I SHOP THEREFORE I AM;
DOES THE SOCIETY OF CONSUMPTION DRIVE CRIMINAL ACTIVITY IN LATE LIQUID MODERNITY?

By Grace Morrison[1]

Abstract

This small scale research project utilises secondary analysis of 6 texts to lay the foundations into the study of criminal motivation in an increasingly individualised society. In order to achieve this it traces the history of criminology as a science and consumption as a socially constructed phenomenon back to their inceptions.

It explores how consumption has become the grand narrative in contemporary society and examines the political and economic context in which this has flourished. It traces criminological thought back to its founders and assess the impact on which it has on modern criminological thought, whilst noting the flaws in its foundations.

It will argue and demonstrate how desire has been manipulated in the core of our biological being and harnessed into consumerism allowing the Kenyan capitalist economic system to grow. It will show the relationship this holds to modern criminal activity.

This paper will conclude that access to the consumption market is the Holy Grail for modern citizens and criminal activity is a result of exclusion to this market and of a revolutionizing process of repression from our basic animalistic drives. It will also show that criminology as an academic discipline and practical science needs to move away from its preoccupation with controlling crime risks and encourage more original thought into discovering individual criminal motivations, rather than nostalgically comparing out dated and flawed theories.

---

[1] University of Teesside, School of Social Sciences and Law, MSc Criminology

Introduction

According to Heinberg (2011) western society is in the midst of the 'fifth great turning in human history' (283). This describes an epochal shift in the organisation, cogitation and rationalisation of social life. Yet this paper will determine that social sciences including criminology is persistently dominated by 'the classic liberal mainstream maintain[ing] its dominant discourse of free will and faulty socialisation in long-running tension with social liberalism's discourse of poverty and social in equality' (Hall & Winlow, 2012, 1). This leaves criminology being reduced to constant rehashing of out dated theories when trying to explain new criminological phenomenon's is it a 'rediscovery of moral panics, sub-cultural resistance and the aggressive labelling and the demonization of the powerless' (Hall & Winlow, 2012, 6). Which this paper will argue leaves the current criminologist with the 'Tower of Babel'- 'a dizzying array of contradictory visions of individuals and the social order, with correspondingly varied definitions of crime and deviance' (Hall, 2012, 5). There is a compilation of theories which are seen as the *classical* theoretical cannon for criminology, which up and coming as well as current criminologists are forced into scrutinizing and evaluating against one another to assess their contribution to current criminological understanding. Therefore there is no encouragement to explore what could be, or what is, renouncing 'little sense of real momentum in the aetiological-theoretical sphere' (Ibid, 2), furthermore it leaves criminology –as a moral and practical science- as 'largely anodyne, entropic and politically ineffective' (Hall, 2012, 1).

This study will establish how this is a result of pre-emptive thought dominating criminology since the days of Beccaria: the risk of crime should be reduced to appealing to one's logical, rational choice, yet no persons logic is identical it is subjective to every one's own symbolic order, a fatal flaw which is over looked. This is not only the foundations on which modern criminal justice is based, but also the increased security state.

It will show that individuality is omitted from criminology and criminal justice; it aims to show that rational choice is subjective rather than a collective given. For example Adam Lazanowski a homeless teenager pleaded guilty to shoplifting food from a Canterbury shop on October 6th 2012 [Canterbury People online], his rationalisation being the need to eat, the exclusion from the market forced him to partake in criminal activity. Whereas the case of Anthony Worrall Thompson, who was caught shoplifting wine and cheese from a Tesco store in Henley-on-Thames, his rationalisation is somewhat different from Adam. Anthony is a celebrity chef who claims that he is not in finical difficulty and the items which he stole were not a necessity to his survival [Daily mail online], therefore the rationalisation of these two cases should be dealt with in context. A fatal flaw as this paper will demonstrate in the current system from its conception. It should place individuality into context of other social constructs such as politics and the economy.

As the security state dominates the criminological sphere, increasingly over the years alternative theories have been weaned out which will be examined in this paper. Knowledge is power according to Foucault, and in this case one maybe inclined to agree, the dominating discourse control the power and therefore the knowledge that is produced within that discourse. Funding into criminology is dominated by ways to reduce crime levels and the risk of crime, the funding to explore why there is a need for criminal activity is non-existent. The text books in which we refer to when researching any kind of phenomenon have all been edited, the author becomes God like in the sense that they decide which theory is important and which should be excluded, these are then primary references for most students and professionals alike, and what is forgot is the theories that did not make the cut, that did not

suit the power institutions of that time, a fact which this paper will set the foundations for rectifying.

Through criminological enquiry this paper will return to a selection of the excluded theories, to show how although they do not fit the ideals of the liberals, they have merit, and can be used as foundations for exploring criminal motivation. This involves criminology being a 'parasite' as Cohen (1998) describes it: 'criminology attaches itself to its hosts subjects-notably law, psychology, psychiatry and sociology- and draws from them methods, theories and creditability' (cited in Tierney, 2003, 12). This paper will explore a plethora of theories within the realms of social science, including sociology and psychology, however far from being a parasite; it is needed to fully understand the context of the social actor and their choices within the context of their social world. Without drawing on other social science theories and methods, we are left with one dimensional theory which provides little understanding into our social reality and therefore criminal activity.

Firstly it will explore a sociological concept, one must not forget whatever our theoretical standpoint, that criminology is grounded deeply in sociology: one cannot discuss, study or conceptualise crime in society, without looking into society itself. Each theory must be contextualised into the societal activity of the time, for example the introduction of the Anti-Terrorism Act (2001) is placed in context of the events of September 11. In regards to this study consumption is where our interests lie.

Consumption will be assessed as the new grand narrative of society, it has infiltrated every aspect of social life and 'to understand contemporary society, it is essential to understand the role of consumption' (Sumner, 2004, 143), moreover 'the new and distinct consumer-driven patterns of relationships and integrative transformations are forcing us to reconsider virtually every aspect of contemporary society' (Ibid). This should of course include criminology, criminal theory, criminal behaviour and the criminal justice system. However due to the scope of this piece it will be restricted to criminology in general and criminal motivation: 'criminology must go further and develop new and more sophisticated "deprivation" models that specifically consider the phenomenal rise in consumer culture' (Ibid, 149).

It will prove how consumption is the driving force in society and with this is it must encompass other areas of exploration, including the economy, the individual and society as a collective body –which will include politics. Each of these elements is intertwined in a non-linear historical process which has led us to the fifth great turn in human history.

To move criminology forward as an effective study of crime, this paper argues it must separate from the celebrated theorists of the twentieth century and incorporate consumption as a grand narrative for social biographies of the modern citizen as Sumner (2004) points out:

> '*If conscious impulsivity is becoming a characteristic feature of modern society, then might it not be the case for future exploration of this line of inquiry could provide a possible way forward for criminology*'
>
> (2004,156).

It will show how in order to study this effectively with positive theoretical and practical influences the modern criminologist must take into account the following:

'*It is important that criminology seeks to engage the political economy of states of exception and the way in which such states may be driven by complex motives that extend beyond the search for 'security'*

(Mythen & Walklate, 2012 in Hall & Winlow, eds, 2012, 328).

It will examine how criminology can no longer ignore other social processes in which it is deeply rooted and entwined, it is this climate in which Reiner (2007) 'suggests that criminology should return to the investigation of motivation' (Hall, 2012, 2) whilst placing in it the context of the social world in which we find ourselves.

This paper will demonstrate the birth of the consumer culture whilst tracing the historical processes which have enabled it to become the new grand narrative. Additionally it will trace the history of criminology as an academic discipline and practical science, evaluating the major theories and the alternatives which were pushed aside. It will then explore all of these theories, and their merit in this overly individualised competitive society, providing the foundations for more in depth research into this lacking area of originality. Secondary analysis will be utilised to pinpoint criminal motivations in modern society, with particular reference to economic and political circumstances. It will touch on every aspect in society, such as crime, family life, work life, personal relationships and the loss of reality. It will also take in account the riots of 2011 and the economic bubble burst of 2008. It will conclude that a need for a return to a more individualised understanding of criminal motivation in context will be required in a bid to answer the crime problem in liquid modernity.

Methodology

When embarking on this process it was originally planned that a questionnaire would be devised and carried out to evaluate if we resided in a consumer culture and what its relationship was to criminality, however after devising the questionnaire and reading the literature, it became apparent that this was not the most effective method: the literature available on consumer culture clearly demonstrated that we are ruled by consumerism, and without establishing a longstanding trustworthy relationship with those who commit criminal activity the questionnaires would not produce, honest, reliable or valid results.

To gain honest, reliable and valid results one would have ideally personally interviewed participants over an established time period, however due to ethical and time constraints, for this small scale research project, this was not possible. As a social scientist researcher setting out on an inductive exploratory project, preferably 'information [should be] straight from the horse's mouth' (Denscombe, 2012, 156), yet to ensure reliability and validity interviews should be based on a relationship of trust with the participant and the researcher(s) where the 'social climate is open enough to allow full and honest answers' (Ibid). Taking this into consideration it was decided that this project would take a theoretical approach; the literature review which is 'the most important part of any research project' (Crow and Semmens, 2008, 82), is sub-divided into components and critically evaluated, whilst introducing the basis for this papers theory.

These sections where born out of the literature on the particular topics. Some of the particular sections concentrate on original criminological theory therefore are profoundly reliant on specific criminologists, this is because the area which this paper addresses is innovative and there are limited studies into these areas. For this reason there are sections which also

introduce my own analysis into this modern area of criminological enquiry, which is verified by substantial analytical evidence. This can be rectified in future studies as the knowledge base grows.

To gain the evidence required to corroborate these inductive and pioneering lines of criminological exploration secondary analysis was utilised, this is because secondary analysis allows 'readily accessible data set [that] can enable students to carry out their own analysis in an area of substantive importance' (Dale *et al,* 1988, 3). Although there are some limitations to secondary analysis I have overcome these to the best of my ability, to increase the reliability and validity of my research project. Firstly, secondary analysis is generally more accepted in the line of quantitative enquiry, this is because it is claimed that when utilising it in qualitative research unless one was a primary researcher on the project one cannot fully understand the data, (Crow and Semmens, 2008). Additionally unless it is the raw data which one is performing analysis on 'often you will be reading and reviewing data which has been analysed by the researchers' (Ibid). To counter act these pit falls, I researched the contexts in which the chosen texts where researched in, which I believe have led to my independent new interpretation of the data, moreover from the texts I ignored all analysis on the interviews that the authors supplied, I simply lifted the interview exerts from the texts. If ethical implications had allowed I would have preferred the raw data to remove the limitations, however this was not possible in this project.

There were 5 texts chosen for this analysis even though the number of qualitative interviews that are generally regarded as producing reliable results is 6 (Bryman, 2008), there were only 5 which were plausible for this inductive research due to the area of inquiry. These were chosen as a non-random purposive sample would be. This is to ensure the reliability and validity of the data sets. Because of the wide range in participants from these texts I would argue that the findings in this research project are there for generalizable. If I had been allowed to interview the sampling strategy would have changed accordingly.

To fully understand the context of the interview exerts each text was researched and evaluated:

Criminal Identities and Consumer Culture: Crime, Exclusion and the New Culture of Narcissm. By Hall, Winlow and Ancrum 2008. This research provided essential information for my study as they interviewed *active* criminals, which as a post graduate student I would not have gained access to. They had a long standing reliable relationship with the participants which provided honest, candid answers, making their study valid and a vial source in investigating criminal motivations. Although it should be noted that these were limited to the North East.

Out of Sight: Crime, Youth and Exclusion in Modern Britain. By McAuley, 2007. This research consisted of 12 months interviewing and Participant observation of 33 young adults, from a rundown estate. This is valid as the participant observation indicates trust between McAuley and the participants.

Reluctant Gangsters: The Changing Faces of Youth Crime: The Changing Shape of Youth Crime. By Pitts, 2008. He studied the emergence and life of youth gangs within 3 high crime estates, he had a large mix sample of 300 participants, making his findings valid and reliable. He used interviews and ethnographic research to immerse himself in the gang life culture. Although he only studied gangs the information and exerts were useful in identifying

criminal motivation and the socialisation of criminals. He also spoke to workers within the social system who had in-depth contact with these gang members.

