27:202:511
FOUNDATIONS OF CRIMINOLOGICAL THEORY
Fall 2017 Syllabus

Professor: Robert (Bob) Apel, Ph.D.
Office: Center for Law and Justice, Room 579H
Phone: 973-353-5216
E-mail: robert.apel@rutgers.edu

Class Location: Center for Law and Justice, Room 572
Class Time: Thursday, 2:00 to 4:40
Office Hours: By appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is a doctoral seminar designed to survey some of the major schools of thought that underlie discourse on the nature and causes of crime and punishment. With a superficial glance, the course topics will seem to derive from sociological theory, but we will approach the subject more generically as social theory, so named because schools of thought follow parallel developments in manifold social sciences (e.g., sociology, anthropology, psychology, economics, political science) as well as philosophy and history, not to mention that it was not until fairly late in time that distinct disciplines arose from the fragmentation of the social sciences. Original sources will be read so that students acquire fluency based on their reading of the social theorists themselves, rather than on some other writer’s (typically derivative, frequently flawed, and always superficial) interpretation of them. In many cases, social theorists do not write explicitly about crime and punishment, so we will be required to infer the theoretical implications for criminology and criminal justice from their writings.

We will see that ideas about crime and punishment do not emerge in a vacuum—they are products of time and place (as well as the biography of the writer!). Different schools of thought are rooted in different ideas about human nature and the relationship of mankind to the social and political order, but in one way or another, all have arisen as a response to some problem associated with contemporary society (e.g., industrialism, urbanism, globalism, and the countless other “-isms”). Some of these ideas are able to withstand the test of time, while other ideas might wither but reemerge in later eras when there is more receptivity to, or renewed interest in, their tenets. Yet other ideas might not come of age until a generation or more later, believe it or not, for lack of English translation!

Completion of this course will involve a substantial amount of reading, and will emphasize some of the foundational ideas about crime and punishment. The empirical status of these ideas will be reserved for the companion course, “Theory II” or Contemporary Criminological Theory (27:202:518). The topics considered in this course will be roughly chronological, and with a few exceptions (e.g., Foucault, Giddens, Garland), the survey will end around the time of World War II. The course readings will cover the usual list of “dead white guys” and their lasting influence on social theory, but will also consider contributions from marginalized (or plagiarized, some might be justifiably tempted to say) social theorists (e.g., W.E.B. Du Bois, Jane Addams). The readings will also stray from the more parochial tendency to survey the rise and development of American criminology, which we will see, at any rate, is derivative of trends in social theory more generally.
Course Objectives

- Understanding of the social, economic, and political contexts in which ideas about crime and punishment arise.
- Familiarity with the principal schools of thought about crime and punishment, including their historical emergence and contemporary manifestations.
- Fluency in the viewpoints of the major classical social theorists.
- Ability to situate a chosen research topic in a particular intellectual tradition.

COURSE MATERIALS

The required readings for this course will come entirely from books, and will average about 400 pages per week (sometimes more, sometimes less). Students should buy, borrow, or steal the books that will be assigned. While students are not required to purchase any of the books, most would be good additions to any serious scholar's library, not to mention that they will all be relevant for comprehensive exam preparation. In any case, students will be expected to have read the material no matter how they acquired it. An early start on the readings is highly recommended.

The following books will be read either in their entirety or substantially so, and are listed alphabetically:


Because many of these books are historical, multiple versions or translations are frequently available, not to mention that many are also available free of charge in digital form. Students have discretion over which version they choose to obtain, and these are noted above as “any version.” Books with only single versions available, and that will likely require purchase, are listed along with their translator (if applicable) and publisher.

**COURSE GRADING**

Students will be graded on the basis of four criteria: class preparation, reaction essays, discussion leadership, and a term paper. The specific breakdown will be as follows, with details provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Preparation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Leadership</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction Essays</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Paper</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grading scale that will be used for the final semester grades is as follows:

- **A** 90.0% or higher (Outstanding)
- **B** 80.0% to 89.9% (Average)
- **C** 70.0% or 79.9% (Below Average)
- **F** 69.9% or lower (Failing)

**Class Preparation (10%)**

Weekly seminars will be oriented toward discussion, debate, and reflection on the course readings. The instructor will avoid providing lectures and instead will facilitate discussion, by taking responsibility for clarifying difficult concepts and keeping the discussion on track. Because the class meetings will be largely student led, it is imperative that students attend each meeting having read and thought carefully (to the extent possible) about all of the readings.

Attendance in class is required, and failure to attend will not be excused for any but the most
serious circumstances. In the event that an absence is unavoidable, appropriate documentation of the absence will be expected, although it may not be accepted. Late arrivals will also not be tolerated, so students should be thoughtful about planning their commutes so they can be on campus in a timely fashion. In other words, students should assume that they will experience traffic delays every week and thus build in sufficient commuting time.

