The underground economy: A selective history, theory and practical

guide to localised underground deviance in New Zealand.

Ben Monckton

"Capitalism...gives to each and every one of us a great opportunity, if we only seize it with both hands and make the most of it." Al Capone

Preface

In order to assist the reader in conceptualising the notions I wish to describe in this thesis, it may be useful to portray my ideas by way of this preface. This will take the form of the perspective, initial focus and development of my research.

After completing my degree I initially lived with, and was consequently interested in looking at people and groups that did not want to interact within the mainstream New Zealand capitalistic infrastructure. These people (myself included) were largely made up of those who felt (idealistically?) that through focusing on money and material gain capitalism had lost most of its appeal as a way of life. Consequently these "hippies" and members of alternative communities choose to live in various differing fashions.

I then came to realise that although many of these people felt they were no longer part of society, or more particularly capitalism (this appeared as a reoccurring theme among the people I spoke with), that was their one constraint. They had to have money in order to operate in relative autonomy from the rest of society. In order to get away from the "rat race" one had to purchase some land, which in turn needed developing. In order to gain money one usually had to participate in the "rat race". This lead me to a change in philosophical tack; I began to see a difference in those that I

(possibly unfairly) saw as running away from capitalism and those who cunningly hid from it.

I saw those who hid from capitalism as the people that use the "system," and exploit it where they can by utilising the underground economy in order to make money, without having to pay the price conventional capitalist citizens do; such as working long hours and paying taxes. The hiding involved concealing their deviant (and often devious) ways, lest they be discovered by those in power, and punished for their clandestine transgressions. Amongst the people I encountered, their primary activities consisted of growing and dealing in cannabis and selling stolen household goods. In a sentence I am interested in those who attempt to use the 'system' by bending it to suit their own socialised and fostered views of how the world can work.

I discovered that much had been written, primarily in the field of criminology, concerning the statistical aspects of crime, such as the percentage of people who smoke cannabis (derived from those who have been convicted of possession of cannabis) and have also been convicted for drunk driving. A plethora of other statistical information looked at how one could stop re-offending; which ethnic groups committed what crimes, etc. The problem I had with all this information was that it was only of any great use if you accepted (and no one does) that all criminals are apprehended and convicted[1], otherwise it becomes a purely statistical game. I wished to understand those who committed unlawful acts, but were not necessarily convicted criminals.

Initially I wanted to examine what sort of people take part in this activity, an activity that I see as grassroots deviance. I had the idea that the participants would be largely made up of 'marginalised' folks - those people who could not get jobs due to

their low levels of education, those with criminal convictions and other social factors that reduced their job opportunities. Initial observation seemed to confirm this as a contributing factor, although interestingly enough there appears to be quite a high rational choice factor occurring - that is people weigh their opportunities and judge that the deviant path of 'a' or 'b' is better and more financially rewarding than the more conventional path 'c'.

Through this research I discovered that becoming a criminal in New Zealand is not difficult, although maintaining a lifestyle based upon criminal activity requires, like all successful careers, a combination and degrees of skills, in this case acute business skills, ability to deal with people, the ability to make quick decisions, often under pressure, the ability to remain calm under pressure and most importantly of all, the art of doing all this without being detected. The individuals who are successful in this career venture are the subject of this research.

The aims of this research required stepping into the world of so called deviants and the underground economy. This proved to be a relatively simple task, especially as I already had a number of contacts and friends engaged in underground activities. Aside from this, it was merely a matter of asking around and being introduced to people. Some individuals were obviously a lot more interested than others, some even reacted to the effect that they certainly would not care to be the object of my scrutiny. Others expressed both an interest and a desire to become involved, and it was amongst these people that I chose a number to be examined individually whilst bearing in mind that they were part of an interactive group.

1. <u>Introduction</u>

In this thesis it is my intention to look at criminal deviance with regard to the underground (black market) economy in New Zealand. This research will consist of three distinct parts, each written as separate chapters, consisting of theory, history, and fieldwork. The thesis will offer an expansive guide to the specifics of how the participants engage in New Zealand's underground economy. It will subsequently develop an argument for why the participants involved in this research engage in the underground economy instead of utilising more conventional notions of work.

