CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The complex demands of Modern life have created widespread personal and social disintegration which has in turn resulted in a steep increase of criminal acts in India and elsewhere in the world. This picture in India is evident from the statistics provided, that while the population increased by 27.4% the increase in the incidence of crime from 1960 to 1971 was of the order of 51.1%. According to Nayyar (1975) on the basis of various studies, one might conclude that India ranks high in violence compared to other countries but not excessively so. Gurr (1969) concluded that it is the "developing nations (like India) rather than the least developed countries, which were the most strife-torn while the developed nations had much less turmoil than either".

Though the subject of violence in India has received considerable treatment at the hands of scholars, political traders, and laymen, empirical investigation who the subject has been conspicuous by its absence (Nayyar 1975) except for a few studies, like those of Sharmugam (1950, 1962, 1969), Uday Pratap Singh (1973), Mohan and Singh (in press).

The majority of the investigators agree upon environmental factors as causes of delinquency (Ganguly and Maitra 1966), but as Nayyar (1975) suggested, some other factors are apparently operative, since socio-economic variables (other than that of urbanization) did not emerge as important.
Low intelligence has also been indicated as a factor in criminality (Mandal, 1961, Shankar 1955). In the sphere of personality, numerous studies have been conducted all suggesting some relationship of intelligence with criminality. For example, Shammugam (1960, 1962, 1969), Singh and Akhtar (1972), Singh (1973), Singh (1976) all found the personality factors of P, E and N had significance in crime causation.

According to Singh (1973), little is known of the behavioural correlates of crime and therefore it is of prime importance that a systematic scientific study be made to understand this problems of crime and the conditions associated with it. Nayar (1975) had concluded that "Long term trends in social behaviour in terms of crime are basically a function of national capabilities in both the economic and political sectors, e.g., an upward trend in the 1960's indicating a decline in domestic security. However, it is evident from the statistics (Crime in India 1971) that there has been a continuous national upward trend in crime rate and therefore there must be factors other than political ones, that are responsible for this increasing crime rate.

One would agree with Tannenbaum (1938) when he says that "Crime is eternal" Crime has been with mankind ever since the beginning of recorded history. Society has framed theories of punishment and established the prison system obviously to redress criminal behaviour. But punitive treatment by way of imprisonment is no guarantee that the criminal is reformed and will not repeat
antisocial acts. To achieve this, the inner dynamics of the individual criminal and the causes inherent in him have also to be considered (Singh, 1973). A psychological approach to the problem of crime is therefore essential. Consequently psychologists have been attempting to understand crime as a product of human behaviour, and the personality traits which characterize criminals, in the belief that certain traits much differentiate the criminals from the non-criminals. Before we understand the inner dynamics of the criminal, it is important to know what crime is.

*What is Crime?*

Crime is a social phenomenon with ethical, legal and psychological parameters. But, as defined by law, "a crime is an intentional violation of the criminal law, committed without defense or excuse and penalized by the state" (Tappan 1947). According to Sutherland and Cressey (1968), criminal behaviour is behaviour in violation of the criminal law. No matter what the degree of immorality, reprehensibility or indecency of an act, it is not a crime unless it is prohibited by the criminal law.

Ideally, behaviour would not be called crime unless the following seven conditions were present (Sutherland and Cressey 1968).

*First*: there must be certain external consequences or "harm".

*Second*: the harm must be legally forbidden and must have been proscribed in penal law.
Third: there must be "conduct", that is, there must be an intentional or reckless action or inaction which brings the harmful consequences about.

Fourth: mens rea or "criminal intent" must be present.

Fifth: there must be a fusion or concurrence of Mens rea 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 (Sutherland and Cressey 1968).

Classification of Crimes

Since crime is not a homogeneous type of behaviour, efforts have been made to classify crimes. They are frequently classified in respect to atrocity or seriousness as (1) felonies and (2) misdemeanours. The more serious are called felonies and are usually punishable by death or by confinement in a state prison. In India this system of classification would not apply, since there is no definite differentiation of crime into these two categories. The Indian Penal Code (IPC) categorizes crime under different heads (Crime in India 1971). Although local and state prisons exist, the criminals are not confined to these prisons according to crime categorization but more according to the state needs, the decision being a state matter, e.g., in Panjab the life termers may be sent to open jails or any other state jail.
Bonger (1936) classified crimes by the motives of the offenders as economic crimes, sexual crimes, political crimes, and miscellaneous crimes (with vengeance as the principle motive). But no crime can be reduced to one motive and the classification is clearly inadequate (Sutherland and Cressey 1968).

