Crit Crim (2015) 23:165–177
DOI 10.1007/s10612-015-9273-8

Jock Young and the Development of Left Realist Criminology

John Lea

Published online: 22 March 2015
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2015

Abstract This article traces Jock Young's contribution to the development of Left Realist criminology beginning with the political interventions of the mid 1980s progressing through the development of the 'square of crime' as the conceptual framework for a Left Realist research programme to some of the final formulations in his later works. The emphasis of the article is less on critical receptions of Left Realism by the wider criminological community than on demonstrating the consistency of Jock's commitment to following through the implications of the Left Realist paradigm.

Left Realist criminology in the UK has gone through a number of stages of development. Beginning in the early 1980s as polemical intervention in the debate about riots and street crime (Lea and Young 1982, 1984) it developed in the second half of the 1980s into a strategy for radical political intervention, an attempt to develop a social democratic crime control policy. Out of this developed a more coherent theoretical discourse around the so-called *square of crime* and an associated methodology of deconstruction as the starting point for a Left Realist research programme. Developments and shifts of emphasis over the years were not simply the product of internal intellectual developments but reflected changes in the wider political environment within which Left Realists were working.

Central to the development of left realism was the work of Jock Young. Jock was a towering figure in all spheres of radical criminology throughout his life but in the particular area of left realism he articulated some of the most fundamental formulations of the paradigm. In this article I will focus on his contributions, aware of course that these were made in the context of interactions with a numbers of co-thinkers—and adversaries—both within and outside the academic world.

J. Lea (✉)
Department of Criminology, University of Leicester, 152-154 Upper New Walk, Leicester LE1 7QA, UK
e-mail: jl466@leicester.ac.uk

Left realist themes are detectable, as I have argued elsewhere (Lea 2014) in Jock's earliest writings. One of the clearest can be found in his 1975 essay *Working Class Criminology* in which he wrote:

> We have to argue, therefore, strategically, for the exercise of social control, but also to argue that such control must be exercised within the working class community and not by external policing agencies. Further, it is only in the process of struggle for control that the community can evolve out of its frequently disorganised and disintegrated state (Young 1975, p. 89)

Left Idealism and Administrative Criminology

The above passage expresses clearly the radical nature of Left Realism and the fact that it was above all else an attempt to develop a radical crime control strategy for the working class communities in Britain which, taking the brunt of post-Fordist de-industrialisation, were faced with rising crime and socio-economic deprivation (see Lea 1997). Meanwhile the Labour Party, still at that time claiming to represent the working class, had precious little to say on matters of crime control. Thus Jock's pithy formulation of the starting point of left realism that "a realist criminology is to be faithful to the phenomenon which it is studying" (Young 1987, p. 337); that "criminology should be faithful to the nature of crime" (Young 1992, p. 26) was both an injunction to embrace (as we shall see below) a methodology of deconstruction, and at the same time a political injunction to start from the lived experience of the working class communities in the deprived areas of the UK. The articulation of such a starting point might seem like stating the obvious until it is remembered that in the early 1980s some powerful tendencies in criminology were failing to do just this. Left realism had from the outset to counter two in particular: administrative criminology and left idealism.

Jock saw both tendencies as a response to the aetiological crisis faced by post war social democratic criminology. The crisis stemmed from the fact that continually rising crime confounded the core assumptions of the traditional social democratic paradigm that rising income levels and poverty reduction would reduce crime. By ignoring the fact that rising overall incomes concealed growing inequality of income distribution, and acute poverty in particular areas, the social democratic thesis failed to identify rising relative deprivation, combined with increasing marginalisation of poor communities, as the driver of rising crime (Lea and Young 1984). A major influence in the development of this understanding was Elliot Currie's study of the US experience (Currie 1985).

Being faithful to the reality of crime involved understanding that crime in working class communities was overwhelmingly *intra-class:* the poor victimising the poor. This was a reflection of the weakening social cohesion of the poorest working class communities suffering the impact of de-industrialisation. Left idealism was a phrase developed by Jock (Young 1979) to describe the tendency among substantial sections of the radical left to respond to this issue either by simply ignoring it or by seeing working class crime as a form of rebellion, albeit unsophisticated, against the privations of capitalism and to ignore the demoralising impact of intra-class crime in the working class community (see for example Hall et al. 1978). Jock wrote:

> Left idealism cannot countenance contradictions, it ignores the fact that most working-class crime is directed at working class people and that the challenge to

> property relations is more often the appropriation of working-class property than any threat to capitalism (Young 1986, p. 16).

