

CRIMINALS AND THEIR SCIENTISTS: THE HISTORY OF CRIMINOLOGY IN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE. By PETER BECKER and RICHARD WETZEL (EDS.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005, 492pp, £60 hb).

Criminals and Their Scientists (2006) approaches the history of criminology as a history of discursive practices rather than conceiving as criminological knowledge as a progressive discourse. Seeking to understand how criminological thought emerged as a disciplinary knowledge formation, this volume examines how discursive choices echo the intellectual, social, and political contexts of a particular place and time.

The various problematizations that enabled and constrained constitution of specific subjects of power and knowledge are explored by interrogating the discursive rules and conditions of possibility for criminological discourses about criminals as mediated through the voices of experts, practitioners and criminals themselves. For example, *Criminals and Their Scientists* traces the shift from a moral-ethical to a medical-anthropological perspective in criminological discourse that yielded the ability to speak truth to power about criminals to experts rather than institutional practitioners (e.g. police, legal, and penal). It also is sensitive enough to appreciate that this shift in the interactions between experts, policy makers, and practitioners was not a dramatic rupture or discontinuity but is gradual occurrence.

In Part I, non-academic sites are considered including the role of practitioners and moral reformers in the context of penal institutions and legislation. Marc Renneville's chapter examines the role that the French Revolution contributed to historical and modern criminological thought in France. Interrogating the concept of the reasonable man, Martin Weiner's analysis of Victorian magistrates reveals a legal norm of individual rationality, perfectibility and self-control. Michael Berkowitz's chapter traces the nineteenth-century association of Jewishness with a criminality. The representation of Jews as the most dangerous of professional criminals was a view held by both the police and common man. Andrew Lees chapter focuses on moral discourse and reform in urban Germany from 1880 to 1914. The language of moral concern, Andrew Lees argues, served to enable and constrain progressive projects of social reform. Tracing the deployment of strategies designed to integrate information, Peter Becker's analysis reveals the presence of both continuity and discontinuity in criminological discourse at the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth century.

Part II considers the role of scientific and political practices on criminological discourse during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Mary Gibson argues that Lombroso's theory of atavistic man should be understood as a starting point that evolved to include degeneration theory and psychiatric categories rather than as an end in itself. Nicole Hahn Rafter maintains that criminal anthropological discourse, and the concept of the 'born criminal' in particular, benefited from its visual and graphic accessibility. Not only is the concept of the 'born criminal' imbued with the persuasive explanatory power of science, it also serves to 'orientalized' the offender by distancing the criminal as 'other' from normal, law-abiding citizens. Mariacarla Gadebusch Bondio claims that the failure to appreciate Lombroso's theoretical complexity led some German psychiatrists to propagate too rigid and deterministic a version of his theories which rendered them susceptible to criticism.

Laurent Mucchielli's chapter utilizes the medical debates on the treatment of incorrigible criminals in France in the 1880s to explore the connections between criminology, eugenics, and social hygiene movement. The outcome of the medical profession's discourse

on crime, Mucchieli concludes, supported repressive penal policies resulted in the ‘naturalization of crime.’ The Australian reception of European criminal-anthropological literature concerning practices of confinement and social regulation, Stephen Garton claims, led Australian prison officials to re-think prisons as “hospitals of moral disease”. This shift required that other problem populations such as the insane, alcoholics, and the “mentally defective” be displaced from prisons into their own specialized institutions. What seems like ‘decarceration’ is more accurately defined as a fragmentation and specialization of confinement that separated the incurables from curables.

Ricardo Salvatore’s chapter examines how positivist criminology’s medical conception of the crime problem gave rise to a “medico-legal state” in Argentina during 1890 to 1940. As positivist reformers gained control of institutions - prisons, courts, police, and insane asylums - new practices of registration and classification were introduced. Effectively colonizing institutions of social control and deploying new rationalities for ruling, positivist reformers transformed the “grammar of governance.”

