

The Reinterpretation of Emotional Factors in Durkheim's Theory of Crime: Some Criminological and Psychological Perspectives

Choi, Kwan[†]

Department of Police Administration, Hansei University

The purpose of this paper is to attempt a role do emotional factor play in Durkheim's theory of crime. This paper would briefly highlighted Durkheim's view that crime is a 'Normal' part of any human society, before going on to discuss the role of the emotional factors in his theory. In addition to fear, anger, and other basic human emotions, the feeling of belonging on social solidarity would also be interpreted as an 'Emotional Factor' for the purposes of this paper. The first part was Durkheim's theory of crime and Merton's view on anomie, here Durkheim defined crime or view it as normal rather than pathological phenomenon. The second part was role of emotional factor in society and also social solidarity which Durkheim used to demonstrate the role of emotional factor in society and these two social solidarity, Mechanical and Organic Solidarity. In conclusion part, it could be argued that Durkheim believe that a normal crime is a crime that was not excessive and the role emotional factor play in a society is to generate and maintain a society, also the division of labour in society of the forms of solidarity. According to Durkheim in his emotion, that which holds a society together, the glue of solidarity is emotion.

Key words : Emotional Factor, Durkheim's Theory of Crime, Understanding of Crime, Social Solidarity, Criminological and Psychological Perspectives

[†] 교신저자 : Choi, Kwan, Professor in Security and Safety Studies, Hansei University.
E-mail : schgosi@daum.net

Introduction

This paper will briefly highlight Durkheim¹⁾'s view that crime is a 'Normal' part of any human society, before going on to discuss the role of the emotions in his theory. In addition to fear, anger and other basic human emotions, the feeling of belonging on social solidarity will also be interpreted as an 'Emotion' for the purposes of this paper. The first part is Durkheim's theory of crime and Merton²⁾'s view on anomie, here Durkheim defined crime or view it as normal rather than pathological phenomenon. That crime is a product of normal society and not a disease of pathological society. Furthermore, Durkheim see crime as a criminal

act that offends strong and defined states of the collective conscience because it is criminal.

Durkheim used anomie to describe a normlessness state or society. In his view of anomie, he meant a normlessness society and rules on how people should behave with each other in a society. While Merton supported Durkheim in his view, stating that if norms guiding any society weaken, the society becomes unstable and a state of anomie occurs. Most people will ask why should Durkheim say that crime is normal part of all societies. We are going to find out why he said that and his reasons. The second part is the role of emotion in society and also social solidarity which Durkheim used to demonstrate the role of emotion in society and these two social solidarities, Mechanical and Organic Solidarity. Mechanical solidarity which is the earliest forms of solidarity such as primitive society which has existed throughout most of the history of human society. In Mechanical solidarity of society, collective emotion is intense, very strong, and binds that society. This solidarity of society, its opponent weakens, anxiety increases such as Mechanical solidarity, and a division of labour becomes a substitute for the binding force of collective emotions. In this solidarity of the society, the emotional bonds to the collective are weaker. Mechanical solidarity is based on individual resemblances while Organic is based on division of labour and their differences. These two solidarities are also means by which society is held together.

-
- 1) Émile Durkheim was a French sociologist whose contributions were instrumental in the formation of sociology and anthropology. His work and editorship of the first journal of sociology, *L'Année Sociologique*, helped establish sociology within academia as an accepted social science. During his lifetime, Durkheim gave many lectures, and published numerous sociological studies on subjects such as education, crime, religion, suicide, and many other aspects of society. He is considered as one of the founding fathers of sociology and an early proponent of solidarism.
 - 2) Robert King Merton was a distinguished American sociologist perhaps best known for having coined the phrase "Self-Fulfilling Prophecy". He also coined many other phrases that have gone into everyday use, such as "Role Model" and "Un-intended Consequences". He spent most of his career teaching at Columbia University, where he attained the rank of University Professor.

Finally, Durkheim's theory of crime and role of emotion is in conclusion, Durkheim believe that a normal crime is a crime that was not excessive and the role emotion play in a society is to generate and maintain a society, also the division of labour in society of the forms of solidarity. According to Durkheim in his emotion, that which holds a society together, the glue of solidarity is emotion.

