CHAPTER II

VARIOUS CONCEPTIONS AND STUDIES ON YOUTH CRIME

There is much talk about 'alienation', 'dropping out', 'disaffiliation' of youth on the street. There is the confusion about the line beyond which 'stealing' becomes 'looting', 'hooliganism' becomes 'rioting', and 'vandalism becomes sabotage'. When do 'reckless maniacs' become freedom fighters? Are the every day encounters between police and urban slum youth throughout the world somehow stripped of their political significance if what is happening is not defined as 'riot' or 'disturbance'? - Stanley Cohen (1973:120)

Background

"Disturbance" or "disorder" in its various forms and the intensity of crimes as well as the predominant association of young people in such acts, that we confront in today's life, have become inevitable characteristics of the modern world. Attempts to understand such changing patterns of crime particularly the association of youth, could be made within specific, unique socio-cultural context of a society. The existing literature on socio-criminological interpretations, especially from the early 19th century (Brown, 1998), have conceived youth deviance or crime as an emerging symptom of wider socio-cultural context of anomie (normlessness), alienation, disintegration or decadence of traditional institutions. These schools of thoughts have also shared their views in interpreting youth crime along with the changing facets of societal development at different stages of time.

The crimino-sociological approach to look at youth and crime has changed over consecutive periods of time that has experienced conservatism, determinism, revolution, freedom and liberalism in the history of social transitions. These major approaches could be categorized as:
1. The classical approach or conservative model that has looked at crime as rational choice and the criminal (or the youth criminal) as a rational actor.

2. The deterministic approach that criminal (or youth criminal) is predestined actor of crime or criminal behavior.

3. Other approaches that considered criminal youth as victimized actors of the situations/conditions.

These three major streams of thought have evolved over a period of time and have sharpened our focus on the youth criminals and crime phenomenon in the changing phase of time and in the process of societal development.

**Development and Youth Crime:**
**A Review in Theoretical Dispositions**

**The Classical School of "Utilitarianism" and "Retribution" and Youth Crime as Rational Choice**

The classical ideas mainly focus on the questions of morality, deviance and crime in relation to social order. The approach has its origin in the history of French Revolution during 18th century in the form of "utilitarianism" and "retribution" theory in penology and correctional system. During the industrial revolution in Western Europe, "youth" played an important role in shaping the economic system. The youth "labor" irrespective of gender became vital in the productive system of industrial growth, corporate business and consumers' demand. To increase the labor force, there was a systematic inclusion of "youth" even in the form of implementing rights in policies and political empowerment of youth by the government unlike in the earlier decades (before revolutionary era). The Theory of "Social Contract" that was initiated by the Classical School based on the proposition of "utilitarianism" and "retribution" conceived "man" as a "rational actor" and it is the "free will" that has formed society in a contractual manner. The idea was propounded by Hobbes (1588-1678), Locke (1632-1704), Rousseau (1712-1778) and Montesquieu (1689-1755). Much later, Bentham (1748-1832) and Beccaria (1738-1794) added to the debate by considering "criminal" behavior
as "rational choice" (as originated from the idea of “free will” of Social Contract Theory).

Thus, retribution was considered a necessary part of penal and correctional system but human in its application. A criminal, here, is a "hedonistic utilitarian" who does wrong deeds in the pursuit of pleasure and thus the punishment would bring the pain as well as avoidance of deviance or crime. Here, the punishment acts as deterrence on a criminal to prevent him /her from wrong deeds. Such an approach established the proposition of penology and correctional system defining the conduct/ behavior as right or wrong that would result in maximum benefits or would harm the society.

Such views also established the idea of an ideal system of penology and correctional method and gave a critical view of the prevailing penalty system at that time which was barbarous and inhuman in execution. Modern penal laws and correctional justice still predominantly follow such theory of retribution. On the basis of "utilitarianism" and "penology of deterrence", Bentham established the idea of 'panoptican', the prison system run by the "inspection principle", as one of the popular institutions of social control implemented in the early 19th century.

**Moral Panics of 80's in Europe, the Problem of Rising Youth Crime and the Birth of Right Realism and Reestablishment of Rational Actor Model**

It was the emergence of new political rights - or populist conservative views - during 1970-80's in UK and USA, that had highlighted the classical view of such "rational actor" model and brought interest in the field of youth crime and research. The models of "rational actor" explained deviant and criminal behavior of youth as a choice and as the symptom of changing phase of modernization and development.
The attack of such intellectuals was on the influence of media that had consistently given publicity to the detrimental effect of popular culture on the decline of the moral fabric of the young people (Fornass and Bolin, 1995). The established government of UK was showing its concern in re-establishing the Victorian values’ and that had perceived legitimization of pro-establishment (soft social science) theories or "right realism". The "getting tough" with young criminals had gained popularity. Right realism emphasized on the findings that the "burden of crime" falls disproportionately on the poor, the disadvantaged and those least able to defend themselves.

They rejected the idea of radicalists’ 'victim actor model'—a struggle of oppressed class against an unjust society. They rather stressed the point that both perpetrators of predatory crimes (economic offences) and the victims tend to come from the lower socio-economic class. The elite, the rich are rather conformists and show little deviance. One of the proponents of the "right realism", Wilson (1975:21) asserted ‘if the supply and the value of legitimate opportunities (i.e. job) was declining at the very time that the cost of illegitimate opportunities (i.e. fines and jail terms) was also declining, a rational youth might well have concluded that it made more sense to steal cars than to wash them'. Thus the modern policy of government should be both to look into providing financial security (i.e. more jobs) as well as strengthening the correctional system.

The approach of such "right realism" stressed the upholding of public order and public morality to assist the fight against crimes where necessarily the offenders were "youth" and much later added to the environmental criminology and "cleaning up" the youth and youth culture from all possible deviance and crimes.

The Deterministic Approach and Youth as Predestined Actor of Crime

The deterministic approach saw the criminal as the predestined actor of the crime. Predominantly the biological (Lombroso, 1876; Ferri, 1895; Garofalo, 1914; etc) and psychological (Goring, 1913; Lange, 1930; Mednick, 1977, etc.)
explanations in interpreting criminal behavior considered typical genetically potential or ascribed criteria that could be ‘criminogenic’ in a person. Though the focus was not intentionally on youth, major studies from such perspectives chose the subjects from the younger generation of society, as a part of criminological research in youth crime (Akers, 1992; Hollin, 1989; Eysenck, 1977, etc.) and attempted to reconfirm such propositions (Muncie, 1999; Morrison, 1995).

**The Sociological Approach and The Young Criminals as Predestined Actor Model: A Popular Notion During 1920-70**

It would be important to say that besides drawing from psychology and biology disciplines, during the same period, sociology and some associated fields of inquiry like criminology and cultural studies also constructed various theories on the youth, over the formative decades of 1920-1970s, and conceived the youth as ‘predestined actor’. The pre-and post-war era had brought out various arguments about society’s disorganizing trend: creation of unhealthy city life through industrial and modern development, emerging slum culture and the subculture of youth and normlessness or anomic behaviour.