Crimes are frequently classified for statistical purposes as crimes against the person, crimes against property and crimes against public decency, public order and public justice.

In another study, Nayyar (1975) put the different crime categories into four major groups as they emerged from a study of the definitions of the crime categories as given by the Indian Penal Code.

1. Offenses against public tranquility.
2. Offenses against the person.
3. Offenses against property.
4. Total cognizable crime.

The IPC has categorized crime under important heads:
1. Total cognizable crime, 2. Murder, 3. Kidnapping and abduction, 4. Dacoity, 5. Robbery, 6. House-breaking, 7. Cattle thefts, 8. Ordinary thefts, 9. Riots, 10. Criminal Breach of Trust, 11. Cheating, 12. Counterfeiting, 13. Miscellaneous (ref. Crime in India 1971). Mohan and Singh (in Press) on the basis of these IPC categories made a two-way classification according to the gravity and seriousness of the crime(s) committed by the criminals, i.e., (1) major criminals, and (2) minor criminals and which were further subdivided into: (a) hardened, and
(b) Casual criminals.

Since no satisfactory classification has been arrived at for the present study, the categories of Major and Minor Crime, used by Mohan and Singh (in Press) were used.

The Criminal

Who is criminal? An obvious answer would be a person who commits a crime. In public thought, the word "criminal" is generally applied only to those who are estracized by society. It is in this sense that Tarde (1912) stated that criminals are "social excrement". A person is assigned to the status of criminal when he is adjudged to be punishable by the authorities in continuous political control over the territory in which he is. Technically therefore, the terms criminal and delinquent are applied only to those proven by plea, or conviction to be guilty of crime (Singh 1973). Although the obvious objection to this would be that among the criminals many are innocent, and vice versa, many others in society who have committed the same acts remain undiscovered and hence are not regarded as criminals by the law and society. According to another objection, selective effects of arrest and conviction introduce some amount of bias in the sample (Singh 1973, Nayar 1975). Though there is logic in the objections, studies of crime have to be concerned only with officially apprehended and labelled criminals (Singh, 1973).

A third category of individuals who commit antisocial and criminal acts but are not considered as criminals is that of psychopaths.
Some of the psychologists (e.g., Schalling 1970, Cleckley 1964) have used the terms 'psychopaths' and 'criminals' as synonyms, whereas Eysenck (1964) clearly differentiated between the two categories. There is a growing tendency to restrict the use of the concept of psychopathy to a well defined syndrome described by Cleckley (1964). Related psychopathy concepts (sometimes denoted sociopathy and primary psychopathy) have been proposed by Karpman (1961), Arieti (1963), McCord and McCord (1964), Schalling (1970). Among the main clinical characteristics included in this more restricted concept of psychopathy are impulsiveness and inability to delay gratification of momentary needs (Arieti 1963, Buss 1966). Further, low anxiety and an apparent lack of the normal emotional components of interpersonal relationships such as affection, empathy, guilt and shame are frequently included in the criteria (Karpman 1961), Cleckley (1964). Deficiency in interpersonal relationships, especially in role making was suggested as an important aspect of psychopathy by Gough (1948).

Some of these characteristics may be conducive to asocial behaviour and many psychopaths are found among criminals (Schalling 1970). However, it has been strongly emphasized, especially by Cleckley (1964), that psychopaths are found also outside criminal groups. It should be noted that most criminals are not assumed to be psychopaths in this more restricted sense of the term (Schalling 1970). It would be worthwhile to investigate further into the historical perspectives and dynamics of crime causation.
Systematic study of crime causation is of rather recent origin. During the medieval and early modern periods, many unorganized and ephemeral explanations of crime were stated and accepted. Probably the principle explanation during the time was that crime was due to innate depravity and the instigation of the devil. Today of course, this viewpoint of the devil no longer holds good.

