Crime today is the most shocking and abominable reality of life which every one has to face while living in society. Despite of the fact that unprecedented world-wide efforts are being made for crime prevention, crime is emerging in its various new forms such as, female criminality, illicit traffic in drugs, terrorism including hijacking and taking of hostages and violence resulting from apartheid. This organised form of crime has become so computerised and sophisticated that it is threatening the economic balance, peace and order of society.

Since the advent of twentieth century the world has witnessed rapid economic and social changes accompanied by technological progress. These changes also brought with them certain criminogenic factors. Rapid industrialization intertwined with urbanisation, split in the joint family system and free for all competitive social order has disabled a man from making healthy adjustments in this changing society. The man affected by the turbulence of this continual change reacts aggressively and dominates the annals of crime. This is clearly indicated by the crime statistics of India which report that there was an increase of 58.1 per cent in cognizable crimes during the decade 1969-1979 while the increase in population was only 24.6 per cent (Crime in India, 1975).
Crime is inevitable in human society because some violation or the other of any code of conduct prescribed for the members of a society is bound to occur. According to Florita (1953) "As there is sin in every society so is crime and it is quite normal." Durkheim (1890) argued to the extent that "even a society composed of persons possessing angelic qualities would not be free from violations of the norms of society". The phenomena of crime through its impact on society "impairs the overall development of nations, undermines people's spiritual and material well being, compromises human dignity and creates a climate of fear and violence that endangers personal security and erodes the quality of life" (c.f. proceedings of United Nations Congress on crime prevention and criminal justice 1983).

In 1961 United Nations general assembly expressed concern at the escalation of crime and violence in many parts of the world. According to Gurr (1969) "it is the developing countries rather than the least developed nations which were the most strife-torn while the developed nations had much less turmoil than either". Indeed, criminality has increased in most countries both developing and developed and has taken on new forms and dimensions challenging the traditional means of coping with it.

In this era of nuclear disarmament wherein Non-Aligned countries are making unprecedented efforts for world peace and
world beyond war, efforts should also be directed towards understanding the dynamics of various forms of crime at a more intensive level in order to bring peace in society. A psychological approach to the problem of crime is therefore imperative. Thus organised crimes such as violence and terrorism may stated to be the result of breakdown of socialization on the part of offenders. These psychological inputs may provide an impetus to understand crime and its different forms in a better way and may further help in crime prevention.

From times immemorial there has been a strong quest to understand the dynamics of crime but empirical investigation into the subject has been conspicuous by its absence. According to Singh, U.F. (1973), "little is known of the behavioural correlates of crime and therefore it is of prime importance that a systematic and scientific study to be made to understand this problem of crime and the conditions associated with it."

A few studies by Shanmugam (1950, 1962, 1969); Gupta and Sethi (1974); Singh (1980); Mohan and Jaspal (1982); Mohan and Gill, J. (1984) and Gill, S.K. and Mohan (1986) have all reported that the personality of criminals is different from that of non-criminals. However there remains a clear dearth of studies which relate crime to its typology. Before we try to analyse the dynamics of crime, it is important to know the legal meaning of crime and the criminal.
Legal meaning of Crime and the Criminal

According to a legal definition crime is defined as "an intentional act or omission in violation of criminal law committed without defense or justification and sanctioned by the law as felony or misdemeanor". Sutherland and Cressey (1966) extended the definition of crime by adding the following seven conditions which must be present before any behaviour may be called criminal:

First: There must be certain external consequences or "harm".

Second: The harm must be legally forbidden.

Third: There must be 'conduct' i.e. there must be an intentional or reckless action or inaction which brings the harmful consequences about.

Fourth: "Mensrea" or criminal intent must be present.

Fifth: There must be a fusion or concurrence of Mensrea and conduct.

Sixth: There must be a causal relation between the legally forbidden harm and the voluntary misconduct.

Seventh: There must be legally prescribed punishment.

In legal terms a person is adjudged to be a criminal when he is proved guilty by court or law.

In order to have a better understanding of causation of crime, it would be worthwhile to study briefly the various theoretical models.
THEORIES OF CRIME CAUSATION

For systematic and scientific study of crime causation, different theories have been advanced over a period of time by leading criminologists. An attempt is being made in this chapter to study in brief, some of the important theories of criminality. A comparative evaluation will be made in order to delve on some salient aspects of crime causation. These theories of crime can broadly be classified into three major groups. These are:

1. Biological or physiological
2. Sociological
3. Psychological

1. BIOLOGICAL OR PHYSIOLOGICAL THEORIES

The logic of this approach suggests that differences in behaviour could stem from the undisputed biological differences among people. Moreover, it is argued that criminal conduct may be traced to specific biological factors that operate so as to cause individuals to break the law. The major theories in this area are briefly explicated below.