Such theoretical assumptions and studies aimed at understanding how and why youth became intertwined with ‘crime’. It is so to the extent that crime and youth culture, as areas of knowledge, have historically dominated the academic field and attempted to provide a rigorous method of interrogating the social transcend, practice of media and popular discourse. It also provides a linkage between unfolding academic studies and the social context of their development regarding the youth and had established the idea of "predestined -actor model". (Brown, 1998; Miles, 2000)

Historical development of sociological work on deviant phenomena on youth could be classified into three distinct periods: the pathological period; the social disorganization period and the normative period. Furthermore, it would be relevant to mention here that such distinct specialized fields in American Sociology did not exist till the First World War. Instead, deviant phenomena were
studied as a part of more general areas of sociological interest in urban social problems. The early conceptions of pathology and disorganization were broad & related to social issues such as urban poverty and community instability as well as various forms of deviant behavior as an offshoot of such conditions.

Social Pathology Period and Studies on Youth Crime:

'Social Pathology' period of sociological work was initiated by a few famous sociologists in the University of Chicago. They were directly confronted with the 'city' as urban way of life that clashed drastically with the values and outlook of traditional structure of society. Chicagoans were appalled by the poverty, slums and youth criminality which they saw as the outcome of amelioration of the degrading condition of urban life and detrimental to human progress. Such a state of urban living was termed by the follower-sociologists as pathological and it has its usefulness even in recent researches (Orcutt, 1983; Davis, 1980; Rubington and Weinberg, 1981; Griffin, 1993; Garland, 1994; Tierney, 1996 etc.)

Pathology in social sciences has a certain parallel meaning to its counterpart in medical sciences. As the study of physical disease is essential to the maintenance of physical health, social environment can never be securely grounded without a wider and more definite knowledge of social diseases (Rubington and Weinberg, 1981). The primary focus of Social Pathologists usually was on individual pathology and maladjustment. Viewing deviant behavior and social problems as product of individual defects, the theoretical speculation of social pathologists amounted to a hodgepodge of biological, psychological, moral and environmental factors that were held accountable for personal maladjustment.

The notion of social pathology was proved by later sociologists to be limited, for conceptualizing social problems. For them, the question of what condition or behavior is 'pathological' depended on the subjective perception of investigator rather than on any objective, empirically identifiable criteria. In this scope, the early sociologists saw the condition of urban society contrasted or conflicted with
their idealized image of rural, Protestant and middle class life - tended to be defined as pathological (Mills, 1942 as cited in Orcutt, 1983).

Moreover, the violence and irrationality of World War I was considered to have shaken their (the propagandists of Chicago School) views on social pathology. They symbolized this incidence as primitive stages of social evolution which modern man was believed to have passed long ago (Hinkle and Hinkle, 1954). This 'value engage ameliorative approach' was soon replaced by a more neutral, scientific approach during the social disorganization period. Social pathologists were criticized also on the ground that their works were filled with impressive scientific jargons borrowed from such disciplines as physics, biology and psychology.

Although their use of analogies drawn from more established sciences added prestige to the young discipline of sociology, it also restricted the ability of social pathologists to formulate distinctively sociological theories of social problems and youth anomie (deviance). In short, the end of the social pathology period left sociological theory and research in an underdeveloped stage. Such lacuna brought interest in macro-scopic approach in the study of youth deviance and crime during the (next) Social Disorganization period.

**Social Disorganization Period**

This period was also predominantly dominated by the Chicago School of Sociology, during 1920-30s. Taking a sharp break from moralistic orientation of the social pathologists, the Chicago School shifted to the sociological study of social problems and deviance in scientific direction (Finnestone, 1976; Carey, 1975). The only similarity between 'social pathologists' and 'Chicagoans' was their common interest in urban problems and youth deviance. Otherwise, whereas the social pathologists attacked the 'city' as the ultimate symbol of pathology, these Chicago Sociologists were fascinated by their urban environment. They viewed rapidly changing diverse city of Chicago as a source of social disorganization...
leading to youth deviance, youth crime and other pathological incidences like divorce, suicide, mental disorder, etc.

The focal concern of Chicago School during this period was of understanding the impact of rapid urban growth, economic development and multi-ethnic immigration on residential areas. It had a wide-ranging mission around the understanding of ‘city’ as a whole culture, using in particularly the anthropological method. Downs and Rock (1998, pp. 62) summarize it: “Chicago sociology was to become the sociology of Chicago itself, a detailed anthropological mapping of the social territories that made the city ... an exploding mosaic of contrasting social worlds. Urban life resembled a phantasmagoria, a welter of shifting scenes and identities”.

For a method of reason, the very diverse projects often ended up on ‘problem youth’. Firstly, the whole point of anthropological and ethnographic method was to capture the culture of city as it was lived, by using observation and life histories techniques. Thomas and Znaniecki (as cited in Orcutt, 1983), for example, used life histories in their famous study of The Polish Peasant’ to trace the declining influence of conventional norms and social controls upon rural Polish immigrants when they moved to the urban slums. Clifford Shaw’s (1930) The Jack Roller’ was based on intensive interviews with a young man who made his living by robbing Skidrow drunks (jack rolling). Shaw vividly depicted the process by which the individual ties to conventional society, became increasingly unstable and disorganized as he drifted into his unconventional way of life on the street in the Skidrow district. In contrast to life histories, ethnographic technique was used by Anderson in The Hobo’ (1923) or by Cressey in The Taxi Dance Hall’ (1932), to observe the existence in personal living in ‘disorganized’ areas of those engaged in unconventional occupations.

There was a link between the activities of the academic researchers and the practical policy initiatives. Also, the focus on ecological approach to the study of city in the flux encouraged a concern with the transmission of culture in the
crime-prone zones of transition. A transition which was always seen to occur through socialization process among young people themselves and passing on to deviant cultures from older to younger age-group. As a result, the Chicago School's study of social change and social processes in the ecological system of the city, in general, became linked inextricably with a gaze directed at the deviant responses of young people to the exigency of urban life (Brown, 1998). In this context, youth were the helpless class and crime as the offshoot of development was recognized.

Chicagoan's studies on social disorganization and youth deviance can be considered as the pre-war legacy of American sociology. It is also significant in the sense of taking up both the micro (through case studies) and the macro level (observations, life histories etc.) approaches, which influenced later researchers like Matza (1969) and other sociologists in the 'labeling approach'. Such Neo-Chicagoan 'labeling theoreticians' favored the sharply accepted qualitative data and criticized the quantitative orientation. This trend became more dominant during the normative period.

