

Criminological
theories – durkheim,
beccaria, lombroso
essay sample essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Criminology is a field that has been researched prolong. Most of the information explicating offense and delinquency is based on facts about offense (Vold.

Bernard. & A ; Daly 2002. p. 1) .

The purpose of this paper is to depict the theories of offense and penalty harmonizing to the rationalists Emile Durkheim and Cesare Lombroso. and the classical criminologist Marcese de Beccaria. The theories were developed as a response to the industrialization and the modernization of the societies in the 18th and 19th centuries and were taking to make a rational society and re-establish societal solidarity (Vold et al 2002. p.

101) . The criminological positions of offense and penalty will be discussed in a signifier of duologue between the three theoreticians researching the relevancy and relationship between the rationalist and the classical school of criminology. Finally. a review of the theories of C. Lombroso and M.

de Beccaria will be provided from Durkheim's point of position. Comentator: Welcome to the ' transhistorical' conference on schools of criminological idea. Today we have three theoreticians. Emile Durkheim. who has accepted to chair the event.

Cesare Lombroso and Marcese de Beccaria. who will discourse their theories on offense and penalty. Durkheim: Thank you. and welcome. The ground we are here today is that many societal alterations are presently observed in the today's society (Dunman 2003) .

The industrialization and modernization of society has the inclination to free people of their restraints (Vold et al 2002. pp. 100) . Traditional or organic societies directed people to command their desires and aspirations.

nevertheless as a rationalist I believe that modern (mechanic) societies ' separate people and weaken societal bonds as a consequence of the increased complexness and the division of labour' .

This is apparent in modern society further divided by beaucracy and specialization in the work force (Vold et al 2002. p. 102) . All these alterations of the traditional society expose it to miss of ordinance. which I call anomie. Anomie leads to offense and aberrance.

which is the chief subject I would wish to discourse today (Bernburg 2002. pp. 6-8) . Durkheim: Harmonizing to my beliefs aberrance is of critical importance for the wellbeing of society as Torahs act as bond between obedient citizens.

When a misdemeanor of the Torahs is recognized by members of society. it is dealt with by legal or societal penalty. Therefore. in my sentiment offense doesn't separate society but it creates societal solidarity. which forms strong societal bonds in it's attempts to cover with offense (Pratt 1994.

p. 2) . Therefore. I see offense as something functional and necessary for society instead than something pathological and a symptom of morbid society.

Furthermore. all societies have experienced offense. therefore offense seems to stand for a status of normalcy (Durkheim 1994. pp. 84-87) . Lombroso:

<https://assignbuster.com/criminological-theories-durkheim-beccaria-lombroso-essay-sample-essay/>

As a classical criminologist I have to differ that societal construction is the chief ground of offense happening.

In my sentiment ' criminality has to be discussed on persons level instead than societal as harmonizing to my beliefs and surveies I have conducted the individual's genetic sciences play a chief function in criminalism (Vold et al 2002. p. 26) . The cardinal thought of my theories came to me as I autopsied the organic structure of an Italian felon called Giuseppe Villela.

I noted that certain features of Villela's skull that reminded me of throwback (crude) phases of human development (Lombroso 1911. pp. 22-26) . I call these anomalousnesss stigmata and ' they could be expressed in footings of unnatural signifiers or dimensions of the skull and jaw and dissymmetries in the face. but besides of other parts of the body' (Lombroso 1911. pp.

22-26) . I believe there are three types of felons. The above features belong to the first type which is born felons (throwbacks) . the 2nd type are insane felons (persons who commit offense due to a psychological upset) .

and the 3rd one is criminaloids. who I identify as persons without physical features or mental upsets. but whose mental and emotional do up predisposes them to perpetrate offense. These factors are the footing of my theory that offense should be discussed on single degree instead than societal structural (Vold et al 2002.

p. 28) . Beccaria: I have a different theory sing offense and delinquency. In my sentiment. all persons possess freewill and rational mode. which means that they make rational picks based on that freewill (Lombroso 2002.

pp. 272-273) . Rational mode is the account of the relationship between Torahs and offense as it means that persons rationally look out for their ain best involvement and personal satisfaction. However accomplishing satisfaction may take persons into activities considered as offense by the society. This clashes with the involvement of society to continue the societal contract and halt condemnable behavior through penalty (Grecian 2005) .