Street Crime. By Hallsworth, 2005. This text provided no useable data for my project, there was very little that I could export; therefore I omitted it from my secondary analysis.

Violent Night: Urban Leisures' and Consumer Culture. By Winlow and Hall 2006. This study is restricted to the North East, therefore my results and findings from this alone would not have been generalizable, but in conjunction with the others makes my results generalizable. However they established a strong relationships with their 43 interviewees, in which open and direct questioning was adopted, allowing the respondents to answer in the same way. They used a snowball sample, which is the best for studying these areas as respondents otherwise would be hard to come by, to ensure their validity most were taped.

As a researcher one must be prepared for 'the possibility that new material maybe published during the life of a project' (Crow and Semmens, 2008, 82), this indeed happened, and as a consequence I chose to add an additional text to the secondary analysis:

Shopocalypse Now: Consumer Culture and the English Riots of 2011. Treadwell, Briggs, Winlow and Hall, 2012. This research took place in only London and Birmingham, over 4 days of the 2011 riots and because of the nature not all were recorded and notes were made after the conversations. They spoke to 30 rioters and orchestrated follow up interviews when possible, this again used a snow ball sample. Because of the nature of the interviews and where they took place, reliability and validity is as good as it would have been able to be in these circumstances, however the rich in-depth rare data it produced, should outweigh any methodological concerns. This is why it was included in this paper, it provides interview exerts and data on the riots from participant's who were involved and in the context of this project, that data is vital in uncovering new analysis.

In summary the methods on this piece are not without its limitations, but no research project is, I have taken into consideration all possible limitations and overcome them to provide a piece which is not only original but has reliable, valid and generalizable findings and conclusions.

A Place in History

> *'To understand contemporary consumer culture in society one needs to consider a long historical process in which new forms of consumption disengaged themselves bit by bit from rigid social stratification'*

(Sassatelli, 2007, 32).

As with other western countries Britain evolved, decisions made in history have affected our lives greatly, yet as social actors we rarely acknowledge this fact, or indeed understand it. For the up and coming generations it will be difficult to comprehend a social world without the internet or social networking sites, yet little under 40 years ago the mobile phone was merely invented. The use of computers will be taken for granted for these generations, and we are already experiencing a shift from traditional desk top computers, to lap top computers and now we are left with the new innovations of the Ipad(s) and Note books, which will in time, render the more traditional computer useless and dated. This is just one of many contemporary examples of how history evolves. To trace the history of consumption and

criminological thought we must delve to the fourteenth century. This chapter will trace societal changes and evaluate how these have brought us to the birth of criminology.

Sombart (1928) argues that we can see traces of a development of a new type of society as far back as the fourteenth century, where he argues that the economy went from a feudal one, to one based on market capital and trade, aided by the discovery of new precious metals (Sassatelli, 2007, 20-21). Additionally in the fifteenth century King Henry VII signed the first treaty agreement: the Magus Intercrusus- allowing trade privileges between the English and the Flemish. Allowing consumption to be enjoyed, at this point, only by the noble classes, proving Sombart right when he claimed that: 'luxury has the capacity to create markers' (Ibid, 21). The King wished to enjoy these luxury items from the Flemish, as a sign of distinction not only from his subjects, but also from other monarchs. This is resounding evidence that by the fifteenth century there was an 'upward spiral of production and consumption' (Sombart in, Hall, 2012, 223).

In the seventeenth century the seeds of capitalism were firmly being sown and nourished by society, through the growth in the dispersal of luxury and exotic items and increased trade. An example is the growth in the sugar, Tabaco and Tea industries: 'the diffusion of sugar and new stimulants seemed to have played an important role in revolutionising consumption' (Mintz cited in Sassatelli, 14). However the changes which occurred from the fifteenth century to the seventeenth century also facilitated the growth and availability of these items: 'by the second half of the seventeenth century people of every class and gender began to acquire via the market, many more finished goods' (Ibid). This marks the materialization of consumption infiltrating society. The desire for these non-essential items is the driving force of capitalism, however to keep the wheels in motion these goods must be accessible to all and as the lower classes gained access to the market, the elites –not wanting to be associated with the lower classes, moved on to different goods, as a marker of distinction. This highlights how distinction and a sense of collectiveness drives capitalism.

Adopting an anti-productivist view, history dictates that it is in fact desire that allowed consumption and capitalism to commence there turbulent romance, rather than production, if there was no desire for the products there would be no market hence no need for production: It wasn't until the nineteenth century that Britain experienced the first factory production, and this wasn't capitalised on until Henry Ford in the early 1900s, by this time the market for these products was already firmly in motion. Otherwise there would be no need to make these products, faster, more efficiently or more accessible. This desire and craving of goods and the reasons for such, are often over looked and dismissed in both sociology and criminology.

Whilst these processes were being undertaken there was a group of intellectuals whom sought to revolutionise the power institutions within Britain, as the monarchic power became to share its burden with parliament -and eventually be replaced by it- the age of enlightenment was upon society. These thinkers 'sought a rational and humane social order in contradiction to the arbitrary power of the absolute monarchy' (Valier, 2002, 6), with this they seen the 'rule of law central to the constitution of a new society' (Ibid). Previous to the eighteenth century most explanations of crime and deviance lent towards the supernatural (Fadaei-Tehrani & Green, 2002, 789), within its context it is understandable as the people often turned to the Church for solutions to social problems, such as education and poverty. However the classical thinkers desired a system which would be based on logic and the rational thinking of man. A system that 'defend[ed] their interests and protect their rights and liberties' (Young, 1990, 6), one which was concerned with 'the establishment of a reformed, equitable and efficient system of justice' (Tierney, 2003, 54).

César Beccaria (1738-1794) -regarded as the founder of classical criminology- created the first outline of a penal system in his text Dei Delitti e de Pene (on Crimes and Punishment), in this he outlined that criminals are infringing on the social contract –which they entered upon at birth- and as a result of this infringement they should be punished, repaying their debt to society therefore rebalancing the social harmony. He believed that social actors are rational cost weighing individuals who acted on a pleasure pain principle, therefore if the punishments were fixed, and applied equally to all citizens, rationality would work as it should and crime would cease to exist. Jeremy Bentham followed Beccaria, he believed that people operated on the 'hedonistic calculus' (Fadaei-Tehrani & Green, 2002,782), and that the punishment of any crime should outweigh the possible pleasure from committing it, he again believed in the social contract of society and emphasised the greatest happiness for the greatest number (Hopkins-Burke, 2001).

The classical school of criminology is based on free will and the motivation for criminal activity is assumed to be on the hedonistic pursuit of pleasure; the law should apply equally to all and the only role the courts should play is determining guilt. There is a loss of individuality in this school of thought as social actors are seen as part of a collective in the social contract. If we return to the example in the introduction of this piece, Adam who was trying to survive another day is reduced to a criminal who impeded the contract and therefore should be punished as such, his individual circumstances hold no baring in his case; his choice is reduced to become a criminal or starve, hardly the equal system they had anticipated. This is because they wished for the legal system to be held separate from the other social institutions including political input, yet how can a social institution be held separate from the others in society and be effective. Moreover unless all men are equal in the other realms of social influence, they cannot be equal in any, meaning unless we all have the same opportunities in life no social institution will ever be regarded as equal, life chances effect every aspect of our society, which is a system of interrelated institutions.

Generally classical criminology is based on deterrence, which presumes too many factors to be efficient, a misconception that is still present in our current criminological climate. The main predisposition is that the offender must believe they are going to be caught for the core principle of deterrence to work, however in the increased state of security that we find ourselves, crime is still being committed and is arguably rising. Additionally, it assumes that criminals hold a lack of control in committing crimes from reasons like not being socialised in to the *contract* sufficiently to addictive behaviour, it provides no insight into individual circumstances on why people would actually commit an offense, again a problem which plagues our system today unsurprisingly, as the modern day criminal justice system is largely based on this line of criminological thought. As the classical school wanted the court system to be separate from the criminal justice system, one can assume that the assumed the same of the economic and political systems.

Misleadingly seen as the opposite to classical criminology, is the positivistic school, based on ideas by Comte and Darwin it 'emphasises the use of the scientific method to understand the factors that mitigate free will and cause criminality' (Fadaei-Tehrani & Green, 2002, 782), the core principle of this method is that 'only through science could truth be found' (Tierney, 2003, 55). The founder of this school Lombroso searched for a criminal type, 'using prisons as a ready-made lab, criminals were classified into psychological types' (Ibid), from this he believed that causes of behaviour and cures could be found. There is no doubt in the criminological sphere that his findings were invalid and would not meet the rigorous ethical standards which we have now. However what he did establish was new a way of viewing and studying criminal types this inspired positivistic criminologists to 'construct new

laws explaining criminal behaviour, which could be used to predict and hence control future events' (Valier, 2002, 6). Eric Ferri (1856-1929) investigated further than his predecessor; he believed that a range of factors must be studied to engage in a holistic picture of criminal activity. 'He radically proposed that crime could be controlled by improving the social conditions of the poor' (Hopkins-Burke, 2001, 66), therefore he seen under socialisation of the social actor as the causes of criminality (Young, 1990). From this he 'provided a new ideology and a new set of aims for penal systems…. to organise programmes which would bring about the desired change' (Hudson, 1987, 8). This is another major aspect of our current criminal justice system 'first they were diagnosed, then offered treatment, then realised when cured' (Ibid, 10) known as rehabilitation. Although Ferri states that improving social circumstances would decrease crime, rehabilitation leaves the responsibility on changing the individual rather than society, and one maybe mislead in thinking this returns to individual criminal motivations and activity, however it is more about coping strategies for those who do not seem to be coping with life as well as others, such as mental health interventions or drug treatment programmes. Furthermore it removes all individual criminal motivations as it removes personal accountability from the criminal and lays the blame directly with society, whilst offering no suggested changes in society. This school of thought dominated the criminal justice sphere until the 1960s, however it merely penetrated it compared to the impact of classical criminology.

What classicalism and positivism established from the start of the eighteenth century is a framework of thought that criminology has not been able to escape, it's difficult to comprehend that the reasons for committing crimes in their hay day are similar to that what we are experiencing now, and centuries later they have clearly been proven not to work either separately or in conjunction. Without understanding what criminology was founded on it one cannot explore what its dominance is. As the classical criminologists were arguing we all have equal choices, the divide between the have and have not's became more apparent with the importation of luxury goods from sailing expeditions, and while the positivist were claiming it's a societal problem they were trying to *fix* the individual, where the increase of stimulants are available to *escape* your problems. Neither looked at the context in which their ideas were being born from, and what it meant for society. Both schools of thought ignored the impact of the psychological theories coming through at the time as well as the role of desire and the economy, three fundamental aspects needed to understand criminal activity.

The Playground for the Odyssean Trickster

'*From the 14th century in England what we can see quite clearly is a broad networked and formalised reticular system of criminalisation and criminal justice system that* **evolved** *to an aid an economic project that needed concurrently to stimulate and pacify a volatile population and facilitate geo-social interaction, production, trade and governance*'

(Hall, 2007 cited in 2012, 23-24, emphasis added).

'*Yes, as through this world I've wandered
I've seen lots of funny men;
Some will rob you with a Six-gun,
And some with a fountain pen.*'

(Pretty Boy Floyd, Guthrie, 1958)

From the fourteenth century social attitude was changing. This chapter will explore these changes in attitudes; it will show how these changes have resulted in crime types that we experience today and how this behaviour was encouraged, resulting in a shift in socialisation and moralisation.

This chapters' title is borrowed from a notion used by Adorno and Horkheimer (1992), who claimed that the deregulation of trading, exploitation of female vanity and other targets of early marketing polys became an arena –or playground- for the gamesters (Hall, 2012, 39), with a passion for deception and trickery. These gamesters embodied individualisation, they had no empathy for those they would trick or con and did so purely for individual gain. This process of individualisation was necessary for capitalism, it played on the created desires of the population to gain an advantage over others, by using goods as a marker of this distinction, this allowed the economy to grow and *progress* to be made:

> *'The process of individualisation was aided by the concomitant of the common law, the ease of transfer of property and the impartible inheritance, which contributed to capitalisms tendency to prioritise exchange'*
>
> (Ibid, 228).