There is of course a tradition of working class 'social crime,' which is mainly about the appropriation of middle class and commercial property by the poor. From eighteenth century poachers and pilferers to twenty-first century poor parents shop lifting to feed their kids there has been a healthy tradition of crime as a form of resistance (Lea 1997). But the very same deprivation that sustained elements of social crime was at the same time fragmenting the cohesion of working class communities with the result that, as Left Realists stressed, poor people were inflicting harm on other poor people. Left idealism restricted harmful crime to those inflicted by the state and the capitalist class on the working class and on the criminalisation of working class resistance to capitalism. Left idealism "centres around the nature of the state and its impact upon its citizens. It does not concentrate on why people become criminals but how the state criminalises people" (Young 1986, p. 17). This critique of left idealism was a theme in Jock's writing for a number of years. In 1991 he repeated that:

> for too long, many voices on the Left have found the kinds of crime which cause greatest public alarm to be an embarrassment, since most of these crimes occur within poor neighbourhoods and involve both poor victims and assailants. It is difficult to romanticise this type of crime as some kind of disguised attack on the privileged (Young 1991, p. 246).

There was of course much that fitted the left idealist paradigm in the mid 1980s. Margaret Thatcher's determination to break the back of the trade union movement in Britain saw with pitched battles between police and mineworkers in the great strike of 1984–1985. The riots in London, Liverpool and other cities in 1981 had resulted from the intolerable regime of stop and search inflicted by police mainly on young black men in poor communities. In both cases the forces of the state were making their own contribution to the weakening of the working class community and doing very little to protect those communities from crime. While pointing to the problem of intra-class crime as an additional burden for the community Left Realists did not argue that it completely crippled the community. Rather the need was to enable local people to mobilise resources to combat crime and other social problems. Rather than celebrating crime itself as resistance to capitalism the need was to enable the community to overcome crime and strengthen its capacity to resist the whole spectrum of deprivations being inflicted by de-industrialisation process generated by post-Fordist finance capitalism (Overbeek 1990). This implied the need to avoid succumbing to the right wing mass media inspired moral panic about crime and to recognise that even in high crime areas the community still had the resources and potential to overcome crime. But to whom could the working class turn for assistance?

Conservative criminology had responded to the aetiological crisis by increasingly adopting the perspective of an 'administrative criminology' which abandoned any concern with the causes of crime and concentrated on prevention. Insofar as it had any theory of causation at all it was a simple rational choice model (Cornish and Clarke 1986). Prevention was conceived as top down and police-led or bureaucrat-led. Two strategies of prevention were popular. First, is a focus on controlling crime by the de facto criminalisation of sub-criminal behaviour not normally warranting police action. The 'Broken Windows' argument developed by political scientists James Q. Wilson and George L. Kelling (1982) that firm police action against low level anti-social behaviour or 'incivilities' such as street drinking or begging would somehow prevent more serious crime

taking a foothold. This argument has had a remarkable survival capacity despite its well known empirical shortcomings both in the US (Skogan1988; Harcourt 2001) and in Britain (Kinsey et al. 1986; Matthews 1992).

A second form of prevention involved forms of architectural determinism which argued, again with dubious empirical support, that crime in public housing estates could be reduced by maximising areas of 'defensible space' (Newman 1973; Coleman 1985). Left realists engaged in substantial empirical arguments with such tendencies and pointed to the key failure as lack of understanding of the importance of community support and interaction rather than externally managed changes to physical space or police behaviour. Left Realists tended to favour the American urban theorist Jane Jacobs (1961) who stressed urban security through maximum interaction on the streets rather than architecture of exclusion.

As Jock put it, the strategies favoured by administrative criminology focus on those "'causes' which can be altered without making social changes which would be politically unacceptable, [and] which stresses the individual rather than the social causes of crime" (Young 1992, p. 31). The police were of course the largely unreconstructed body who, when not waging war on the mining communities were waging war on young black people through massive rates of stop and search. Yet conservatives imagined that these communities would meekly sign up to police-led neighbourhood watch surveillance schemes designed to turn local people into the 'eyes and ears of the police.' For left realists the need was to democratise the police and to organise the community to take control of its own crime prevention.