In tracing out the history of criminological thought over the last two centuries, the classical view was the earliest and was mainly centred around the concepts of hedonism and free will. According to this psychology, man governs his behaviour by considerations of pleasure and pain alone. Thus, the criminal was a person who made a deliberate, rational, hedonistically oriented decision to engage in law breaking. The psychology underlying this assumption is now generally questioned.

Recently, criminologists dispute what should be called crime and how to account for it. However all societies, do in fact define certain people as outside the pale of acceptable behaviour and in turn, punish, ostracize or hospitalize them. Current theories of criminal behaviour lean heavily at present towards those which stress personality factors (Elliot 1952). According to Nettler (1974) many explanatory theories of crime have been offered under different headings, but for our purpose these can be broadly classified under four major groups:
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I  PHYSIOLOGICAL OR BIOLOGICAL THEORIES OF CRIME

Such theories are concerned with attributing crime to physiological or biological reasons alone. This biologically inherited predisposition to crime makes the individuals commit acts of law-breaking and violence.

(a) The Positivists: Cesare Lombroso (1835-1909) was the originator of this viewpoint. The positivist theory maintains that environmental and psychological factors determine all of human behaviour and that an understanding of these forces can change the course of events, determined as they are by forces beyond man's control. Lombroso proposed that there were essentially three types of criminals: (1) the born criminal, (2) insane criminals and (3) criminaloids. This view was supported by Garofalo (1914), Ferri (1917) and Hooton (1939).

(b) Biological Influences

(1) Heredity: Johannes Lange (1919) attempted to demonstrate the inheritance of criminality by comparing identical and fraternal twins and came to the conclusion that there must be an inherited tendency towards crime.

(2) Predisposition to Crime: Dr. Lenz (1931) contends that the family histories of antisocial tendencies and traits should
be investigated since they may indicate an inheritance of reduced ability to make social adjustments. He claims that instead of criminal inclination, it is the predisposition to maladjustment that is inherited. This is especially true of the habitual or constitutional or 'real' criminal (as distinguished from the occasional criminal) Vervaeck (1926). Jesness (1962) on this assumption, made the Jesness Inventory for predicting delinquency scores.

Criminologists today, do not except the contention that there are hereditary predispositions to crime which alone account for criminality.

(c) Body Types and Crime: Kretschmer (1925) had identified body-mind types widely used in clinical work. Sheldon More recently (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. The Gluecks (1956) used the logic of Kretschmer and Sheldon in a study of juvenile delinquents and found that delinquent boys were somewhat more mesomorphic or athletic in bodily structure than were the non-delinquent.

(d) Physical and Physiological Defects: Physical defects are sometimes regarded as important in relation to criminality. According to Sutherland and Cressey (1968), these physical defects may be due to various reasons, but regardless of their origin, their frequency in the criminal population is not known.
Although a relationship between glandular functioning and criminal behaviour (Berman, 1931) has been suggested, no conclusive decision has been arrived at (Johnson 1964, Gibbons 1968).

(e) Electrical Activity of the Brain: Argyle (1964) said that differences between criminals and non-criminals was in respect of the presence of 'theta' rhythm, when electrical activity is measured. The study of Yoshui, Shimokochi and Tani (1961) indicated positive correlations between theta wave patterns and criminality. Schalling (1970) also suggested that there was slow-wave activity of EEG in psychopaths which could be related to their lower cortical arousal.

Evaluation of the Physiological Theories:

Considering the evidences for and against these theories, one is inclined to agree with Vold (1958) that "there is no present evidence of physical type as such, having any consistent relation to legal and sociologically defined crime. The studies done suffered from inadequate sampling and use of control groups (Johnson, 1964). Sutherland (1936) using Sheldon's data found no relationship between constitutional types and delinquent behaviour. Singh (1973) said that any relationship between physical types and criminality, seems to be assumed rather than verified or explained. Thus it is evident that there must be some other explanation to crime which would relegate secondary importance to biological explanations."
Enrico Ferri (1884) ushered in the school of criminal sociology. He focused attention on the bad conditions under which criminals lived and on the pressures that were placed upon persons living under such conditions. After Ferri (1896), Lombroso, and Bonger (1916) all emphasized the economic and social determinants of crime. The underlying assumption of this school of thought is that unfavourable environmental conditions influence the person and force him into delinquency and crime. Every individual develops in a society which influences him. Singh (1973). Criminal Behaviour is learnt through group association (Healy & Bronner 1936).