**Discussion Leadership (20%)**

On two occasions during the semester, each student will be expected to lead class discussion of the readings. This will be done in teams of two students, and students will be paired up with a different team member for each of their discussion sessions. In anticipation of this role, the discussion leaders should have closely read all of the required material (more closely than usual, that is) and at least some of the recommended material, should be able to summarize the main arguments and principle concepts of these readings, and should have composed seminar questions designed to stimulate discussion. To assist in this preparation, the discussion leaders will also be given access by the instructor to all of the reaction essays submitted for the week (described below).

**Reaction Essays (40%)**

Beginning in the third week of the course, students will be expected to submit a weekly, 2-4 page reaction essay prior to each class meeting (1,000 words minimum). The reaction essays are intended to be thinking exercises that discuss ideas or raise questions from the readings, and each week, some essays might be selected by the instructor or discussion leader to guide class discussion. In these essays, students are to reflect on what they have read about the topic for that week, and to draw out the implications of the readings for theorizing about crime and punishment. As already mentioned, many social theorists do not write directly about these topics, so students will be forced to infer their ideas from the readings.

The reaction essays are to be typewritten and e-mailed to the instructor by 8:00 am Saturday prior to the class in which a given topic is to be discussed. Note that students will not be required to submit a reaction essay during the two weeks they are to be discussion leaders.

**Term Paper (30%)**

The semester will culminate in a term paper on a topic of the student’s choosing. Students have maximum discretion to develop their own topic. Some possible ideas for the term paper include the following:

- Summarize the writings and ideas of any one of the countless social theorists who were not covered in the course (e.g., Alexis de Tocqueville, Ferdinand Tönnies, Charles Cooley, Talcott Parsons, Anna Cooper, André-Michel Guerry, Karl Polanyi, Harriett Martineau, Thorsten Veblen), as they pertain to better understanding the nature of crime and punishment.
- Elaborate on the recommended or any other non-required and undiscussed writings of any of the social theorists who were covered in the course (e.g., Durkheim or Weber on the nature of religious belief, Engels on the working class in industrial Manchester), with an eye toward drawing out implications for theorizing about crime and punishment.
- Compare and contrast two social theorists with respect to some of their key ideas or implications about crime and punishment (e.g., Marx vs. Durkheim, Marx vs. Weber, Weber vs. Simmel, Thomas and Znaniecki vs. Addams, Elias vs. Foucault).
- Draw connections between a foundational theoretical idea and contemporary theoretical
ideas in criminology and criminal justice (e.g., self-control from the standpoint of Elias versus Gottfredson and Hirschi; social disorganization from the standpoint of Thomas and Znaniecki versus Sampson).

- Trace the theoretical roots of a contemporary topic relating to either substance (e.g., desistance, inequality, procedural justice, gangs, public housing) or method (e.g., crime mapping, social networks, qualitative interviews, experimental methods), situating it within one or more schools of thought about crime and punishment discussed over the course of the semester.

The objective of the term paper is to encourage students to explore theoretical issues in depth. This will necessitate consideration of the readings completed for this course (both required and recommended), in addition to extensive reading outside of the course. Note that the goal of the term paper is not to conduct any kind of evaluation or survey of empirical tests of a theoretical idea. This is boring, and is likely to be more relevant for Theory II, anyhow. The goal is also not to simply describe a theorist or summarize a theoretical idea, but instead to explore how a theorist or theory fits (or could fit) into a criminological tradition.

Other details about the term paper (e.g., its length) will be left intentionally vague, so students have maximum discretion in identifying their topic of study and choosing the scope of their survey. Students are urged to start thinking early in the semester about potential term paper topics. Done strategically, the term paper can serve as the start of an empirical paper, dissertation prospectus, or other work. Students are welcome (and are in fact encouraged) to use it as an opportunity to consult with their faculty advisor or mentor, and to make theoretical progress on ideas which, accompanied by empirical analysis, could eventually lead to a publishable manuscript.

COURSE POLICIES

Class Announcements

As needed, e-mail will be utilized to post course announcements (e.g., class cancellation due to inclement weather) as well as to occasionally provide links to items that are relevant for the topics covered in this course (e.g., newspaper articles, journal articles).

Disability Services

Students with a documented disability who wish to discuss special accommodations should contact the instructor as soon as possible at the beginning of the semester. For information on documentation and reasonable accommodations, students may consult the website of the Office of Disability Services at http://disabilityservices.uw.rutgers.edu.

Counseling Center

Students who experience any emotional or other difficulties that interfere with their performance in this course should be aware that the university offers a variety of free, confidential services. For information on psychological and counseling services, students may refer to the Counseling Center website at http://counseling.newark.rutgers.edu.

Classroom Climate

Disruptive behavior in the classroom cheats other students of the opportunity to learn. Examples
include arriving late to class, leaving and re-entering the classroom during the seminar, talking excessively, using cell phones, eating, reading outside material, and persisting in speaking without being recognized. The instructor reserves the right to ask disruptive students to leave the classroom.