As an accompaniment to the view that crime could only be dealt with top-down by police the government seemed determined to demonstrate the irrationality of the community view of crime. Official criminology saw fear of crime in poor neighbourhoods and among particular groups such as women as largely irrational given the actual likelihood of victimisation. The 1982 *British Crime Survey* (Hough and Mayhew 1983) achieved a certain notoriety in this respect by showing that the "risk of experiencing a robbery in England and Wales was once every five centuries; an assault resulting in injury once every century: a family car stolen once every 60 years and burglary once every 50 years" (Young 1992, p. 50). This was less simply statistical or methodological ineptitude on the part of the Home Office than a political reflection of the marginalisation of poor communities. Left Realism asserted the need to focus on the situation facing poor communities and to develop knowledge-gathering tools undistorted by the statistics of meaningless national averages. Issues like the fear of crime had to be understood in terms of the impact of offences on particular categories of people in particular types of localities. For example, women's fear of burglary appeared less irrational when it was taken into account that household burglary may well be the precursor of serious sexual assault. Being 'faithful to the reality of crime' meant precisely this process of detailed understanding of its impact. Administrative criminology and left idealism, although they had different policy agendas, amounted to the same denial of working class reality—that crime was not a problem for the poor.

By contrast, radicals needed to understand the working class community as it really was. The research programme outlined by Left Realism was to achieve ever-greater approximation to the concrete reality and complexity of crime as an aspect of, and in interaction with, the totality of community dynamics. The methodological aspects of this will be discussed presently. But the politically Left Realist policy advocacy had to tread a difficult path. It

> must neither succumb to hysteria nor relapse into a critical denial of the severity of crime as a problem. It must be fiercely sceptical of official statistics and control institutions without taking the posture of a blanket rejection of all figures or, indeed, the very possibility of reform (Young 1986, p. 25).

In other words, the methodological (as well as political) failure of both administrative criminology and left idealism is the loss of any exploration of the concrete situation of the deprived working class communities. To both left idealism and right wing administrative criminology, Left Realists juxtaposed radical democratic reform aimed at enabling the community to take control of its crime problems and social problems in general. To left idealism's fantasy community somehow led by its criminal offenders and to administrative criminology's community debilitated by irrational fears left realism juxtaposed the resilient democratic community. Democracy functions as an integrative and community building mechanism. Jock and I wrote, in what became the founding manifesto of British Left Realism,

> Democracy… has an educative and an integrative function in itself. It is through participation in decision-making in matters that affect our lives that we learn political responsibility, the respect for other people's right to their point of view, and the acceptance that the final decision will have to be a compromise between differing points of view (Lea and Young 1984, p. 239).

A crucial part of that integration process would be "a community-wide debate on crime… [which]… would provide a new source of cohesion as different groups discovered that they faced similar problems and had similar needs" (Lea and Young 1984, pp. 259–260). In particular, young people increasingly marginalised from work and politics might find new meaning in community participation and reduce their vulnerability both to crime and to victimisation. This was the aspiration of left realists during the mid 1980s.

Social Democracy and Criminal Justice Policy

The role of radical political intervention would be to assist communities in organising the debate, to arm the community with new tools for gathering information about its problems: tools which maximised the autonomy of the community from dependence on the police and other government agencies for information about crime. The local victimisation survey became the focus of left realist intervention. The most important example of this was the *Islington Crime Survey* conducted during 1985 (Jones et al. 1986).

The political situation in Britain at the time was complex. The UK government was in the hands of the Conservatives, led by Margaret Thatcher, who had assumed power in 1979 with a neoliberal agenda of reducing state spending and weakening the power of organised labour to resist the de-industrialisation and financialisation of the British economy (Gamble 1988; Lea 1997). The bitter battle with the mineworkers in 1984–1985 was one aspect of this. The government was trying to create the demoralised working class community as a precondition for low wage flexible non-union labour and left realists saw themselves as part of the fight back against this. However, at the same time at a local level the Labour Party was strong. The majority of boroughs in London and the London-wide authority (the Greater London Council) were Labour controlled and were in strong opposition to central government.

This was the context in which the London Borough of Islington financed one of the most innovatory local victimisation surveys of the time. Islington had some large deprived working class communities based on council estates (public housing projects) and from the outset Jock and his colleagues (including myself) saw the survey in political terms. If a government wedded to administrative criminology and a far left gripped by left idealism had deserted the working class, community left realists, as radical social democrats, sought to strengthen the focus of the Labour Party on supporting the working class community. Jock wrote in the introduction to the Islington survey:

> it has become increasingly obvious that there was an extraordinary hiatus in Labour Party policy over crime. Despite the fact that socialist administrations control virtually every inner-city high crime area in Britain… the Labour Party has come to regard law and order as the natural and exclusive realm of Conservatives. The question is how to develop policies which help protect women, ethnic minorities, and the working class… who are the natural constituents of Labour, whilst refusing to accept the draconian policing policies and people practice of the Tories…. To do this demands humane policies which accurately reflect people's needs, which are guided by the facts and which can be monitored effectively. All of this is provided by the local crime survey (Jones et al. 1986, p. 6).