The Role of Emotion in Durkheim's Theory of Crime

In his explanation of emotion, social solidarity is used to illustrate the role of emotion in a society and these social solidarity; Mechanical and Organic solidarity which author would explained later has contributed a lot in Durkheim's theory of crime (Giddens, 1998). Emotions in Durkheim's theory of crime depended on the level, if individuals are deeply integrated into his/her society, it would give him/her the emotional stability or cause him/her to commit crime of solidarity because if him/her mind is socialized to see and perceive the norms of society as your own then the likely hood that you would be influenced. (Merton, 1938; Strenski, 2006).

The role emotion play in a society is to generate and maintain a society. It is necessary that collective emotion are experienced. Collective emotional experience is the glue which holds a

society together and these collective emotions are things like feeling of reverence, obligation, sympathy and empathy. Here we do not work without each other, these are the things that binds individual or society together (Smith & Natalier, 2005). Social bonds is created, deterring any tendency to leave or break down a society, and what are these social bonds, they are things that holds us together (Empey, 1982). According to Durkheim what holds a society together, the glue of solidarity is emotion and Marx implied in his explanation of emotion that what mobilizes conflict the energy, strength, of the mobilized groups are emotions. Most current studies treat emotions as a dependent variable, something to be explained by social causes, but Durkheim, the emotional experience of collective effervescence is a necessary condition for generating and maintaining (Williams & McShane, 1988).

As mentioned before, Mechanical and Organic solidarity has been used by Durkheim to demonstrate the role of emotions in a society. In Mechanical solidarity which is the earliest forms of solidarity such as primitive society, which means that which has existed through out most of the history of human society. In Mechanical solidarity of society, collective emotion is intense and binds that society. If some individual violates that societies rules then the collective response is an outburst of emotion. Punishment of the individual is characterized as an outburst of emotion or vengeance (Collins, 1994; Strenski,

2006). It is based on division of labour. In organic solidarity of society, mechanical solidarity weakens, anxiety increases and a division of labour become a substitute for the binding force of collective emotions. In organic society, the emotional bonds to the collective are weaker (Vetter & Silverman, 1978). Furthermore, in organic society, deviant behavior arouses the collective emotion of the society to condemn that deviant individual, who committed the offense. Therefore, the collective emotion has a positive effect in binding society together (Gastil, 1971). According to Durkheim who say that deviant behavior is normal, deviant behavior is good for reinforcing the collective which is eroded in organic society. Organic solidarity is born of necessity while in mechanical solidarity as the volume and the moral density of society increases, it weakens, anxiety build up (Reid, 1990).

According to Durkheim, how can he simultaneously be more personally developed and more socially dependent? Durkheim's answer is because in organic solidarity the division of labour become substitute for strong emotion which binds the mechanical society together.

Durkheim's Attitude about Understanding of Crime and Social Solidarity:

Critical Points

There are two key contents in Durkheim's

acknowledges to better understand in terms of crime and disorder. First is the understanding of crime and disorder. In Durkheim's theory of crime and disorder, he defined or view crime as normal rather than pathological phenomenon. Durkheim defined crime and disorder as a criminal act that offends strong and defined states of the collective conscience, and also as an act that shocks the common conscience because it is a crime (Hirschi, 1969). For him, crime is the product of a normal society and not a disease of pathological society. Crime functional within that society, it has a role to play in a society (Merton, 1938). A society has values, when a criminal commit a crime, offender is undermining those values. By undermining those values, the values themselves are focused up. Hence by punishing the criminal those values are re-asserted. According to Durkheim, a normal crime is a crime that was not excessive. He continued to say that every society had crime. Furthermore, he explain that crime should be seen as something functional and necessary for society (Anderson, 1999; Reid, 1990). When a crime is committed or law is violated in a society, people talk about it, articles are written and the news will be spread around the community. People will gather and a social community bristles with activity when a norm is broken or violated (Strenski, 2006).