**Academic Integrity**

The instructor will uphold Rutgers University policies concerning ethical behavior and academic integrity, and students are expected to familiarize themselves with these policies. The relevant principles, policies, and disciplinary procedures can be accessed from the university's website at http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu.

**COURSE SCHEDULE**

This schedule is subject to change depending on time demands and adverse weather events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Date</th>
<th>Discussion Topic</th>
<th>Discussion Leader(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thu., Sept. 7</td>
<td>1. Beginning at the End: Giddens</td>
<td>Bob Apel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., Sept. 14</td>
<td>2. Beginning at the Beginning: Beccaria, Bentham</td>
<td>Bob Apel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., Sept. 21</td>
<td>3. Alienation and Class Struggle: Marx, Engels</td>
<td>Team A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., Sept. 28</td>
<td>4. Sources of Social Solidarity: Durkheim</td>
<td>Team B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., Oct. 5</td>
<td>5. Iron Cage of Rationalization: Weber</td>
<td>Team C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., Oct. 19</td>
<td>7. Urbanization and Social (Dis)Organization: Thomas, Znaniecki</td>
<td>Team E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., Oct. 26</td>
<td>8. Self as a Social Process: Mead</td>
<td>Team F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., Nov. 9</td>
<td>10. Forgotten Female Reformers: Addams</td>
<td>Team H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., Nov. 16</td>
<td>11. Psychoanalysis of Social Life: Freud</td>
<td>Team I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., Nov. 23</td>
<td>12. Evolution of Court Society: Elias</td>
<td>Team J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., Nov. 30</td>
<td>13. Knowledge and Discipline: Foucault</td>
<td>Team K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., Dec. 7</td>
<td>14. Punishment as a Social Institution: Garland</td>
<td>Bob Apel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., Dec. 14</td>
<td>TERM PAPER DUE VIA E-MAIL (5:00 PM)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Beginning with the class on September 26th (Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels) and ending with the class on December 5th (Michel Foucault), reaction essays must be e-mailed to the instructor by 6:00 am each Saturday in anticipation of the class meeting. Beginning with the same class, teams of two students each week will have the responsibility of being the discussion leaders. Note that discussion leaders will not be required to submit a reaction essay during the week they are prepping their material.

Discussion Leader Teams

During the first course meeting, each student will be randomly paired by the instructor with two other students. These pairings will be given the designation Team A through Team K, and each paring will be responsible for leading class discussion on the date listed in the schedule and as described above.

COURSE READINGS

The course readings are divided into two different sections. Each week, students will be expected to complete the required readings before class and write a reaction essay based on them. It would be a good idea to read these in the order listed. Discussion leaders are encouraged to complete some of the recommended readings as part of their class preparation, otherwise, they are provided as sources which students should consult at some point in their academic career to make them well-rounded theoretical scholars. Note that many of the older books are in the public domain and are thus accessible free of charge and in digital form on the Internet, so it will not be necessary to purchase them.

Students who are interested in more general reading about the history and content of some of the key ideas in social theory might consider adding some of the following recommended books to their libraries:


For students who are particularly interested in various takes on the history of criminological ideas, the following books are recommended:

Week 1: Beginning at the End

Required Readings:


Notes: Anthony Giddens is the premier living social theorist (other than Jürgen Habermas, that is). He is best known for developing an integrative social theory known as structuration theory (to which we will not devote any direct attention in this course, but which will be obliquely evident in our readings of Giddens and Garland, the bookends for the course). For our more immediate purpose, he is also well known for his analysis of our contemporary era that he calls “late modernity” or “high modernity” (as opposed to post-modernity, the description favored by other social theorists but which Giddens persuasively argues is inaccurate). Modernity and Self-Identity provides an insightful characterization of this period of Western history, notable for the reflexive transformation of social institutions and the nature of day-to-day life. These transformations consist of a variety of dualities, for example, universality of experience produced by the flattening of time and space (via “mediated experience”), coupled with new forms of fragmentation made possible by pluralizing of choices and opportunities. They also give rise to new concerns that are distinctly relevant for criminology and criminal justice, among them risk, ontological security, and sequestration, with many paradoxical, unintended, and uncontrollable consequences that flow from these and other changes. Elsewhere, Giddens very vividly characterizes the experience with late modernity as “riding the juggernaut.”