The nexus of criminology and the politics of order between 1910 and 1940 in Japan is the focus of Yoji Nakatani’s chapter. Nakatani maintains that criminologists were instrumental in the Japanese eugenics movement. As an example of this, he draws attention to overtly politicized concepts such as “dangerousness” that equates involvement with communism as “dangerous thought” indicative of psychological abnormality.

Part III examines criminology’s knowledge-based tools and practices with particular scrutiny on the networks that criminologists built that opened up new discursive spaces that enabled the exchange of ideas (e.g. conferences and journals). To this end, Martine Kaluszynski’s chapter provides us with insight into the creation of new criminological discourses through specialized forms of academic communications. David Horn’s chapter focuses on criminological tools of a different kind; the specialized tools for criminal anthropological and psychometric research. Scientific tools and methods, Horn argues, were instrumental in establishing and sustaining criminal anthropology’s claim to scientific ‘truth’ despite an antagonistic scientific community.

Jane Caplan suggests in her study of tattoos as complex signs with meanings that defied a singular discourse demonstrates the ‘progressive’ limits of the Italian and French positivist schools of criminology. Through the autobiographical writings of criminals about their lives, Philippe Artières demonstrates that some criminals actively resisted their expert-imposed criminological identities. Media representations of criminals in Imperial Berlin, Peter Fritzsche suggests, challenged academic criminologists monopoly on the production of criminological knowledge. Media representations informed the urban city dwellers about their social environment without naturalizing criminals as atavistic or degenerate.

In Part IV, Richard Wetzell provides an overview of the development of criminology in Weimar (1919–33) and Nazi Germany (1933–45). Characterized by a tension between the hereditarian biases held by psychiatrists versus a methodological complexity and conceptual sophistication of the interaction of nature and nurture, Wetzell concludes, German criminological discourse in the 1920s and 1930s between criminology and Nazism was complex. Some criminologists, Wetzell observes, had little qualms about an association with the “biological politics” and eugenics agenda of the Nazi ‘racial state.’

Oliver Liang’s chapter focuses on the Criminal-Biological Service of the Bavarian prison system in Weimar Germany which rendered categorical judgments of “corrigible,” “incorrigible,” or “undecided” based on “criminal-biological examinations” of prisoners. Liang demonstrates that the biological data collected in examination paled in comparison to the

extended discussions of sex, gender, class, religion, and politics that used bourgeois values as a standard for judging prisoners. In truth, ‘diagnoses’ such as “incurability,” were simply moral judgments cloaked in scientific language.

At the other end of the spectrum, Gabriel Finder’s examination of psychoanalytic criminology, which searched for the cause of crime in the unconscious motives relating to psychological maladjustments that originated in childhood; whereas criminal biology focused on the search for the heredity factors. Psychoanalytic criminologists, rather than reflecting a liberal sensibility, were not adverse to the principle of confinement, and often favored increased penalty.

In the final chapter, Geoffrey Giles examines the German discourse on drinking and crime from Imperial Germany through to the Weimar and Nazi periods. Criminal responsible for drunkenness depended on the social class of the offender. Despite the discourse on alcoholism including the statistical evidence, Giles notes that considerable debate existed as to who exactly was properly defined as a “drinker.” Institutions for treating alcoholics were almost indistinguishable from prisons and had negligible, if any, curative effect. Despite a lack of medical symptoms relating to chronic alcoholism, individuals with criminal convictions, who consumed alcohol, could still be sterilized as “severe alcoholics” because their criminal behavior was an indication of severe alcoholism. Criminal behavior was itself deemed symptomatic of a biological abnormality. It was relatively easy to re-define social problems in scientific terms given that medical theories were already permeated by social values. These new possibilities not only applied to the detection of crime, but also opened up possibilities for the prevention of crime as a ‘social disease.’