To Durkheim, normal crime is crime that was not excessive and he argued that every society had crime therefore, it must serve some

functions and these functions are social experimentation and pressure release. To him, crime is an integral part of all healthy societies, that crime is healthy and normal. Crime is a social category defined by the collective sentiment of the day rather than any universal values. Furthermore, Durkheim not only believed that crime was normal in any society but crime is in existence and was normal because no society existed in which crime was not resulted or committed (Durkheim, 1951).

According to Sutton, Cherney, and White (2008) crime is one of contemporary society's main problems, affecting many people's lives. Serious crimes against people and property induce considerable fear within the community. Crimes such as theft, break-and-enter, sexual assault, and murder pose serious threats to the safety of the community. It has been argued that a heightened sense that these types of crimes are being committed locally causes community members to restrict their movements and prevents them from participating fully in community activities (Felson, 1998). In particular, some groups of community residents perceive that they are more vulnerable to crime (e.g., the elderly, women, and the disabled) which causes them to avoid both (1) certain perceived dangerous areas, and (2) activities held at times late at night (Lupton, 1999). Many different strategies are needed to combat the complex issues of crime and anti-social behaviour, and these should include techniques

to reduce people's fear of crime (Hancock, 2012). Community engagement with the police and citizen participation in crime prevention are possible strategies.

Traditionally, communities turn to the police and the criminal justice system for protection from criminals and anti-social behaviour. Recently, however, some crime prevention initiatives for community safety are operating outside of formal agencies such as the police (Crawford, 1998).

Traditional criminologists such as Merton (1938, in Brown et al., 2010), Park, Burgess, Shaw and McKay (1942, in Brown et al., 2010) and Sampson and Morenoff (2006) from the Chicago School, have argued that the wider, macro-social structure of contemporary society is intrinsically related to deviant behaviours such as offending and anti-social behaviours.

The term 'community crime prevention' is regarded as preferable to 'crime prevention' by practitioners because it stresses the idea that strategies for preventing and controlling crime should be coordinated and managed locally, rather than by a disengaged government or a distant, hierarchical police Command. According to Newburn (2008), crime has a significant direct impact on the everyday lives of community residents, and therefore the plan and strategy of crime prevention should focus on the microcosm of community or neighbourhood. Zhong and Broadhurst (2007) suggest that communities have a locus of informal social

control constituting an important force in reducing crime.

The Neighbourhood Watch (below NW) programme is usually regarded as the showpiece of community crime prevention and as its most re-cognisable and explicit operation. NW is the most successful voluntary community activity for preventing crime. According to Crawford (1998), the primary aim of NW is the reduction of crime, particularly opportunistic crimes such as residential burglary; although crimes involving vehicles (e.g., Motor Theft) and criminal damage are also seen as problems that NW could significantly influence. The second aim of NW is reducing the community's fear of crime by increasing awareness of (1) crime prevention activities, and (2) improvements to domestic security. However, this aim is also achieved by facilitating greater contact between neighbours and improving liaisons between the community and the police (Sutton et al., 2008). How well this aim is achieved depends on how many NW members actively and positively look out for suspicious behaviour in each community; they become 'the eyes and ears of the police' (Coward, Etherington, Macmillan, & Wells, 2004).

Theories of traditional expectations, modes of analysis of criminology and criminal justice may no longer be sufficient for the task (Brown, Esbensen, & Geis, 1996). An understanding of community culture is important in preventing crime and anti-social behaviour in the

community. How do we explain the fact the United Kingdom, more than any other country, has embraced CCTV cameras in public spaces, and has a successful voluntary NW programme, as well as a paid work community policing system, the PCSOs? How do we explain the fact that South Korea, more than any other country, has embraced the Marine Fellow Soldier Club, involving voluntary activity in public spaces by ex-marines, and the voluntary community policing system, the PCPVs? Government policies can be fixed around the idea of citizen partnership and cooperation of community security services (Ling, Jihong, Lovrich, & Gaffney, 2006). Government can use citizen groups and community resources for crime prevention which is particularly beneficial when there is shortage of police resources. They offer important opportunities in managing society.