Recommended Readings:


Week 2: Beginning at the Beginning

Required Readings:


Notes: Cesare Beccaria (pronounced CHEZ-a-ray beka-REE-ah) is frequently regarded as one of the founding fathers of criminology, which I think is a pretty gross exaggeration. The fact is that philosophizing about crime and punishment can be traced as far back as antiquity (e.g., Plato, Aristotle, Saint Augustine), not to mention other Enlightenment contemporaries also wrote on the subject (e.g., Locke, Voltaire, Montesquieu). Yet Beccaria’s short treatise represents the first truly comprehensive treatment based on a set of more or less coherent principles, and is indeed a watershed in the history of Western punishment scholarship. On Crimes and Punishments is a volume that you are likely to read more than once over your graduate career, because it has far-reaching implications for criminal procedure and criminal justice administration, coupled with a rudimentary theory of the etiology of criminal behavior, rooted in the principles of deterrence (e.g., certainty, severity, and celerity). Beccaria emphasizes that good legislation prevents crimes rather than punishes them, and points out many ways that poorly written laws can lead to the very crimes they are supposed to prevent. An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation is painfully dry, because Bentham was overly fond of classification, not to mention that he made footnotes to his footnotes (who does that?!?). The principle of utility (“the greatest happiness for the greatest number”) is imported directly from Beccaria and according to Bentham is the only legitimate justification of punishment. Many modern theoretical perspectives are in fact rooted in Bentham, most notably deterrence and rational choice theory (although in my view, rational choice is actually a model rather than a theory), but less obviously social control theory, self-control theory, routine activities theory, and situational crime prevention. Although deterrence is typically regarded as a conservative rationale for punishment, this derives from a misunderstanding of the principle (and failure to actually read Bentham beyond the first couple of chapters), so you might be surprised to learn that many liberal ideas underlie Bentham’s writing on the subject. We will return to Bentham (in Panopticon Letters) to pick on him when we consider Foucault’s Discipline and Punish.

Recommended Readings:


Week 3: Alienation and Class Struggle

Required Readings:


Notes: Karl Marx has a very bad reputation among lay audiences (note how commonly “socialist” or “Marxist” is used as an epithet, especially during election years), but among social theorists, he is almost revered for his penetrating analysis of the inner workings and contradictions of capitalism. Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts (1844) is a conversation with (or about) political economy and German philosophy (note the abundance of references to Hegel and Feuerbach). In this early
work, he develops the concept of “alienation” or “estrangement,” proposing it as the origin of private property and the division of labor (interestingly, the concept of alienation is conspicuously absent from Marx's later writings). He proposes that true communism, meaning the elimination of private property (not simply communal property, which he regarded as crude communism not altogether different from prostitution), is the transcendence of all forms of estrangement (i.e., religion, family, and state) and the return of mankind to its essential, social nature (“communism is the riddle of history solved, and it knows itself to be this solution”). The German Ideology (1845, co-written with Engels) expands on Marx’s and Engels’ materialist view of history, which represents a significant break from the idealism of his intellectual forebears (notably, Hegel). It is here that they explore the historical relevance of the “mode of production” in determining the material conditions of society and class relations. In Grundrisse (1858) (a.k.a., Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy), Marx more thoroughly explores the mode of production by focusing his attention specifically on capitalism (i.e., “modern bourgeois production”), which to him presupposes very definite and non-recursive systems of “production,” “distribution,” “exchange,” and “consumption.” He also provides a fascinating description of the emergence of capitalism out of feudalism (and as a bonus, he goes on an epic rant about Reverend Thomas Malthus, calling his ideas "stupid" and “childish” and at one point referring to him as a “baboon”). All of the foregoing but incomplete works contain the seeds of Marx’s thoughts which famously bear their full fruit in Capital, Vol. 1 (1867), a much longer, denser, and more difficult tome that formalizes his insights (lucky for you, we will only read excerpts of this nearly 1,000-page book). Here you will read your fill about “commodity” and “value,” occasionally in excruciating detail, but you will also acquire insight into the nature of capitalist exploitation that seeks to extract as much surplus labor as possible. Manifesto of the Communist Party (1848, co-written with Engels) is unabashedly propagandist, but it is not intended to turn you into a political revolutionary (¡Viva la revolución!). This early work does, instead, provide great insight into Marx’s and Engels’ historical leanings, specifically as they relate to how and why society changes (“The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles”), and what the antagonisms between the bourgeoisie (management) and proletariat (labor) hold for future society.

**Recommended Readings:**


**Week 4: Sources of Social Solidarity**

**Required Readings:**

Durkheim, Émile. (1893). *The Division of Labor in Society* (French title: *De la Division du Travail Social*). Any edition. Book 1 (Chapters 1-6), Book 2 (Chapters 2-3), Book 3 (Chapters 1-2).