However, during the social disorganization period, the Chicago sociologists did not succeed in overcoming the simplistic formula for the study of deviance that had been introduced by social pathologists: "bad things result from bad conditions" (ibid: 21). So, if criminogenic environment exists, crime would be destined to be manifested. Furthermore, in spite of conscious effort to avoid the moralistic stance of the social pathologists toward the city and its changing environments, the Chicago Sociologists still tended to equate the 'good life' of an organized society with a stereotype image of the stable, rural community. Against such ideological standard of organization, it was natural for them to assume that the urban slums, with their ecological instability and social diversity, were disorganized. Since they also assumed that personal disorganization and youth deviance were the result of social disorganization, the Chicago sociologists did not seriously entertain alternative explanation of high rate of youth deviance and crime found in slum areas. The question that arises from such locked theorization
is: why does deviant behavior occur in the urban slum? (because the slum areas are disorganized); how do we know that the slum areas are disorganized? (because it has a high rate of deviance), and thus it goes on with no way of distinguishing the cause from the effect (Clinard and Meir, 1979).

Chicagoans' 'zonal circle' and 'inner city' crime was later criticized by Marx. For Marx, city was the carrier of capitalism and therefore had no entity of its own in the developmental process of social change. While failing to develop an explicit systematic theory of deviance, the Chicago sociologists did prepare the way for emergence of normative perspectives in late 1930's. The basic question comes from the assumption that deviance or criminality might stem from certain circumstances of organization instead of disorganization, especially in the areas with organized crime syndicate or well-entrenched criminal youth sub-culture (Newborn, 1996).

There are groups of critics who suggest that social disorganization theory pays insufficient attention to the division of power in society (Saunders, 1985; Bursik, 1987). From such perspectives, later, the relativistic approach emerged dominated by Neo-Marxists or radical criminologists, considering the criminal youth as victim of the dominant system/structure.

**Normative Period: Youth Behaviour Revisited**

During the normative period of sociological inquiry, researchers' interests continued on youth. Their focus was on inequality, particularly utilizing the notion of delinquent sub-culture as 'deviant adaptation' (Brown, 1998).

Normative Period concept was predominantly contributed by Robert Merton and to a lesser extent by Edwin Sutherland. Some earlier sociologists also like Sellin (1938), and Shaw and McKay (1942) pointed towards conflict between cultures and values as a factor in deviant behavior. Conceiving such an idea, Merton went ahead of his theorization. He asserted that the deviance in youth arose out of strain between the culture and the social structure. When
opportunities were more circumscribed than permitted within cultural ideology and where legitimate goals often could not be attained through legitimate means, deviant activities would often result and create 'anomie'. The evident inability of many lower class young people to gain access to the 'avenues of success' led Merton to a reworking of Emile Durkheim's concept of 'anomic' (1938). It is the dysfunction between cultural goals and structural means that create 'strain' where, the concentration of the pressure of 'strain' results in the subculture (Orcutt, 1983). The subculture, as criminogenic, could be seen as a solution between culturally desirable goals and structurally attainable means. For Merton, deviants are as social as law-abiding people. In "Social Structure and Anomie"(Merton, 1938), deviation is conceptualized as infringement of social codes. The causes of deviant behavior are not to be found in the kinds of young people who chose to violate norms, rather the crucial theoretical issue is what kinds of social environment force normal people to make a deviant choice?

Following Merton's view, Sutherland (1939) also made his primary focus on the consequences of conflicting values. In his version, "systematic criminal behavior is due immediately to differential in a situation in which cultural conflicts exist, and ultimately to the social disorganization in that situation"(p: 9).

Differential Association theory (of Sutherland) is entirely a product of the social environment surrounding individuals and the values gained from "important others" in that social environment. By the term "differential association", Sutherland meant that "the contents of patterns presented in association" would differ from individual to individual. He never meant that more association with criminals would cause criminal behavior. Instead, the 'content of communication' from others might lead to deviancy. His theory, thus, states that 'criminal behavior is learned in association with intimate others by interacting and communicating with those others'. Two basic things are learned, the technique for committing criminal behavior and the definition (values, motives, drives, rationalization and attitudes). Thus, criminal behavior occurs, according to Sutherland, when there is an excess of definitions favoring criminal behavior, as
opposed to those definitions that are unfavorable. He thus focussed more on micro level approach.

Unlike Sutherland, Merton’s approach remained a dominant macro level theory of deviance. But many of the subcultural theorists are critical about Merton’s macro-level explanation of the lower class crime and delinquency. For example, Cohen (1955), propagating the idea of formation of subculture of deviant youth, argued that rather than being a product of ‘strain’ resulting from unwanted economic opportunity, such subculture represents an attempt to solution to the problems experienced by adolescents in a class based society. Cohen saw delinquent subculture as a collective solution to the exclusion from achieving middle class success. The delinquent subculture develops behaviors, which are negativistic, malicious and non-utilitarian, and committed to short run hedonism. As a result of a process of reaction formation, the middle class value system is inverted by the delinquent subculture. Such a theory later was put forward by Cloward and Ohlin (1960). They combined Merton’s ideas of blocked social opportunity with Sutherland’s (1939) theory of ‘differential association’. In the subcultural theory, the key issue while explaining the youth crime particularly was on why one form of deviance rather than another.

**Micro-Normative Approach**

Unlike macro-scopic approach of Merton to youth deviance, Sutherland’s theory of ‘Differential Association’ generally focuses on micro-scopic approach. It explains how/why certain individuals become criminal. Why all pathological potentials do not lead to criminogenesis.

Besides Sutherland’s ‘Differential Association’ theory, there is a ‘Control Theory’ tradition, which raises a different kind of question as to why a certain individual youth remains conformist to social values and norms though being vulnerable to pathological forces of society. Hirschi (1969), in this regard, states that a person is prone to deviation on the basis of his/her non-attachment to conventional values. Control theory simply argues that "a person is free to
commit (deviant) act because his/her ties to conventional order have broken (ibid, p:3). Whereas, Matza (1964; p: 28) argued that "a delinquent is a drifter who is neither committed to delinquent nor to conventional enterprise and who drifts between crime and conventional action".

While explaining subcultural perspectives of youth deviance and crime, it is important to mention here that it was the structural functional theory, which introduced us to the concept of "youth culture" and subsequently "youth subculture," and much later in a more radical way the concept of "counter culture" developed. The new concept of counter culture was a critique by neo-Marxists of the sub-culture. It has generally relied upon the concept of "youth class". In many ways such debate of "counter culture" and "youth class" was related with the prospect of "youth class" as a genuine source of radical social change during 1960's by the media and generally in the public domain.