To achieve this I will examine certain criminological, sociological, and anthropological theories of criminality. I will argue that the economic and socio-historical situation leading up to the present environment in New Zealand provides for an increasing potential for black market operations to be a viable and lucrative way of life, especially when seen in a relative light with conventional job opportunities. This analysis will consist of three chapters, the first is a brief summary of the prevalent social theories regarding deviance and crime[2]. The discussion of these theories will be used with particular reference to the participants later in the thesis. This discussion also helps construct the parameters and ideas with which the thesis will be examined. The theories chosen will cover three prevalent theoretical fields: traditional, interactionist, and radical perspectives on deviance.

The second part of this thesis concerns New Zealand's recent political and economic history. This socio-historical foundation will help us examine the economic aspects concerning participants decisions and choices (or nonchoices as the case may be) regarding their career options. It is my intention to show that increasing urbanisation, a

polarisation of wealth distribution, reduced job opportunities, and disassociation with traditionally held values coupled with material desire has, over time, led to the underground economy becoming more pervasive in New Zealand society. This historical analysis will begin with the emergence of New Zealand's "welfare state" and follow the progress and relative decline of New Zealand's economy to the present day.

The third part and primary content of this thesis is concerned with the information gained through field research. Ned Polski highlights the importance of such work; "Experience with adult, unreformed, 'serious' criminals in their natural environment - not only those undertaking felonies in a moonlighting way, such as pool hustlers, but career felons - has convinced me that if we are to make a major advance in our scientific understanding of criminal lifestyles, criminal sub-cultures and their relation to the larger society, we must undertake genuine field research on these people."[3,4]

While it is not possible, within the scope of this thesis, to use field research to study a large segment of the 'deviant' population, it is possible to study several people with reference to the larger social context within which they operate. This is emphasised in order to explain the references which fall outside the scope of the participant individuals. Having said this, I will deal largely with four selected participants and how they survive, and obtain income by utilising the underground or black-market economy through the sale of stolen property and goods, growing and selling of cannabis, manufacture and sale of cannabis oil, sale of LSD and Ecstasy and finally shoplifting.

The two principle questions I wish to address through this research are how, and why? How, or in what form, does this blackmarketeering take place? Why did

these individuals become involved in this form of deviant activity? Why do these

individuals continue to engage in this behaviour? Given that this is not a psychological

but an anthropological, assessment these questions will be examined within the social

context that these individuals operate in.

The first question - how - is more readily answered than the following

two, as it is by direct observation and communication with the participants that it is

answered. Consequently, the sections on participants one through to four contain the

information necessary to answer the question. The second and third questions -

concerning why - run deeper than just the participants answers, as it is reasonable to

suggest that there are many different forces contributing to an individual's engagement in

the underground economy, some obvious, others more obscure. It is intended that the

chapters on Theory and History in this thesis will help shed light on many of these forces.

The concluding chapter on Theoretical Analysis attempts to answer the "why?"

questions.

My general approach to this participant research will be holistic; I will

examine the cultural, social, psychological, environmental, and economic factors within

the lives of these people. This multi-perspective approach to the underground economy

and the individuals within it will be used to argue that these factors, such as an

environment of reduced job opportunity due to low education, a lack of desire to engage

in regular working patterns, and New Zealand's economic instability, means that the

underground economy presents an increased avenue for marginalised individuals to gain

monetary return for their efforts, as opposed to conventional employment. It is also my

contention that while the underground economy is utilised by marginalised individuals, it

is also used as a viable and calculated business venture for those who would seem to

have many other options available to them (as we will see when we discuss Rational

Choice Interpretation).

Finally, and by way of conclusion, I hope to show clearly how and why the

participant individuals (and by inference others) engage in specific underground

activities. This will be shown by reconciling both the theoretical overview and the

historical commentary with my own participant observation and conclusions.

Before we continue with the main body of the text I would first like to

remove some of the ambiguous nature of this topic by offering some definitions of terms

that have been discussed, or will be discussed.

Initially a definition of the economy of deviance, the black market or

underground economy is necessary. For the purposes of this thesis, the black market and

underground economy can be considered synonymous, and the underground economy

will be taken to mean the environment where transactions of stolen or illegally acquired

goods takes place. These are transactions which involve either money or the barter of

other, usually stolen, goods to obtain the goods one desires. All transactions involving

money are informal[5], and so any individual (or groups) who assiduously uses this market,

will never pay taxes on their transactions. It also involves the interchange of quantities of

illegal drugs for either money or goods. Underground activities are also considered those

activities that are undertaken for the procurement of tax free dollars. Specific to this

research, this includes the manufacture of cannabis oil, growing of cannabis and

shoplifting, all of which, whilst not strictly black market activities, are engaged in as a

means to that end.