Notes: Émile Durkheim’s is the quintessential functionalist perspective in social theory, and his books are classics in sociology and criminology. Durkheim did much for early sociology by
bracketing out the study of “social facts” as the unique content of this new and emerging discipline (itself the product of specialization resulting from a scientific division of labor). *The Division of Labor in Society* offers an analysis of how the nature of social solidarity changes during the transition from primitive to industrial society. The key concepts for understanding this societal evolution are the collective or common consciousness (*conscience collective*) and the division of labor, which are most clearly reflected in his analysis of different types of law. It is also in this work that Durkheim provides his clearest statement on the function of punishment as a quasi-religious “expiation” for behavior which offends collective sentiments. *Suicide* is a study of the religious, familial, and economic characteristics that underlie regional, cross-national, and temporal trends in suicide rates. This study is remarkable for its extensive use of statistical data and careful method of controlling for confounding variables (it is by no means the first quantitative treatise; that distinction probably goes to the “moral statisticians,” André-Michel Guerry and Adolphe Quetelet), but more so for the way that it subjects what would seem to be the most intimate and personal kind of act—suicide, presumably fully within the realm of psychology—to a distinctly sociological analysis. Durkheim characterizes the origin of suicide in two (among other) pathological conditions of contemporary society—egoism (*égoïsme*) reflecting excessive individuation or detachment from other members of the community, and anomie (*anomie*) reflecting moral deregulation or the absence of collective restraints on the limits of desires. These two conceptions foreshadow the development of some of the major macro-level theories of crime (e.g., social disorganization, structural strain, institutional anomie) as well as major micro-level theories of crime (e.g., social bond, general strain). It is worth noting that, in his books, Durkheim frequently employs the Latin expression, *sui generis* (literally, “of its own kind” or “in a class by itself”), which epitomizes the very sociological idea that “the whole is greater than the sum of the parts,” in clear contradiction to the utilitarians (à la Bentham) for whom society is nothing more than the sum of individual utilities. It is also just plain cool to say and something we should all start inserting into our written work.

**Recommended Readings:**


**Week 5: Iron Cage of Rationalization**

**Required Readings:**


Notes: Max Weber’s handprints are all over criminology, although he is woefully underappreciated for it, probably because of the sheer range of his work and also because he is tough to pigeonhole as a theorist. He is best known for his methodological standpoint (e.g., *verstehen* or interpretive understanding, pure or ideal types) and his manifold sensitizing constructs (e.g., legitimacy, charisma, discipline) as opposed to his distinctly theoretical contributions. The latter comprise his writings on rationalization and bureaucracy, and they are relevant for modern theorizing about the
criminal justice system. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism is a short but very powerful cultural analysis of Western capitalism, specifically as derived from a peculiarly Calvinist “spirit” (geist) of asceticism. A quasi-religious “calling” persisted when the ecclesiastic foundation of capitalism eventually eroded, leaving a highly rationalized remnant resembling an “iron cage” of pure utilitarianism (“The Puritan wanted to work in a calling; we are forced to do so”). The Vocation Lectures (“Politics as a Vocation,” “Science as a Vocation”) derive from a pair of speeches that Weber delivered to university students in 1917-1919. In his lecture on politics, he provides a definition for the “State” that is still employed in political science circles (an entity which “claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory”) and outlines sources of obedience rooted in three forms of authority or domination—tradition, charisma, and law. His lecture on science is a reminder that no form of scientific inquiry is free from presuppositions, and that there are inherent limits in science for producing answers to certain kinds of questions (e.g., whether something is worth being known). The remaining chapters of From Max Weber are translations of excerpts from his two-volume epic work, Economy and Society, never completed and published posthumously in 1922. In these chapters, you will be exposed to Weber’s ideas about the distribution of power (in both ideal and material form) and the various structures of domination. His most seminal statement on the subject is his three-fold system of social stratification—class, status group, and party. You will also find a detailed description of the rise and spread (in both public and private spheres) of bureaucratic organization or “officialdom,” which could just as easily have been written today as opposed to 100 years ago.

**Recommended Readings:**


This is the most widely read and regarded, full English translation of Economy and Society (1922). Note that a 1947 translation of volume 1 (part 1) was also produced by Talcott Parsons under the title, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Parsons’s introduction of this work is worth reading.

**Week 6: Geometry of Social Forms**

**Required Readings:**


Notes: Georg Simmel has only recently begun to be appreciated as one of the major social theorists of his day, and his work has compelled many scholars to expand the classical canon from the “Big Three” to the “Big Four.” Chronologically, he should probably be read prior to Weber, because there is good reason to believe that Weber was influenced by his work (e.g., Simmel’s “pure forms of sociation” bear uncanny resemblances to Weber’s later “ideal types”). Like Weber, Simmel was not a grand theorist in the tradition of Marx or Durkheim, but was interested in the more modest objective of drawing out the meaning of social interaction (verstehen). He was also a bit of a dilettante, making it a challenge to classify his contributions into a coherent school of thought—his contributions are fragmentary in a way that can be frustrating. *On Individuality and Social Forms* and *Conflict and the Web of Group-Affiliations* are collections of his writings from a variety of sources, but mostly translations of excerpts from his book *Sociology* (1908) (the exceptions being the chapters on exchange [1907], fashion [1904], and the metropolis [1903]). One of Simmel’s key contributions to social theory is his distinction between contents (the “material” of sociation, e.g., individual drives and personalities) and forms (the unities or “modes” of interaction within which contents are realized), only the latter of which, in his view, are properly the study of sociology. Indeed, he is best known for his elaboration of many different forms of social interaction, in particular, exchange and conflict (among many others). But there are so many interesting ideas, well ahead of their time, which a careful reader will acquire from Simmel’s writings. Portions of his work contain elements of symbolic interactionism well before any such school of thought existed; his characterization of affiliations as representing intersecting circles of various sizes anticipates contemporary interest in social network analysis; and his short essay on the social positioning of “the Stranger” still resonates today. And do not be fooled into thinking that Simmel’s essay on fashion is strictly about trends in styles of dress, because the dualistic tension which he describes as the root of fashion—imitation versus differentiation (this sounds a bit like a dialectic, does it not?)—plays itself out among many different contents and in many different settings.