Discussions of community crime prevention programmes invariably note two common facts (Sutton et al., 2008; Schneider, 2007). According to Lord Scarman, the first is that official agents of social control such as the police cannot prevent and control crime and disorder without citizen cooperation (Tilley, 2000). The second is that engendering citizen involvement in crime prevention is difficult; successful community crime prevention with participating community residents is elusive (Schneider, 2007). Most of the current programmes reveal a wide range of success and failure. One obstacle, perhaps, has been a lack of attention to the distinction

between implementation failure (failure due to practical difficulties in implementing community crime prevention programmes) and theory failure (failure of measures to produce community crime prevention outcomes) (Rosenbaum, 1986). If preventive measures are perceived to be inappropriate, unacceptable, costly or impracticable by those whose cooperation is required to put them into practice, then it is unlikely that they will be implemented, let alone demonstrate success in reducing and preventing crime and anti-social behaviour (Hope & Lab, 2001).

According to Ling et al., (2006), citizen cooperation in crime prevention is an old tradition in the criminal justice field. Citizens involved in community safety were, at first, peace officers patrolling the streets, and had an important role for public safety prior to the advent of the modern British police force. Since then, the crime prevention activities of citizens has become a very common element of contemporary community crime prevention activities.

According to Newburn (2008), citizen involvement in community safety was encouraged, even though the formal crime rates decreased during the early 1980s. One reason for this was that decreases in the formal crime rates were only modest in comparison to increases prior to the 1970s, and involving the community in community safety programmes was good public relations for the government. The

second reason was that criminologists predicted that decreases in formal crime rates were temporary and likely to rise again in the 1990s when some of the baby boomer generation reached the age when they could become adult offenders and engage in anti-social behaviour (Renauer, 2007). Another reason was that fiscal conservatism was emphasised the budgets allocated to police for community safety was limited (Renauer, 2007). Therefore, police had to find other, less expensive methods of crime prevention and control, and hence citizen participation in crime prevention activities was explored and expanded.

That said, little attention has been paid to how ordinary citizens view community crime prevention, or to the kinds of activities they are prepared to engage in for community safety (Ling et al., 2006). According to Crawford, (1998), most policy interest has been with developing mechanisms to 'supply' crime prevention to the community - whether, for example, through the development of an infrastructure of statutory agencies (The Crime and Disorder Act, 1998), by encouraging multi-agency partnership working at local levels, or putting into service organisations to adopt more crime-preventive practices for community safety. Ekblom (2000) argued that the intended purpose of most of these mechanisms is to influence the behaviour of private citizens in the community, primarily to forestall their chances of becoming victims. Private citizens are frequently

the proximal operators to be manipulated to forestall criminal outcomes, especially to affect opportunities and risks of crime in everyday life (Felson, 1998).

Much of this focus on the supply of community crime prevention reflects, in one way or another, Garland's characterisation of the 'responsibilisation strategy' being pursued by many governments of 'sovereign states'. Responsibilisation involves the transfer of responsibility for controlling and preventing crime and protection to society in response to the political realisation that government can no longer deliver to its citizenry effective protection against crime and anti-social behaviour (Garland, 1996). Garland (2000) argues that this shift in policy likewise reflects cultural changes in what might be termed the 'demand' for community safety:

"The groups that had been the prime beneficiaries of the post-war consumer boom now found themselves to be much more vulnerable than before ... what were once, for much of the middle-class population, fleeting, occasional fears, linked to particular situations and un-usual circumstances, now became much more routine, much more part of the habitus of everyday life, particularly in large cities" (Garland, 2000).

The theoretical concept of responsibilisation by Garland is that the risk and fear of crime becomes a routine and common experience in community life, and citizens have limited powers and capabilities to prevent and control crime in

the contemporary sovereign states. Rising crime rates and fears outstrip the powers and resources of government agencies, including their ability to deal with the fluidity of crime across borders (Ayling & Grabosky, 2006; Crawford, 2006). The responsibility to prevent and control crime lies not just with the state alone. Hinds and Grabosky (2010) argued that non-government agencies and individuals have to be involved in cooperative processes with government agencies, such as police, for community safety. As a consequence, over the past thirty years "security consciousness has reached a threshold point where it has become a collective pattern" of crime prevention activities and behaviours (Garland, 2000).

