology' and 'criminal policy', between the study of crime and punishment and the actual mode of controlling crime" (Radzinowicz, 1999). Similar comments have been made about the situation in the United States and in the Nordic countries, as well as in Australia and New Zealand. Alfred Blumstein argues that the overt and irrational politicization of crime in the United States has replaced criminological research in policy making. "The role of research findings in the public policy arena," he says, "does seem largely to have been put aside, though only temporarily one would hope" (1994).

Perhaps we overestimate the novelty of our situation. Media-based criminology has always been a powerful rival. Extending our historical view further back than the past 50 years, we can see that media-based criminology preceded the organization of academic criminology. Shoemaker (in this book) demonstrates that crime was a recurring topic in almost every form of 18th-century print. As print became more available, for the first time in English history, popular understandings of the nature of crime as a social problem were shaped more by what people read than by personal experience and reports of friends and acquaintances. Pamphlets by social reformers, such as Patrick Colquhoun and Henry Fielding, tended to exaggerate the extent of crime to justify their projects. Newspapers overemphasized violence, not only in the frequency of their reports but also in the tone and substance of reporting. Printed reports of trial proceedings shaped understandings of crime and justice, by what was left out as much as what was said. Edited versions of trials portrayed English justice as a coherent and efficient system. Shoemaker concludes that 18th-century readers approached this surfeit of information with a skeptical eye; they knew the crime problem was more complicated than reformers like Fielding made it appear. Perhaps the difference today is that criminologists are less confident of the acuity and knowledge base of the general public: they worry that media presentation is taken as reality; criminological nuance disregarded in the age of sound bites.

Critcher's analysis (in this book) concerns the moral regulation of media, rather than media portrayals of crime as such, but also contributes to an understanding of media power in relation to criminology. He reviews the rise of the film industry, comics, and videos in 20th-century Britain and America. Cinematographs rose to popularity in the 1930s and became even more popular after the war. Reaction to dramatic content was nervous and centered on the impact on youth: boys, it was felt, would be incited to commit crime and girls to indulge in illicit romance. Comic books, which included crime as well as horror, cowboy, and war genres, attracted similar concerns. The early emphasis on comics as a potential cause of criminal behavior gave

way to concern about the inherent depravity of the content and its impact on children's minds. Fears about the decline of British civilization (reflecting the decline in prestige from old imperial days) and the corrupting influence of American culture surrounded comics, as they did films. After the "panic" about "video nasties" in the 1980s, however, concern over the role of media in prompting deviant behavior has waned although never entirely died; it was concluded that viewers interpreted themes metaphorically rather than literally.

Seeing the balance of power among university, media, and governmental criminologies in historic perspective suggests that explanations for the decline of academic criminology in government policymaking need to look beyond the rise of media-based criminology. Academic criminology managed to emerge despite the head start enjoyed by media-based criminology, and it thrived at a time when the cinema was already very influential. It also suggests that we ought not to underestimate, nor discount, "the public." Shoemaker and Critcher point to a British public that was, as early as the 18th century, capable of sifting and evaluating media portrayals of crime and justice. The assumption that popular views of crime represent collective ideology or false consciousness underestimates what the masses are capable of and exaggerates the role of intellectuals in promoting truth.

### **Preoccupation with Science and Policy**

There is a difference between criminologists seeking to have a voice in policymaking and criminologists wanting to be *the* voice in policymaking. Criminologists' concern about the gap between what criminologists know and what policymakers do derives in large part from the belief that organized knowledge (science) and research present a superior form of knowledge (Blumstein, 1994; Brownstein, 2007). Conclusions made by academic criminologists, because they are drawn from scientific research, should trump those of the other criminologies, media-based and governmental. Hood (2002) urges criminologists to speak from a firm base of "scientifically rigorous" research as "this is what distinguishes criminology from other types of discourse about crime. Unless legitimacy can be claimed for this view, the 'criminologist' will be treated as just another person with an 'opinion' on the subject."

In the 1960s, the heyday of criminologists' claimed influence on policymaking, it is interesting that, despite sociological criminology's growing interest in power within criminal justice, there was little insight into criminology's own power within criminal justice policymaking. The power of the state and of the criminal justice system over individuals, both directly and through labeling, was being recognized. The power of (some) criminologists, both within and outside government, to influence those processes was not blazoned.