According to this Counter-Culture theory, when culture gains ascendancy and subordinate culture experiences itself in terms of prescribed norms by the dominant culture, the dominant culture becomes the basis of dominant ideology. By 'youth culture' they mean the cultural aspect of youth. By 'culture' they mean the level at which social groups develop distinct patterns of life and give expressive form to their social and material life experience. 'Culture' is the practice which realizes or objectivates group life in meaningful ways, shape and form. Thus, culture of the group or class has its own 'conducts of norm' and is associated with the meanings, values and ideas embodied in institution, in system of beliefs, in mores and custom, in the uses of objectives in material life. Culture, in such a sense, is the social relations of a group that are structured and shaped, but it is also in the sense, those shapes which are experienced, understood and interpreted by youth (Smith and Visher, 1981; Void, 1958).
The Issue of Counter Culture and Youth Criminal as Class: A Merging Point of the Victim - Actor Model

The basic argument has been that the 'culture of delinquency' or the subculture of youth' arise as "... the young inherit a cultural orientation of subordination' and 'subordinated' from their parents towards "problematic" common to the class as a whole which is likely to weigh, shape and signify the meanings they attached to different areas of their social life" (Smith, 1981: 241). It is within the cultural context that specific youth culture arises between 'class' and subculture'. The function of working class culture to 'win space' from the dominant culture is called 'the negotiated solutions' where working class modifies the dominant values without actually attempting outright to reject them. Thus, there is an acceptance of the rule of law but an ambivalence in face to face encounter with the upholders of law (i.e police). Cohen (1965) in this regard asserts: "Subculture is a compromise between the need that create autonomy, difference from parents and the need to maintain the parental identification which support them"(Cohen, 1972:26). Such "generational consciousness", they (neo Marxists) argue, was an intense form of post war youth subculture where youth felt and experienced itself as different especially where differences are inscribed in activities and interests to which 'age' principally provided the passport.

Thus, subculture of youth or counter culture, must be understood in terms of the position of 'youth' at three levels: level of structure i. e, the basic material of social condition of 'class'; culture which consists of socially organized and patterned responses; and biographies by which they mean the 'careers' of individuals through these structures and cultures. In this context, counter culture appears to limit the term 'subculture' to the working class youth (Smith, 1981)

Miller (1958), as one of the followers of this tradition, concluded that middle class values are less important to young deviants than Cohen and others thought. Miller's emphasis was on social class of youth and life style. His major arguments are: "Society is composed of different social classes whose life styles or subcultures have both common and differing features. The subcultures of lower
middle and upper classes differ in significant respects from one another. It is so, because the dominant culture is the middle class; the existence of different values often brings the lower class into conflict with the dominant culture. Lower class youth may be "perceived as deliberately non conforming or malicious by an observer strongly attached to middle class norm" (ibid.). But such subculture, for Miller, is normal and useful in lower class life. Lower class subculture emphasizes on a set of issues or ‘focal concerns’ (features or aspect of subculture) that influence customary behavior. This includes trouble, toughness, smartness, excitement, fate and autonomy. Many lower class males are raised in fatherless households. Learning behavior and attitudes appropriate to adult male thus pose special problems. Youth gangs provide a context for learning, and provide psychological benefit, such as, sense of belonging and opportunity to gain prestige and enhance self-esteem. Gang crime that seriously victimizes the larger community is in part a byproduct of efforts by lower class youth to attain goals valued within their sub cultural milieu. However, Miller did not make a concrete effort to explore the critical question for the normative perspectives that were implicit in his cultural diversity. Nonetheless, the remained interest in societal diversity was reflected in Miller’s work and in other conflict analyses in late 50’s by Void and Bernard (1986), Coser (1956), and Dahrendorf (1959). It was more a sign of growing dissatisfaction with Merton’s Consensual Model of society. With the emergence of relativistic perspectives, few years later, this dissatisfaction materialized as an open challenge to normative perspective and its dominant influence on the central issue of deviant phenomena among the youth.

The Victimized Actor Model or Left Realism Approach towards Youth Deviance and Crime: A Postwar Legacy

The Victimized Actor Model of youth crime and their criminal behavior provides a challenge to the predestined actor notion of determined human behavior and its uncritical acceptance of the socio-political status quo. The victimized actor model proposes that the criminal youth is in some way victim of an unjust and unequal society. It is the behavior and the activities of the poor and disadvantaged that are targeted and criminalized while the action of rich and
powerful are simply ignored or not even defined as criminal. As Box (1983:10) rightly put it: "Definitions of serious crime are essentially ideological constructs. They do not refer to those behaviors which objectively and 'avoidably' cause us the most harm, injury and suffering. Instead they only refer to a sub-section which is more likely to be committed by young, poor, educated males who are often unemployed, live in working class impoverished neighborhoods, and frequently belong to an ethnic minority" (ibid.)

The victimized actor model has two theoretical foundations. First, there is the critique of the predestined actor model of youth crime offered by symbolic interactionists, which was to become increasingly influential during the later half of the twentieth century. The labeling theory provides the initial component of such arguments. The interactionists approach basically analyses the way individuals conceptualize themselves and others around them with whom they interact. Of central importance of that analysis is the concept 'procedural self'. This broadly means that a person’s self identity is continuously constructed and reconstructed in interaction with ‘significant others’, those who have an influence on the individual and that behavior can only be understood by reference to this process. Moreover, it proposes that meanings do not reside within the person or within the psychological elements of the individual but rather emerge out of the social processes of interpretations by which the definitions of objects are created (Plummer, 1975).

The Labeling Theory

The 'left realism' approach began with the Tannebaum's 'labeling' approach. In the labeling tradition it is believed that the behavior is always screened by community as conventional or non-conventional. The latter is in the form of deviance, crime or delinquency. It is based on the assumption that human beings usually respond to the definitions placed upon their behavior labeled by others, especially by dominant, powerful groups. Tannenbaum (1938 pp.19) states that the young people merely involved in mischief gradually become labeled as delinquents. For him, "the dramatization of evil separates the child out of his
group, for specialized treatment plays a greater role in making the criminal than perhaps any other experience”. Following Tannebaum, Lemert (1967) also denied the natural existence of deviance and advocates Tannebaum’s proposition of labeling process in making a youth’ as deviant (Shoemaker, 1985; Bartol and Bartol, 1989; Binder and Gillut, 1988).

Becker (1963) tried to find the avenues by which individuals get labeled. He stated: "Social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others, of rules and sanctions to an offender” (ibid.: 9). Thus, a deviant is one to whom the label has successfully applied.