Durkheim: Punishment is one of the chief purposes of the condemnable justness system. As offense is an act that is in breach with the corporate witting the penalty of felons plays a chief function in the care of societal solidarity. When the province of corporate scruples is violated. the response of the society is consisted of ' repressive sanctions' that do non take for requital or disincentive.

but purpose to forestall the demoralization of those who are doing forfeits for the involvement of society. The penalty of felons is required to prolong the committedness of citizens to the society (Pratt 1994. pp. 2-3) .

If penalty is non present members of the community may lose their committedness and their motive to do the forfeits necessary for the society. Furthermore. penalty has the map to show the social lower status and culpability of felons. This strengthens the societal solidarity. as it reinforces a sense of rightfulness and amongst observant citizens (Vold et al 2002.

pp. 104-105) . Lombroso: In my position the intent of penalty is non to discourage or to rehabilitate. as I do non believe that criminal's actions are based on rational pick of persons but believe that condemnable behavior is predetermined.

<https://assignbuster.com/criminological-theories-durkheim-beccaria-lombroso-essay-sample-essay/>

Given the premises of biological positivism. the lone sensible principle for penalizing wrongdoers is to disable them for every bit long as possible so that they no longer present a menace to the peace and security of society. all of which is justified by a philosophy of societal defence (Lombroso 2002. p. 272) . I am besides in favor of indeterminate sentencing.

It embodies good biological science and protection for the society as unsafe persons would have longer sentences. and their lives are mentored purely (Gould 1981. p. 142) . Beccaria: My position in relation to penalty is different than Lombroso's. Harmonizing to my theory the chief purpose of the condemnable justness system is to forestall the misdemeanor of Torahs that persons possessing free will.

might perpetrate in order achieve their ends and chase personal satisfaction (3 - p. 8-11) . As human actions are predictable and possible to command. if the right penalty is inflicted the condemnable justness system can command the rational and free willed single.

The job the condemnable justness system has. is happening the right penalty (Garland 1990. pp. 8-11) .

Beccaria: My theory of penalty is built on the thought of " social contract" used by province of nature theoreticians such as Hobbes and Rousseau. Punishments must be relative to the involvements violated by the offense. It must non be in extra or be used for reformation. as this would be in struggle with the rights of the person and the societal contract (Beccaria 1994. p.

284) . I am really much against cruel and arbitrary penalties. but I do experience that the authorities has the right and responsibility to penalize those persons that threaten the society. However. the authorities has the right to bring down merely penalties that are necessary for the offense as: 'for a penalty to achieve its terminal.

the immorality which it inflicts has merely to transcend the advantage derivable from the offense ; in this surplus of evil one should include the surely of penalty and the loss of the good which the offense might hold produced. All beyond this is otiose and for that ground tyrannical' (Beccaria 1994. pp. 282.

283) . So while the authorities could penalize it could non travel over that what is necessary for the security of the society (Beccaria 1994. pp. 282.

283) . The penalty must besides be certain which means that all error is punished. Promptness of penalty is besides critical for a well organised condemnable justness system as if there is a long hold between the committedness of offense and the penalty. the deterrent consequence on future offense happening would be diminished. (Grecian 2005) .

Durkheim: After hearing the theories of both of you I need to do a few remarks. Beccaria's thought of rational economic histrions discusses human behavior merely on single footing and fails to see the impact of society and societal establishments on members of society (Vold at al 2002. pp. 28-29) . Second. due to miss of grounds it can non be concluded that hypotheses are to be considered accurate.