Thirty years ago, Christie (1977) explained what is lost when “experts” in criminal justice exercise a claim to priority based on scientific knowledge. Ordinary citizens should have a voice because of the knowledge they possess about how to resolve their own conflicts. He described how the professionals, lawyers and social workers, steal the management of conflict by convincing us we do not really know how to go about it. “Conflict thieves” promote the idea that they possess the sole, or legitimate, means of conflict resolution. Christie (in this book) returns to this theme. The success of restorative justice in recent years has seen a push (driven by those undertaking the activity) toward the professionalization of mediation and a new category of conflict thieves in the person of mediation specialists:

I warned against lawyers here in Sheffield 30 years ago, and called them professional thieves (Christie, 1977). They still are, but are now followed by a flock of well-educated generalists on the outlook for challenging tasks that it may be possible to convert into paid work.

The intrusion of educated specialists into conflict resolution carries the danger that it will estrange ordinary citizens from the means of settling their own disputes, particularly poorer residents of cities with little formal education. This is regrettable, Christie explains, because residents of poor neighborhoods possess “nonauthorized knowledge” or “life knowledge”—the experiences of everyday life, acquired and exchanged, in homes, pubs, and shops. The gains made by the new conflict thieves result in a loss of this sort of knowledge.

These processes of professionalization are common when new fields of social activity open up (Dietrich & Roberts, 1997). Lawyers and doctors have, in the past decades, been joined by many other professionals within criminal justice. In such a newly becoming professionalized area, those workers initially in the field are keen to protect their hard-won expertise and may also seek to protect their economic activity by “drawing up the ladder” behind them and erecting new barriers to first-time entrants, involving training requirements and educational/practice tests to belong to the new professional bodies (Allaker & Shapland, 1994). If they also create knowledge that they seek to protect and not to give out to those who receive their services, then they create and perpetuate both power and knowledge asymmetries, which disempower ordinary people. Criminologists are not necessary accelerators of these processes. They could choose to empower ordinary people by making knowledge more available and facilitating discussion. However, if they choose to facilitate processes of professionalization in fields previously occupied by ordinary people, or solely to empower government knowledge through government evaluation and research, they are in effect choosing to empower particular parties in these emerging fields of the reaction to crime.



Various social thinkers have made similar distinctions between kinds of knowledge. Christie mentions Bourdieu's "practical knowledge," but there is also Oakeshott's (1962) "traditional knowledge" and Polanyi's (1958) "tacit knowledge." In Polanyi's terms, explicit knowledge can be written out in words, graphed, or expressed in mathematical formulas; the knowledge contained in a cookery book, for example. Explicit knowledge appears superior because it lends itself to precise formulation. It can be written down, stored, distributed, and accessed by various means, from books to computers. Tacit knowledge cannot be expressed directly because it exists only in use. It is an inarticulate, or prearticulate form of knowing, such as the knowledge of how to ride a bicycle. For Polanyi (1958), "we know more than we can tell." Polanyi argues for the validity of personal knowledge within the moral order: "As we know order from disorder, health from sickness, the ingenious from the trivial, we may distinguish with equal authority good from evil, charity from cruelty, justice from injustice" (quoted in Scott and Moleski, 2005). People already know important things about crime.

Curiously, criminologists approve of triangulation in the context of research methodology but seem less interested in pursuing it in relation to policymaking. Good empirical research seeks to make sense of data from various sources; conclusions are to be taken from reflection of a comprehensive range of the best available data. Similarly, good policymaking should include "data" from all sources—from scientific criminology as well as from ordinary life. It may be that in claiming a more modest role for ourselves, as one voice in a larger conversation, we have a more appropriate basis for affirming our importance in the policymaking process. It may also be that we could support different parties through the skills we possess. What we know may become more valuable, not so much by acknowledging what we do not know but by acknowledging what others know. However, triangulation of knowledge for policymaking is about more, or something other than, reclaiming the prominence criminology enjoyed in the 1950s and 1960s. It is an essential contribution to the ethics of criminology: assessment of crime policies is not solely the province of criminologists (or of politicians or civil servants) but also a matter for all those whose lives are affected by the policies.

The reaction to the belated realization of the power of knowledge and of the different weights given to different knowledge producers could result in a "bunker mentality." Criminologists might say, "Well, government and the media don't seem to want to listen to us whenever we want to speak today. They're happy to ignore us. So we'll go away and do our own thing, remain within our own academic circles, keep our knowledge to ourselves." This seems to us to be a self-devaluing of criminological knowledge. Others may not always listen; criminology's power may have diminished—but surely this does not negate criminology's results and insights. Radzinowicz (1994) also pointed out the need for criminologists to go public and keep public. If we