This effectively summarises the role of the local crime survey in left realist thinking at that time. The survey was conducted as a political project rather than simply a piece of criminological research. For example, a number of preliminary public meetings were held on council estates to explain the purposes of the survey and to discuss what questions might be included. Local councillors and even local police participated in some of the meetings. Police were being pressured—largely as a consequence of the 1981 riots in London and Liverpool—to develop a closer dialogue with local communities. The result was a high response rate for the survey around 80 percent). Space prevents a discussion of the innovatory methodological features of the Islington survey and indeed its impact on changing the methodology of the government's British Crime Survey. The local victimisation survey became a key aspect of left realist intervention. The Islington survey owed much to the pioneering work of Richard Kinsey (then at Edinburgh University) who directed a predecessor survey in Liverpool (Kinsey 1984). It was followed by other surveys in the UK and developed further in the North American context by Brian MacLean (who was research manager of the Islington survey) and Walter DeKeseredy (see MacLean and DeKeseredy 1990).

The political issues remained uppermost. As Jock put it later, "for Left Realism, the social survey is a democratic instrument" (Young 1991, p. 147). The survey was an opportunity to put into practice key left realist ideas, to demonstrate in miniature some features of a radical social democratic approach to crime control. The survey had four important political aspects. First, it undermined administrative criminology by exposing the falsity of the notion that the fear of crime in poor areas was irrational. By using a large sample size (with oversampling of particular groups such as young people and the elderly) and gaining a high response rate, the Islington survey was able to show that fear of crime was closely related to actual victimisation rates. This was particularly true in the case of women's fears of sexual assault.

Second, it undermined the left idealist view of crime as rebellion. If this were the case then high levels of community support for offenders should have been exhibited. Instead, what the survey found was a substantial degree of concern about crime levels as a problem combined with a sophisticated distinction between different types of offending. Street

robbery, sexual assault, hard drug dealing and burglary were seen as problems while the police were criticised as having little understanding of the problems facing the area and spending too much time on crimes such as vehicle crime and cannabis smoking which the community did not prioritise. The survey also revealed serious levels of alienation from the police, particularly among young non-white members of the community. Negative attitudes to the police increased with contact either as offender, victim, or member of the public and were also more evident among young people (Jones et al. 1986).

Thirdly, by providing detailed information on crime and victimisation in a focused area, the survey provided a database that empowered the community to develop its own detailed and sophisticated knowledge about crime. The aim was to wrest the taken for granted 'expertise' about localised crime from the police and to place it in the hands of the community. Islington borough, working with community groups, was able to present a much more coherent set of demands on local police to adapt their practices, policing methods, attitudes and even proposed to run its own crime prevention surveillance scheme rather than the police-led 'neighbourhood watch' (an import from the US) which was gaining ground at the time.

This led to the final political issue: police accountability, a major theme for Left Realism. As long as the police and the government could portray local communities as fractious and divided—among ethnic lines for example—then it could be argued that increased local accountability would result in domination of policing by a particular political faction. Images of the white dominated Sheriffs and Police Departments of the US 'Deep South' were deployed to make the argument that the British tradition of 'constabulary independence' should not be interfered with. The aim of course was not to tell the police whom to arrest but what policing strategies to use, which types of crimes to prioritise and in which geographical areas. The survey, and the radical social democratic politics which inspired it, aimed to facilitate the integrative functions of factually informed community-wide debate as noted above. This would enable police to come under coherent control of locally worked out crime priorities rather than continuing to act as an external agency with their own methods and priorities. The reciprocal benefit for the police would be increased trust by the community and so a better flow of information about crime. The survey showed a substantial demand for greater police accountability to local communities. At the beginning of the next decade, Jock summed up the experience of the Islington crime survey and the left realist politics with which it was associated in the following terms:

> A social democratic approach to crime must… take care to discover the experiences and concerns of ordinary citizens… it should encourage the move towards more accountable strategies of crime prevention and control, in which fairness and non-discrimination should be the founding principles… Left Realism offers the hope that something can be done about crime (Young 1991, p. 147).

Left realists were not exactly an isolated tendency. They were working in the same direction as a number of local boroughs, voluntary organisations and community groups. I remember that many of the probation officers and social workers whom Jock and I were teaching during the mid 1980s at Middlesex Polytechnic saw left realism as simply common sense. The importance of community control was stressed by voluntary sector groups like the Safe Neighbourhoods Unit set up by the National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NACRO) which did useful work with tenants groups on local authority housing estates and argued that the best schemes in terms of security and social control of crime were where tenants had an incentive to get involved with the general management of their housing estates by having a say in such matters as repairs and

maintenance (Osborn and Shaftoe 1995). Many local authorities at the same time were decentralising some of their offices to local neighbourhoods. The theme of community control was popular and it had a left democratic flavour. This theme of democratic control *of the state* is quite different from the gathering neoliberalism (which would later be substantially embraced by the 'New Labour' governments of Tony Blair) of the *self-responsibilisation* of working class communities for solving their own problems and with agencies such as the police or crime prevention partnerships acting as the external agents of central government engaged in 'building community cohesion.'