In seeking to trace the interrelations between discourse, practice, and the wider political field, *Criminals and Their Scientists* demonstrates both continuity and discontinuity within the emergence and transformation of criminological discourse. The papers gathered together for this volume demonstrate that the discipline not only constructs dominant representations of the world but also defines the ways that the people who inhabit it can be known, studied, calculated, trained, helped, punished, and liberated. Rather than focusing on crime, *Criminals and Their Scientists* provides a framework for investigating the discursive constitution of criminals through discursive practices. The use of the criminal-scientist effectively displaces the criminal act in favor of the criminal as an object of criminological curiosity. This approach facilitates an appreciation of the contribution to the criminological enterprise that derives from the discipline itself.

While Becker and Wetzell provide an introductory canvas of the themes and findings of the articles, they do not provide a concluding chapter that draws the salient lines of inquiry together, nor do they suggest further directions for research. Some of the choices concerning the location of chapters in various sections can be quibbled about but do not substantially detract from the collection. Intriguingly, an intellectual debt seems owed to an early article by David Garland (1985) yet goes unacknowledged. These relatively minor shortcomings certainly do not outweigh the contribution that this volume makes to the literature on the history of criminology. While many of the authors have published book length elaborations of their conference papers, those seeking a rigorously critical introduction to the disciplinary constitution of criminology would be well advised to look to *Criminals and Their Scientists*.

Carleton University, Canada

Lawrence Buhagiar

doi:10.1093/bjc/azl046

Advance Access publication 12 June 2006

REFERENCE

GARLAND, DAVID (1985) "The Criminal and His Science" A Critical Account of the Formation of Criminology at the end of the Nineteenth Century." *British Journal of Criminology* 25(2): 109–137.

FRAGILE MORALITIES AND DANGEROUS SEXUALITIES: TWO CENTURIES OF SEMI-PENAL INSTITUTIONALISATION FOR WOMEN. By ALANA BARTON. (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005, 162pp. £45.00 hb)

Fragile Moralities sets out to construct a history of a UK women's non-custodial facility (pseudonymously referred to as Vernon Lodge) which is currently a bail and probation hostel staffed by probation and opened in the nineteenth century as the County Refuge for the Destitute, with the mission of reforming deviant women. Since its opening, the establishment has been used for a variety of purposes connected with the protection and rehabilitation of women in trouble with the law in some way or another, and the author's main argument is

"that what primarily links the past with the present, in terms of this form of institutionalisation, is the constancy of the discourses and practices mobilised to identify, explain and manage 'deviant' women." (p5)

The type of institutionalisation described is what is usually referred to as an 'alternative' to custody, and it is this type of non-prison accommodation and regime used by the criminal justice system that Barton calls 'semi-penal' because of the existence and persistence of its punitive and disciplinary strategies for 'normalising' wayward and lawbreaking women.

In many ways the investigation on which the book is based is a model of one type of qualitative social research. The author gathered her data via participant observation, semi-structured interviews and documentary analysis. But she herself found (in the hostel's attic) many of the handwritten historical documents which she subsequently quotes to good effect in the text, and the story of their discovery makes the Methods Appendix at the end of the book more intriguing to read than is usual with 'Methods' Appendices. In fact, the book is a good read overall. It is scholarly, carefully argued, written and presented and, as I have already indicated, the quotations from the historical records make for a lively narrative which, by and large, well supports and illustrates the arguments being made.

It will come as no surprise that Barton found that the main 'normalising' discourses utilised were those which made assumptions both about women's proper place, that is, the home, and about 'normal' women – who could be expected to be more docile than men. Persistence of the first assumption has led to constant attempts to domesticise 'deviant' women, while persistence of the second has resulted in infantilising regimes in women's hostels and prisons. But although there is nothing new in the author's identification of the feminising discourses, her analysis does show nicely how the same discourses have been used to justify changing strategies and coercive practices from the early nineteenth century to the present day. As Barton herself claims, with justification, she has used a coherent theoretical framework to translate a series of events into a history (p152). And that is no mean feat. However, some of the insufficiently theorised commentary on that history may well raise readers' hackles - as it did mine. In my own case, I found the discussion of the concept of 'resistance' incoherent; and the argument about transcarceralism and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.