(1) Constitutional and Physical Explanations

(a) Phrenology: Franz Joseph Gall (1758-1828) worked on this theory investigating the bumps on the skulls of criminals and insane. The theory of phrenology is based on the propositions that the exterior of the skull corresponds to the interior and to the brain's conformation. The brain
can be divided into functions and these functions or faculties are related to the shape of the skull. Corollaries to these propositions held that in general the brain was the organ of the mind and that certain areas of the brain contained organs to which correspond an equal number of psychological characters or powers (Fink, 1943).

(b) **Body-type Theories**: This approach claims that there are differences among individuals in embryonic development and that people with certain body types are more or less likely to have particular temperaments. Sheldon (1949) made an attempt to differentiate criminals from non-criminals with respect to somatotypes. He found three somatotypes: (1) **Endomorphic** (2) **Mesomorphic**, and (3) **Ectomorphic**.

Glueck and Glueck (1950) found that delinquent boys were somewhat more mesomorphic or athletic in bodily structure than non-delinquents. Later several studies as reviewed by Rees (1973) have found an association between broad and muscular body build and crime.

Furthermore, studies by Gibbens (1963); Eysenck (1964); Sheard (1971); Cortes and Gatti (1972) have all reported differential effects of psychoactive drugs according to body type. For example, mesomorphic aggressive prisoners showed better temperament response to lithium carbonate than do ectomorphs.
(ii) Heredity

(a) Feeblemindedness: Goddard (1914) argued that hereditary feeblemindedness accounts for conditions of criminality. Through his famous study, by tracing the family history of Kallikak family, Goddard (1925) concluded that every feebleminded person is a potential criminal but whether he becomes one would be determined by two factors - temperament and environment.

(b) Family and twin studies: More recently, research on genetic factors have attempted to demonstrate the inheritance of criminality by comparing identical and fraternal twins and concluded that there is an inherited tendency towards crime. Genetic research both old and new on twin studies by Lange (1931); Robins (1966); Christiansen (1968, 1977) and Mednick and Volavka (1980) suggests that identical twins evidence greater concordance about (60%) for criminal behaviour than do fraternal twins.

Moreover a sophisticated carry-over of adoption studies by Schulsinger (1977); Cadoretts (1978); Bohman (1978); Mednick et al. (1982) have all suggested that genetic factors account for some of the variance associated with criminal behaviour.

However, there are other theories which have related biological dysfunctioning to crime causation. These are:
(iii) Endocrinology

Proponents of this theory viewed crime as a "perversion of the instinctive drives dependent upon a deficiency and imbalance of the endocrine glands" (Schlapp and Smith, 1929).

More recently studies of human males have reported that lower level of plasma testosterone is significantly related to self reports of physical and verbal aggression (Shah and Roth, 1974; Olewus, 1975 and Wolfgang and Weiner, 1982). Among women premenstrual tension appeared to be associated with the imbalance of the two female hormones (Shah and Roth, 1974).

(iv) Chromosomal Abnormality Theory

A more recent version of the biogenic thesis has attempted to link violent criminal conduct to chromosomal abnormality known as the XXY pattern (Sandberg et al. 1961). This research has shown that a slightly large number of incarcerated individuals have the XXY pattern. The extra Y was supposed to produce a hyperaggressive male who would be prone to violent criminal outbursts. However a detailed comprehensive review by Fox (1977); Owen (1972) and Wilkin et al. (1977) have failed to attribute criminality to chromosomal abnormalities.
Latest research in neurophysiological and psychophysiological factors in criminality have pointed towards some more variables which are considered to be directly related with criminal behaviour.

(v) Brain Dysfunctioning

According to Stott (1982) "destruction of frontal regions which produces loss of foresight and the ability to control primitive impulses is a plausible explanation for explaining the inconsequent behaviour of delinquents". Some other studies by Yeudall (1977); Florhenry (1975); Hare (1971); Fitzhugh (1973); and Andrew (1980) have all suggested that violent individuals predominately suffered from impairments of frontal and temporal brain regions.

Furthermore sexual deviation in various forms e.g. exhibitionism, fetishism, and transvestism has been shown in patients, with brain dysfunctioning (Hunter et al. 1963; Walinder, 1965; Kolarsky et al., 1967; Epstein, 1969 and Blumer, 1970).