The Square of Crime and Realist Methodology

In seeking to be 'faithful to the nature of crime' in the working class community left realism had understood the need to be aware of all the participants in the crime control process and the interactions between them. The critique of administrative criminology and left idealism had showed the importance of the victim as rationally responding to the impact of crime and the community as a source of information about and attitudes towards crime. Finally, the relations between the community and the police had come to be understood as crucial for the flow of information about crime. In our 1984 manifesto (Lea and Young 1984), Jock and I had analysed the 'vicious circle of police community alienation,' which was a key factor in the 1981 riots.

As the police receive less information, so they turn to trawling mechanisms such as stop and search. This in turn alienates the community further as innocent people, particularly young black men, are stopped and searched. The whole process then is repeated. This model of circular causation, as I have noted elsewhere (Lea 2014) owed much to Jock's earlier work in *The Drugtakers* (Young 1971). The result of a breakdown in relations between police and community was seen as a general increase in crime, both in the community and by the police:

> In a situation where the police become marginalised from a community, not only do they commit more illegalities and thus generate discontent with the law, and hence crime, but they receive less information, thus facilitating the successful commission of crime (Lea and Young 1984, p. 62).

Our argument for democratic accountability of police to communities, reinforced by the findings of the *Islington Crime Survey,* was a way of breaking this vicious circle. The answer to effective policing was not, as the Thatcher government of the time (and later the Blair governments) saw it: a question of more police, targets and performance indicators. Rather, the key was the flow of information. Communities would give information to the police if they trusted them and the mechanism for restoring a trust that had long disappeared—and which indeed had always been precarious (Brogden 1982)—in poorer working class communities was democratic accountability.

During the second half of the 1980s, left realists began to develop more formalised theorisations of the dynamics that we had been involved in as researchers and political actors. In the immediate empirical sense, our work—in Islington in particular—had confronted us with the broad contours of the issue of crime control as a relation between victims, offenders, the community and the police. We understood that the practical politics of left realism involved precisely the issues of the relations between the community and the police (the flow of information about crime); the victim and the police (willingness to report the crime); the victim and the community (mutual support and recognition of victim

status); community and the offender (de facto criminalisation and recognition of harmful action) (For a fuller specification of these dynamics see Lea 1992, 2002).

The notion of the 'square of crime' developed as a convenient term to describe these interactions. But once formulated as a theoretical concept, other uses became obvious. The weakness of much criminological theory could be identified as one-sidedness and partiality. This served as the starting point for a left realist methodology of deconstruction and concretisation. Jock produced an elaborate statement of this methodology as early as 1987:

> Realism is not empiricism, it does not merely reflect the world of appearances: the trademark of conventional criminology and conventional public wisdoms. Rather, it attempts to unpack the phenomenon, display its hidden relationships and pinpoint the dynamics which lie behind the apparent obviousness of a single criminal incident at a particular moment in time. To do this it must contextualise the moment and place its trajectory in time. Fundamentally, realist criminology involves an act of deconstruction. It takes the phenomenon of crime apart, breaking it down to its component pieces and sequences: it notes, though, how the various criminologies tend to focus on fragments of this construction, taking one empirical verity like a single reflection from a multi-faceted mirror and claiming that it represents the whole. Realism places together these fragments of the shape of crime in their social context over time - to capture the real forces behind the one-dimensional time-frozen images of conventional accounts (Young 1987, p. 337).

This perspective remained dominant in Jock's writing well into the 1990s. In his 1992 essay he explicitly linked the realist square of crime to his earlier work with Ian Taylor and Paul Walton during the 1970s, which had called for a 'fully social theory of deviance:'

> Such an agenda was set out within The New Criminology, (Taylor et al. 1973) namely, that the immediate social origins of a deviant act should be set within its wider social context and that such an analysis should encompass both actors and reactors. Realism takes this a stage further, insisting not only the actions of offenders and the agencies of the state must be understood in such a fashion, but that this must be extended to be in formal system of social control (the public) and to victims (Young 1992, p. 28).