Individualisation was an evolving process and at the beginning, it needed a reworking of society and its motivational processes. Previously to this time violence and public executions were used to express dissatisfaction with someone or to repay society for a crime: 'it required a partial relocation of central motivational values into a restrictive normative order' (Ibid, 25). Meaning that society became less violent but more competitive with each other in normalised and encouraged ways:

> *'Practices such as usury, exploitation, mendacity, deception and so on became tolerated and either legalised or punished less harshly to lubricate their social diffusion and augment their economic functionality'* (Ibid).

Resulting from this the population became pacified through civilisation. Attributes which were previously frowned upon were now being celebrated and encouraged, just as the neoliberals encouraged them in the post war era, these attributes flourished in this playground known as entrepreneurial spirit: 'the entrepreneur has to be a conqueror, a risk taker, a crude psychologist, a gambler, an organiser and a trader all rolled into one' (Hall, 2012, 39). These attributes marked the start of individualisation and acted as a catalysts for a change in opinion towards criminal activity: 'if they were planned, economically functional and used persuasion rather than the abrupt practices of transparent deception, intimation or violence, they were allowed to cross the ethical line that separated criminality from acceptable business practice' (Ibid). This is shown clearly in post war politics, where celebrated neo-liberals encouraged such behaviour to advance the economy and capitalism.

By the eighteenth century violence was not encouraged as pacification took place, and economic growth depended on the seduction performed by the *entrepreneur*. The underlying reform of the criminal justice system needed a distinction between functional and dysfunctional criminality (Hall, 2012) for this to be legal. This was stimulated by the desire to consume which was spreading throughout the eighteenth century (Sassatelli, 2007, 16). The entrepreneur or gamester expanded the boundaries of the social norms –a shared standard of behaviour (Bootzin, 1991, 660) - but did so in a way that was accepted and welcomed, allowing the Odyssean playground to remain.

By the nineteenth century this ethos reached every social class 'the willingness to risk inflicting direct or indirect harms on others in the process of furthering self-interests are not confined to the popular classes' (Hall, 2012, 30). Inevitably the socialisation of new generations were altered as families started to instil the values of the gamester, whilst trying to balance it with a contradictory rule of religious doctrine once considered as fundamental. Hall (2012) describes this as schizoid socialisation. This schizoid has not disappeared, however it will be shown in post war politics that as traditional structures such as religion has declined the schizoid has decreased with entrepreneurial qualities superseding.

 Cybercrime, alleviated in a technological society, should be examined in this section because if the principles of cybercrime are taken; it offers a vast range of *opportunities* and that these are distinctive today. This allows cyberspace to become a perfect modern playground for the odyssean trickster. The internet needs to be 'seen as a set of social practices' (Yar, 2006, 6), and the latest set of ONS figures show that 93% of households have internet access, which is increased by wifi hot spots and mobile access, we live our lives online, which provides would be criminals with a 'distinctive opportunity for offending' (Ibid, 8) and an 'endless supply of victims' (Reynes *et al,* 2011, 1149). The 'hidden nature [of the internet] leads to them going unnoticed' (Wall, 2010, cited in Yar, 13), which results in a 'new crime wave of internet related crimes including e commerce, which may have become the crime of choice for new offenders' (Farrel *et al,* 2010, 33).

The main crime in which flourishes in this modern playground is fraud, the attributes noted in Hall (2012) which describe entrepreneurial spirit are the ones in which fraudsters excel in and with the aid of the internet, this trickery is easily to partake in and become a victim of. Internet fraud made up 71.2% of all fraud complaints received by the ICCC in 2004 (Yar, 2006, 81-82), and in 2011 they received over 300,000 complaints (ICCC online), and with 'societies increasing dependence on networks and computer technologies render us ever more vulnerable to the failure and exploitation of those systems' (Ibid, 19). The very qualities that were encouraged from the fourteenth century have now found their breeding ground amongst the invisible networks across the globe, which 'possess challenges to the existing criminological perspectives' (Ibid, 17), as the existing framework is not equip to deal with it. Another place in which these characteristics are encouraged and flourish is the advertising industry, which will be explored in the next chapter: Modern Britain.

Modern Britain: The Breeding of the Blaptica Dubia

> *'So if you want to change the economy, you need to change the culture, and if you want to change the culture, fundamentally you have to change people's consciousness'* (Heath & Potter, 2005, 61).

> *'Economy of the 20th century has been progressively but completely transformed by marketing'*

> (Stiegler, 2010, 150).

The marketing industry has 'a history which is intertwined with the history of consumer culture' (Sassatelli, 2007, 129). Its conception is deeply rooted in advances with the industrial revolution, which coincided with; the birth of the first advertising agency in the USA followed by celebrity endorsements, the birth of the neon sign and in the middle of the century the television. Whilst these techniques were being utilised branding –which is now a major advertising ploy- was born: Pears soap a family run businesses used a famous painting to create a brand of soap that was linked to family use.

Smart (2010) credits the growth of consumer culture to advertising:

> *'It is developments from the period 1880-1930 that have been identified as particularly influential in promoting the growth of consumer culture, as inaugurating a series of qualitative changes that might be said to have ushered in a new age of consumption, to have given birth to consumerism as a distinctive way of living to which more and more people have aspired'* (Smart, 2010, 7).

The most influential figure of these developments is Edward Bernays (1891-1995), in his publication '*Crystalizing Public Opinion'* (1923) he outlined a 'new public relations profession that had a set of clearly demonstrable practices coupled with a theoretical grounding' (Burton & Lamme, 2011, 223). He claimed that public relations could distinguish sets of appeals within the collective society which could be manipulated to better control them, moreover he 'maintained that is was possible to move the masses by understanding the social milieu, rather than individual knowledge as key' (Ibid, 226). This was established by 'sub dividing groups and developing appeals for them' (Ibid, 227), this resulted in the modus operandi of the media or the popular press becoming a set of distinctions between *us* and *them.*

In essence Bernays revolutionised advertising, one of the most famous examples of his work is the smoking campaign for women to expand their target market, making smoking not only acceptable in public but also to women. He manipulated the fact that:

> '*Psychopower controls the individual and collective behaviour of consumers by channelling their libidinal energy towards commodities- by provoking the investment of desire in the object of consumption it becomes possible to derive profits from industrial investment in the apparatus of production'* (Stiegler, 2010, 150).

As the Nephew of Sigmund Freud he adapted his knowledge of his uncle's theory of personality to further instil the desire of commodities into the public.

Freud (1856-1939) claimed that personality is a 'composite of three interacting components, each having separate purposes; the *id, ego* and *superego'* (Walsh & Ellis, 2006, 175). The *Id* being the biological raw material of personality, it represents our drives, desires and wants, obeying the pleasure principle it demands instant gratification, working alone it is dangerous, being described as selfish, unmoral, uncaring and anti-social. This is the only part of our personality we are born with (Ibid). Formed form the material in the *Id* through socialisation, the *ego* and *superego* aim to control the *Id*, this is realised in the *ego*. Obeying the reality principle the *ego* tries to fill the wants and desires of the *Id* in a socially acceptable way as to avoid punishment or negative consequences; it is this part which forms our hedonistic calculus (Ibid). The *superego* is just as irrational as the *Id*, striving for perfection it is seen as the conscience, representing the moral and social norms instilled during socialisation by generating guilt to try and supress the *Ids* urges. What the *ego* must do is filter these urges from both sides and act in a way that not only satisfies both but in a way that is acceptable. This shows the *me* or *I* part of our personality that is on display to others (Walsh & Ellis, 2006, 176).

Bernays redirected the wants and raw urges from *Id* into commodities, whilst also satisfying the *superegos* desire for moralisation by providing images which instilled these desires as moral and social norms, into the public, this makes the desire for commodities guilt free. They became normalised within our personality as the *ego* used these commodities as a form of self-perception of who we are and thusly they became markers of individual and collective

identities. In doing this Bernays removed the process of free thought within individuals; we are told by the marketing industry what is acceptable.

In essence he created the breeding of the Blaptica Dubia- a breed of cockroach, easily multiplied who possess wings but do not utilise them to fly- individuals have the capacity for free thought – it is indeed how inventions are born- yet we as a society, a collective of mass individuals, chose not to employ this free thought –like the Blaptica Dubia and their wings- we succumb to the control of Bernays and subsequently the advertising industry. The effectiveness of this is shown from a participant in Winlow and Halls study (2006), where Darren does not realise the prominence of advertisings impact:

> '*I don't think that im affected by advertising really. Maybe a little bit by adverts for trainers but that's not really the advert it's just telling you something new is out'* (2006, Violent Night, 86).

As a consequence of these processes advertising became the new guardian of morality 'enticing individuals to participate in the consumption of commodities and experiences once restricted to the upper classes' (Featherstone *et al*, 1991, 172), and with the expansion of the Odyssean playground these goods have become more widely available.

This demonstrates that many theories of consumption and the role of advertising are somewhat misguided, Featherstone (1991, 2009) notes that its premised upon the expansion of commodity production, which created the rise in consumer culture, Lury (1999) not only claims that it happened in the second half of the twentieth century, but that it is in fact a need for profit which led to the production of products. However simple logic denotes that unless there is the desire for items, goods, commodities, they would never have been produced. The mass production/expansion of the consumer market and the profit came after the desire for these were instilled, and did not create the desire for them. In a question of what came first the chicken or the egg, it would be the chicken, the egg like mass production and profits were a result of the chicken that represents the desire for these goods. They also claim that the increase in goods resulted in individuality, as MacFarlane (1995) notes in the birth of the individual, yet again this is somewhat misguided, it has shown that individuality gave way to collective identities: 'collective individualities has been destroyed by marketing and the construction of the consumer proletarian, the prosumer' (Hall, 2012, 151). The birth of individuality in this paper is reserved for post war politics, where it is shown that the neo-liberals continue the work of Bernays, to an unprecedented platform. But before that can be explored the birth of industry must be addressed.

The Evolution of a Revolution

> '*Fordist entrepreneurial innovation, based on taylorism, presupposes the organisation of mass consumption'* (Stiegler, 2010, 87).

According to Harvey (1989), Fordism, is the introduction of particular production practices; a division of labour that simplified tasks, standardised components, and sequentially organised machinery in an assembly line (Smart, 2010). This endeavoured a radical transformation in the way goods were produced and sold. Henry Ford felt that if workers were stable and satisfied in their work place they would produce more. He created a workforce that inspired his principles throughout the western world. He also created the working class consumer market, he made the goods they were producing available to those who could not usually afford them, he achieved this by over average wages and a loan scheme for his employees. This made Fordism a 'total way of life' (Ibid, 10). Fordist notions were implemented

throughout the western world which led to a 'de-eroticisation' of work, an army of alienated workers, which Heath and Potter (2005) claimed capitalism needed to function creating a 'self-regulating market' (Thornsen & Lie, 2006, 8) and indicates the start of Keynesian economic system.

With the growing economic system, 'American corporations, consumer goods, cultural forms and styles exerted an increasing influence over people's lives' (Smart, 2010, 1), a concept more commonly known as McDonaldisation. Developed by George Ritzer (1993) it should be seen as an ideological and cultural occurrence, it not only imported goods but more importantly values, a way of life, we lost the Bisto family meal time to a spectacle of a fast food restaurant. It's in this sense it

> '*Implodes boundaries between tradition and the contemporary, coding their advertisements with traditional images of Americana and family ideology, as it undermines family eating practices and redefines diet and culinary value, familial togetherness and communal experience*' (Kellner, Cited in Smart, 1999, 191-192).

It is through Americanisation process that 'commodities were gradually reconfigured as a spectacle' (Sassatelli, 2007, 27). These changing economic, cultural and work place practices combined with Bernays advertising movement come together as a catalyst for the culture of consumption.