**Recommended Readings:**


**Week 7: Urbanization and Social (Dis)Organization**

**Required Readings:**


Notes: At the turn of the 20th century, social theory underwent a shift from largely abstract theorizing and comparative-historical research to empiricism, and probably no institution
contributed to this shift more than the University of Chicago. It is the first true “school” of thought in America, despite the fact that it was comparatively short lived. Affiliated with the Department of Sociology at the time, William Thomas and Polish-American sociologist Florian Znaniecki produced a landmark piece of sociological analysis. The five-volume *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* is remarkable for its method as well as its substance. It relies on the extensive use of biographical material (e.g., letters, diaries, life histories) — a methodological innovation which anticipates the oral history tradition — and it diagnoses the conditions of social disorganization caused by rapid social change. It is also in this work that Thomas and Znaniecki appeal to the provisional concept of “definition of the situation,” a concept that is developed a little more fully by Thomas in *The Unadjusted Girl* (1923). Thomas is also well known for coining, in another later work (*The Child in America* [1928]), what is now known as the Thomas Theorem: “If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences.” Note that it should technically be referred to as the Thomases’ Theorem, because his co-author was Dorothy Swaine Thomas, his wife later in life (Thomas was her maiden name) and a reputed scholar in her own right. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* left a lasting imprint on American criminology, and contributed to what is now known to as the Chicago School of criminology. For example, the biographical method was to be later employed by Clifford Shaw in the classic, *The Jack-Roller* (1930), not to mention that the theme of social disorganization (supplemented by concepts from the ecological model of Robert Park and Ernest Burgess, e.g., concentric zones, natural areas) was to be taken up enthusiastically by Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay in another classic, *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas* (1942).

Recommended Readings:


**Week 8: Self as a Social Process**

Required Readings:


Notes: In criminology, the Chicago School is closely associated with macro-sociological research and its structural and cultural traditions. In sociology, on the other hand, the Chicago School is actually more closely aligned with the micro-level or social-psychological tradition, with George Mead the figure most closely tied to this tradition. His intellectual home was actually in philosophy rather
than sociology. One of his chief contributions to social theory, rooted in his background in pragmatism (from philosophy) and behaviorism (from psychology), is the idea that reality is constituted through verbal and non-verbal forms of communication ("gestures") as opposed to being something which exists "out there" in the world and which is imposed on and passively internalized by the individual—a major point of contrast with structural-functional schools of thought, for example, those rooted in Durkheim. Mead referred to his form of inquiry as (social) behaviorism, but several years after Mead’s death his student, Herbert Blumer, coined the term "symbolic interactionism"—a description that obviously stuck. By whatever name, it is probably the most distinctly American contribution to social theory. *Mind, Self, and Society* was published posthumously (regrettably, Mead never published a book-length treatment of his ideas during his lifetime), and is a compilation of his lectures as reproduced from detailed notes taken by students in the 1910s and 1920s (which explains the occasionally repetitive nature of the material), supplemented by some selections from his published and unpublished articles. In this book, Mead defines the concepts that are uniquely associated with symbolic interactionism: significant symbols, role taking, generalized other, and "I" and "Me," among others.

**Recommended Readings:**


**Week 9: Forgotten Black Scholars**

**Required Readings:**


Notes: Ida Wells (Barnett) was a journalist at the forefront publicizing the brutality of the southern lynching of African Americans at the turn of the 20th century, often at great personal risk. Her short books *Southern Horrors* (1892) and *A Red Record* (1895) debunk the "rape myth" underlying lynching, and reframe the prevailing narrative from it being a vengeful response to a brutal attack against white feminine virtue ("frontier justice," in a manner of speaking), to it being an intentional and collective act of terrorism targeted at curbing black progress (be forewarned that some of the descriptions of lynching events are difficult to read). The last 30 years or so have witnessed a revival of interest in lynching research, but it is regrettable that there is frequently little mention of Wells. Similarly, W.E.B. Du Bois was denied the esteem that he well deserved in early sociology, but it is now widely acknowledged that he made major contributions to theory and research. While the (white) sociologists of the day concerned themselves with the problems arising from immigrant settlement and cultural assimilation, Du Bois wrote extensively about black migration and the "color line" against a cultural and scientific background of perceived racial inferiority that gave rise to a certain degree of indifference toward the black community (and black scholars, in particular).
The Philadelphia Negro is a superb example of mixed-methods research, combining household interviews, census records, social observation, and historical documents to better understand the life of the black community of the Seventh Ward. Truly, it is superior to the best empirical work ever conducted by the Chicago School, and in fact predates that work by some 25 years. But good luck ever finding a reference to Du Bois in any work by a Chicago School criminologist, then or now. All too tellingly, The Philadelphia Negro is not cited a single time in Louis Wirth’s extensive bibliography on urban sociology, published as the closing chapter of Robert Park, Ernest Burgess, and Roderick McKenzie’s The City (1925). It is hard to imagine why it was omitted from a bibliography of over 400 books and articles (seriously WTF, Chicago School?!?).