Finally, Lombroso's theory focuses chiefly on the biological facets and analyses criminalism merely on single degree disregarding the influence of society on its' members (Vold et al 2002. pp. 28-29) . Durkheim: And to reason. after discoursing offense in penalty I noticed that there are many differences between classical criminology and positivism.

I view positivism as opposed to the classical construct of free will. It does not see that societal abnormalities determine offense degrees and that these factors determine single wrongdoers. In positivism, free will and rational pick exist at the single degree and are constrained by society and the environment (Vold et al 2002. pp. 8-10) .

However positivism ignores pick and creativeness and denies single activity as meaningful. Furthermore, positivism is deterministic in nature or in other words it considers that offense is outside of individual's control. It views offense as unnatural non a protest or originating from different value systems (Vold et al 2002. pp. 8-10) .

Durkheim: In contrast with positivism, a position held by classical criminologists in relation to penalty is that it has consequence on individual's behavior but the consequence of other variables is not considered. On the other side, positivism argues that biological and psychological factors affect human behavior but the facet of certainty and badness of penalty is not considered (Vold et al 2002. pp. 28-29) .

However, I can reason that notwithstanding the many differences between the classical criminology school and the positive school, they are portion of the same endeavor as both purpose to place the chief factors that have <https://assignbuster.com/criminological-theories-durkheim-beccaria-lombroso-essay-sample-essay/>

consequence on condemnable behavior. ' The chief jobs are to place which of these factors have more influence on human behaviour' (Vold et al 2002. pp.

28-29) . Bibliography: 1. Beccaria. Cesare (orig. 1767 ; reissue 1994) choice from On Crimes and Punishments.

Reprinted in Joseph E. Jacoby (ed.) Classics of Criminology. Prospect Hills. Illinois: Waveland Press. pp. 277-86. 2.

Bernburg. Jon (2002) . ' Anomie. Social Change and Crime' . The British Journal of Criminology.

vol. 46. 729-742. Retrieved from Expanded Academic Asap database. 3.

Dunman. Joe (2003) . Emile Durkheim: The Emile Durkheim Archive. Retrieved March 27.

2006. from: hypertext transfer protocol: //durkheim. itgo. com/biography. hypertext markup language4. Durkheim.

Emile (orig. 1895 ; reissue 1994) choice from The Rules of the Sociological Method. Reprinted in Joseph E. Jacoby (ed.) Classics of Criminology. Prospect Hills.

Illinois: Waveland Press. pp. 84-88. 5. Garland.

David (1990) . Models of Inquiry in the Sociology of Punishment. The British Journal of Sociology. vol. 41.

<https://assignbuster.com/criminological-theories-durkheim-beccaria-lombroso-essay-sample-essay/>

1-15. Retrieved from the Expanded Academic Asap database. 6. Gould.

Stephen Jay (1981) .

choice from The Mismeasure of Man. New York: W. W. Norton Company. pp.

122-43. 7. Grecian. Cecil (2005) . The Classical School. Retrieved March 29.

2006 from: hypertext transfer protocol: //www. criminology. fsu.

edu/crimtheory/week3. htm8.

Lombroso. Cesare (1911) . Introduction to Criminal Man. reworked by Gina

Lombroso-Ferrero.

Reprinted 1972. NJ: Patterson Smith. pp. xxi-xxx. 9. Lombroso.

Cesare (2002) . ' Cesare Lombroso and the Origins of Biological

Criminology. The Criminology Journal. vol.

12. 272-275. Retrieved from the Expanded Academic Asap database. 10.

Pratt. John (1994) . ' Understanding Punishment: Beyond Aims and

Objectives' . The Criminology Journal. vol.

5. 2-8. Retrieved from Expanded Academic Asap database. 11.

Vold. Bernard. & A ; Snipes. Jeffrey (2002) .

Theoretical Criminology. Oxford University Press. New York.