It is obvious that any work attempting to cover the underground economy must also centre on notions of conformity and deviance. In defining these terms, it becomes clear that human lives are governed by rules and regulations. It would appear it is widely accepted that without these rules and regulations society would erupt into chaos. This is primarily because these rules dictate what behaviour is appropriate in what context. Giddens uses the analogy of driving to illustrate the concept of rules; "orderly behaviour on the highway... would be impossible if drivers did not observe the rule of driving on the left and other traffic conventions."[6] Some of these rules are regulated in our society by the law. Of course, not all people follow the law; in fact, many if not all people deviate from the law from time to time. Newbold defines deviance as "the obverse of social control, it is what happens when control mechanisms fail."[7] Giddens adds that "(d)eviance may be defined as nonconformity to a given norm, or set of norms, which are accepted by a significant number of people in a community or society."[8] So we can see that the basic premise behind deviance is not following the rules, laws, or majority opinion. This deviance can take many different forms, from stealing pens from work to murder or rape the latter considered in western society to be the most deviant, while the former would scarcely raise an eyebrow of many. For this research we will be concerned with neither the most nor the least deviant. Perhaps it could be termed or considered the middle ground in deviance. Either way, as with any deviance, it is termed or viewed subjectively, and generally viewed as less deviant if one is not the recipient of the deviance.

2. Theory

Having discussed the basic outline of this thesis and defined the terms that were potentially ambiguous, it is now time to delve into the theoretical overview. It is not the object of this thesis to offer a comprehensive theoretical critique. It is, on the other hand, the object of this thesis to analyse the participants with regard to social theories. With this in mind I have attempted to select the theories that may help us in this endeavour by both displaying and covering the more pertinent and prevalent theories postulated in the social sciences. Thus the theories selected will cover the three aspects of contemporary anthropological, criminal, and social theory. That is, traditional, interactionist, and radical perspectives. The theories will be presented in that order drawing on the works of the major contributors to each.

2.1 Traditional Perspectives

The first theories we will look at are the traditional theories (also called Control Theories[9]) starting with Edwin H. Sutherland's Differential Association.

Sutherland followed the Chicago School approach to criminal theory[10], yet he wished to devise a more cohesive explanation due to existing Chicago School theories being criticised for being too vague[11]. Differential Association postulated that within any society that contains differing sub-cultures, some of these social environments would tend to encourage illegal activities, and others would not. For the purposes of this study, we can assume that Sutherland (and others) when referring to sub-culture mean the values and norms held by a group within the wider society, that are different from those views held by the majority[12].

Differential Association goes on to explain that individuals become deviant through the social process of associating with other members of the sub-culture, who are themselves carriers of deviant norms. Sutherland contends that within these sub-cultures peer groups are primarily responsible for this education of deviants. The variables involved in Differential Association reflect the following aspects of frequency, duration, priority, and intensity. These in turn represent the deviance of the individuals making up a subculture:

Frequency: refers to the number of times deviations occur, or frequency of association with the deviant sub-culture.

Duration: over what period of time the association with the sub-culture takes place.

Priority: at what stage in life association with the subculture occurs. The younger the age the more susceptible an individual is to taking on deviant sub-culture norms and values.

Intensity: this refers to the intensity of the relationship, the prestige of the person making the definition, or the amount of respect demanded by a peer, which effects an influential young member of a sub-culture.

We can now see why individuals become criminally deviant according to traditional theory, yet we still need to ask and answer the question; 'why do some sub-cultures encourage illegal activity (while others do not)?' To examine this question we must progress upon the theoretical framework we have embarked upon. In doing this we see that Emile Durkheim touches on this question with his notion of anomie which he used to refer to the thesis that in modern societies traditional norms and standards

become undermined without being replaced by new ones, leaving people feeling
disoriented and anxious.