**Recommended Readings:**


**Week 10: Forgotten Female Reformers**

**Required Readings:**


Notes: Jane Addams was the major Progressive reformer of her day. She was truly a sociologist, and over her career she published countless papers in the *American Journal of Sociology*, founded at the University of Chicago. But because there was little place for female sociologists in academic institutions at the time (other than in women’s colleges), she lived and carried out her research in settlement houses and later became a founder of the field now known as social work. While her work was marginalized in the academy, her methods and ideas were nevertheless incorporated (a little too enthusiastically and often uncredited) by the men of the Chicago School. Addams also had an international reputation, and was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1931 for her work with children and the poor at Hull House, as well as for her role in the founding of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom. The three short books that we will read are a selection of her writings on some of the urban social problems of her day, and highlight her special concern for the experiences of women and young people. Her epistemology bears some similarity to Weber’s “interpretive understanding” (verstehen), but is instead a kind of “sympathetic understanding” that I like to think turns Weber from his head onto his heart. Addams’ more reformist tendencies—her merging of theory with practice—will come through pretty clearly. *Democracy and Social Ethics* derives from a series of lecture that Addams delivered on the moral challenges of modern life, which she proposes require a new code of “social ethics” capable of keeping up with changing times. Her code is inspired by democratic sentiments embracing cultural diversity and an understanding of others’ perspectives. *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets* diagnoses the underlying root of delinquency as a misdirected and unfulfilled “spirit of adventure.”
There are many theoretical themes evident in this work, which we have already encountered in this course, that an alert reader will detect: resistance of youth to being swallowed up in the modern city (Simmel); egosim from a disconnection with the past as well as anomic from unfulfilled desires and ambitions (Durkheim); alienation of youth workers from their tasks (Marx); youth gang formation rooted in charismatic leadership (Weber); and the importance of organized games for youth development (Mead). *A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil* provides an account of the “white slave trade,” known today as sex trafficking, which victimizes and demoralizes poor immigrant women. Despite the overly sensational tone of the book (it resembles a “moral panic,” in a number of respects), it provides an interesting early look at the inner workings of commercialized vice.

**Recommended Readings:**


**Week 11: Psychoanalysis of Social Life**

**Required Readings:**


Freud, Sigmund. (1923). *The Ego and the Id* (German title: *Das Ich und das Es*). Any edition.


**Notes:** Sigmund Freud probably seems like an unusual addition to a course on social theory, but he left his mark on the social theorists of his time (including one Talcott Parsons). Putting aside his psycho-sexual fascination, psychoanalytic method, and overt sexism, central to Freud’s thinking was that the human experience is one of resolving tension between competing drives or instincts that operate on the unconscious mind—echoing Hegel, one might be inclined to label this tension a dialectic. One might infer that there is a similar tension that operates between society and the individual, and that social (dis)order arises from this internal process writ large. The four selected books provide the Freudian perspective on some of the questions that are of interest in this course. In *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, Freud considers how collective behavior emerges from individual actions as though such a thing as a “group mind” existed. Groups range from
transitory and highly heterogeneous crowds (e.g., the mob) to stable and highly organized institutions (e.g., the church, the army)—in all cases, groups free individuals to act on unconscious and instinctual impulses that are otherwise repressed in day-to-day life. To Freud, group influence bears a resemblance to hypnosis, and stems from a form of suggestibility rooted in libidinal ties (Eros) to other group members, coupled with identification with the group leader as an “ego ideal.” *The Ego and the Id* provides the definitive statement about the three-part “structure” of the mind, comprising ego, id, and superego. A horse-and-rider analogy is used to characterize the interplay of the id with the ego, with the superego (as “heir of the Oedipus complex”) originating in childhood identification with one's father. *The Future of an Illusion* contains a strongly worded rebuke of religious beliefs, deriding them as an “illusion.” But in the course of delivering this rebuke, Freud provides deep insight into his view of the nature of human civilization and the mental (vs. material á la Marx) forces which constitute society and social institutions (religion being his institutional example). *Civilization and Its Discontents* addresses what Freud regards as the paradox of civilization: our chief protection from unhappiness is simultaneously our chief source of unhappiness. Specifically, societal prohibitions (akin to a cultural superego) protect people from one another, but because these demand the repression of our libidinous and aggressive instincts, they give rise to the discontent referenced in the title.