Kitsue’s (1975) and Kitsuei and Dictrick’s (1959) analyses of societal reaction takes an even more radically relativistic position. While Becker (1963:14) grants that audience reaction may be based in part on a given set of violated rules shared by a particular group, Kitsue completely avoided the use of particular norm or rules, even particular standard for defining behavior as deviant. For Kitsue, deviance is the intersectional process by which audiences define and react to others as deviant. He further asserted that audience created deviant by interpreting behavior as deviant. Thus, Kitsue’s relativistic concept of deviance is almost focussed on the subjective behavioral reaction of social audiences. Kitsue and Becker’s ideas were further perused by Erickson (1966). He attempted to review some broader positive functions, which a deviant provides for the entire community. By labeling a deviant, community provides a concept of non-deviant between the invisible line of moral and immoral behavior. Thus, Erickson pointed out a selective theme of social control.
Conflict theorists or radical criminologists were basically influenced by Marx's proposition of structural inequalities in a capitalist society. Throughout all his writings, Marx had little to say specifically about the deviance. But he commented on crime. For him, crime is a brutal and barbarously violent form of social war on hostility between the individual against the capitalist. It is the offence against law (set by bourgeoisie) that is committed by the working class against capitalist social order (Taylor et al, 1973). He conceded criminal tendencies of the "lumpen proletariat". In his own words, "lumpen proletariats are the dangerous class" (Marx, 1851-2: pp. 63). It refers to the "entirely pauperized people who include those able to work but have no work, orphan and pauper children and those demoralized and ragged"(Marx, 1863: pp. 602-3). Lumpen proletariats, according to Marx, have 'dubious means of subsistence' and 'dubious origin'. They are 'ruined and adventurous offshoot' of bourgeois society. Discharged soldiers, discharged jail birds, swindlers, pickpockets, tricksters, gamblers, brothel keepers, beggars etc. are some of the members of this class (Marx, 1857: pp. 63).

Marx also points at the ironic influence to the function of crime, pointing out that such occupational groups as the police, judges and professors of criminal law would function for the dominant and powerful class. For him, '...bourgeois society does not know a better instrument for its own defense than the hangman and hence proclaims its own brutality as eternal law' (Marx, 1863; pp. 151).

Under the influence of such thought of Marx, radical criminologists have developed the analytical tool to critique capitalist society in terms of conception of class, structural conflict and ideology. Chambliss (1964), and Piatt (1969) are the leading spokesmen for the neo-Marxist approach. Chambliss (1964) in his historical analyses of vagrancy law in England, attempted to show that the status attributed to vagrants i.e defining them as criminals was to protect the interests of wealthy landowners and merchants. Piatt (1969), in his work, 'Child Savers' argued that invention of the delinquent label, juvenile delinquent and the
associated movement to establish juvenile courts in U.S.A. may be understood through the symbolic and ceremonial function for native middle class Americans. These scholars' early historical analyses of the social definition of deviance were more closely linked to a broader interest group conception of status policy.

For Quinney (1970), crime is a definition of human conduct that is created by authorized agents in a politically organized society. Criminal definition describes behavior that conflicts with interest group that has the power to shape political policy. It is applied by the segment of society who has the power to shape the enforcement and administration of criminal law. Behavior patterns are structured in segmental organized society in relation to criminal definition. He further states that the conceptions of crime are constructed and differ in the segments of society by various means of communication. He asserts that the social reality of crime is constructed by the formulation and application of criminal definitions; the development of behavioral patterns relate to criminal definitions and the construction of criminal conception.

Quinney (1970) went on to imply that the public's subjective conceptions of crime and criminals are shaped by powerful interest groups that control mass media. Although Quinney's approach in general, was a macro relativistic approach with the emphasis on pluralistic conception of interest group politics, he gradually shifted towards a more radical, Marxist orientation. In the review of his theory (1970) of the social reality of crime he substituted the Marxist concept of powerful segments of society.

Despite the defection of Quinney, there were several other sociologists who continued to advocate 'interest group conflict theory'. However, neo-Marxist theory represents a significant departure from the long-standing normative approach.
Neo Marxists' Conflict Theories: The Introduction of 'New Criminology' by Taylor, Walton and Young

Ian Taylor, Paul Walton and Jack Young (1973) are the three British sociologists who have contributed significantly to the radical conflict approach. Their critique essentially takes the form of dialectical analyses. Using a distinctly Marxist method, they focussed on a number of contradictory themes (i.e., thesis and antithesis) that have emerged in the course of historical development of deviance theory. For example, the contradictory ideas of 'freedom' versus 'constraint' appeared early in the history of social thought on deviance as a dominant theme in the philosophical conflict between classical and positivist school of criminology. Whereas Beccaria (1964) and Bentham (1970) viewed criminal acts as freely willed, deliberate choices made by rational individuals; positivist criminologists such as Lombroso (1911), contended that criminal behavior was determined or constrained by various biological and psychological causes.

A second dialect theme was 'individualism' versus 'structuralism' which emerged in Durkheim's work and represented an important step towards a wholesome theory of deviance. His macro-level approach basically concerns societal perspective on deviance. By conceptualizing 'deviance' as social 'phenomena' produced by structural conditions external to individuals, Durkheim confronted the sociologists engaged in 'individualistic' explanations of deviant behavior (Orcutt, 1983).

Finally, Taylor, Walton and Young (1973) view the recent emergence of the theme of "consensus" versus "diversity" in the work of labeling theorists "as a remarkable approach towards a fully social theory of deviance"(pp. 139). In contrast to Merton's assumptions that 'norms' and 'values' are based on cultural consensus and that deviant behavior can be objectively defined as an act, which violates the consensus, social diversity is the keynote of labeling theory's relativistic position that argued: "what is deviance for one person may not be deviance for another"(Ibid.: 140).
According to Taylor, Walton and Young (1973), the labeling theory attacks the assumption of the normative perspective that...." certain behaviors are consensually and objectively deviant often lapses into a relativistic idealism" (pp. 145), where the assumption connotes the idea as if without labels there would be no deviance. For them, a fully social theory of deviance should render as topic for sociological analyses of the contradictory theme of freedom versus constrain, individualism versus structuralism and consensus versus diversity. They assert that all these elements "...must appear in the theory as they do in real world, in a complex dialectical relationship to one another" (ibid.:277). Thus, an adequate theory of deviance must combine both normative and relativistic perspectives in order to account for social origins of deviance acts as well as audience reaction to those acts. A macro-level analysis of such a theory would require both 'political economy' of crime and political economy of social reaction.

To meet these requirements, deviance theory must draw heavily on Marx's general analysis of the political and economic structure of advanced capitalism. The structural constraints that contribute to criminal activity can only be understood "within the overall social context of inequalities of power, wealth and authority in the developed industrial society" (ibid.:270). Similarly the political economy of social reaction would "lay bare the structural inequalities in power and interests which underpin the process whereby the laws are created and enforced" by the capitalist state (ibid; P; 168).

Thus, Taylor, Walton and Young (1973) concur with Marx that social change stands as the ultimate criterion for judging the success of radical theory and radical criticism as a basis for theoretical development. Their work was followed by several others neo-Marxists like Spitzer (1975), Davis (1980), and Hepburn (1977).
The Youth Criminal as "Victim-Actor" Model in the Context of Third World: A Developmental Paradigm in Criminology

An alternative approach to look at the youth in terms of a victim-actor model predominantly emerged in the 70’s and early 1980’s as an extension of a more general Marxist challenge to criminological theory ((Huggins, 1985; Sumner, 1982 a; Gordon, 1973), and in the context of the Third World developing scenario. Taylor, Walton and Young (1973) reflect the propositions of 'dependency theory' in their interpretation of young criminals.