Robert Merton expanded Durkheim's idea of anomie[13] to discover "how some social structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons in the society to engage in non-conforming rather than conforming conduct."[14] Merton termed this idea "socially derived sin" as opposed to the biblical and biological[15] notion of "original sin". Merton's theory centres around the reason why people deviate (anomie) and the types of deviance which people engage in, and it stresses that crime is the outcome of a strain between what people wish to achieve and what is possible, the theory is often referred to as strain theory.

In other words Merton, in this theory, was contending that all people want to achieve the same material success, but due to unequal opportunities many people (or sub-cultures) must resort to deviant actions in order to try and fulfil their ambitions. For example people wish for a large house with modern appliances, and two new cars. They cannot afford this with a conventional job, so turn to deviant criminal means to achieve these conventional ends.

Merton also recognised that political, economic and social institutions mean that not all people get equal access to realise the ideal of material success. Compounding this, not all people have been socialised to utilise the legitimate avenues that are available for them to achieve success. Therefore the discrepancy between peoples social desires, values, and goals on one hand, and their inability to achieve these goals through legitimate ends, on the other, results in anomie. Anomie once realised means that an individual or sub-culture who experience(s) these conditions is more likely

to use deviant means to assist them in achieving their material goals. Merton concluded that; "If we can locate groups peculiarly subject to such pressures, we should expect to find fairly high rates of deviant behaviour in these groups..."[16]

Merton goes on to identify five "modes of individual adaptation", which identify and explain Sutherland's sub-cultures:

1) Conformity - The majority of the population falls into this category, accepting generally held values and conventional methods of achieving these goals. These values are kept regardless of the level of success they enjoy.

2) Innovation - This group is made up of those people who accept generally held values, but use deviant (illegal) methods to achieve these values.

3) Ritualism - This group consists of those who conform to socially accepted standards, although they have lost sight of the values that initially prompted the activity. For example someone who is engaging in a job that has no further prospects and pays poorly.

4) Retreatism - This group consists of those who reject the dominant values and the conventional methods of achieving these values. A typical example of this is alternative communities.

5) Rebellion - Those who reject the dominant values and the normative means, but wish to actively reconstruct the social system. Political radicals and anarchists afford an example.

Though we are now enlightened as to the different people who make up the different sub-cultures and in which capacity they act, we have yet to answer how the people within these sub-cultures can perform in a seemingly prescribed (deviant) manner.

That is, anomie tells us why people become deviant, but not how they are able to be deviant.

Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin[17] have an answer for us, arrived at by linking Sutherland and Merton's theories. Cloward and Ohlin felt that Merton had exempted the existence of an *illegitimate opportunity structure*[18] (this title is sometimes used to describe Cloward and Ohlin's theory) that ran parallel to the legal one. In other words, Cloward and Ohlin saw levels of opportunity as stratified within both the legal and illegal sub-cultures. Just because an individual utilised the underground economy, was not necessarily because they could not achieve in conventional society. The illegitimate opportunity structure has three levels: criminal subculture, conflict subculture and retreatist subculture. The criminal subculture exists when there is a stable, cohesive community (sub-culture) with contact with both the mainstream legal community and the illegal one. This subculture has several functions: It means stolen goods can be sold through the wider community. It provides for successful criminal role models to inspire aspiring criminals. Finally it provides an age demographic for criminals to travel through, for example a deviant teenager has older contacts and role models to encourage continued deviant behaviour and provide continued contacts.

In the conflict subculture, the methods of peer support and contacts of the criminal subculture are not present. Therefore, the resulting participants violently vent their frustration at their perceived career failure. An example of this is gang warfare which provides for a social hierarchy of fear (often interpreted as respect) for the physically successful combatant.

The retreatist subculture is the final level of Cloward and Ohlin's criminal subculture. Individuals who are unable to achieve in criminal and violent subcultures turn their failure into drug and alcohol addiction, paid for by petty theft, shoplifting and prostitution.

Cloward and Ohlin established this theoretical structure whilst studying youth gangs in America. They argued that these gangs emerge in "sub-cultural communities, where chances of achieving success legitimately are small"[19]. These gangs accept the desirability of material goods (as with differential association), but these ideas are filtered through gang networks, the result being theft of material items for resale or ownership. This fits in with Merton's type two, the innovator (as we are yet to see, this also applies to the participants involved in this study). Albert Cohen[20] also adheres to this explanation, except he rejects the idea of an acceptance of material desire and consequently sees all theft in the same light as fighting and vandalism that is, a rejection of 'respectable' society. This would be more in line with Merton's type five, rebellion.