These days, crime prevention and community safety focuses on the everyday lives of private citizens. The routine activities perspective of crime causation, which has been influential in shaping government policy to crime prevention, places the routines of citizens at the centre of its plan to limit opportunity for offending by potential criminals (Newburn, 2008). Other studies describe how concerns about crime and security have permeated the discourse of everyday life (Taylor, 1995), even though the more affluent have, on the whole, managed to avoid victimisation (Hope, 1995). In view of this widespread concern, governments might be forgiven for assuming that the needs of its citizens for community crime prevention assistance are universal, and that their

requirements for community protection are uniform. Indeed, much of the tenor of the British governments' crime prevention publicity toward its citizens over the past couple of decades (e.g. the 1980s "Campaign Crime - Together We'll Crack It") has been couched in terms of appeals to the active citizen, to the individual self interest in the face of predation, and to address the apparent needs of average citizens for the protection of themselves and their property (Central Office of Information, 1989).

Yet, these interventions have been based on policy-makers' assumptions about the nature of the public's participation in crime prevention activities, which have been shown to be erroneous or invalid. For instance, Stanko (1990) has argued compellingly against government advice to women, since this advice ignores risks faced by many women - of violence from intimates - or implies culpability for victimisation in certain women's presumed 'lifestyles'. Similarly, the failure of NW to take root in many communities, especially high-crime areas, may be due to the failure to appreciate the complex intertwining of trust and anxiety which make up the fabric of social control in high-crime communities, and which the Neighbourhood Watch concept fundamentally violates (Hope, 1999; Hope, 1995).

Such insights, combined with the 'unexplained' failure of many community-based crime prevention strategies, draws attention to

the lack of knowledge that we currently have concerning what ordinary people do about the crime risks they perceive themselves to face (Newborn, 2008). Of course, private citizens in the community do take measures to protect themselves - even if these are not the 'right' or appropriate measure to take, given their likely risks. Indeed, it is a logical corollary of the routine activity / rational choice approach that individuals adopt precautions against crime in their everyday lives (Felson & Clarke, 1995). Nevertheless and Gilling (1997) said the problem of low citizen participation in 'official', recommended or organised crime prevention activities suggests there may be some variance between what policy-makers think the public ought to think and what the public actually thinks, and does, about crime prevention for community safety.

It could be argued that deviant acts can also help form the collective conscience of what is normal and abnormal, these collective response to deviance contributed in shaping the societies morality, and Durkheim defined collective conscience as the totality of beliefs and sentiments common to the average members of the same society, a totality that forms its own determinate system and has its own life in his theory of crime.

Durkheim said that crime is a necessity / normal part of society and is an act that offends strong and defined state of the collective conscience. Durkheim in his explanation of

anomie, which is derived from the Greek word 'a nomos', meaning lawless and Durkheim used it to describe a normless state society (Vold & Bernard, 1986). In his anomie, he meant a normless society and rules on how people should behave with each other were broken down and thus people did not know what to expect from each other and these breaking down laws, Durkheim felt that it could lead to deviant behavior. Anomie can be seen as a problem of a weakened common morality (Anderson, 1999).

It could be argued that it occurs when these rules holding us are weakened not functioning to the extent that it could not be enough to allow the norms to be maintained or established. Merton supported Durkheim's view pointing out some areas where he said that society live without norms governing human conduct. Merton states that if norms guiding any society weaken, the society becomes unstable and a state of anomie occurs. While Durkheim believe that anomie occurs during rapid social change.

Second is the understanding of Social Solidarity. In Durkheim's role of emotion and theory of crime, social solidarity is used to demonstrate the role of emotion in the society and the level of crime in his theory. According to Durkheim, he explained social solidarity as the feeling that we belong to an ordinary or common society, individual have basic values and norms in common with people (Williams & McShane, 1988). He used two types of solidarity

to demonstrate what he meant in this definition. According to him, individuals have two consciences; Collective conscience and Individual conscience. Collective conscience is reflected by mechanical solidarity and individual conscience is reflected by organic solidarity. These two solidarity are means by which society is held together. The mechanical comes from earliest forms of solidarity. The collective conscience passes on knowledge through the generation and acts to control the individual and governed the they society. The organic solidarity, instead is held together by the division of labour (Giddens, 1998). According to him, organic solidarity thus consists in the ties of cooperation between individuals or groups of individuals which derive from their occupational interdependence within the differentiated division of labour (Lynch & Groves, 1986).