(a) EEG abnormality: According to Stott (1982) "another reason for suspecting brain damage or brain dysfunction among criminals is that many persistent criminals especially those with violent tendencies produce test profiles similar to those of brain damaged persons who had abnormal EEG's". Some of the studies by Williams (1969);
Bach-Y-Rita et al. (1971); Mark and Ervin (1970); Monroe et al. (1977) have all reported that there was a prevalence of EEG abnormalities in violent individuals.

Furthermore it has been reported that tumours and atrophic and other destructive or inflammatory processes of the limbic system which result in marked behaviour abnormality, personality changes, psychiatric disorders and aggressive behaviour have been noted in persons with brain tumours (Zemon and King, 1958; Fenton and Udwin, 1965; Malamud, 1967).

(b) **Head Injury**: Some of the studies by Yeudall (1977); Bach-Y-Rita et al., (1971, 1974) and Mark and Ervin (1970) held that prisoners had histories that included loss of consciousness through head injury.

(c) **Stress, illness and injury during pregnancy**: Studies by Stott (1963); Drillen (1963); Pasamanick et al. (1956) and Wolfgang and Weiner (1982) have all suggested that brain damage which occurs early in life due to perinatal difficulties may be an important cause of aggressive behaviour.

Though biological factors serve as important determiners of crime causation, yet these theories lack supportive evidence which suggests that an individual living in a society is influenced by many other factors rather than biological alone. Since crime is a social phenomena it can be explained better with the help of sociological theories which stress the
importance of social factors in explaining crime causation.

2. **SOCIOLOGICAL THEORIES**

Sociological theories attempt to explain the causes of crime within the social environments faced by the law breakers. As Hartjen (1975) has stated, "Evil after all is the cause of evil, what more, logical than to explain evil by locating the undesirable conditions that give rise to it." Some of the important sociological theories are briefly discussed below:

1. **Theory of differential Association**

Sutherland and Cressey's (1966) theory of differential association may be summarized as follows:

1. Criminal behaviour is learned.
2. Criminal behaviour is learned in interaction with other persons in a process of communication.
3. The principal part of the learning of criminal behaviour occurs within intimate personal groups.
4. The learning of criminal behaviour includes:
   
   (a) techniques of committing a crime, which are sometimes very complex, sometimes very simple; and
   
   (b) the specific direction of motives, drives, rationalizations and attitudes.
5. The specific direction of motives, drives etc. is learned from definitions of the legal codes as favourable or unfavourable.
6. A person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favourable to violation of law over definitions unfavourable to violation of law.

7. Differential association may vary in frequency, duration priority and intensity.

8. The process of learning criminal behaviour by association with criminal and anticriminal patterns involves all of the mechanisms that are involved in any other learning.

9. Although criminal behaviour is an expression of general needs and values, it is not explained by these needs and values alone, since non-criminal behaviour is also an expression of the same needs and values.

(ii) **Culture-Conflict Theories**

A basic premise underlying this approach is the notion that because socializing influences and experiences vary a great deal, people are frequently confronted with conflicting definitions of a situation. "Thus if they act in accordance with their own values, they may be defined as deviants by those who are operating in accordance with different set of values" (Selling, 1958). Miller (1958) and Confield (1968) have also attributed crime causation primarily to the variations within the culture.

(iii) **Labelling Theories**

Labelling theories contended that, once a person is labelled as a criminal he will tend to live up to his reputation.
In Becker's view (1963) deviance is a 'master status' which overrides all others. Thus once a person has been labelled as a deviant he is differentiated from others, segregated and may eventually be excluded from conventional society. Furthermore just as a deviant is defined as an outsider by others he learns to define others as outsider and eventually he may even accept his deviant role as a normal way of acting.

Welford (1975) has distinguished three key hypotheses of labelling theory. These are:

1. No act is intrinsically criminal.
2. The sequence of events from surveillance to the type of sentence received is a function of offender rather than offence characteristics.
3. Labelling is a process that eventually produces identification with a deviant image and subculture.

Thus according to labelling theories deviance or criminality is not a quality of one's behaviour but a consequence of the way society treats an offender.

(iv) Anomie or Opportunity Theories

Merton's theory of Anomie (1957), is postulated on the assumption that persons who are denied the means to reach their goals get frustrated and resort to deviant behaviour. Since it is the low socio-economic groups which are discriminated
against they have a greater incidence of deviance.

(v) **Functionalist Theories**

"Functionalist theories contend that deviance is an integral part of any social system and that such behaviour satisfies some societal need. They maintain that deviance serves the important function of demarcating and maintaining current boundaries of acceptable behaviour" (Durkheim, 1938).