This structural idea of deviation, as purported by Sutherland, Merton, Cloward, and Ohlin, has been criticised for relying on the supposition that all people and societies have the same values and desire to achieve material and monetary success. Lemert, although largely a supporter of Merton's theory[21], says "The associated ends-means schema, while it may be valid for the analysis of deviation in situations or societies with patterned values, is insufficient for this purpose in pluralistic value situations."[22] This problem is also associated with differential association, as it also presupposes that poorer people aspire to the same level of success as those who are affluent and consequently can only be applied to these people. This type of criminal

activity, it logically follows, would be prevalent where a major gap between aspirations and opportunities exists.

2.2 Interactionist Perspectives.

Interactionist perspectives on deviance and crime centre around labelling theory, and it is claimed that "...labelling theorists have presented a more enlightened and progressive response to problems of crime and criminal justice in our society than have most of the traditional approaches."[23] Labelling theory illustrates Newbold's[24] earlier definition of deviance, as it shows that deviance arises through its contrast with non-deviance. Interactionism illustrates the idea that people actively go about creating their own lives, that people make decisions based upon their subjective interpretation of a given situation[25]. Society is therefore seen, not as the controlling force of the people, but as the product of people's interactions with it.

Becker defines labelling theory with reference to deviance thus:

Social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labelling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an "offender." The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behaviour that people so label.[26]

Willem Dienstien describes labelling theory within a social context: "...society also defines the offender. It tells us how he is viewed, what he is in the eyes of the people. What he is, is realised in the manner in which he is treated by the agencies of control... The affluent person who steals and the poor person who steals both commit theft. The affluent person is called a kleptomaniac, a psychological term, the poor person is called a thief, a social term."[28]

Labelling theory, unlike anomie and differential theory, does not look at deviance as a set of characteristics of individuals or groups. Labelling theory claims that those in positions of power, such as the police and the law, provide the labels for others. The rules in terms of which deviance is defined, and the context in which they are applied can be seen as following a Marxist approach. As the wealthy define it for the poor, men for women, the older for the younger, and the ethnic majorities for the ethnic minorities. Therefore once a person is labelled as deviant by one of the dominate forces, they are stigmatised and treated and considered as untrustworthy. This in turn pushes the individual into a more marginalised philosophy and they begin to view themselves as deviant and act accordingly.

Edwin Lemert[29] sees Labelling Theory as having two distinct parts. The initial act of being labelled by the dominant forces in society is termed primary deviation. Secondary deviation occurs when the individual comes to accept their label and sees themselves and interprets their acts as deviant.

Giddens comments that "Labelling theory is important because it begins from the assumption that no act is intrinsically criminal. Definitions of criminality are

established by the powerful through the formation of laws and their interpretation by the

police, courts, and correctional institutions."[30]

The actual process of labelling someone is not as straightforward as it may

at first seem as there are several different elements involved. Moore uses the studies of

Kitsue, Reiss, and Becker to identify three parts to labelling theory[31]. The first he calls

Variability; this is the notion that not all people perceive all people in the same way, even

if they have observed the individual carrying out the same deviant act.

The second part of the dynamic of labelling is that it is negotiable or

reflexive. This refers to the idea that we often change our views and consequently our

labels of people, depending on circumstances and contact. For example, a person is often

labelled on a first meeting due to the first impression they make and perhaps the clothes

they wear or vehicle they drive. Subsequent contact and interaction with the same

individual may result in a different perception of them.

Finally, Moore adopts Becker's term of master status. This refers to the

idea that once an individual has gained a label, this label is then used to interpret all of

their actions, past and present. For example, if an individual is labelled a thief, their new

clothes will be perceived by the labeller as having been stolen.