**Recommended Readings:**


**Week 12: Evolution of Court Society**

**Required Readings:**


Notes: Norbert Elias is the inspiration for a strand of thought known as “figurational sociology,” also known as process sociology. His perspective concerns the way that culture frequently has the appearance of being a possession handed down to us ready-made when in fact it is a process in which we ourselves are involved, and which at any given time bears witness to particular structures or figurations of human relations (and consequently, human psychology). *The Civilizing Process*, the most important of Elias’ work, was not introduced into Western social theory until 30 years after its publication, simply because nobody bothered to translate it from its original German (probably due to the outbreak of World War II and its patently uncivilized character). In this work, Elias observes that many forms of conduct in Western society which did not arouse any shame in prior centuries have come to be regarded as shameful in recent ones. His book documents the evolution of “civilized” public behavior, and he provides fascinating documentation of many customs—having to do with table manners, bodily functions, and bedroom behavior—that we
would today judge to be unsightly, embarrassing, or vulgar (and how we acquired our modern-day reaction to it is precisely the subject of the book). Elias proposes that this cultural evolution happens by way of evolving behavioral standards inspired by social elites, enforced by societal constraints via shaming mechanisms, and reproduced internally in a way that gives rise to individual self-restraint or self-control (there are similarities here with Freud’s characterization of the superego, though obviously not in the proposed mechanism). Foreshadowing Pierre Bourdieu, he refers to the resulting dispositions as “habitus,” or patterns of behavior and thought that, once internalized, become second nature and basically taken for granted. However, do not be misled into thinking that the process described by Elias is recursive (i.e., one-way)—we can infer that society can also undergo such a thing as a “de-civilizing process” at various points in its history (and one can probably be forgiven for thinking we are in the midst of that process in today’s world).

Recommended Readings:


**Week 13: Knowledge and Discipline**

Required Readings:


Notes: Michel Foucault is a social theorist tied to an intellectual movement known as French post-structuralism (some classify him in the post-modernist camp). He focuses much of his analysis on the development of modern institutions—asylums, hospitals, and prisons, namely—and the new scientific disciplines (psychiatry, medicine, and penology, respectively) and bodies of knowledge that were commensurate with their rise. There are a number of recurring themes that will be apparent when reading Foucault: discourse, discipline(s), power/knowledge, and “the body.” *Madness and Civilization* (an abridged version of the 1961 *History of Madness*, Foucault’s doctoral thesis) traces the emergence of the new forms of exclusion or “sequestration” that characterized the “Great Confinement” during the Age of Enlightenment. These reflected a new sensibility toward diseases of “unreason”—mental illness, poverty, unemployment, and idleness; with madness as the catch-all affliction of these social undesirables—that culminated in (in fact, was epitomized by) the birth of the asylum in the modern age. The epic *Discipline and Punish* provides a rich history of Western punishment from public executions to the penitentiary (be forewarned that the opening pages of the book, relating the 1757 execution of Robert-François Damiens for attempted regicide, are pretty gruesome). In this work, Foucault takes special interest in the writings of Jeremy Bentham on the Panopticon (from *Panopticon Letters*)—Bentham’s architectural model for a prison, never fully realized—seeing in it the perfect exercise of power though the “disciplinary gaze,”
wherein many inmates can be surveilled by a single guard who "sees without ever being seen." If you think that modern prisons merely represent the deprivation of liberty and punishment for wrongdoing, Foucault will likely convince you that “you have got another think coming.”

**Recommended Readings:**


**Week 14: Punishment as a Social Institution**

**Required Readings:**


Notes: Anyone familiar with the Western—especially, American—experience of the last several decades might observe that crime and punishment unfold quite independently of one another, or at the very least, they seem to have become decoupled in the last generation. David Garland is second to no one for his insights into the development and symbolic nature of punishment. One of his most important contributions is the idea that punishment is a social institution like any other, and consequently is not something autonomous but rather is something that is produced and reproduced, and is thus a byproduct of society and societal arrangements (notice the influence of Giddens’ theory of structuration here). *Punishment and Modern Society* is a work of synthesis that interprets punishment from the perspectives of many of the social theorists we have read this semester (e.g., Marx, Durkheim, Weber, Elias, Foucault). It provides a formal exposition of themes that we have already discussed over the course of the semester, but to this point we have done so in a fairly superficial way and not always explicitly in reference to the criminal justice system. *The Culture of Control* concerns contemporary developments in crime and punishment, and in a way, it answers the question, “How did we get here?” It analyzes the manifold causes of the “crisis of penal modernism” that has culminated in the crime control strategies which now predominate. In the process of doing so, it partly implicates the disciplines of criminology and criminal justice.

**Recommended Readings:**