In mechanical solidarity, individual has the same in common, every body is similar / equal, in these type of solidarity, there is hardly any individual consciousness, instead there is collective consciousness. Furthermore, in organic state, they do not have a pervasive collective conscience like that associated with mechanical solidarity. In organic solidarity, individuals are dependent on others to perform their responsibilities and functions which they can not perform such as producing wealth (Vold & Bernard, 1986).

It could be argued that organic solidarity is a highly complex and specialized form of solidarity. Mechanical solidarity is a form of social unity

based upon the similarity of individuals who share a uniform way of life and have an identical belief system while in organic solidarity is present when there is extensive social differentiation. Finally, in mechanical solidarity, it is based on individual resemblances while in organic is based on division of labour and their differences.

Conclusion

It could be argued that Durkheim's writings about crime touch on issues of political organization and morality, the fundamental concept diffused throughout his writings reflects a desire to provide a theoretical framework for describing and understanding the social construction of societal life. The overall agenda for Durkheim is to explain the process by which individuals socially integrate into society, as well as to provide a model for understanding the relationship between people and their respective societies. Most basically, Durkheim develops a framework for analysing the construction and constitution of social life.

Durkheim views society as an entity, which though a consortium of individual actors, is more than simply the sum of each individual part - the amalgamation of these individuals creates a social solidarity, which would be impossible for any one individual to achieve by him or herself.

Durkheim also stressed the importance of sociologists operating and studying a given society in its contextual environment. In this way, Durkheim sought to deviate from the philosophical tradition of examining absolute truths removed from any contextual parameters, and instead aimed to perform analysis within the contextual environment being studied. He viewed sociologists akin to physicists, astronomers, and chemists, in that all learned about new phenomena through the analysis of facts present in individual environments, and not simply by engaging in isolated, individual mental exercises and theorization. Durkheim hoped that sociologists, through data collection and analysis would be about to reveal social laws, just as scientists of the hard sciences are about to reveal natural laws. More simply, Durkheim insists that while sociology must analyse data and make observations in order to develop theories, sociologists must focus on generalising their analyses to develop universal social laws. This is akin to physicists using observations from any one situation to theorise and support formulations of universally applicable laws.

The Durkheimian vision of sociology as utilising similar procedures, methods, and modes of operation as the natural sciences requires a set of assumptions about the nature of social life and societal evolution. The most fundamental assumption underlying Durkheim's theory of crime regards the nature of society itself. He comes from the perspective that every social

institution and process has a purpose and reason for existing - that is to maintain social order and solidarity within a given society. Durkheim's functional views of social processes and occurrences is well illustrated by his view of ritual practice in religion. Durkheim stresses that the goal of ritualistic practice in religion is to reinforce the social solidarity of a society, as it is necessary 'to strengthen sentiments which, if left to themselves would soon weaken', and thus 'it is sufficient to bring those who hold them together and to put them into closer and more active relations with one-another'. Throughout his work, Durkheim continually analyses the role of individual processes in furthering social order as a whole.

Durkheim's theoretical framework is also based on a lesser assumption - that societies evolve along a linear track from traditional to modern, as a result of a number of factors, including population growth.

It could be argued that Durkheim outlines the differences between traditional and modern society, as well as outlines the progression from the former to the latter. This linear progression of societies allows Durkheim to illustrate the manner in which social solidarity is maintained in modern societies, despite the rise in individualism.

Through his work, Durkheim champions a positive approach for understanding social processes and societal mechanisms, as he assumes a functional view of the social universe. He

hopes to understand the social construction of society by applying scientific methods to social situations, and analysing the social world much as a physical scientist would analyse the natural world. Durkheim's approach and contributions were paramount in sociology's quest to achieve legitimacy as a social science.