In amidst of these early revolutions, many others were born; 'the evolution of education and literacy' (Herman, 2007, 13) penguin books started to publish allowing literacy to the masses, the 1944 Butler Act seen education become compulsory, the state offered support to university students in 1963 and health care became available to all with the formation of the NHS in 1948. However as these revolutions were taking the place, the economic system required individuals to become more self-regulating and responsible for the consequences of their choices (Thorsten and Lie, 2006, 15) to ensure its continued growth.

This individuality of choice was not echoed in the criminological thought of the time which was the Chicago School. Developed in the 1920s by Park and Burgess they believed that cities had different zones within them, and some were more prone to crime than that of the others- transitional zones- this was due to lack and care of the community, often with no fixed roots and the breakdown of social institutions which made conditions ripe for criminal activity, the closer to the city centre the more one would experience criminal behaviour. If one did not wish to be involved they could move into a different zone with less criminal activity, of course socio-economic circumstances were not taken into consideration. Also if this was the case, authorities could just target these areas to decrease criminal activity, or improvements to the social institutions could be adopted to increase a smoother transition into the community. However this is one dimensional, to presume that crime is merely the result of ecology, ignores the plethora of other influences on criminal activity such as individual choice. It was more concerned with the control of criminal activity than the motivations for such. Nevertheless the Chicago School grew and as Mays and Morris show in Tierney (2006) the 'British sociological Criminology in the main favoured an approach which had more in common with the Chicago School' (122). This dominated criminological theory till the 1960s, yet the concern for dealing with the practicalities of crime, rather than criminal motivation still dominates today. This is tied to protecting ones goods and social status, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

The Buying Power

The middle of the twentieth century seen clear class structures, status and expression of identity which was tied to profession and Britain was a state of production. Pinnacle advancements in this era were the 'growth of working class purchasing power' (Miles, 1998, 6). This had been building up from the sixteenth century: 'since the expansion of banking industry in the sixteenth century, wealth had been transferred from the aristocracy to the nascent bourgeoisie by means on money lending and indebtedness' (Hall,2012, 35). This advancement went from metal money, to credit screening credit cards to lending and in store credit, in this sense Whitely (1993) is correct in perceiving the introduction of the credit card in 1950 as a symbolic event (Miles, 1998, 8). Furthermore Borock (1993) suggests that it was after this period that consumerism became more specific and focused (Ibid, 9) resounded by Moxton (2011) who claims consumer culture became a mass phenomena after the Second World War. This is because 'as long as the economy is growing, that means more money and credit is available, expectations are high, people will buy more goods' (Heinberg, 2011, 6).

Stiegler (2010) sums up the use and consequence of credit in the following exert:

> '*Credit is the concrete social expression of protentions which realise themselves, which perform, as one could say, adapting Austin's theory of performativity to the question of credit performance such as it has led to the transformation of matter, social relations and behaviour- that is of wills, and from which proceeds the extraordinary permanent revolution in which capitalism since the industrial revolution has consisted*'   (67).

It allowed the capitalist system to operate without physical money: 'consumption has been fuelled by so-called remortgaging, the possibility of renegotiating mortgage loans in order to get more credit' (Marrazzi, 2010, 35).

With the increase of disposable income and credit available the realisation of the 'American Dream' seemed theoretically possible. The American dream was established by Merton (1938), he believed that the strain placed on social actors to realize the American Dream – conventional core values into which all Americans were socialised into, which promoted success as material success- resulted in crime. Social actors were not equally placed to realise their American Dream therefore crime would aid those less well placed in the social pecking order to gain material objects to display their success. He seen the source of strain as being 'located within society, rather than the individual' (Tierney, 2006, 102), mitigating all personal responsibility and rational choice of the social actor. Society was to blame as it socialised us into a 'disjunction between the cultural goals and the opportunities of legitimate means within social structure(s) for achieving it' (Ibid, 103), achieved with the manipulation of the *superego.* Mertonian strain theory impacted criminology massively, it influenced many followers to take up the idea of stain within in society, such as Cohen and Cloward and Ohin, however its core assumption – that society is to blame – takes away all individuality and rational choice from criminal activity, which as noted is what the criminal justice system is based on. Therefore all criminal motivations are ignored on an individual level. Moreover how does one decide when they are successful, the concept of keeping up with the Jones – which keeps consumer culture turning- would imply that the American Dream will never be realised and crime will continue indefinitely. His solution to criminal activity was basic: increase opportunities for those deprived in society, this would be acceptable, if only the deprived committed criminal offenses. The MP Scandal, where MP's were claiming extra expenses, how would Strain theory explain this, they were not deprived yet they still wanted

to realised their American Dream, a deeper examination of desires are required covered in the ideological genesis of needs. Merton's theory is merely skin deep. The malady of infinite aspirations a concept coined by Aristotle would go some way in explaining this, no matter what we have we always want more, there is no limit on our aspirations, in this sense the American dream and strain theory is an excuse more than an explanation for crime within society.

By the latter half of the century the neoliberals decided to jump on the wagon they had woven, they allowed council house tenants to purchase their homes on credit and proceeded to sell of public industries to private sectors. This created massive unemployment throughout the country, and more deprivation in Mertonian terms. The increase in crime rates in this period may suggest to some that strain theory is accurate and without a theory with as much impact to rival it, many are happy to accept it. However the premise of this paper suggests that criminal motivation lies within everyone in society which must be explored more in detail. At this time in Britain many industries collapsed and the identities of the workers who were tied to such dissolved, leaving a gap a space in the circle of joussaince that must be replaced. Happily living on credit we moved from 'a society of solider producers to one of sensation gathers' (Bauman, cited in Moxton, 3). It did not matter that we did not have industries or fixed identities anymore as we could be distracted by the bright lights and welcoming smiles in shopping centres, where we could use our credit cards to buy symbols of our identity: 'the notion of production has become irrelevant in world dominated by the mode of significance' (Bertens, 1995, 149). In this fifth turn in history we are left 'free to laugh, play, love and create' (Heath & Potter, 2005, 60), create ourselves as we wish to be seen, results in us now being a commodity a fact which is carefully concealed. Yet the increase in websites which promote us to sell ourselves demonstrate this, for example the rise in Facebook a popular social networking site, we are selling ourselves to our *friends,* the increase in dating websites show that we are selling ourselves to possible partners, the increase in work recruitment websites mean we have to sell ourselves professionally, we are commodities that are bought, traded and reinvented, we have been 'dissolute[d] into a sea of commodities' (Bauman, 2007, 12). This is has been expanded and encouraged since the post war era with the neo-liberals, resulting in a loss of traditional fixed class structures and collectivism.

Post War Politics the War is Not Over: The Making of a Class in Itself for Themselves

At the heart of the neoliberal wagon was the 'condemnation of the governmental industrial and long term policy and the corresponding accusations that governments inevitably promote inefficient models of economic administration' (Stiegler, 2010, 101), meaning that 'the economy is always a political economy' (Zizek, 2011, 183). This concept is ignored by criminologists shown in the previous chapters such as Merton and is continued with Sutherland, it is also contradictory to the ethos of classical and positivistic criminology, as they have always been expressed as separate entities. Economy has sparsely been discussed in relation to criminal activity, or with political conditions being taken into account, however the new political economy 'by contrast stresses the embeddendness of the *economic* in wider networks of political and social processes' (Reiner, in Hall & Winlow, 2012, 32), which criminology needs to address.

The political economy that was imposed by the neoliberals post war was to alter and redirect the drives and desires of the population, started by Bernays in the 1920s, Thatcher and Regan managed to nail the coffin shut. Through what Hall (2012) termed 'Thacterite drives' –'a core assumption that the systematic simulation of vices such as greed and envy can, if

harnessed through the mechanism of the market, produce mutual benefits in the form of economic growth and individual freedom' (Hall, 2012), they promoted self-interests, and looking after oneself which should be prioritised before anyone else, community and collective solidarity would not give you the *edge* over others. These principles were in direct opposition to that which are preached in religious doctrines as they could not encourage entrepreneurial spirit. Religion prescribes destiny as already set and neo-liberals encouraged the making of one's own destiny. Resulting from these traditional structures needed to be minimised, and the schizoid socialisation was diminished.

As a result traditional structures were dissolved, whilst the generation were being spoon fed notions of individualism – it's a dog eat dog world and there is no such thing as society, you must come out on top or you will be left in the *underclass* – we must in a Beck (1992) sense not only write our own biographies but create them. This had a trickledown effect on society the once schizoid socialisation, is now dominated by 'sink or swim individualism' (Southwood, 2011, 38), which was being drummed into the up and coming generations from birth, therefore the *superego* has very different standards to a nostalgic generation. The drives and desires present in the *Id* which were already relocated into commodities were now allowed by the *superego* as its morality was destroyed in a bid for competiveness, the vices that Thatcher harnessed had become the moral compass for the *superego,* leaving all sense of altruistic notions in a world left behind in the name of economic progress and capitalism.

This is demonstrated clearly through the secondary analysis of the interviews. In Violent Night (Winlow & Hall, 2006) Ray and Phil, two of the participants speak at length about how marriage is viewed in society today –marriage once being regarded as a highly religious ceremony/union. They speak of how now it is easy to obtain a divorce therefore it has lost its meaning, and how easy it is to find another partner once the one you are with *bores* you. They hold hedonistic notions of life where marriage is seen as a ball and chain, stopping you from having fun; Phil sums it up nicely when he states *'people are more selfish now'* (pp.44) - a neoliberal success story.

With increased competitiveness, and utilising commodities as a marker of success, more and more women went to work, inspired by a woman prime minister, anything was possible, this left the notion of the nuclear family unit and the male bread winner destroyed. The socialisation of children then was left to popular television and child minders, and as a social worker commented in Reluctant Gangsters (Pitts, 2008, 111) *'I think their parents are too stretched with trying to just make a living. They haven't got time to care.'*

Moxton (2011) states that 'we should scarcely be surprised when *Thatcher's babies* behave like *aggressive entrepreneurs with scant regard for law'* (2), this however is in stark contrast to the theory of crime which dominated throughout this epoch. Sutherlands (1939) theory of Differential Association claims that criminal behaviour is learnt, like other behaviours. Neighbourhoods were not disorganised, just organised differently accounting for different crime rates within different places and a person's exposure to these norms in specific places would determine criminal activity, and the moralisation of committing crime (Tierney, 2006). He pays no attention to why crime exists in the first place, or why it is continued, he ignores organised crime and like Merton, the crimes of the powerful. What he created was almost the underclass: if you lived in certain places you would become criminal, instead of exploring why these places were more prone to criminal activity, they were written off, this is present in contemporary criminal thought an these are thought of as high risk areas, which results in more of the security states solutions of prevention rather than cure.

These processes have resulted in a loss of any class solidarity, the Brixton riots (1981) were an example of this solidarity, a class standing together to change the political processes, however the neoliberals in turn destroyed any sense of solidarity so that they could not be challenged anymore, and we are left with life being 'motivated by the individual's perception of a constant struggle with hostile others in a dog eat dog world' (Hall *et al,* 2008, cited in Moxton, 3). However in order for the neo-liberals to keep the fluidity of identity, consumer goods must be in a continuous cycle of being used and replaced, with the speed that will allowed the capitalist system to operate.

Neophilla

The imposition of the neoliberal policies outlined in the previous chapter lead to what Hoggart (1995) described as the decline in working class culture, not only the loss of employment and prospects, but the identities to which these were tied: 'the prospect of constructing a lifelong identity on the foundations of work for the great majority is dead and buried' (Bauman, 2005, 28). Resulting in:

> '*Individuals, now disengaged from all collective obligations of a magical or religious order, liberated from archaic, symbols or personal ties, at last private and autonomous, define themselves through an objective activity of transforming nature'*
> (Lee, 2000, 22).

Making this century unique according to Sumner (2004) is the way 'that creation and expression of identity via the display and celebration of consumer goods have triumphed over and above other traditional modes of self-expression' (144), achieved from choosing it from shop windows, he goes on to state that Descartes notion of *I think therefore I am,* has been replaced by *I shop therefore I am* (Ibid, 150). Within in this notion the 'modern individual is made conscious that he speaks not only with his clothes, but with his home, furnishings, interior decoration, car and other activities which are to be read and classified' (Featherstone, 2002, 84), this was shown undoubtedly with some of the participants:

Karen from Criminal Identities and Consumer Culture (Hall *et al,* 2008) says:

> '*The right shampoo, the right shoes, the right fucking name on your t-shirt, its life isn't it, it's all there is'* (35)

Echoed by Ray in Violent Night (Winlow & Hall, 2006):

> '*Ideally you want to be wearing all the best gear…. Its quality isn't it…. Its just flash isn't it'* (36).