The key task then for a left realist criminology as a fully social theory of deviance was clear. The 'act of deconstruction' is the starting point for unpacking the elements which make up the square of crime as an initially abstract dyad of 'action' (offender and victim) and 'reaction' (police and community) and locating them in their social context over time. In his two essays, (Young 1987, 1992) Jock sets out his vision of how this research programme might develop, that being faithful to the nature of crime means acknowledging the *form* of crime, the *social context* of crime, the *shape* of crime, its trajectory through *time*, and it's an enactment in *space* (Young 1992, p. 26; see also Lea 1992).

The form of crime is the starting point for analysis—the square of crime in its most general terms: the general dynamics of criminalisation. The social context is the setting of each point of the square in the wider social structure from which it derives. The shape of crime refers to the different dynamics of interaction for different types of crime. The trajectory of crime through time refers to the fact that interactions within the square of crime obviously continually restructure the situation within which individuals act and develop attitudes and behaviour. Finally, the spatial dimension refers to the distribution of the square of crime through space, again changing for different types of crime.

It is not possible here to give elaborate examples of such a programme of deconstructive criminology. Nor is it being suggested that a substantial amount of criminological research may be congruent with the left realist research programme. However two points have to be emphasised. Firstly, that it is the synthesis of all four elements of the square that marks out the left realist research programme. As Roger Matthews has remarked "it is extremely rare to find an approach that examines the changing nature of crime by incorporating all four dimensions into the analysis" (Matthews 2009, p. 346).

The potential of the left realist research programme as set out by Jock was to integrate subcultural and structural perspectives in criminology. Studies, for example of the growth of the repressive penal state (e.g. Wacquant 2009) or repressive penal culture (Garland 2001) may lack an account of the subcultural resistance they produce while at the other end of the spectrum 'cultural criminology' can only "imagine" a study of the state as repressive and constraining force (Ferrell et al. 2008). The integrative potential of Left Realism for criminological theory, yet alone for linking criminology to a wider sociology of social structure and a political economy of the state has remained relatively underdeveloped.

The second question is what is 'left' or radical about this methodology as such. What was to stop the square of crime becoming a variety of abstract static structural functionalism in which the four categories of the square are mercilessly imposed on any empirical situation however fluid and conflictual? Jock's methodology, it should be clear from what has been said above, saw the square of crime as a starting point for deconstruction—and then a more concrete reconstruction—of the real dynamics of a situation, in sum a process of *critique* in which, among other aspects, the power relations between police, community, offender and victim will be revealed. This, as the origins of the square of crime analysis in *political* intervention makes clear, is its radical potential. The aim of left realist criminology, as with all forms of radical analysis, is to reveal dynamics of power in order to change them.

Left Realism and The Exclusive Society

In that sense Left Realism was tied to the possibility of a radical social democratic turn in British politics, The Islington interventions and the development of the square of crime were developed a decade or more before the New Labour governments in the UK led by Tony Blair. Blair's famous slogan 'tough on crime, tough on the causes of crime' rapidly metamorphosed into 'tough on the causes of crime *by being tough on crime* and other sorts of sub-criminal behaviour.' Some commentators in the UK traced a link between Left Realism as a policy orientation and the crime control policies of the Blair governments (see for example Hopkins Burke 2005, p. 228).

Only a short discussion is possible here and what is important is Jock's own reaction to the crime control policies of the Blair governments. Left Realism stressed, as has been shown, the necessity of intervention in all aspects of the square of crime—democratic control of policing, a community debate on crime involving all sections of the community, and of course empowering the victim as part of that process. New Labour certainly adopted the strategy of intervening at all points in the square of crime but it did so in an authoritarian way, which completely negated the left realist stress on democratic community mobilisation. Blair talked about the need to "rebalance the criminal justice system in favour of the victim and the community" but this became a programme of pre-emptive criminalisation (Fitzgibbon 2007) inspired by the writings of Wilson and Kelling which

Jock had rejected a decade previously. Under the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act in the UK, for example, Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (popularly known as ASBOs), could be issued against activities 'likely' to cause alarm or distress.

These measures were certainly a response to real problems of disorder and intra-class crime. In his major book *The Exclusive Society* (Young 1999), Jock ironically pointed out that devices such as CCTV electronic tagging *could* have progressive uses. "It can in a *different political context*, be liberating and protective. The kids who hound the elderly on sink estates can be documented and traced… CCTV can log police racism on the streets… The cameras can be turned around; their context and control can be changed" (Young 1999, p. 192–193, *my italics*). But as part of a strategy of social control by exclusion (and when combined with a battery of curfew orders, new police powers to declare 'dispersal zones') then the marginalisation of young people from the community is reinforced. The accompanying politics "is not an inclusionist philosophy which embraces those found guilty of an offence and attempts to reintegrate them into society. Rather it is an exclusionist discourse which seeks to anticipate trouble whether in the shopping mall or in the prison and to exclude and isolate the deviant" (Young 1999, pp. 44–45).