Three main criticisms of labelling theory exist. First, labelling theory is

not arbitrary; differences in socialisation attitudes, and opportunities of individuals

influence how far people engage in behaviour particularly susceptible to being labelled

deviant. Second, and most obvious, calling someone a deviant or criminal does not

necessarily make one so, as people may not be all that susceptible to labelling. Third

Giddens says "...we have to investigate the overall development of modern systems of

law judiciary and police if we are to understand how and why different types of labels come to be applied."[32] Albert Cohen offers a similar comment:[33]"deviance is defined in terms of the application of rules to *particular people* and a labelling of them as outsiders."[34] Reiss offers similar again: "...while an individual may deviate from norms without any organisation being deviant, there is no individual deviance that does not involve social interaction and organisation.[35]" What is essentially being said is that in order to be deviant one must be taking part in the larger social arena, that is society, and within this society are a number of hierarchies of power. This has particular relevance when looked at with regard to Labelling Theory, as it is for precisely this reason Labelling Theory is said to operate. It is the wider societies view of the individual which is what Giddens, Lemert and Reiss are referring to, and without fully understanding why labels are applied one cannot fully comprehend their full implications.

Cornish and Clarke[36] propose a theory, called, rational choice interpretation. This takes the view that individuals are more responsible for their own actions than society. Rational choice interpretation suggests that individuals make decisions on whether or not to break the law based on rational decision making; individuals will make the decision to engage in deviant behaviour based upon the pros and cons of such an action. They will weigh up the value and benefits of performing an action versus the risk of getting caught.

The idea that an individual who enters a shop, sees an item and then proceeds to procure it without paying, is seen as analogous with an impulse purchase, as the same decision process is gone through. The argument follows that given that an individual is prepared to consider engaging in a criminal activity, many criminal acts

involve quite ordinary decision making processes, even if they are in extraordinary circumstances.

2.3 Radical Theory

Radical theories offer the idea that crime is located in the historical development and structure of society's institutions. If interactionist theories offer a microcosmic look at deviance and crime then this is the opposite, the macrocosm. Thus most radical (also referred to as Marxist or critical theory) analysis would suggest that the historical development of capitalism was and is intrinsically linked to the development of our particular criminal law. Criminal law, in turn, is primarily responsible for the origin and development of crime itself. Capitalism, criminal law, and crime are therefore inseparable, as they form a social and historical process. Turk comments that:

...Marxian and Weberian criminologists clearly agree that laws, law breaking, and law enforcement originate in and contribute to patterns of social conflict and of disproportionate power. Both assail and reject any alternative biologistic, psychological, functionalist, or evolutionist explanations of the phenomena of legality or illegality. Distinctions between the legal and the nonlegal are understood to be primarily the products of effort by more powerful groups to justify and strengthen their dominant positions... The proposition that economic exploration and the political repression that makes it possible account directly and indirectly for most deviant behaviour.[37]

We will divide the arguments of radical criminologists into three separate headings: Socio-economic class, power and authority relationships, and finally new criminology of left realism.

Socio-economic class arguments are most closely associated with Marx, Bonger and Quinney. When Marx's views are applied to crime, it is apparent that crime is a result of class conflict, which in turn is based upon economic inequality. Therefore, Marxists would argue that to reduce the rate of crime, a classless society needs to emerge. Problems associated with this theory are its obviously monodimensional nature and that its dated view of the labour force and market meaning it is hard to apply this to a situation in a contemporary society.

Bonger[38] follows this deterministic Marxist framework in arguing that crimes are committed due to the fact that the economic interests of society are in conflict. Most people are deprived of the means of production and consequently come under the economic control of those who own the means of production. This in turn creates a situation where the workers are disenfranchised. These dispossessed masses commit crimes relating to their economic subjugation (Bourgeois crime is also related to the economy). Huff had this to say in summarising Bongor's theory "...it must be said that Bonger's theory of crime causation was basically a global, unidimensional one based on classical Marxist theory."[39]

The traditional functionalist perspective has also been challenged by Walter Millar in his publication on subcultural delinquency[40]. Millar postulated that lower class subcultures in American society were not criminally deviant due to striving for material success that they could not achieve, nor were they disorganised. Instead, it is

the socialisation process in these subcultures that emphasises different (criminally deviant) values. This differential socialisation process was a result of heterogeneous culture, due to the in-migration of various cultural groups.

Millar argued that deviance occurred due to differential conduct norms and differential socialisation. In other words, a subculture may instil values or socialise behaviour amongst its members, which are considered consistent with the subculture, yet viewed as deviant by the larger society. As a consequence these lower class values bring the subculture into conflict with the dominant classes in society.

