

# Objective analysis of broken windows theory

[Law](#), [Criminology](#)



I agree with Broken Windows theory. One aspect of the crime fighting rationale or the theory that was developed by objective analysis is the rationale of the theory itself, which is basically a metaphor, and therefore not subjective. A metaphor is something that is used to signify an idea through example, and therefore this is an objective example of applying something that may be completely unrelated objectively, but still has meaning as it is seen to relate to a larger concept.

In the case of the broken windows theory, this larger concept is the assumption that, basically, one thing leads to another. This is related in some ways to the previously objective portrayal of the domino metaphor, in which it only takes one domino falling to make many other dominos fall.

Objectively, in terms of the broken window theory, the idea is simple and compelling from the very beginning—a hostile environment to people does not do any harm to a community if it is kept from being hostile through tending, but if left untended, it leaves a signal that no one cares, so that people might as well go do things like spray-paint buildings and break windows (Gaines and Miller). The first part of this statement is very objective by nature, while other parts of the statement may be more subjective.

I agree with the Broken Windows theory because it presents an objective view through cautionary punishment measures instituted by policy-makers who are working in a reaction in response to events. Though objective on the surface, the policies that have come out of this way of thinking have been generally controversial in their response to the presented issue. This way of thinking is being made objective in terms of reaction limiting or what could

be called damage-control for the policy or theory. REFERENCE CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN ACTION (4TH ED ) BY LARRY K GAINES AND ROGER LEROY MILLER. pg172.