Youth and crime is seen, here, within the overall context of inequalities of power, which in Third World nations are seen to reflect the international economic and political order faced by the younger generations. These criminologists argue that scholars should stop focussing on individual youthful offenders and instead lay bare the political economy of crime. Criminal law is seen as a tool of the colonial (and later postcolonial) states and its class allies.

The study of crime in the colonial setting reminds us that criminal justice procedures were legitimate practices of moral political control which developed in response to conflicts spawned by the class relationships of exploitation and domination constituting the capitalist mode of production (Sumner, 1982 b). Studies in this vein have attempted to show how the newly defined crimes, such as vagrancy, were created in order to ensure the labor for the developing capitalist's economy, usually in sectors such as plantations or mining (Huggins, 1985; Sumner, 1982(a); Van Onselen, 1976). Hall’s (1939) study revealed that development of substantive criminal law in colonized countries was to protect the growing trade in wool and textiles in England.

However, all these theoretical approaches led to the emergence of two divergent views in the field of socio-criminological researches which attempt to explain crime either in terms of etiology or the nature of difference (epistemology) or the role of criminal justice. It basically creates two conflicting groups of
intellectuals; Correctionalists verses Radicalists (Orcutt, 1983; Taylor et al, 1973; Rogers, 1988).

The correctionalists reflect on belief within the normative structure of the society where law is seen to be codifying and enforcing moral beliefs. On the other hand, the radicalists try to formulate questions about the structural forces of power in the capitalist society, a suitable approach to the third world on crime where crime could be considered as an act that offend the perception based interests of elite (Rogers, 1988; Orcutt, 1983).

Radicalists argue that the correctional views are narrow and deterministic and reflect the underlying concern with reform or correction of those subordinate members of society who trespass against the existing order, and such view undermines / overlooks structural bases of power in the capitalist society. As Taylor, Walton and Young (1973:281) argued: "any theory that is not inspired by radical commitment to the abolition of inequalities of wealth and power...is inevitably found to fall into correctionalism".

**Overview of Sociological Perspectives on Youth Deviance and Crime**

A few observations can be made on various theoretical approaches and perspectives reviewed in this Chapter. These are:

1. The predestined actor model mainly consists of three major schools of thoughts viz., social pathology, social disorganization and social normative. Precisely they emphasize on the following:

   a) The social pathologists basically focussed on pressing social problems resulting from industrialization and immigration to urban areas. Deviance was considered as an outcome of social pathology. Basically, they adopted structural - functionalists' approach with the conception of society as an organism. They advocated consensus view of progressive and h
organization of society. Their attempt was to concentrate on the adjustment and adaptation of individuals within the organismic system.

b) Theorists emphasizing on social disorganization attempted to describe the nature and consequences of social disorganization in urban areas. Deviance and crime, to them, appeared to be a by-product of social disorganization. By focussing on an individualistic conception of personal disorganization, aspects like community social problems, individual crime rates and individual criminal careers were lumped together as indicators of general phenomena of social disorganization.

c) In the normative approach, 'anomie' and 'differential association' perspectives were specialized in scope where social disorganization and social problems were combined as an indicator of anomie, deviance and crime. Merton and Sutherland’s theoretical efforts were to explain various forms of deviant behavior. They treated deviant behavior as socially normal. With the normative definition of deviance, these theorists were able to conceptualize deviance as a predictable choice made by normal social actors in response to certain kinds of environmental pressures. It was no longer necessary to link between maladjustment or disorganization of individual who has lost ties to the organized society.

2. The victim - actor model or the left realism approach basically provides critical postulates on the normative approach or predestined actor model. Its followers attempted to develop new concepts like 'counter-culture and labeling of criminal.

3. Labeling or relativistic approach in defining deviance and crime aimed at minimizing the inherent distinctiveness of norm violators, which are instead labeled or relatively defined by the official and dominant powerful agencies of social control.
4. Marxian interpretations have been aimed at treating crime and criminal behavior as bourgeois concept. Marxists consider criminal behavior only as the abrasion of class situations. Especially, such "victim-model" has made contribution in the context of youth crime in the developing countries.

It would be significant to mention here that during 1960's and 1970's some of these criminologists, while floating debates on youth crime and their criminal behavior, turned their attention to the Third World countries with a little modification of these theories (Wood, 1961). The reason could be the dominant mode of discourse during that time on modernization theory emphasizing on the malaise of development. The standard work on Third World crime formulates the problem as one of young male migrant with rural family background failing to adapt to city life (Clinard and Abott, 1973). Under such pretext of discussions, a close look into the researches relating development and youth crimes through their empirical findings should be of relevance here.

**Development and Youth Crime: A Review of Literature in Empirical Findings**

From the sociological point of view, it would be important to look at the dynamics of urban industrial processes that have an effect on youth crime. Much of the difference between societies today are related to the degrees of urbanization and industrialization.

The assumption that youth crime is associated with urbanization and industrialization has had a strong influence on the development of criminology as discipline. For most of the 20th century, the criminological research has focussed on the city, especially on those urban residents who are young male and poor. Those who committed particularly street crimes (as sub-cultural theory would explain) were labeled as deviants and their behavior was explained by a variety of social and psychological theories (Taylor et al, 1973).
One popular argument was that "normlessness" (anomie) takes hold in certain urban neighborhoods that are plagued by bad housing, uneven employment and poverty (social disorganization period). This view largely gave way to the theory that slum conditions lead to youth subcultures of violence and thus criminality. The values held in this youth subculture were seen as contrary to those of wider society and their origins explained by the social change, lack of education, racial prejudices and absence of conventional opportunity for social mobility.

Youth crime in this context has been considered as the price of progress (McDonald, 1982; Rogers, 1988). For example, Durkheim's frequent conviction of fear was revealed in almost all of his works as disorganization which emanated from industrialization. As he (Durkheim, 1933:401) suggested that "...since the division of labor became the chief source of solidarity, it becomes at the same time the foundation of moral order". If there is a break in such solidarity or moral order, it would inevitably lead to anomie, i.e., 'normlessness' (Taylor et al, 1973).