Reference

- Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence and the moral life of the inner city*. New York: Norton.
- Ayling, J. & Grabosky, P. (2006). "When Police Go Shopping". *An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*. Vol 29(4): 665-690
- Brown, S. E., Esbensen, F. A. & Gels, G. (2010). *Criminology: Explaining Crime and Its Context*. Seventh Edition. N.J.: LexisNexis.
- Brown, S. E., Esbensen, F. & Geis, G. (1996). *Criminology: Explaining Crime and Its Context*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Central Office of Information (1989). *Practical Ways to Crack Crime: The Handbook*. London: COI.
- Collins, R. (1994). *Four Sociological Traditions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1951). *Suicide: A study in sociology*. New York: Free Press. (Original work published 1897).
- Coward, S., Etherington, D., Macmillan, R. & Wells, P. (2004). 'Neighbourhood Wardens:

- More than the 'Eyes and Ears' of Communities?'. Research Report 60. Sheffield: Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research of Sheffield Hallam University. [Online]. Available: <http://extra.shu.ac.uk/ndc/downloads/reports/RR60.pdf> [Accessed: 15 July 2015].
- Crawford, A. (2006). "Networked governance and the post-regulatory state?: Steering, rowing and anchoring the provision of policing and security". *Theoretical Criminology*. Vol 10(4): 449-479
- Crawford, A. (1998). *Crime Prevention & Community Safety: Politics, Policies & Practices*, Longman Criminology Series. Essex: Wesley Longman.
- Ekblom, P. (2000). *The Conjunction of Criminal Opportunity: A Framework for Crime Reduction Toolkits*. London: Home Office.
- Empey, L. (1982). *American Delinquency: Its meaning and construction*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
- Felson, M. (1998). *Crime and Everyday Life*. Thousand Oaks, C.A.: Pine forge press.
- Felson, M. & Clarke R. V. (1995). 'Routine Precautions, Criminology and Crime Prevention'. In Barlow, H. D. (Ed.) *Crime and Public Policy*. Boulder, C.O.: Westview.
- Garland, D. (2000). "The Culture of High Crime Societies: Some Preconditions of Recent 'Law and Order' Policies". *British Journal of Criminology*. Vol 40(3): 359-379
- Garland, D. (1996). "The Limits of the Sovereign State: Strategies of Crime Control in Contemporary Society". *British Journal of Criminology*. Vol 36(4): 445-471
- Gastil, R. (1971). Homicide and a regional culture of violence. *American Sociological review*. Vol 36: 412-427
- Giddens, A. (1998). *Emile Durkheim: Selected Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. T. and Ball, R. A. (1989). *Criminological theory: Context and consequences*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gilling, D. (1997). *Crime Prevention: Theory, Policy and Politics*. London: UCL Press.
- Hancock, L. (2012). 'Securitization, Urban Policy and 'The Community''. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. [Online]. Available: https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/32360/011_03_hancock.pdf?sequence=1 [Accessed: 10 July 2015].
- Hinds, L. & Grabosky, P. (2010). "Responsibilisation Revisited: From Concept to Attribution in Crime Control". *Security Journal*. VOL 23: 95-113
- Hope, T. (1999). 'Privatopia on Trial? Property Guardianship in the Suburbs'. In Painter, K. & Tilley, N. (Eds.) *Surveillance of Public Space: CCTV, Street Lighting and Crime Prevention*. Crime Prevention Studies. Vol 10. Monsey, N.Y.: Criminal Justice Press.
- Hope, T. (1995). 'Community Crime Prevention'. In Tonry, M., Farrington, D. P., Walklate, S. & Evans, K. (Eds.) *Zero Tolerance or Community Tolerance*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hope, T. & Lab, S. P. (2001). "Variation in