Furthermore Lattler (1959) and Erickson (1964) have postulated that (1) groups tend to induce, sustain and permit deviant behaviour (2) deviant behaviour functions in enduring groups to help, maintain group equilibrium (3) groups will resist any trend towards alienation of a member whose behaviour is deviant. Thus according to this approach an understanding of deviance and its categories can be achieved through the examination of prevailing definitions of conformity.

Sociological theories have emphasized the environment of the social structure and its effects on crime rates and crime causation. Though social factors are important determiners of crime causation yet these theories ignore individual's contribution towards criminal behaviour. This is better explained by psychological theories which consider the individual and his motivational patterns in an attempt to explain criminality or delinquency.
3. **PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORIES**

Psychological theories have stressed upon the importance of individual and personality factors in determining the causes of crime. The major psychological theories are:

1. **Psychoanalytic Theories**

   Originally developed by Freud (1856-1939) psychoanalytic theories contend that life and death instincts (Eros and Thanatos) are in constant conflict with each other and that aggression builds up in a person, which needs to be released now and then. Failure to develop an adequate superego can mean that ego cannot handle a person’s lust and hostilities. Consequently many forms of aggression especially to frustration may result (Ferracuti and Newman, 1976).

   Adler (1870-1937) held that inferiority complex might be an explanation of crime causation. According to him the commission of a criminal act is one of the best ways to get attention and the attention helps in compensating a person’s sense of inferiority.

   Abrahamson (1944) believed that all past experiences are important in explaining criminal behaviour. Abrahamson developed a following formula for explaining crime:

\[
C = \frac{T + S}{R}
\]
According to him criminal behaviour (C) is basically a result of imbalance of the three elements in his formula i.e. Tendencies (T), situation (S) and Assistance (R).

(ii) Psychiatric Theories

This theory as proposed by Healy and Bronner (1936) takes into account a multifactor approach towards the understanding of criminality, emphasizing the environmental and personality disorders among delinquents. According to this theory, delinquency is a purposive behaviour, which results, when children meet frustration in their attempts to fulfill some of their basic needs such as the need for secure social relations both inside and outside the family. The method of diagnostic case study was suggested to determine the roots of causes of delinquent behaviour.

(iii) Self-concept and Containment Theories

Reckless and Uinitz (1967) outlined their belief that the important question that must be answered in explaining criminal behaviour is—why, given the alternatives of law-abiding and law-violating behaviour some people turn to one or to the other. They advocate that self-concept is the key factor in explaining the choice among alternatives of behaviour. A favourable self-concept directs an individual towards law-abiding behaviour and an unfavourable self-concept directs him or her towards delinquent behaviour.
It was further concluded from the theory that a good self-concept is evidence of favourable socialization and the development of a strong inner-self which is commonly called as conscience and vice versa is true of poor self-concept. Thus a favourable concept of self acts as an inner buffer or inner containment against antisocial conduct.

Though the above mentioned psychological theories have given an interlocking set of conditions in explaining why people move away or towards criminal careers, yet these theories are not specific in their claims in explaining fully the concept of crime causation. This is better explained by Eysenck's theory of criminality (1964, 1970), which offers an interrelated theory of sociological, biological and psychological factors. Eysenck (1970) stressed the role of personality factors in determining the causes of criminal behaviour.

(iv) Eysenck's Theory of Criminality

In the last several decades investigators have shown keen interest in the study of genetic causes, deemed to predispose individuals to deviate from social norms. Eysenck (1964, 1970) has reviewed in details the research evidence relating genotypic determination to criminal conduct and concluded that all the existing empirical evidence supported neither purely hereditarian nor purely environmentalist view of criminality. It rather tended to favour
the view that delinquent and criminal behaviour are the result of the combined effect of both heredity and environment.

Eysenck's (1964, 1970) theory of criminality may be summarized as follows:

1. Propensity to crime is universal but is held in check in most cases by given person's "conscience".

2. This conscience was essentially a generalized set of conditioned responses built up during childhood and adolescence, according to the rules of Pavlovian conditioning.

3. That such a conscience might be expected to be underdeveloped either through failure of social and family conditions to provide the proper means of developing it, or through innate weakness of the person concerned in the development of conditioned responses.