The assessment of economic development is made by means of indices of productivity, investment, and rates of growth, distribution of type of employment and similar measures (Avison, 1972). However, in 1980's there has been an interest in the development of more sensitive indices of quality of life. Appropriately measured, crime can serve as one of such social indicators. As Kassebaum (1982) stated that 'criminal statistics were among the very first social indicators collected in the 18th and 19th centuries by European Nations as a part of "moral condition" of the nations. William Petty and Jeremy Bentham in England, and Quetelet and Guerry (1827) in France expressed serious concern on increasing crime rates, either in terms of questioning the "utility" of criminal law and justice or by pointing at social maladies of development and "immoral condition" threatening the value laden consensus of society which gave birth to "right realism" (Void and Bernard, 1986).
In general, sociologists during 19th century, as Nisbet (1967) states, reflected aversion towards industrial revolution and assumed that increase or decrease in crime might not necessarily be the rough gauge of quality of life. But in particular, the measure of crime is an important factor to the resolution of the question of crime and quality of life. This would be necessarily true in the rise of capitalism in the West. Marx (early 19th century), asserted that the subordinate position of the workers under capitalism led to increase in youth crime. Other scholars (during the pathological (1920-28) and also normative periods) assumed that increasing urbanization and industrialization resulted in social disruptions that produced alienation and antisocial behavior, predominantly committed by youth.

Kassebaum (1982), in this regard, observed that with the expanding market economy, youth crime was assumed to be increasing. The association of youth crime with development has not been confined to scholarship, it has also been a truism among government officials and the wider public (Radznowitzc and King, 1977). Radznowicz (1966:72), stated: "undeniably crime was a general phenomena. It occurred not merely in all advanced societies but in all societies of whatever type, at all stages of development".

Christiansen (1976) also observed that while Japan had demonstrated a steady growth in the proportion of population living in urban areas, it had shown the development of urbanism or the urban way of life characterized by impersonality and anonymity that was a primary factor of higher rates of delinquency or youth crime.

The importance of work situation for youth is also seen in Japan in relation to the increasing youth crime. Kiefer (1970:71) has opined: "responsible behavior is secured in Japan by developing allegiance of the individual to the work group in such a way as to legitimate its disciplinary claims on him and intensify his feelings of obligation not to offend against it".
The relationships between unemployment and youth crimes have been considered as predominant factors in several researches (Hellburg, 1977; Toby, 1967; Christie, 1975) across societies.

A careful study of Germany and France in the 19th century by Howard Zehr (1976) showed that the predominant form of crime in agrarian societies had been violent crime like, assault, murder, sometime growing out of kinship feuds or land disputes. With the growth of the new economic order, crime rates in general and in particular property crime rose. As Zehr (1976), in this context observed that the shift from violent crime to property crime (like theft) gave rise to the modernization of criminal behavior.

Similarly, Shelly (1981:36) in the context of American society stated: "only as urbanization progressed and recently arrived urban inhabitants adjusted to city life, did crimes of violence cede their once paramount place to crimes against property….the transition from a society dominated by crimes of violence to one characterized by property offences is the hallmark of modernization". Due to the rise of large industrial cities in the Northern part of America (as a result of both northern factory towns and the mechanization of southern agriculture), a large number of rural "black" youth migrated to the city and the youth crime rates began to rise precipitously and remain high even today. For these scholars, it is the institution and not the criminals which are of primary importance for understanding crime. Furthermore, since 1950s such views were reinforced by the wide publicity given to rapidly increasing crime rates in Western Europe and North America (Rogers, 1988).

Brillion (1973:22) made similar observations "...after very little schooling, the young people from the countryside flock to the cities. Since they are not sufficiently trained to take on a well-paying job, they merely swell the ranks of the unemployed, and hence find themselves in a highly criminogenic situations". Humphries and Wallace (1980: 179), also emphasized the effect of such environment on crime: "in areas affected by the withdrawal of capital, the out-
migration of higher paid (jobs) and the marginalization of the remainder, accompanied by the absorption into the labor force of low paid workers, women and youth, intensify central city distress and interpersonal conflict over the distribution of shrinking resources. High rates of interpersonal conflict registered as violent crime (will) characterize these metropolitan areas. (But) in areas affected by the infusion of capital, the absorption of new workers into the manufacturing labor force depresses property and personal crimes. Similarly, the data on manufacturing work force (in 23 cities of United States) between 1950-70 and measures of central city impoverishment were used as predictor variables. It showed that the decreases in the manufacturing labor force were associated with increase in personal and property crimes (ibid.: 179).

In a similar study, drawing data from 90 cities, Jackson and Carroll (1981) revealed that high unemployment among blacks and in particular black youth, increased in segregated central city areas. Welfare dependency and unmeaningful work, falling municipal revenue, deteriorating services, rising crime rate, increase in police coverage in central city and higher rates of arrest and conviction of black youths, all raise the likelihood of subsequent arrests for blacks.

Greenberg (1977) showed that the economic burden was heavier on the lower class, but since teenage life-style expenses rose with class rank, middle class delinquency was to be expected as well. As teenagers get older and move into adult jobs with adult social commitments, their involvement in delinquency also ceases. But, most delinquents, particularly ethnic minorities, whose access to legitimate employment opportunities are limited and those who get into well paying illegitimate work, have higher probabilities of staying in crime as adults. One consequence of criminology's focus on this sort of crime was that offences committed by middle class youth, such as fraud or drug sales account form a disproportionate share of serious offences and are considered as of marginal theoretical importance (Rogers, 1988; Kassebaum, 1982).
Carleton (1967) inquired in detail into the consequences of urbanization. He attributed a variety of riots, agitations and terrorist activism to industrial and urban growth. Shaw and Mckay (1942), while studying 87 countries in Minnesota, USA, observed a correlation (+0.213) between the proportion on public assistance and seeking work and the crime rate. In contrast, he found a strong correlation (−0.717) between the degree of urbanization of the cities and their crime rate. There are many plausible explanations of this phenomenon. As is commonly observed, urban type of civilization is complex and brings in its wake a good deal of mobility and anonymity. Under such conditions, primary group controls give way to secondary relations; individuals and family groups are exposed to economic insecurity; and as a whole, general antisocial behavior and increased crime rates become almost concomitant.

Elliot (1952), in this regard, is rather definitive about the relationship between crime and urbanization. The incidence of crime, according to her, is noticeably higher in cities than in town and villages. Furthermore, she observed that urban crimes are predominantly offences against property (theft, fraud, property and embezzlement). In this connection, she also mentions such problems like abortion, drug abuse and political corruption. During this period many writers ([Shaw and Mckay, 1942; Morris, 1960; Khan and Krishna, 1982) have noted the relationship between crime and population. Also the linkages between crime and urbanization are suggested in reports of international bodies, like the U. N. (United Nations, 1957).

This apart, the nature of youth crime committed in rural areas reportedly differs from those in urban areas. To many writers, juvenile delinquency is an urban problem (Cloward and Ohlin, 1961). The same, is, more or less, the case with gang formation (Thrasher, 1947; Cohen, 1955; Yablonsky, 1962).