Left realism had been part of a radical politics struggling precisely for a 'different political context' and that was why democracy was central. In *The Exclusive Society*, Jock recognised that the shift from the post Second World War Fordist society of the secure, high paid, unionised industrial jobs and strong working class communities to the present world of insecure employment and social exclusion cannot be easily reversed. This has been a constant theme in left realism. That is the importance of the stress on democracy and the adherence of left realism from its earliest development to a strategy of "changing the democratic system from one which reflects only the compromises between those social classes rooted in the system of production to a system in which the interests of the new strata of people marginalised from production can find a voice" (Lea and Young 1984, p. 240). We had seen democracy as a way of inclusive rebuilding of communities where the homogenising tendencies of work and family life had not only decayed but needed to be critiqued from the standpoint of hitherto suppressed categories of victimisation (such as domestic violence) and marginality (of young people).

In *The Exclusive Society* Jock continued themes from Left Realism (Yar and Penna 2004) but confronted much more explicitly the issue of diversity, difference and multiculturalism though an appropriation of the work of the feminist philosopher Nancy Fraser. In deploying concepts such as 'low intensity community' and 'transformative multiculturalism' (see Young 1999, p. 183) he was attempting to clarify possible forms of community whose cohesion and inclusion did not depend on the old Fordist structures. This was not a break from but a continuation and further development of classic left realist themes of community and democracy. The latter remains central to the work of Fraser (see Fraser 1997, p. 26) and is endorsed by Jock and supplemented with a principle of 'radical meritocracy.' This brought him back to a critique of the Blair governments in the UK and Clinton in the US:

> if one reads any of the policy statements coming from either the Clinton or the Blair administration one finds that… even the restricted notion of meritocracy as reward by merit in terms of one's occupation alone is, strangely, muted. Thus welfare to work schemes would seem to believe that the mere fact of achieving employment at a rate over the minimum wage is an end goal - the colossal differentials in rewards between different jobs and professions and those that occur between the different labour markets is not questioned. The 'winner takes all' society which allows

enormous wealth at the top of society and excessive wealth amongst the upper middle classes is not subject to political scrutiny (Young 1999, p. 152).

The democratic community must, in Jock's view, be at the same time meritocratic. At present it is not and the programmes of the Clinton and Blair governments were not concerned to change this. The result of course is intensified relative deprivation for the poor; greed, individualism and arrogance for those with vast inherited wealth. Modern capitalism thus remains, at the end of the day, an exploitative and criminogenic system.

Conclusion

There are of course other themes in Jock's last works, which I have not considered here. In *The Vertigo of Late Modernity* (Young 2007) for example he argues, following Bauman's (2000) concept of 'liquid modernity' that the insecurity felt by the poor and marginalised become generalised throughout society. In his last book, *The Criminological Imagination* (Young 2011), Jock returns to earlier themes and contains a scathing critique of the pseudo-scientific use of quantitative methods in criminology and sociology. But there is also the pressure to remember that the Islington survey made use of quantitative methods to develop the preconditions for democratic policing. Nevertheless the weight of the argument is concerned with the role of qualitative methods as essential for capturing the lived reality of crime and its contexts in terms of localities, victims, and offenders. The argument about whether Jock ended up as still a left realist or as something else is, in my view irrelevant. The Left Realist research programme was open ended and the process of 'taking the phenomenon of crime apart' is open ended by necessity. And Jock certainly never wavered from that project.

References

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge, UK : Malden, MA: Polity Press.
Brogden, M. (1982). *The police: Autonomy and consent*. London: Academic Press.
Coleman, A. (1985). *Utopia on trial*. London: Hilary Shipman.
Cornish, D., & Clarke, R. (1986). *The reasoning criminal: Rational choice perspectives on offending*. New York: Springer.
Currie, E. (1985). *Confronting crime: An American challenge*. New York: Random House.
Ferrell, J., Hayward, K., & Young, J. (2008). *Cultural criminology: An invitation*. London: Sage.
Fitzgibbon, D. (2007). Institutional racism, pre-emptive criminalisation and risk analysis. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 46*, 128–144.
Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the 'post Socialist' condition*. New York: Routledge.
Gamble, A. (1988). *The free economy and the strong state*. London: Macmillan.
Garland, D. (2001). *The culture of control: Crime and social order in contemporary society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J., & Roberts, B. (1978). *Policing the crisis: Mugging, the state and law and order*. London: Macmillan.
Harcourt, B. (2001). *Illusion of order: The false promise of broken windows policing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Hopkins Burke, R. (2005). *An introduction to criminological theory*. Cullompton: Willan.
Hough, M., & Mayhew, P. (1983). *The British crime survey: First report*. London: HMSO. Home Office Research Study76.
Jacobs, J. (1961). *The death and life of great American cities*. New York: Random House.