Therefore identity as Lasch (1979) notes takes on a form of 'consumption orientated narcissism' (Sumner, 2004, 145) giving meaning to consumable objects: 'material goods are not only used to do things, but they also have a meaning, and act as meaningful markers of social relations' (Lury, 1999, 12). Slater (1997) goes further and claims that 'the style of one's consumption is then explained as the display of one's social status' (153), this is organised in what Bourdieu (1977) termed as the Habitus – which is how the preferences are socially organised (Ibid). This leaves commodities no longer being defined by use value but what they have come to mean and signify within society (Baudrillard, 1998) they are now used to create social bonds or distinctions (Featherstone *et al*, 1991). Take clothes as an

example, the practical use is to protect and cover one's body, in a consumer society they show who you are:

> '*Clothes are just about who you are really*'

(Emma, Violent Night, Winlow & Hall, 2006, 83).

 To keep the capitalist wheels turning the identities that goods bestow must be constantly be reinvented, as people must keep on consuming. 'Consumers must not be attached to their objects' (Stiegler, 2010, 151) because of the 'planned obsolesce' (Heath & Potter, 2005, 5) in them ensuring they go out of date, that they will always be something better, newer on the market, leaving consumers with a 'constant source of dissatisfaction' (Lasch, in Sassatelli, 118).This is why consumerism in a Lacanian sense is about a lack, manqué, which is never realised, identity will never be filled as the desire for this will never be filled. As the desire for these items lie within our *Id* therefore they can never be filled as it is a hollow void, so we buy more to try and fill it, and create who we are through this, and as goods are also constantly reinvented, it's a cycle which will never cease so 'whether we like it or not we are engaged in a kind of continual reinvention of identity' (Elliot, 2009, 138).

Now people are feeling deprived of the material product itself and the identity which is linked to them (Sumner, 2004). It is seen as a fundamental right to the current generations to be able to show who we are through consumption (Hayward, 2004), when they are excluded from this through lack of credit or income they become lost, with no sense of direction, or who they are, and there is no traditional structures left able to replace consumerism in trying to fill this hollow void. These are the generation of the lost, who have no real focal point left to hold onto, just a spectacle.

The Death of the Real

This lost generation only see their social reality as reality; they have no understanding of the world in which elder generations grew up in. This is because 'the reality of everyday life is taken for granted as reality' (Berger & Luckman, 1966, 37), however 'reality is socially constructed' (Ibid,13), and since the start of the twentieth century it has been constructed by advertising and the media (Jones, 2003), which means 'reality is increasingly stimulated for people' (Agger, 1991, 118).

'In the course of consumption, the consumed things cease to exist' (Bauman, 2005, 23) this is because once we consume a product we detach ourselves from its original use value, it becomes what we want it to be, and what we want it say about us, through our subjectivity in the symbolic order as this happens the 'distinction between the real and appearance becomes erased' (Baudrillard, cited in Featherstone, 2007). This is because as Baudrillard (1998) notes we are never consuming the actual object itself, we use the object as a symbol, manipulating them to give it our own meaning. This happens when our perceptions pass through into the symbolic order, which we need to share as a collective in order to participate in the social world, shown in detail in the genesis of the real. 'Through this process people construct a symbolic world out of their own subjective version of social reality' (Valier, 2002, 84), this is where 'the real and ideal combine in a dialectal tension to create a third realm' (Hall, 2012, 208). It is in this subjective reality that people 'lose the ability to distinguish between these stimulations and reality' (Agger, 1991, 118), 'as the line between the representation and the real slowly collapses' (Mirchandani, 2005, 94). Once fixed meanings became liquidised

leaving signs and symbols, fluidly moving from one to another, with no social order (Craib, 1992), 'in a world of endless reproduction' (Jones, 2003, 149), 'leading to the pure liquidation of social relations' (Stiegler, 2010, 57), because our symbolic order is individualised meaning its subjective to their owner.

We are now left with a copy of a copy of a copy, nothing is real or authentic anymore, everything has been giving a subjective meaning by someone, in the symbolic nexus, thus we are living in what Debord (1967) called the 'The society of the Spectacle':

> '*Consumer capitalism has taken every authentic human experience, transformed it into a commodity and then sold it back to us through the media. Thus every part of human life has been drawn into the* spectacle *which itself is nothing but a system of symbols and representations, governed by its own internal logic'*
> (Heath & Potter,2005, 7).

Baudrillard furthers this by claiming we have 'no back room of reality, just layer upon layer of spectacle and simulation' and because 'everything has become commoditized, nothing is real' (Ibid, 278). Heightened by the space and time compression which Harvey (1999) speaks of, everything is glocal, at the touch of a button- exacerbated by the wifi on mobile phones, we can be anyone, anywhere. It is because of these advancements tied with consumption that we have sacrificed 'all depth, authenticity and even alienation [which] have disappeared from the information saturated world' (Bertens, 1995, 151). Facebook again illustrates this point, we use it as a social networking site, to connect with our *friends* yet on average we speak to only 5 of those on our friends list on a regular basis [times online], therefore it is a show, there is no real or depth of friendship, there is however constant adverts which are tied into our *likes*. Work places are affected by this, and in effect they become 'non places' (Southwood, 2011, 32). Everything we experience is not real, advertisers contact us via email, with *personalised* offers that are sent to everyone in a subscription list. Relationships are no longer real in the sense that they used to be as shown by the participations and their views on marriage (Ray & Phil), once the use is used on one you move to another. Crime has moved on with times, unlike the theories used to explain it. Criminals use the resources they have around them: Aldridge et *al* (2010) found that there is a significant disappearance in British urban drug gangs, from the street into cyberspace, as more effective distribution networks can be established (Cited in Hall, 2012, 58).

So if we're living in a system of unrelated signs and symbols where nothing is real, why do we still participate in this system of consumption? For the most part this is all people have ever known, and they do not realise or care that this is not real, the participations from the interviews repeat several times in several of the texts *it's just life init,* if we take the popular film the Matrix (1999)–based on Baudrillard's theory- Morpheus when talking to Neo sums it up perfectly:

> '*You have to understand, most of these people are not ready to be unplugged. And many of them are so invested, so hopelessly dependant on the system, they will fight tooth and nail to protect it'* (in Heath & Potter, 2005, 7).

What we are left with 'is simply a struggle over who will have the power to define reality' (Ibid, 151).

We are also experiencing simulated desire, which has been altered from that of our forefathers, therefore some criminal behaviour could be a result of this, our increasing stimulated world is not enough for the criminal types so they partake in criminal activity to

get more excitement: ' thinking about crime is exciting. Committing crime is exciting even getting caught is exciting' (Samenow, 1984 cited in Hayward, 2004, 149). Katz (1988) speaks about the criminal acts that are often not only tied with excitement but also generated by the thrill of committing the crime, it could be described as nipping ones self to make sure one is awake. However as a criminologist this theory of crime is very illogical, when one can get a massive amount of thrills in many number of ways without risking ones liberty, criminal motivation must run deeper than a mere thrill seeking adventure because if the get caught the opportunity to seek thrills through crime will be removed. The participants would be inclined to agree:

> '*With the coke and that there is no way I would be doing that if I didn't need the money … You'd have to be daft to do it otherwise … so it's got to be about money'*
> (Foz, Criminal Identities, Hall *et al,* 2008, 55)

> '*These fuckers who say people do it for the buzz, for some sort of jolly, what a load of shit, you don't fucking risk your liberty for a buzz'* (Tony ,Ibid , 83).

Rather than being a thrill seeking experience these participants describe criminal activity as a necessity to them, as a way to generate income, money, so that they can be included in the culture of consumption and enjoy the simulation of reality, which provides its own thrill. In this ever increasing stimulated reality, subjectiveness means goods have different values in different contexts to people, which must be explored.

The Price of Everything and Value of Nothing

> '*Money's infiltration into every aspect of social exchange during the course of modernity facilitated the possibility of purchase and sale of objects thanks to its impersonal and abstract nature, making exchange infinitely easier than in economies based on barter'* (Simmel, 1907, in Sassatelli, 2007, 3).

What Simmel (1978) shows us is that money is a primary example of the means becoming the end (Hall, 2012), its sole purpose was to aid economic transactions, yet it has become the sole aim and objective within society, one cannot exist in this social climate without it, it is the holy grail. As this happens we lose other virtuous merits in society, as shown by the neoliberals, as they increased the importance of money we lost more traditional social structures, which can be extended to personal attributes:

> '*The more money becomes the sole centre of interest, the more one discovers that honour and conviction, talent and virtue, beauty and salvation of the soul, are exchanged against money, and so the more mocking and frivolous attitude will develop in relation to these higher values that are for sale for the same kind of values as groceries, and that also command a market price'*
>
> (Simmel, 1978, in Hall, 2012, 37-38).

And so 'the individual is nothing but the subject thought of in economic terms' (Lee, 2000, 22) we are reduced to our monetary value, or our potential monetary value. The more value we have the more elitist we are to become: 'with the accumulation of money comes an accumulation of social power' (Hall, 2012, 45), the monetary system in society is like that of wealth it needs both those who are included and excluded, if we all had the same monetary value there would be no market or competition. What we have is a system that requires

inequality for growth, which has 'come to depend on impossible-to-realise expectations of perpetual growth and was set to detonate. Money was tied to credit, and credit was tied to assumptions about growth' (Heinberg, 2011, 20). When credit stopped being available after the burst of 2008 this inequality was heightened, and now we retain an economy which is 'destined to shrink not grow' (Ibid, 40). This will only further exclusion from the consumer market, and as noted in neophillia the chance to build ones identity, and as exposed in the 2011 riots, it will increase the potential for criminal activity.

 Jock Young (2000) notes that it is at this 'disjuncture between exclusion and inclusion' that explains crime and deviance (Grover, 2011, 2), although only this is only sweeping, it may however touch on the surface of explaining some criminal behaviour:

> '*No doubt I'll always get my hands dirty in some way, but if I had **real money**, that's what I would be doing, buying places and doing them up an selling them'* (Graham, Criminal Identities, Hall et *al,* 2008, 39, own emphasis).

We're experiencing what Heinberg (2011) termed a ' self-reinforcing destructive feedback loop'*,* meaning the economy isn't growing therefore interest on previous credit cannot be paid, resulting in a negative snowball effect; job losses, reduction in income, and consumer spending decreases – which is used to keep our economy growing. This is why in the initial stages of the recession we were told to spend our way out of it, which is only an option if one has the funds to do so. Now we have an 'ever shrinking pot to be divided among the winners' (Ibid, 2), creating a highly competitive society, who with the introduction of money, know the price of everything, including our souls, but the subjective value of nothing.

Everything in society including our qualities- which we must *sell* to companies to generate money- has a price to be bought and sold: 'all commodities have a price tag attached to them' (Bauman, 1990, cited in Lury, 1999, 5), this price tag has evolved from basic monetary value to personal subjective value of the owner: 'Simmel maintains that the value of things depend on the value they are given by the subject rather than being founded on absolutes' (Cited in Sassatelli, 2007, 64), the value of objects must be placed in to context of those who consume them, for the *true* subjective value to be realised. This is why in society we know the price of everything and the value of nothing. Money needs to be placed in context of an exchange value for the consumer:

> '*Money is just a means to get what you want, to do things you want to do, to go out to travel'* (Martin, Out of Sight, McAuley, 2007, 95)

Reiterated by Tony who believed that commodities or stolen goods could be used to generate income to then be spend on whatever he wanted:

> '*If you can sell it, I will take it'* (Ibid, 77)

David explains how money can also be a symbol of other virtues held in high regard in his neighbourhood, superseding the actual monetary value of money:

> '*Their lives revolved around money. Money gets you respect and being able to take it off other people, violently, gets you even more respect'*
>
> (Reluctant Gangsters, Pitts, 2008, 99).