Eysenck (1964, 1970) claims on the basis of a good deal of research evidence that extraverted people tended to condition less well than introverted ones, thus making them 'ceteris paribus' more likely to behave in an antisocial fashion. He also suggested that high degrees of anxiety or Neuroticism tended to act as a drive strongly reinforcing the extraverted or introverted tendencies favouring or disfavouring antisocial conduct (Eysenck and Eysenck 1970).
In 1970 Eysenck put forward another factor of Psychoticism (P) which may in addition to E and N be implicated in the causation of criminality. Many studies have confirmed this formulation. Furthermore, Eysenck and Eysenck (1971a) argued that aggressive crimes and crimes involving unnecessary cruelty seemed to carry implications of high Psychoticism. According to Eysenck and Eysenck (1973) there is a close relationship between P and masculinity. Marriage (1975) studied a group of 228 long-term prisoners and concluded that violent and sex offences are high P offences. Eysenck et al. (1977) also found that violent and theft offenders scored very high on P. The traits characterizing this factor resemble rather closely to those often exhibited by hardened criminals, such as - troublesome, aggressive, sensation seeking, cruel, solitary and making fool of others (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1970a).

Thus according to Eysenck's (1970) theory antisocial conduct and particularly aggressive and violent crimes would be found more frequently in people whose personality placed them in high E/N/P quadrants. A number of studies have supported Eysenck's (1970) theory of criminal behaviour (Caine et al., 1967; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1971a, 1971b, 1973; Burgess, 1972; Wilson and McClean, 1974; Eysenck et al., 1977; Singh, 1980; Mohan and Jaspal, 1982; and Gill, S.K. and Mohan, 1986).
Eysenck (1970) is also of the view that impulsivity is of primary importance in the explanation of criminality. Schalling and Holmberg (1970) also put forward this hypothesis and later confirmed it experimentally that the impulsivity component of extraversion is higher in criminals as compared to non-criminal subjects. Thus Eysenck's theory of criminality gives a comprehensive picture of causation of crime, combining both the heredity and environmental factors.

ASSESSMENT OF VARIOUS THEORIES OF CRIMINALITY

Although various theories of crime causation have been offered over a period of time, yet no viewpoint is satisfying enough to the workers in this field. Several theories do indeed provide insights into the genesis of some forms of crime, but all fall short of explaining the range of phenomena they purport to explain. As Gibbons (1968) has stated, "it is not that existing general theories are false, rather they are plausible but basically untestable. In addition, they are not sufficiently specific in their claims regarding ways in which particular factors conjoin to produce crime of one kind or another."

Although modern research has established some relationship of biological, physiological, endocrinological and genetic factors with crime, yet biological approaches have lost much of their credibility with the advent of more
sophisticated environmental theories. Their main weakness lies in the fact that they fail to see that crime represents a socio-cultural phenomenon which is not associated with the physical or mental equipment of an individual as such. Beside this, modern genetic theory states that inherited traits are specific in nature but the socially defined category of crime is very broad. It ranges from those criminals who commit crime once and never again to those for whom crime is a way of life. Biological research has taken little cognisance of these obvious differences.

The dynamics of crime can be better explained with the help of sociological theories which view criminal behaviour as a result of adverse group or societal influences. Sutherland's theory of differential association offers a plausible explanation of criminal behaviour by stating that criminal behaviour is mostly a learnt behaviour and this learning occurs in the process of communication. The most obvious objection against sociological theories, is that they ignore individual, has been met by psychological theories. The 'Self Concept Theory' has the advantage of merging social and psychological factors in understanding the dynamics of crime. Backless and idintz (1967) by stressing the importance of favourable and unfavourable 'self-concept' have attempted to explain that given an identical, adverse social environment different persons behave differently, some turn to criminals while others do not.
Aforementioned discussion shows that none of the theories gave a conclusive evaluation of the relationship between sociological, physiological, environmental or other psychological factors for explaining crime causation. Eysenck (1970) on the other hand, offered an interactionist theory, a view combining both heredity and environmental factors. He gave a chain of arguments suggesting that "different personality conditions/combinations give rise to different types of crime or at least antisocial behaviour". Each link was supported by experimental evidence and various studies by Lykken (1957), Mills (1971) Schalling and Holmberg (1970) supported this deduction.

Eysenck (1970) did not offer an all inclusive theory of crime but one which was of partial relevance to contributing towards a better understanding of criminal behaviour. The theory does not explain crime in terms of gravity and frequency of crime. Though a few studies were later reported, relating different personality variables to different types of crime, yet the evidence is insufficient in generating causal claims for different crime categories.

Conklin (1981) has stated that "Eysenck's approach may work better for property crimes which involve an immediate tangible rewards; than for crimes against people which do not as obviously involve direct rewards to the offenders". Otherwise, Eysenck's theory is quantifiable and can be put to empirical testing.