- Crime Prevention Participation: Evidence from the British Crime Survey". *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: An International Journal*. Vol 3: 11-22
- Ling, R., Jihong "Solomon", Z., Lovrich, N. P. & Gaffney, M. J. (2006). "Participation community crime prevention: who volunteers for police work?". *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*. Vol 29(2): 464-481
- Lupton, D. (1999). "Dangerous Places and the Unpredictable Stranger: Constructions of Fear of Crime". *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*. Vol 32(1): 1-15
- Lynch, M. J. and Groves, W. B. (1986). A primer in radical criminology. New York: Harrow & Heston.
- Merton, R. K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review*. Vol 3: 672-682
- Newburn, T. (2008). Handbook of Policing. Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- Reid, S. T. (1990). Crime and criminology. Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Renauer, B. (2007). "Is neighbourhood policing related to informal social control?". *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*. Vol 30(1): 61-81
- Rosenbaum, D. P. (1986). Community Crime Prevention: Does it Work?. Beverly Hills, C.A.: Sage.
- Sampson, R. J. & Morenoff, J. (2006). 'Durable inequality: Spatial dynamics, social processes, and the persistence of poverty in Chicago neighbourhoods'. In Bowles, S., Durlauf, S. & Hoff, K. (Eds.) Poverty Traps. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Schneider, S. (2007). Refocusing Crime Prevention: Collective Action and the Quest for Community. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Smith, P. and Natalier, K. (2005). Understanding Criminal Justice: Sociological Perspectives. London: Sage Publications.
- Stanko, E. (1990). 'When Precautions are Normal: A Feminist Critique of Crime Prevention'. In Gelsthorpe, L. & Morris, A. (Eds.) Feminist Perspectives in Criminology. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Strenski, I. (2006). The New Durkheim. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Sutton, A., Cherney, A. & White, R. (2008). Crime Prevention: Principles, Perspectives and Practices. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, I. (1995). "Private Homes and Public Others". *British Journal of Criminology*. Vol 35(2): 263-285
- Tilley, N. (2000). 'The Evaluation Jungle'. In Ballintyne, S., Pease, K. & McLaren, V. (Eds.) Secure Foundations: Key Issues in Crime Prevention, Crime Reduction and Community Safety. London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Vetter, H. J. & Silverman, I. J. (1978). The nature of crime. Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Vold, G. B. & Bernard, T. J. (1986). Theoretical criminology. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, F. P., III. & McShane, M. D. (1988). Criminological theory. Upper Saddle River,

NJ: Prentice Hall.
Zhong, L. Y. & Broadhurst, R. G. (2007).
“Building Little Safe and Civilized
Communities: Community Crime Prevention
with Chinese Characteristics?”. *International
Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative
Criminology*. Vol 51(1): 52-67

1 차원고접수 : 2015. 09. 22.

심사통과접수 : 2015. 10. 20.

최종원고접수 : 2015. 11. 09.

뒤르캤 범죄이론에서 '정서적 요소'에 대한 재해석: 범죄학적 · 심리학적 접근

최 관

한세대학교 경찰행정학과

이 연구는 Emile Durkheim(이하 Durkheim)의 범죄이론에서 정서적 요소가 범죄의사결정에 어떤 영향을 미치는지에 대해서 재해석을 해보고 사회학이론을 통하여 범죄자라는 인간을 어떻게 한층 더 이해해야 하는지에 대한 발전적 논의를 이끌어내기 위함이 본 논문의 목적이다. 특히, 본 논문에서는 Durkheim이 인간사회의 일부분으로 본 범죄라는 것에 대해서 심도 있게 분석하였다. 또한 추가적으로 두려움, 격노, 그리고 다른 기본적으로 인간이 가지고 있는 정서적 요소들이 사회적 결속이라는 공식적 비공식적 틀 속에서 어떻게 다루어지는지에 대해서 Durkheim의 이론을 통해서 분석하였다. 이를 위해 2절에서는 Durkheim의 범죄이론과 머튼의 아노미이론의 관점에 대해서 살펴보고 범죄라는 것이 왜 병리학적 현상에서 보던 지 극히 정상적인 행동인지에 대해서 논리적으로 분석하였다. 제3절에서는 기계적이고 유기체의 복합체인 사회에서의 정서적 요소들의 역할과 사회결속에 대해서 살펴보았다. 그리고 결론에서는 상기에서 살펴본 내용을 통해서 어떻게 범죄자라는 인간을 한층 더 이해해야 하는지에 대한 살펴보았다.

주요어 : 정서적 요소, Durkheim의 범죄이론, 범죄의 이해, 사회적 결속, 범죄학적·심리학적 관점