1. **Sociological Theories of Crime**

   (1) **Subcultural explanations of Crime**: The concept of a culture refers to the perceived standards of behaviour observable in both words and deeds that are learned, transmitted from generation to generation and hence somewhat durable. A subculture describes variations within a society upon its cultural themes (Nettler 1974). Sellin (1938), Miller (1958) and Banfield (1968) attributed crime causation primarily to these subcultural variations.

   (a) **The Conflict of Norms of Conduct (Sellin 1938)**: The standards by which behaviour is to be guided vary among men and over time. It is in this change and variety that norms of conduct may conflict and it is out of this conflict that crime is defined. Sellin (1938) found the roots of crime in the fact that groups have developed different standards of appropriate
behaviour and that in "Complex Cultures" each individual is subject to competing prescriptions for action. 'A conflict of norms' is said to exist, when more or less divergent rules of conduct govern the specific life situation in which a person may find himself (Sellin 1938).

(b) **Class Cultures**

(i) **Miller (1958)**: When society is stratified by categories of education, income, occupation and prestige, differences are found in the amount and style of crime. Miller (1958) describes lower class values as 'focal concerns' which run counter to the majority interests that support the laws against crimes. The lower class differs from the strata called 'Middle' and 'Upper' Class in these focal concerns. By contrast, the Middle Class values are themselves lawful, the Middle Class men being more socialized (Miller 1958). In a study by Mohan and Singh (1977), highly significant results were obtained on the variable of caste in relation to crime. The murderers belonged to the higher castes whereas the other offenders emerged mostly from the lower castes.

(ii) **Banfield's Propensity and Incentive**: A similar class oriented thesis is advanced by Banfield (1968). He holds that crime depends upon two sets of variables. One set relates mainly to class culture and personality and determines an individual's propensity to crime. The other relates to situational factors and determines his 'incentive'. The probability that he will commit crimes - his proneness to crime - depends upon propensity and incentive (Banfield 1968). Banfield's description
of the lower class 'propensity' to crime parallels Miller's (1958) description of its focal concerns.

(c) Ethnic Predisposition: A more general subcultural explanation of crime, attributes differences in ethnic patterns to be found within a society. Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967) have tried to explain variations in the amounts and kinds of violent behaviour by describing the lessons that are transmitted from generation to generation within ethnic groups. Many studies done in America for example, have established that the rates of offences committed by the American Negro population is very high (Wolfgang 1958, Cortis and Gatti 1972).

**Evaluation of the Subcultural explanations of Crime**

These theorists lay great emphasis on culture as the primary factor in criminality. Critics allege that though a culture has come stability, it is not permanent and may move, changing in turn, the class boundaries. No importance is given to individual or familial values within these culturally laid down norms, which may affect learnt morals. Although the rate of crime among the Negro population is high, it does not ensure that every negro is a criminal. Other factors are clearly operative. Toby (1950) suggested that ethnic traditions, economic position and personality traits are intertwined determinants of lawful and delinquent careers and the subcultural explanations alone cannot account for criminal behaviour.
(2) **Structural Theories**

A powerful and sociological explanation of crime finds its sources in the social order. This explanation looks to the ways in which rewards and punishments are handed out by the social system. The major theories in this area are now explicated.

(a) **Durkheim's Anomie**: Modern structural explanations of criminogenesis derive from the ideas of the French sociologist Emile Durkheim (1858-1917). Durkheim viewed the human being as a social animal as well as a physical organism which depends also upon moral connections. Pressure or restraint is required for social life to ensue and for the psychic health of the individual. Social conditions that allow a deregulation of social life, Durkheim called states of 'anomie'. It refers to a condition of relative normlessness in a society or group. As the utility of the concept for understanding diverse forms of deviant behaviour became evident, it was extended to refer to a condition of individuals rather than of their environment.

Merton (1957) applied Durkheim's idea to a new approach. According to him, Anomie is conceived of as a breakdown in the cultural structure occurring particularly when there is an acute disfunction between the cultural norms and goals and the socially structured capacities of members of the group to act in accord with them.