An explicit link was observed between crime and social progress. As stated by Clinard and Abott, (1973) 'one measure of the effective development of a country probably is its rising crime rates' in these above mentioned researches.
They made an explicit comparison with Europe in early 19th century at the beginning of industrialization when it suffered with increase in crime, as developing countries suffer now. Many researches are still influenced by above observations, although some scholars now emphasize the role of uneven modernization and development (a term used by the Marxists during the 60's) which is blamed in part, influencing world economic systems and anomie behaviour of a section of populations. (Branna-Shute and Branna-Shute, 1980; George, 1982; Jones, 1981; Shelly, 1981).

Research on Youth Crime in India: A Paucity of Literature

Any serious debate on implications of development to crime - in Indian context - has singularly been missing. However, very recently, in an edited volume (Bajpai, 2002), a few academics have raised several issues related to political economy of ‘development’ and its implication to ‘crime’, which amply bring out the need of empirical studies in the area. For, Srivastava, S. P. (in Bajpai, ibid, p:42) "...the debate on ‘development and deviance’ is a flawed one on number of considerations. Firstly, despite vital importance of the question, solid factual information is entirely lacking. Secondly, there is very little empirical research that determines the connection, if any, between ‘development’ and ‘crime’. He also reminds that general consensus which seems to emerge favours a positive correlation between the two. For him, this viewpoint has found favour due to high crime rate in a developed society like America wherein the incidence of crime and delinquency has in recent years registered a baffling upward trend despite strong and technology backed measures of crime control (ibid.: 43-46). For Srivastava (ibid.: 45-46), "...these societies provide strong indications that certain types of crimes are fostered by such facets of development as the automization of families, rapid and unplanned urbanization, differential sectoral rates of growth, inequalities in income distribution, and increased social mobility resulting in the decline of traditional social bonds. Economic growth has increased the opportunities for wide variety of illegitimate conditions leading to commission of economic criminality of an unprecedented nature”. In support of his arguments, he cites famous studies by Clinard and Abbot (1973) and Clifford (1967).
Srivastava (ibid), however, reminds that development by nature may not be criminogenic, as amply proved by human faced development in Scandanian countries. It is rather the course of development and evolved politic-economic institutions that would have implication to growth of crime. In case of Indian society he rightly observes that 'the criminality of the neo-rich has unleashed formidable forces of greed and lure for riches, which often lead the fast increasing tribe of our money-makers commit multiple forms of economic crime' (ibid:53). The present study, by and large, takes such a stand, while probing the entry of youth in hardcore crime in the context of Mumbai City.

A few empirical studies in India have also focussed on crime. A study conducted by the Center for Study of Developing Societies, New Delhi (1974), showed that the research on urban agglomerates in India hardly takes into account the increasing incidence of violence, insecurity of life and property, deterioration in law and order and the rate of crime.

By using secondary data and official records, Gurr (1976) observed cyclical fluctuations in the incidence of crime in the Metropolis of Calcutta, during 1880-1970. While studying dynamics of crime, Venugopal Rao (1981) observed that about one-tenth of cognizable offences under the Indian Penal Code are reported from Metropolitan areas.

Khan and Krishna (1982) have observed that the incidence of crime tends to go up as the population increases; however, their findings do not touch upon the role of urbanization in this regard. In a longitudinal study by Singh and Khan (1983), comparing two districts of Uttar Pradesh (Unnao and Almora districts) and two districts of Tamil Nadu (Chengalpattu and Kannakumary districts) showed that the districts with higher urban growth showed higher rate of crime as compared to more traditional districts lacking mobility due to urbanization and development of industries.
Thus, it is evident that there is a paucity of data in the areas of development and youth crime in Indian context. The information on differences between rural and urban areas in terms of the incidence and nature of youth crime is also scanty. Whatever trends (in research) are available, however, show positive links between crime and development (manifested in urbanization and industrialization).

**Conclusion**

a) The present Chapter is mainly divided into the three sections. Section One, in detail, reviews the literature through focusing on the emergence of theories and concepts in conventional field of 'criminology'. Various schools of thought are briefly outlined in understanding the phenomenon of crime as conceptualised over a period of time. The experiences of Western societies predominantly formed the basis for evolution of these theories. The early theorization of crime mainly drew insights from the non-informative behaviour caused due to changes under industrialization & urbanization of Western societies. Three periods are identified in evolution of theories on Crime: Social Pathology, Social Disorganisation and the Normative periods. The theories under social pathology period mainly originated from the Chicago School and considered the 'urban way of life' and mobility of people to urban settlements leading to criminal behaviour. Social disorganisation phase gave birth to theories where personal traits were associated with undesired consequences of social change. The 'normative period' was more related to the imbalance created by social actors with instrumental goals, violating the institutional means in achieving their goals. Merton's famous 'Paradigm of Anomic' and Sutherland’s Theory of Association can be cited as relevant examples of such conceptions of crime.

b) The Marxist thinkers presented a critique of above theories, and propagated the victim actor model, which coined the concepts like 'counter-culture' and 'labeling' in interpreting the crime phenomenon. For them, crime was essentially an abrasion of bourgeois society and its institutional set up, which favoured the rich and 'punished' the 'unprivileged'.
c) There also emerged a tradition in criminology which focussed on the 'correction' than prevention of crime. As regards specific conceptualizations on 'youth crime', the emphasis was on their being catalysts of change and defiants of norms and values. Freedom and individualism, which became the guiding principles of life styles of people in Western-affluent societies, created suitable conditions for the youth to defy moral values and normative codes of conduct. Racial factors were also brought into focus in segregating the black defiant youth as the symbol of criminal behaviour.

d) The last section in the present paper focuses on several empirical studies, which stress on the relationship between 'modernisation' and 'development' and recent developments in hardcore organised crime. Such studies show that the development mostly under the banner of 'capitalist formations' tends to create opportunistic cultures where the dominant and defiant ones tend to violate law for amassing wealth or grabbing opportunities. Whereas, large cities became the hub of creation of wealth and opportunities, they attracted daring migrants who aspired for gains of development. Once failed, they indulged into property crimes, drug trafficking, extortions and such other criminal activities. The Third World countries caught in the contradictions of traditional poverty and squalor on one hand, and development through peripheral capitalism and private business, on the other, create favourable situation for criminal acts in those urban centres which become centre of such development.

Under such context of theoretical and contemporary analysis of development, crime and youth, it would be relevant to discuss the evolution of crime culture in the context of Mumbai City. Mumbai, popularly known as the commercial capital of the country, could be a source of concern as it has experienced the fruits of development both in commercial and industrial progress and also shown seeds of well organised crime. Such crime culture, especially in the form of "gangs" or organized Mafia Syndicates has lured a large number of youth into the crime world. The creation of wealth in the city by all kind of means - fair or foul - has unleashed an opportunistic culture. Such developmental
process of change, over decades, that has made Mumbai as the commercial capital of the country and also the "el-dorado" for young criminals, has led to well organised crime culture in the city. This crime culture is unfolded in the next chapter where the evolution of hardcore crime and its genesis, are the main focus.