 Money is needed by everyone which will be explained in the ideological genesis of needs, and the encouragement of the entrepreneurial spirit, spun from the neoliberals and continued

by the New Labour, has reached its goal in society, everyone is trying always to gain more wealth, some are participating in criminal activity to gain access to the market. Some are using popular methods such as recycling your old goods, the increase of websites such as Ebay and Amazon, are prime examples of this, and on a more local level Facebook selling pages. However the current coalition government do not like this spirit being uncontrolled and there have been recent suggestions that there will be tax added on to these websites, so it will not be classed as uncapped income.

With the increased subjective value on money, it no longer holds the same denomination for everyone in a simulated society of the spectacle, it does not even appear in a physical form to most, with the increasing use of cards, and online banking systems and our money is seen as a set of numbers usually on a screen. If we returned to the physical sense maybe we would be more inclined to save rather than spend, and the bankers of Wall Street, which caused the burst of 2008, may have been more responsible if money wasn't just displayed as a set of numbers to gamble with. Money is needed not only too physically to survive, but to socially survive by partaking in the consumer market which is used to create our identities.

Consumption: The New Omnipresent

 Every aspect of society is realised through consumption: a 'product becomes a product only through consumption' (Marx, 1973, cited in Smart, 2010, 5), this is because 'when consumerism is combined with a cultural obsession with the quest for authentic self-expression the result is a society collectively locked in a large number of consumption traps' (Heath & Potter, 2005, 187). Unquestionably we are now 'addressed as consumers, first and foremost' (Southwood, 2011, 10), since 'mundane consumption is necessary and a routine part of people's lives' (Smart, 2010, 4). This makes consumption a 'powerful element of social control' (Baudrillard, 1998, 84), which also makes it 'a class institution' (Ibid, 59), a class institution that is 'deregulated and [where in] social relationships become more variable and less structured by stable norms' (Featherstone, 2007, 15).

This 'success of the *neoliberal* agenda, embraced to a greater or lesser extent' (Standing, 2011, 3), has affected every aspect of society, including employment practices: 'new times we are both exhausted by and injured to job insecurity and continuous availability, obligatory consumption and persistent debt' (Southwood, 2011, 12-13). Standing (2011) argues that in this we have a new Precariat class 'consisting of many millions around the world without an anchor of stability'. This new class experiences in every aspect of their lives what he termed the four A's: 'anger, anomie, anxiety and alienation', angry at the system, anomie from the defeat they feel, live in constant anxiety and insecurity and alienation from everyone and thing in this individualised state. In the case of increased flexible, short term and temporary work contracts, the Precariat life is constantly on hold and in a state of transition, they must 'exist in a state of readiness' (Southwood, 2011, 15). Aptly shown by Rousseau's (1988) statement 'man in born free, yet everywhere is he in chains' (cited in Heath & Potter, 2005, 71). 'The role once performed by work in linking together individual motives, social integration and systematic reproduction has now been assigned to consumption (Bauman, 2005, 27), which marks a massive dialectical shift from the 'inclusive to an exclusive society' (Young, 1999, 7), leaving 'no ladders of mobility to climb' (Standing, 2011, 20), therefore the enterprising individual has no choice but to 'immerse himself in this new virtual environment' (Southwood, 2011, 37). This has led to a demoralisation of work, which was in our not so distant history a source of pride and status:

> '*I don't care about it really [work]. It's just to get me money so I can buy stuff I want really*'   (Judith, Violent Night, Winlow & Hall, 2006, 29).

> '*Really it's just a way to get some money. For me it's the money it's not like a career. I just go in get it and then that's it*'   (Moe, Ibid, 30).

Resulting from consumer items living a double life as Lee (1993) notes in Miles, employment is now spoken of as a consumer item. This double function leads to what Miles (1998) calls a 'consuming paradox' which in effect both enables and constrains (147) shown by the Precariat class. As society moved forward freedom meant 'freedom to shop, and shopping increasingly meant the freedom to be' (Morris, in Winlow & Hall, 2006, 79), and inequality was increasingly seen in terms of rights and access to consumption. This is a result of 'manufactured desires and drives tailored to economic expansion and ushered to the boarders of joussaince' (Hall, 2012, 149) , therefore consumerism can never be 'solely about marketing and claiming status' (Slater, 1997, 157), it is 'essentially a site of politics' (Sassatelli, 2007, 113), which has replaced the former role of traditional politics. As a site of politics it has created the death of any real political symbolism, demonstrated by the riots of 2011.

This is because consumerism is a potent force, which can be claimed has reached its limits as it is ultimately short termist (Stiegler, 2010, 5), however as shown in Neophillia this is how consumption works to keep the economy in movement it needs to be short termist. Our lives revolve 'around wanting things, the longing for things, the purchasing of things, a way of life which having, desiring and wishing for more and more things' (Smart, 2010, 5), as Heath and Potter (2005) put it 'we are obsessed with acquiring more and more consumer goods, even though this leads us to make unreasonable sacrifices in other areas of life' (104). This notion affirms the malady of infinite aspirations, no matter what we have we will always want more, this is because in the core of our being, our *Id,* there is an absolute void which can never be filled, which has been manipulated- from Bernays to the neo-liberals- enhanced and then harnessed through consumption. We have also moved from a society of waiting and saving for things, to one which requires immediate gratification (Sumner, 2004), to display instantly our successes through our consumer goods and because of the life line woven into goods, this must be done immediately or the commodity will be out of fashion and thus use.

 Consumption works so effectively on the premise that desires cannot be realised: 'consumer capitalism sustains desire by constantly disappointing subjects as they experience objects of desire, with this it keeps alive the aim of desire, which is to stay alive' (Hall, 2012, 158). This as 'a cultural ethos is propagating new and often destructive emotional states, feelings and desires that contribute to the crime problem in a number of new and novel ways' (Hayward, 2004, 158). Meaning that consumerism is a site of multidisciplinary processes-including but not exclusive to: politics, economics, psychology, criminology and sociology, which criminology must reflect.

The summer Riots of 2011 encapsulate this although David Cameron stated 'these riots were not about government cuts: they were directed at high street stores, not parliament. And these riots were not about poverty' (Cited in Grover, 2011, 1), and have been described as a 'zero-degree protest, a violent action demanding nothing' (Zizek, cited in Moxton, 2011, 3). However this part of the paper will argue that these assessments of the riots are superficial and do not place the actions of the rioters into any sort of context, it would be inclined to agree with Sumner (2011) who states that 'behaviours do not speak for themselves; and less

today than ever, (in Hall & Winlow, eds, 2012, 170), society must delve deeper into the motivations for these actions, to hear what they were truly saying.

They tried to copy the rich well (Ibid), and in doing this they 'represented conformity to the underlying values of conformity' (Moxton, 2011, 1) and are aptly described as a 'direct expression of a free market economy working as one would expect it to' (Sumner, 2012, in Hall & Winlow, 176). The riots have been building up under the surface since the inception of the dialectical tension with the importance of consumerism rising, Sumner describes it as a 'volcanic magma waiting to burst the surface' (Ibid, 175), and should be placed into *the new* grand narrative of society:

> '*Frame the riots in in a critical account of the current conjuncture: a world beset by perpetual economic and political crises as the certainties of modernity disappear from view; a world in which the political elite seems incapable of creating the ground for a future beyond neo-liberalism; a world of advanced resource depletion and growing social unrest as capitalism approaches the objective limit to its growth (Harvey 2011; Gorz 2010; Heinberg 2011)*'
> (Treadwell, *et al*, 2012, 2).

Since 'the targets were retail outlets and much of the energies of the participants were put into looting' (Grover, 2011, 3), where 'around 2,500 shops were looted' (Topping & Bawdon, 2011, cited in Treadwell, *et al.* 1) validates that 'adverts have worked' (Sumner, 2012, 176). Some of the rioters included people who were otherwise non-criminal and included 'a millionaires daughter, an ex-Olympics ambassador, and a children's charity volunteer' (Ibid), this furthers the explanation that the rioters were not a *fera*l underclass, but they were otherwise everyday citizens, who merely 'stuck their fingers into the pie of western affluence' (Ibid). This happened because no longer being a collective class, individual competition is rife between every social actor, enhanced by the Medias constant celebration of the symbolic order, the social actor is left with no-where to take this dissatisfaction except to the local shops (Treadwell, *et al*, 2012, 3):

> '*We thought easy money, quick money. The man who was stabbed was an excuse. It was there [the opportunity], we need money, we are going to steal*'
> (Killa, Treadwell *et al*, 2012, 5).

Proving Cameron wrong these riots were about poverty and exclusion from the market, they seen an opportunity and ceased it, a celebration of post Thatcher politics, and the death of politics in any previous traditional sense:

> '*Opportunities come and you don't let them go, you know what I'm saying*'
>
> (G, Ibid).

The fact that they did not know the catalyst of the riots show this point only in more depth, in fact Mark Duggan was shot by police, not stabbed, these riots were about excluded social actors gaining access to the market, it can be seen as consumerisms victory over all other social institutions: 'revealed by the fact that, after selling the goods that they had stolen, they returned with the proceeds to the very stores they had looted to buying legitimate goods' (Ibid, 6). The death of politics in any traditional sense left consumerist drives to dominate the social actors psyche, because nothing else can or does exist in its place and the riots could not continue 'because there was no progressive political narrative to carry it further' (Ibid, 8).

In this sense consumerism has dug its own grave; it created this expression of dissatisfaction, as the *superego* became more and more demoralised with the images and normalisation of advertising, it effectively destroyed its soul. The entrepreneurial spirit is now given free rein in the *ego,* as we were encouraged to cease opportunities in an increased competitive society; however it is superseding all expectations. This spirit makes commodities into to totem like objects which are to be worshipped: 'manufactured objects act as totems in the modern world' (Sahlins in Lury, 1999, 16), which increases criminal activity in the generation of the lost, to purchase these totems: 'whenever serious criminals embark on a project, the objective is usually money' (Hall, 2012, 43). This point is echoed by Terry Jackson (2012, in Hobbs, Cited in Hall & Winlow, eds, 257) who clearly states '*it was never about the money, never for me. It was about what I could buy with it'*. The participants share this view:

> '*I'd like to have more money'* (Donna, Violent Night, Winlow & Hall 2006: 63)

> '*I need my wages for, just stuff really, fags, clothes, rent a video, whatever'*

> (Paul, Ibid, 36).

What the riots did however display is what Standing and Southwood have touched the surface on earlier in this chapter, consumption has dissolved the working class, we now have a class that is no longer for itself, contrasting the Brixton riots (1981) who stood together and fought for a purpose, these riots show how we are now just a collective groups of individuals, all looking out for their own interests, therefore there is no need in politics in the traditional sense. All sense of community is now lost, in a bid for bettering oneself and ones' own interests. This is shown by the participants, who explain that you must even in the criminal world do this:

> '*People around here try to rob you, beat you out for a fucking quid man. You've got to have your eyes open 24 hours a day. People try and break in and steal your fucking shit'*   (Billy, Criminal Identities, Hall *et al,* 2008, 76)

> *It's not just people robbing any old woman on the street they are robbing there so called friends….it's the same people who rob each other because they think there are in the same situation'* (Ace, Reluctant Gangsters, Pitts, 2008, 93)

This has led to a generation of the lost who trust no-one, making any sort of relationship impossible to hold:

> '*I don't trust no-one'*   (Blade, Ibid 94)

This is the ethos that consumerism has grown and reproduced itself on.

Resulting from the facts shown in this chapter consumption must be thought of as encompassing all of the social sciences paired with economics, to engage in an understanding of modern consumerism and its impacts. Taylor notes that there is no force in society which is as powerful to oppose it (Sumner, 2004), and as a result we are left with a truly leisure class in the Veblenian sense we do not produce anything anymore and increasingly we are becoming a temporal work force, with high unemployment rates, we have nothing left to do has Heath and Potter (2005) noted earlier but love, laugh and play. The participants illustrate this well:

> '*It just goes [money] clubbing, drugs, mates, girls, taxis, more drugs, mates, girls, going out. It just goes.'* (Del, Reluctant Gangsters, Pitts,2008, 95).