The most prominent application of Merton's ideas has been to the explanation of juvenile delinquency, and in particular to
that of urban gangs. One formulation is given by Cloward and Ohlin's work aptly titled 'Delinquency and Opportunity' (1960).

(b) Labelling Theories: Some criminologists argue that once a person is labelled as a criminal he will tend to live up to his reputation. In Howard S. Becker's (1963) view, deviance or criminality is not a quality of one's behaviour but a consequence of the way society treats an offender. In other words, the nature and implications of criminal acts are determined by our social handling of them. The trial procedure is an example of a "status degradation" ceremony, in which a person's law abiding status is taken away and a criminal status is substituted. And as Edwin Lemert (1967) suggests, once an individual begins to perceive himself as a criminal, he may use this deviant behaviour to cope with the problems created by the societal reaction to him. A person labelled "Criminal" accepts this identity and behaves accordingly (Scarpitti 1974).

(c) Reactive hypotheses: Reactive hypotheses are related to other structural schema in emphasizing the role of the status system of a society in producing crime and delinquency. The reactive hypotheses describe criminal subcultures as formed in response to status deprivation. The pure reactive hypothesis claims that the social structure produces a 'reaction formation' in those whom its rules disqualify for status (Nettler 1974).

(d) Expressing Violence and Learning: Some social psychologists believe that children will grow up violent if they
are not adequately nurtured (Eron et al. 1971). Adequate nurturing includes both (1) appreciating the child and (2) training him to acknowledge the rights of others. Similarly, it is believed by many sociologists that hostile behavior can be learned as easily as pacific behavior. Once learned, the codes of violence are their own 'positive values'.

**Criticism of the Structural Theories**

The structural theories contain some truth but are not in themselves sufficient to give a comprehensive account of criminal behavior. Although the group is important, it is not the sole determiner or vital influencer of all behavior. The structural theories lay too much emphasis on group effects and neglect the importance of individual functioning in society. Although Merton (1957) attributed importance to social and group conditions that result in states of 'anomie', he failed to explain individual alienation from such social conditions. The reactive hypotheses emphasized the role of the status system but neglected the role that self-esteem and prestige (Maslow 1968) play in determining crime. The structural theories gave some importance to learning processes but did not adequately elaborate on the effect that positive and negative reinforcers have on such learning. The structural theories failed to explain the role of the individual, i.e., they sometimes go beyond the cores of veracity and assume too much. "Social Control" has been emphasized and is common to all these explanations who see crime as the result of a weakening of these social controls (Nettler 1974). The explanations are
unable to explain fully how this deregulation of social life comes about and what causes it.

III  SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORIES

The underlying assumption of the school of criminal sociology is that unfavourable environmental conditions influence the person and force him into delinquency and crime. A strictly sociological approach finds difficulty in explaining the behaviour of a child who despite the fact that he lives in a slum neighborhood, associates with a gang and is exposed to criminal models, never becomes a delinquent. The survey of sociological and other factors shows that any criminal behaviour is the outcome of environmental presses and the inner urges of the individual (Singh, 1973). A social-psychological interactionist theory assumes that human behaviour is the result of some reciprocal connection between an organism and its environment (Nettler 1974). Such approaches have been elaborated below:

(a) Sutherland's Theory of Differential Association

According to Sutherland (1939) the core assumption of the Differential Association hypothesis is that criminal behaviour is learned behaviour (rather than the release of some inherited predisposition). The social influences persons encounter through their life times are inharmonious and inconsistent, so that many individuals become involved in contacts with carriers of criminalistic norms and become criminals as a consequence. This process is known as "differential association" (Sutherland 1939).
The elements of differential association theory are 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. When criminal behaviour is learned, the learning includes (a) techniques of committing the crime, which are sometimes very complicated, sometimes very simple, (b) the specific direction of Motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes.
5. The specific direction of Motives and drives 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.