Jones, T., MacLean, B., & Young, J. (1986). *The Islington crime survey: Victimization and policing in inner-city London*. Aldershot: Gower.

Kinsey, R. (1984). *First report of the Merseyside crime survey*. Liverpool: Merseyside County Council.

Kinsey, R., Lea, J., & Young, J. (1986). *Losing the fight against crime*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lea, J. (1992). Left realism: A framework for the analysis of crime. In J. Young & R. Matthews (Eds.), *Rethinking criminology: The realist debate*. London: Sage.

Lea, J. (1997). Postfordism and criminality. In N. Jewson & S. MacGregor (Eds.), *Transforming cities: Contested governance and new spatial divisions* (pp. 42–55). London: Routledge.

Lea, J. (2002). *Crime and modernity*. London: Sage.

Lea, J. (2014). New deviancy, Marxism and the politics of left realism: Reflections on Jock Young's early writings. *Theoretical Criminology*, *18*(4), 432–440.

Lea, J., & Young, J. (1982). The riots in Britain 1981: Urban violence and political marginalisation. In D. Cowell, T. Jones, & J. Young (Eds.), *Policing the riots* (pp. 5–21). London: Junction Books.

Lea, J., & Young, J. (1984). *What is to be done about law and order?—Crisis in the Eighties*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

MacLean, B., & DeKeseredy, W. S. (1990). Taking working class victimization seriously: The contribution of Left Realist surveys. *The International Review of Modern Sociology, 20*(2), 211–228.

Matthews, R. (1992). Replacing broken windows: Crime, incivilities and urban change. In R. Matthews & J. Young (Eds.), *Issues in realist criminology* (pp. 19–50). London: Sage.

Matthews, R. (2009). Beyond 'so what?' criminology: Rediscovering realism. *Theoretical Criminology, 13*, 341–362.

Newman, O. (1973). *Defensible space: People and design in the violent city*. London: Architectural Press.

Osborn, S., & Shaftoe, H. (1995). *Successes and failures in neighbourhood crime prevention*. Housing Research, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Overbeek, H. (1990). *Global capitalism and National decline: The Thatcher decade in perspective*. London, Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Skogan, W. (1988). Disorder, crime and community decline. In T. Hope & M. Shaw (Eds.), *Communities and crime reduction*. London: HMSO.

Taylor, I., Walton, P., & Young, J. (1973). *The new criminology: For a social theory of deviance*. London: Routledge.

Wacquant, L. (2009). *Punishing the poor: The neoliberal government of social insecurity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. F. (1982). Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety. *Atlantic Monthly*, *249*(3), 29–38.

Yar, M., & Penna, S. (2004). Between positivism and post-modernity?: Critical reflections on Jock Young's The exclusive society. *British Journal of Criminology, 44*(4), 533–549.

Young, J. (1971). *The drugtakers: The social meaning of drug use*. St. Albans: Paladin.

Young, J. (1975). Working class criminology. In I. Taylor, P. Walton, & J. Young (Eds.), *Critical criminology* (pp. 63–94). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Young, J. (1979). Left idealism, reformism and beyond: From new criminology to Marxism. In B. Fine, R. Kinsey, J. Lea, S. Picciotto, & J. Young (Eds.), *Capitalism and the rule of law: From deviancy theory to Marxism* (pp. 1–28). London: Hutchinson.

Young, J. (1986). The failure of criminology: The need for a radical realism. In R. Matthews & J. Young (Eds.), *Confronting crime* (pp. 4–30). London: Sage.

Young, J. (1987). The tasks of a realist criminology. *Contemporary Crises, 11*(4), 337–356.

Young, J. (1991). Left realism and the priorities of crime control. In: K. Stenson & D. Cowell (Eds.), *The politics of crime control* (pp. 146–160). London: Sage.

Young, J. (1992). Ten points of realism. In J. Young & R. Matthews (Eds.), *Rethinking criminology: The realist debate* (pp. 24–68). London: Sage.

Young, J. (1999). *The exclusive society: Social exclusion, crime and difference in late modernity*. London: Sage.

Young, J. (2007). *The vertigo of late modernity*. London: Sage.

Young, J. (2011). *The criminological imagination*. Cambridge: Polity Press.