With regard to power and authority relationships, Weber added the two variables of power and prestige to the unidimensional Marxist notion of property to help explain social stratification. When this is taken from a Weberian criminologist point of view, it is said that the differential distribution of power and prestige, coupled with the notion of social stratification, are crucial variables in the analysis of crime and crime control. This notion of crime is defined by Weber as the ability to secure compliance against someone's will to do otherwise. The Weberian view sees deviance as pervasive in all societies and subcultures, and as indicative of the political struggle subcultures engage in, in order to achieve power, prestige, and status in a stratified society.

Dahrendorf and Turk both follow this basic Weberian theory, centering on the relationships between authorities and their subjects. Dahrendorf sees Marx's concept of class as better served by the concept of authority. Turk also uses this notion of authority to explain criminal deviance as being defined by those in authority and not by the "subjects" who must accept or resist "such law creating, interpreting, and enforcing

decisions"[41]. Deviance is therefore seen as the outlet for subjects (sub-cultures) conflict with those in power.

Finally the New Criminology Of Left Realism starts from the observation that high crime rates of the "working class" are a reflection of the fact that these people actually commit the majority of crime. New Left realists do not argue, as Marxists would, that this is due to overt bourgeois oppression towards these people causing more proletarians to be prosecuted and convicted than their higher earning counterparts. The New Left focuses on the following elements; subculture, relative deprivation and marginalisation.

Subculture is seen as a response to problems. Those who are criminally deviant exist in subcultures as a response to their particular problems and position in society. Members of a subculture are not necessarily aware of this.

Structurally speaking, the problems members of a subculture face are a direct result of the political and economic system they are part of. In other words, capitalism ensures that some people are less powerful and wealthy than others, and this causes problems for members of less well off subcultures.

The values of the subculture are those of wider society and because of this the "marginalised" subculture feels they must act in a criminally deviant manner to succeed.

The subculture's criminal deviance is not socially fostered through the generations, it is recreated by each generation according to their subjective experiences and the context in which they live.

Unlike what Millar suggests, New Left theorists Lea and Young[42] contend that the working class does not have an alternative set of values from the dominant class. Instead their values are constantly changing, reflecting the broader changes in society. Lea and Young contend that unemployment and poverty are not directly the cause of crime. Instead people measure their situation against others, and so their deprivation is relative. Therefore a materially poor person may not feel deprived if all around them are in a similar financial situation. Conversely, if such a person was surrounded and constantly aware of objectively rich individuals, they would feel more aggrieved. Lea and Young argue that contemporary youth feel frustrated and bitter due to the disparity between their high expectations and the reality of what they can actually achieve, which in turn means some of them turn to crime to enable them to solve their problems.

Marginalisation occurs primarily to the youth, because they have no voice or avenues with which to vent their opinions and concerns. Workers are at least able to picket and strike in order to gain attention to their plight.

Three main criticisms of new left theory exist:

1) Too much emphasis is placed upon working class crime and its causes. Marxists would argue that more attention needs to be turned towards white collar crime and law creation.

2) It is no radical breakthrough to say that the crime statistics are a reflection of the true situation.

3) It is not really a new approach to criminal and social theory, as it follows a traditionalist approach, such as Merton's anomie and places it in a more radical perspective.

In conclusion, we can see that traditional theories explain deviance as a consequence of individual socialisation and interactionist and radical theories explain deviance as a consequence of the distribution of power in society. As is the case when dealing with individuals within society, all these theories offer useful guidance to the study of deviance, within the appropriate circumstance. When taken as a theoretical whole, they give a large frame of reference with which to work and so are particularly useful to this study, with reference to the following analysis of the participants.

If we were to look at all these theories, premises and conclusions, what could we expect a criminally deviant individual to be, what characteristics would be evident? The individual would be a member of an objectively viewed deviant sub-culture, which had lost sight of the majority societies values, yet still wished to achieve in a materiel world. They would be engaged in criminally deviant activity within their sub-culture. They would be viewed by the powerful in society as deviants, and would believe it themselves, and act accordingly. They would feel that the criminally deviant career they were involved with was both the result of their own interpretation of the world, and consequently a rational choice, and also the result of pressure exerted by capitalist society which had marginalised them into this position. They would be male, young (16-24 years old), violent, unemployed, unqualified and a habitual drug user, with an unstable family life.