(b) Lemert's Contribution (1967): Lemert's viewpoint is based on the assumption that "behavioural deviations are a function of culture conflict which is expressed through social organization". He distinguished between two categories representing polar extremes on a causal continuum and many occurrences of deviant conduct arise as the joint product of pressures of social situations and factors from the inner life of the individual.
He distinguished between social contexts within which deviant conduct can arise and gives the categories of individual, situational and systematic deviation. Individual deviation refers to deviant acts which emanate from psychic pressures; situational deviation is conduct which develops as a function of situational stresses or pressures. Lemert employs the term 'systematic deviation to refer to those patterns of deviant behaviour which take on the colouring of subcultures or behaviour systems. One major distinction introduced by Lemert is between primary and secondary deviation. This pair of concepts reflects his concern with deviance as a social process and the impact of societal reactions upon persons (Gibbons, 1968).

**Evaluation of the Socio-Psychological View Points**

The socio-psychological theories offer some explanation of criminality and the role that group and society plays in learning processes. But the theories are too general and broad in their policies to illuminate fully the roots of crime causation.

Backless (1971) notes that an obvious criticism of Sutherland's theory is that it applies to behaviour in a world which offers the individual several alternatives. The theory does not account for those who adopt particular patterns of behaviour and those who do not, including the patterns that deviate and conflict with the norms of society in general. Evidently there must be an internal factor present which makes the person gravitate towards criminal patterns of behaviour (Backless 1971).
It is assumed by social psychologists that learning occurs through group influences and from the legal codes or definitions prescribed by these groups. An obvious criticism would be that learning may occur through individual carriers who are agents of socialization. Lack of knowledge of legal codes may result in faulty learning of immoral codes.

In any theory of criminality therefore, both the factors of personality and situation have to be taken into account (Singh, 1973). Sociologists so far have been unable to explain why crime is as rampant in a prosperous society as in a poor society or why some individuals rather than others succumb to undesirable environmental influences. This is better specified by the psychological theories (e.g. Eysenck 1970) who tried to relate biological, sociological and psychological factors to a general interactionist theory of crime (Nettler, 1974).

IV PSYCHOLOGICAL VIEW POINTS

The psychological approach is devoted predominantly to social-psychological questions regarding criminality and delinquency so that it attempts to specify the factors which result in law-breaking by particular actors. The central hypothesis is that the critical causal factors or variables center around personality problems to which criminal deviance is presumed to be response. The environment may act as a precipitating but never as a primary force in causation (Gibbons, 1968).
(1) **Pathogenic Views:**

(a) **Mental disorder and crime:** Following the demise of the feeble mindedness theory of criminality, the idea grew that criminality is often attributable to serious forms of mental disorder or impairments. A frequently cited study of Sing Sing inmates by Bernard Glueck (1918) classified 12% of the prisoners as mentally diseased or deteriorated along with 19% as "psychopathic personalities". Later inquiries revealed that these conditions are not much more common in offenders than among law abiding citizens (Erickson 1938, Dunham 1939, Schilder 1940).

By now it seems established that few criminals are psychotics. As this version of psychopathological theory has proved untenable, interest has shifted towards other hypotheses related to pathogenic causes. One of these modern currently popular views is the psychoanalytic.

(b) **Psychoanalytic Theories:** Psychoanalytic essays on crime and delinquency are numerous and complex, so only a brief and terse summary is presented.

Although psychoanalytic thought originated in the writings of Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), there are presently a number of versions, some representative of the original views, while others like those of Horney represent drastic departures from the basic postulates.

Three propositions are at the heart of psychoanalytic thought: (1) First it is held that behaviour is largely the product of psychological-biological forces "drives of instincts"
which are unconscious in nature and are not directly perceived or understood by the actor (Gibbons 1968). (2) Second, functional behaviour disorders including criminality, arise out of conflicts related to these basic drives. These behavioural pathologies may be the result of the repression of instinctual energy which presses for recognition in disguised form or they may be the product of inadequate socialization, so that normal control over impulses is lacking. Third (3) it is argued that in order to modify the undesirable behaviour of a person, he must be guided towards insight into the unconscious roots of his responses so he can develop control over such impulses. This process of gaining insight is by means of psychoanalysis. Applications of psychoanalytic notions to criminality grow directly out of the general theory. Vold (1958) has summarized the psychoanalytic view of criminality in this way: "Criminal behaviour, under this general theoretical orientation, is to be understood simply and directly, as a substitute response, some form of symbolic release of repressed complexes. The conflict in the unconscious mind gives rise to feelings of guilt and anxiety with a consequent desire for punishment to remove the guilt feelings and restore a proper balance of good against evil. The criminal then commits the criminal act in order to be caught and punished. Unconsciously motivated errors (i.e., careless or imprudent ways of committing the crime) leave "clues" so the authorities may more readily apprehend and convict the guilty, and thus administer suitably cleansing punishment (Vold 1958).
Aichhorn (1955) has applied psychoanalytic thought to the explanation of criminal behaviour. Friedlander (1947) agrees with Aichhorn (1955) that delinquents are persons expressing antisocial impulses that are repressed in normal persons. Unfavourable environments may be a precipitating cause but never a primary one (Abrahamsen 1952, Friedlander 1947).