Therefore this paper would disagree with Lyotard (1979) when he argues that we're at the end of the grand narratives, this would argue and show that consumption is in fact a grand narrative, furthermore Foucault (1969) who claims that we are in a midst of competing discourses, it would argue that we are not, and that consumption *the* discourse to which all other discourses must be tied together with.

The Ideological Genesis of Needs

We have arrived at consumerism being the driving force in society by a number of forces working together and the 'desire for luxury goods occupies an important position among the genetic factors of capitalism' (Sassatelli, 2007, 21). This is because it now holds a position of power over the social actor and therefore society. We *need* consumer items and luxury goods to create our *ego*. Resulting from the Americanisation within society:

> '*From the moment that American capitalism implements the American Way of Life as a new libidinal economy through the psychpower of marketing, it can make this infinity, which is infinity, which is desire*' (Stiegler, 2010, 95).

Desire is a libidinal energy which is unlimited and harnessed into the economy through consumption; however it must be noted that libidinal energy is not that of a sexual one which it is often associated with:

> '*Libido is not the sexual drive, but rather the desire in so far as it is capable of diverting its energy to non-sexual objects*' (Ibid, 153).

We are all born with libidinal energy yet it is now diverted into acquiring consumer commodities, the desire for such objects is a 'universally distributed desire' (Hallsworth, 2005, 123), and through early socialisation Thatcher's babies, 'are given to understand that through possession of these desirable objects other desirable objects follow… identities are produced and reproduced' (Ibid). When they are excluded from participation in the market, excluded from trying to fulfil their desires, what they are experiencing is 'the deprivation of identity, a basic right, therefore consumption becomes not simply something that is culturally desirable, but something that is fundamentally expected' (Sumner, 2004, 150).

Previous needs and desires crucial to survival can be found in Maslow's hierarchy of Needs (1954), in his first model there was 5 stages of needs: the base being biological and physiological needs, followed by safety, then belongingness and love needs, esteem and eventually self-actualisation. In the 1990s this was adapted and included; cognitive needs and aesthetic needs –placed at 5 and 6, and transcendence needs as the ultimate need. Maslow believed that until you had successfully fulfilled one stage you could not move on to the next, therefore you could not be a fully functional member of society until you had reached self-actualisation (McLeod, 2007, online). What is missing from his analysis is the role of consumption. At first glance, one may think this is an absurd suggestion, however if we take the base needs the need for air, food shelter etc we cannot achieve these basic needs without purchasing food, somewhere to live and hydration, on the most basic level we cannot survive without consuming. This is applied throughout the other stages in his model; we need security and stability which comes from a steady income; we need belongingness and love which would come from our work or collective identity; our esteem needs are met through a sense of achievement, or skill mastery; our cognitive needs are met through acquiring knowledge and life meaning; the aesthetics is found in beauty and balance; self-actualisation

is then realised in peak personal growth and transcendence is found in others reaching their self-actualisation. The society of consumption has penetrated every stage of Maslow's model, and it is shown in this paper that the desires and needs that we once found to be fundamental are only achievable now through consumption. Moreover the higher level of needs can never be realised as even if some climb up the hierarchy, the society of consumption has created cycles within in each stage which will never be filled, this is because contrary to Maslow's belief, desire can never be fulfilled. Consumption has not only penetrated each stage but has made itself a necessity to fulfil each stage, making it the grand narrative.

We experience a constant state of unrealised desires, unobtainable needs, this is because were previous needs were filled with collectiveness and employment; we have moved into a state of individualisation and flexible employment therefore we try to fill our needs and desires with commodities. However this will never be completed as 'the gratification desired by human beings is almost unlimited' (Hall, 2012, 117), and consumerism continues to penetrate and rule society.

This is why capitalism and neo-liberals needed to create new needs within the public and manipulate them –just as Bernays did- to keep the wheels of *progress* turning, the more the desire, the more will be spent on trying to realise the desires and the more the economy will grow, a point used by Marx in Sassatelli (2007) 'the capitalist system must therefore induce ever-new needs in the human spirit, manipulating desires for commodities and increasing them incessantly' (75). This is best shown when the bubble burst in 2008 and society was encouraged to spend our way through the recession. This is achieved as Stiegler (2010) notes 'as libidinal energy, desire is produced by that apparatus that transforms the drives into investments in objects, via binding systems that were at once super-egotic and sublimatory'(156). Meaning that over the period of history the desires that are held in every person, their basic animal spirit, the *Id,* has manipulated and stimulated and increasingly harnessed in to consumer objects, ensuring the continuation of capitalism: 'these stimulated drives and desires can be harnessed into the economy whilst the system establishes and reproduces the degree of pacification and public order necessary for the maintenance of the circulatory economic processes required for it to Function (Hall, 2012 cited in Hall & Winlow eds). In order for this to be achieved successfully it must pass through the psyche apparatus, which is achieved by the *superego* being pacified over a long evolving time period. This 'results in both the squeezing of all anticipations into ultra-short term horizon of speculation, and the collapse of the system of motivations' (Stiegler, 2010, 107).

To understand how people operate within society we must start with motivation, why people act as they do, what drives people to do things. Everyone has motivations, which, have been largely ignored in society. Yet these are ever present 'our primitive desires do not go away, they are simply repressed' (Freud, cited in Heath & Potter, 2005, 43), and just because society has changed it does not make it less repressive (Ibid), in fact Heath & Potter (2005) illustrate the evolving process of repression using Elias' civilising process. Because we still possess our animal spirit, our drive in the core of our being, the violence which was once celebrated in societies, seen in the case of great warriors, has not disappeared; it's simply repressed. For example we do not discipline our children as we once did this desire is repressed in today's society and is seen as unacceptable behaviour: 'the violence has not gone away, it has simply become internalised' (Ibid, 48), they go further and argue that the 'history of civilisation is essentially the history of gradual repression'. They use the prominent example from the film Fight Club (1999) based on the novel of the same name in (1996), when Tyler Durden one of the main characters describes the changes in society:

> '*We're designed to be hunters and we're in a society of shopping. There is nothing to kill anymore, there's nothing to fight, nothing to overcome, nothing to explore. In that social emasculation this everyman is created*'

The film sums up accurately how society has created a society of shopping, and repressed the animal drives, which are taken back in the film by creating a fight club and then essentially a revolution on the economic system. The civilising process

> '*Idea was not to redefine the individual psyche down to its instinctual core, but to retain a sublimated form of barbarism as symbolic violence to fuel interpersonal competition and insulate this with the development of pacifying sensibilities in a customised super ego*'   (Hall, 2007 cited in Watson, 90)

This is what was seen in the chapter on neoliberal politics of the post war era. The effects of this process are different to conditioning, as seen in A Clockwork Orange (1971) based on the novel of the same name (1962), where the main character Alex is given psychological conditioning as part of his rehabilitation, yet his desire for violence and rape is not taken away as shown when he is released, he merely cannot physically partake in these activities- the desire to commit his crimes have not been repressed- society has experienced a different type of conditioning, our needs and desires have been manipulated-unlike Alex's'- into consumer activities, and as a result our behaviours and ways of thinking have changed. In this society all that we can do ' is carry on endlessly constructing and naming temporary, rootless, imagined collectiveness and identities in the midst of destruction' (Hall, 2012, 179). This is because all of our basic needs and drives being manipulated to the point where the evolution has taken its course and we have no alternative to consumerism -not even politics as shown in the consumerism chapter-this has become our default setting from birth, consumerism is the start and the end, in the 'evacuation of a political landscape' (Treadwell *et al,* 2012, 2).

This destruction of animal instinct and desire leads 'to a drive based frustration, forming a system' (Stiegler, 2010, 82) which is based on a plethora of social complexions, and 'criminology not only operates with underdeveloped models of desire, but largely restricts itself to narrow interpretations of strain theories, wherein crime is the result of frustration by the social structure of the needs which culture identities for the individual' (Morrison, 1995 cited in Sumner, 2004, 148). This paper has set the foundations for further investigation. It would argue and agree with Hall (2012) when he states that 'criminal actions are those of an individual who is both ideologically and neurologically motivated to undertake to go considerably further than the law abiding citizen' (Hall, 2012, 193), they are trying to include themselves in the market, by any means possible, their moralisation within the *superego* has now surpassed that of our predecessors, and not all criminal activity is seen as negative to all of society. Benefit fraud for example can be interpreted as the marginalised in society, trying by any means possible to survive in an increasingly symbolised world order.

 The aggression which is sublimated into individual competition is now showing itself in criminal activity, were competition is fuelling motivations and desires, shown with the riots of 2011. These criminals create fear within the public as they threaten to dissolve the symbolic identities they have created for themselves: 'the criminal arouses fear as he threatens to steal the law-abiding workers' joussaince' (Ibid, 159). As criminal means are becoming more and more mobilised through cybercrimes and the use of the internet it could be argued that it is a 'strategic normative practice employed to realise goals' (Moxton, 2011, 3). 'Envy and resentment are aroused by the possibility of being cheated and therefore

outcompeted in the open competition in which everyone is a compulsory entrant' (Hall, 2012, 159). This creates mistrust with people, and is shown in the breakdown of the traditional class systems and political system, as Standing (2011) notes through the dissolution of the working class and the creation of the Precariat, where 'marginalised young people now live in the absence of a unifying political symbolism that represents a coherent alternative to ideology' (Treadwell, *et al*, 2012, 15). There is no class solidarity as a result of the manipulation of needs, Simdon in Stiegler (2010) calls this process individuation, who is in conflict with the other social systems within society, which are again just a collection of individual discourses, for example the criminal justice system, which as shown in this paper, is disconnected from not only society, but the individuals who are a part of the system. We have moved from amour de soi to that of amour prope just as Rousseau predicted. Leaving the societal actor as an individualised competitor, in an increased competitive society, with no brethren to stand by him and fight, because there is no class, there is no politics as politics like Bentham believed of criminal justice is there to create the greatest happiness for the greatest number, in this society there is no place for collective happiness, only individual, and we are left with a:

> *'Post political present, [where] it seems almost impossible for a potential collective of marginalised subjects to construct a universal political narrative that makes casual and contextual sense of their own shared suffering'*

(Treadwell *et al,* 2012, 3).

The Owl of Minerva

In the temporal shift noted by Rousseau -the move from amour de soi to amour prope- a plethora of profound intellectuals within the twentieth century were ignored, pushed aside, highly critiqued or misunderstood. A direct consequence of the dissension with the *celebrated* theories of the time: 'Freud, Veblen and Adorno saw certain human tendencies as the main part of the problem' (Hall, 2012, 34). This human tendency is linked to the drives and desires of the human being. Starting with Freud, who believed that the nirvana principle and the death drive, which is 'the urge for us to destroy what threatens us before we can understand and deal with it in a reflexive and rational manner' (Hall, 2012, 336), was a fundamental driving force in our personalities. These ideas were marginalised before they were assed in a rational manner, however it is only in hindsight that we can revisit these and asses them truly, as this paper has shown.

Lacan (1992) distinguished between drives and desires, both are central to his theories, he seen desire as a human certainty, a biological instinct which we all hold, and the drives are to fill the desire which is principally concerned with a lack or manqué, there main aim is to recreate desire, to keep it alive within the human psyche. For Lacan the real was something that caused trauma, as it's 'a concentration of externally and internally sourced stimuli that stir into the sense of life but cannot be understood' (Ibid). He believed that at the core of being we have a huge void of nothingness, surrounded by our energies (drives) which are in conflict with each other, whilst trying to fill the void with meaning and existence, in order to achieve this these drives must pass through a nexus –a gate- which leads us into our conscious. It is in this nexus we find meanings in symbolic things, the coherent symbolic order is formed, which we need to survive within society. What this paper argues is that now consumerism rules and gives shape and meaning to this symbolic order, not creating the endless void, but manipulating it and using it as a cash cow to keep the wheels of capitalism

in motion. This can be described in lament terms as we the consumers in society are essentially like the character of Dr Faustus in Marlow's play of the same name (1604), where we are constantly on the search to fill our desires with knowledge, consumer items etc, however in doing this we have sold our soul (identities as producers, class solidarity) to the devil or the celebrated capitalist system, which has somewhat distracted us –as a spectacle is ought to- from deeper issues within society, such as politics, which is why we are now a set of individuals rather than a collective society who can achieve change. This cannot be reversed now as at the nexus, which creates meaning as it passes through consumerism now controls. It is this symbolic order we need to give ourselves any sense of stable understanding within society. These 'accents on symbolic relations also informed the psychodynamic theories of Freud and NeoFreudians such as Lacan and Ellis' (Hall, 2007, in Watson, 83).