Criticism of the Psychoanalytic Theory of Crime

General criticism of the said theory centres around the vagueness and circularity of reasoning which renders the proposition untestable (Hull and Lindzey 1960). Some other criticisms are (1) The theory is in error because it is built upon assumptions of unconscious motivation. The evidence in support of this is lacking and basically unscientific. (2) The theory is flawed because it minimizes the influences of social factors on human behaviour (Gibbons 1968). Gibbon (1968) suggests that these criticisms persuade one to reject psychoanalytic views of criminality in favour of alternative theories which make better sense of the facts of lawbreaking.

(c) Emotional Problems and Criminality: Beginning around 1900, much has been written by psychologists and others about personality problems or emotional disturbances and criminality. Burt's (1938) allegation that 85% of the delinquents studied by him were emotionally impaired stands as an early example of the general personality problems view. Healy and Bronner (1936) comparing 105 delinquents and 105 of their non-delinquent siblings
concluded that 91% of the delinquents were emotionally disturbed. Hakeem (1966) criticized this conclusion saying that the results were biased and that this study is therefore not valid. He concluded that the results probably reveal more about biases of the psychiatrists than about characteristics of the offenders. The Gluecks (1951) and Hathaway and Monachesi (1953) both suggested emotional factors in criminality. Mohan and Singh (1977) in their study found that rural criminals are more maladjusted in all spheres except that of health than the urban criminals. The casual criminals are better adjusted than the hardened criminals. Swanson (1949) on the other hand, found negative correlations and his study therefore does not lend support to the emotional disturbance argument.

The refrain that virtually all criminality and delinquency is the product of emotional disturbances continues unabated in spite of considerable evidence indicating to the contrary.

Evaluation of Pathogenic Theories of Crime

We must concur with Inkeles (1964) that personality formulations must be articulated with sociological ones on criminality. Some previous psychogenic views have contributed little conclusive evidence regarding criminality. Certain new directions are called for regarding psychogenic hypotheses in criminological analysis. More attention is required to the task of explicating hypotheses which spell out the specific personality ingredients assumed to accompany some specific pattern of
criminality (Gibbons 1968).

(2) Psychological Theories

(a) Family Factors and Criminality: In almost every society, the family has the most intense and consistent contact with children from infantile dependence through at least the preadolescent stage of life. Thus the behaviour of all youngsters, delinquent or non-delinquent, is probably greatly influenced by primary group interaction within family settings (Gibbons 1968). The family is thus seen as an important force in adult criminality. Sutherland and Cressey (1966) have summarized the generalizations made involving some conditions and delinquency. They indicate that delinquents tend to come from homes characterized by one or more of the following conditions:

(a) Other members of the family are criminal, delinquent or alcoholic.
(b) One or both parents are absent from the home through divorce, desertion or death.
(c) The home is marked by a lack of parental control.
(d) Home uncongeniality is evidenced by such things as domination by one member, favouritism, over solicitude, over severity, neglect or jealousy.
(e) Racial or religious differences in conventions and standards, foster home or constitutional home situations.
(f) Economic pressures stemming from unemployment or insufficient income (Sutherland and Cressey 1966).
The comparative study by the Gluecks of 500 delinquents and 500 non-offenders represent a major source of data regarding home factors (Glueck and Glueck 1930). The amalgam of factors led the Gluecks to conclude that defective family patterns represent the major causal dimension in delinquency.

It would be hard to ignore this generalization given by these supportive findings. However, it is evident that other variables loom equally large in the etiology of delinquency (Gibbons 1968).

(b) Control Theories: These theories make the assumption that the higher organisms require training if they are to behave socially. Margaret and Harry Harlow (1967) say that, "one of the most important functions of the social learning in primates is the development of social patterns that will restrain and check potentially social behaviour. These positive learned social patterns must be established before negative unlearned patterns emerge" (Harlow and Harlow 1967).

There are 2 versions of the control theory (Nettler 1974) (i) One point of view has been proposed by the American Criminologist Beckless (1967) and his associates under the title of Containment theory. (ii) Another theory has been advanced by the British psychologist Rysenck (1970).

(i) Containment Theory: The Containment theory recognizes that not everyone in the same environment catches the same disease. There are differences in immunity. So too with criminality
individuals are differentially immunized against the temptation to be criminal. Beckless and his colleagues (1971) conceive of the immunity to contagion by criminality as a matter of control, of ones being "contained", or restrained against the allure of crime. The controls that "contain" a person are in turn considered to be of two orders, "outer" and "Inner".

(i) Outer containment or social pressure. This source of restraint consists of social pressures to obey the norms of one group.

(ii) Inner containment or self control. No community can depend completely upon the constant control of individuals through social pressure. All socialisation aims at the development of self control. The agent of such control is commonly called "conscience".

Criticism: Though the containment theory has much truth and points to a set of interlocking conditions that move people towards or away from criminal careers, yet it is too general to explain fully the fact of crime. This is better specified by Eysenck's theory of Criminality which offers an interrelated theory of sociological, biological and psychological factors. Eysenck (1970) stressed the role that personality factors play in the determination of crime.

(ii) Eysenck's Theory of Criminality: It is common place observation to say that all human (and animal) behaviour is phenotypic and is produced by the interplay of genotype and
environment. In the field of criminal conduct, the last fifty years have seen an ever increasing interest in genetic causes predisposing certain individuals to behave in an antisocial fashion. In a recent publication (Eysenck, 1970), the literature has been reviewed in some detail as far as the evidence for genotypic determination of criminal conduct is concerned and the conclusion was drawn that the facts supported neither a purely hereditarian nor a purely environmentalist but rather an interactionist theory, i.e., a view combining both hereditary and environmental factors.

In crime and Personality (second edition, 1970), a psychological theory was put forward to the effect that

1. Propensity to crime is universal, but is held in check in most cases by a 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. This "Conscience" might be expected to be underdeveloped either through failure of social and family conditions to provide the proper means of development or through innate weakness in the person concerned of the mechanism involved in the elaboration of conditioned responses. It was further postulated that:

4. Extraverted people tended, under certain stated conditions to condition less well than introverted ones, thus making
then 'ceteris paribus' more likely to behave in an antisocial fashion and 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).

From this chain of argument each link of which was supported by experimental evidence, it was deduced that antisocial conduct, particularly crime, would be found more frequently in people whose personality placed them in the high E/high N quadrant and a number of empirical studies were quoted to support this deduction (Passingham 1967) i.e., those of Mills (1971), Sanocki (1969) etc.

Assessment of Various Theories of Criminality

Although various theories have been offered through the years to explain criminal causation, no viewpoint could sufficiently satisfy workers in this field.

The biological theorists suggested that inherited biological traits predisposed an individual towards crime. This theory lacked from sufficient supportive evidence which suggests that an individual living in a society must be influenced by factors other than biological alone. The sociologists attribute all human behaviour as the result of group or societal influences. The individual is neglected and though they contribute towards a theory of crime they can only supplement other viewpoints and are not
In themselves sufficient. No theory gave a conclusive evaluation of the relationship between sociological, physiological, environmental and other psychological factors. Eysenck (1970) on the other hand, offered an interactionist theory, a view combining both hereditary 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 anti-social behaviour" (Eysenck and Eysenck 1970). Each link was supported by experimental evidence (Eysenck 1970). Various studies by Lykken (1957), Mills (1971), Schalling and Holmberg (1970) support this deduction. Eysenck (1970) did not offer an all conclusive theory of crime but one which was of partial relevance to contributing towards a better understanding of the criminal. The other theories offered before could only supplement his theory. They suggested sociological and biological factors, but did not take into account individual differences in behaviour. Eysenck (1970) gave a theory which appeared to be quantifiable and warranting testability.