Another theorist which can be described as 'hit [ting] the nail on the head' (Heath & Potter, 2005, 117), is Veblen (1837-1929). 'He blames consumers for consumerism. More specifically he argues that the existing social hierarchy is activity maintained by competitive consumption among all classes of society' (Heath & Potter, 2005, 118), he states that even though it wasn't in the working classes interests they still participate in it. He also saw 'consumer goods as markers of social prestige and status' (Miles, 1998, 18), which fuelled the competitive consumption which has meant that identities are pinned on these goods - an 'elaborate system of ranks and grades' (Ibid). The economy thusly determines social behaviour by participation; however 'the progressive left has spent most of the twentieth century trying to resist his ideas' (Heath & Potter, 2005, 118). Moreover Heath and Potter claim that his analysis 'is far more penetrating than any of theories developed in the twentieth century. In Veblen's view the fundamental problem with the consumer society is not that our needs are artificial, but the goods produced are valued less for their intrinsic properties than for their markers of relative success' (Heath & Potter, 2005, 115), which is shown clearly in the chapter entitled 'the price of everything and value of nothing'.

There are many more theorists and theories which could be explored here such as Adorno, Baudrillard, Baudiou, Freud and Zizek to name a few, yet due to the constraints on this paper, one cannot explore them here, but they should be incorporated into any detailed analysis. This is due to the celebrated theorist of the twentieth century trying to outdo the great theorists which preceded them:

> '*From symbolic interactionism to Derridean deconstruction and Foucauldian discurvity, all contemporary idealists theorists fail because they have set up a straw man Hegel, in their efforts to supersede him*'   (Hall, 2012, 212).

 Criminology as noted in the introduction is a discipline which is drawn on from other disciplines notably sociology, and the different strands within it highlight the problems faced when trying to study it: ' from its inception the discipline of criminology has been highly differentiated in its theoretical, methodological and empirical concerns (Huey & Pare, 2010, 237), because 'as an umbrella discipline, it encompasses a wide range of academic and practical pursuits that have had their central focus problems related to law making, law breaking and social reactions to both' (Ibid).

 What we are faced with now is a 'preoccupation with individual offenders is overlaid by concern with identifying and classifying suspect populations in order to manage risks they collectively pose' (Zendner, 2007, 265), individual risk management dominates society, and as a result criminology's rasion d'etre is questionable and confusing. Even security and safety is a consumer item and seen as an industry, and 'post crime orientation of criminal justice is

increasingly over shadowed by the pre-crime logic of security' (Ibid), rather than criminal motivation, security and control are the reason and focus of criminology in this century, and 'much now goes under the heading of criminology is the study of crime control and criminal justice' (Ibid, 268).

One of the most prominent criticisms on the theories in the twentieth century, such as labelling, sub-culturalism, rational choice and situational crime prevention is that the 'focus on crime events diverted attention away from the root causes of crime' (Cullen, 2011, 303). Security is now used as a political controlling tool, and increases the individuals' responsibility, thus increasing individualisation of social actors, this is reflected in the growth in crime rates, what one must remember is that crime is a socially constructed phenomena, and without going into the reliability and validity of published crime figures, it is reported that they are on the rise, but what if it's the social reaction to crime which has increased thus reflecting on the figures: 'rise in crime began signs not so much of any changes in the real crime rate but of increased government and public responses to crime' (Young, 1999, 35).

What is required now, this paper would argue, is a construction of 'a multi-layered theory of criminogenic conditions and experiences that at least offer explanations for many forms of harmful crimes' (Hall, 2012, 192-193), 'economic psychologists like Hoch and Lowenstein claim the only way forward is to collapse these two very separate literatures into one' (Hayward, 2007, 241). This paper would go further and argue that we need to bring in any form of analysis that would increase the understanding of criminal actions and criminal motivations, such as, economics, psychology, sociology, and politics, which requires revisiting the philosophers which were previously cast out.

Indeed 'many thinkers are now coming to understand that the visceral subject is far more than an effect of language and discourse, the history has not ended, that the economy is without a doubt a major part of the bedrock of human existence' (Hall, 2012, 1-2). Hall (2012) has started to lead the way in this approach and used Elias' civilisation process, among various other theories which have been ignored to reach the pseudo pacification process, it traces history to show how we have evolved or sublimated our raw anxiety into competitive individualism against each other, exacerbated by consumerism:

> '*They suggest that during the transition from feudalism to capitalism the bourgeoisie repressed violence and hostility in order to protect private property. Yet the aggressively competitive value system that underlay nascent capitalism remained undistributed, and since the Thatcher-Regan years state efforts to slow atomisation by expanding opportunities to engage in consumerism and by coming to something a rapprochement with labour have been largely abandoned. Thus, symbolic violence is encouraged and this includes the disparagement and humiliation of others due to perceived defects in their consumption choices*'   (Moxton, 2011, 3).

The pacifying process is in separable from a process of criminalisation, as human nature is not predictable, or one dimensional therefore criminal behaviour is needed to be placed in wider sociological circumstances, but individualisation needs to be taken into consideration for motivations of criminal activity, the one area in which it seems to be ignored, and therefore behind the societal times. These points have been commented upon throughout history and ignored, it is only now in retrospect that their true value can be seen, like the owl of Minerva.

Findings: Criminal Consumerism A Way of Life I Shop Therefore I Am

The cost of living in today's society, for an average family of 4 it was reported on the BBC [online, 2012] that it costs £26,800 to survive, a report by the Joseph Rountree Foundation, shows that on social welfare benefits you only receive 60% of this income- as a couple aged over 18 you receive £111.45 a week income support, and £20.30 for your first child and £13.40 for each child thereafter (www.gov.co.uk). The study found that in order to earn enough to live a 'socially acceptable' life one must earn £9.39 an hour, whereas in this country the minimum wage is £6.11, and according to Pay Scale UK [online, 2012], there is only 2 jobs (for the average person) out of 7 which earn over the £9.39 an hour, which is an electrician and a carpenter, both of which are highly skilled professions. This is in a context of mass unemployment, although it is reported today that we're experiencing the highest fall in unemployment since June 2011 (Kollewe, J. 2012, guardian online). However what must be taken into consideration is the change in employment trends, such as we have more people in part time and flexible/temporary employment than before, which provide no security or match the minimum £9.39 an hour to survive. Therefore work or claiming benefits is not the logical choice for the participants, as you do not get the lifestyle required; end up in debt, and for what, there is a resounding attitude that if you're not in a life of criminality you're a *mug*. 'According to many criminals, everyday lives plagued by debt, moderate incomes, low social status, sacrifice and responsibly are for mugs' (Hall, 2012, 45):

> '*I don't know anyone who works and gets real cash….I'd just be some little mug living in a shitty flat on a sinking council estate, probably with a few kids to boost my benefits'* (Karen, Criminal identities, Hall *et al*, 2008, 34-35).

The secondary analysis of the interviews within the chosen texts have shown that criminal activity is in fact based on logical choice, as the classical school imposed on the current criminal justice system, however what is evident from the interviews is that logical choice is not universal to everyone, it is like everything else, subjective to that person and their circumstances, which is a fatal flaw in not only the classical schools argument, but as a consequence our current system: the application, the study of, and the perception of it. People chose to commit crime, but what is depleted from the study is the reason why, Karen is a sex worker, which is a criminal offence, she has chosen this life path:

> '*End of the day, im a fucking sex worker, because I want the money'*

> (Criminal Identities, Hall *et al*, 2008, 34).

Craig also tells the researchers how it is a choice:

> '*You've got a choice, either manage to get the money or miss out, it's simple. But why should I miss out?'* (Ibid, 44).

Freddie forms a stronger argument, showing how when he took part in the looting of the 2011 riots, it was not only a rational choice, for him, but it was logically and coherently planned:

> '*Fuck the police, I am going to get what I can. We arranged to steal stuff. We didn't just go out and see what we could get, we got together to discuss it and which we*

would use. We decided on a corsa and white van. It was organised bruv.'
(Shopocalypse Now, Treadwell *et al*, 2012, 7).

This is because he and his friends wanted a piece of the pie; they ceased an opportunity, which was logically sound to them. To these participants, and arguably a plethora of others taking part in all types of criminal activity – such as the MPs in the expenses scandal, although no criminal charges were brought in this- crime pays: 'successful criminality is an efficient way of avoiding debt and tax whilst elevating the individual up the ranks of security and post social status' (Hall, 2012, 45).

This is because legitimate work to these does not provide enough income to be secure, or where one would like to be in the social hierarchy, or to even survive:

> '*How the fuck can you go and work your arse off for a couple of hundred quid a week'* (Tony, Criminal Identities, Hall *et al,* 2008, 83).

Damon's situation is worse than Tony's he sees criminal activity as a necessity to survive:

> '*Cause I never 'ad any money, never had any money for me or the family. Sitting eatin' baked beans out of the tin and thought that's it. That's all I see, that's why everyone does it, livin' on the dole or doin' a job and aving no money, can't go out, can't live like everyone else.'*
> (Damon, Out of Sight, McAuley, 2007, 62).

Money is needed as consumerism is not only a fundamental right, but also a necessity to survive as shown in the evaluation of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, in Ideological Genesis of Needs, consumerism infiltrates every aspect of the social world and to consume one needs money to do so. This is shown by the participants:

> '*You hear these people on the box and that, and its all money doesn't make you happy and that. Fucking money doesn't make you happy?! Give me some money, give me some fucking money, see how happy it makes me. Fucking wankers. If you've got nowt, money is, money is fucking, well moneys fucking **IT**, isn't it?'*
> (Carl, Criminal Identities, Hall *et al,* 2008, 49).

Carl seems very angry that money is pushed aside as the road to happiness, it may not be the road to happiness, but in this society it is as clearly shown as a marker of success. What criminality allows is access to the market, it generates money for them to be able to do so, to survive:

> '*With the Coke and that, there's no way I'd be doing it if I didn't need the money'*
> (Foz, Ibid, 55)

> '*I can remember having to go and pinch from the Spar cos she would leave us with nowt'* (Stevie, Ibid,30)

And to live to the standards which could be interpreted as successful:

> '*When you're buying it's not just the stuff you buy, it's the shop init*

> (Dwayne, Ibid, 60)

> *'Ideally you want to be wearing all the best gear'*
>
> (Ray, Violent Night, Winlow and Hall, 2006, 83).

However what consumption has also instilled into the social actor is the fact that no matter what you have you always want more, you must keep up with the Jones, no sooner as your successful markers are displayed there is new ones out, which are needed to continue your display of success, the malady of infinite aspirations, which have been altered into consumer goods allows this to continue:

> *'I was making alright money but it wasn't enough for me….. so It made sense to go on a naughty graft'* (Graham, Criminal Identities, Hall *et al* 2008, 37).

For some of the participants money is a case of life or death, and they risk their lives on a regular basis in order to be rich:

> *'Get rich or die trying. That will be fucking me that, I'll either be loaded or some cunt 'll end up topping ez'* (Taz, Ibid, 42)

This is because the alternative that the marginalised is left with is unbearable to them:

> *'It's daft man, just never having any money, never having nowt, never going out, never having no gear, what's the point '* (Billy, Ibid, 77)
>
> *'It would be shit being one of them normal fuckers that never does nowt. Just going to graft all day then sitting board of your tits'* (Jonathon, Ibid, 59).

The vibe that the participants show to non-criminals, or those in receipt of benefits, is that of disgust, or a slight snobbery, this is a result of the entrepreneurial spirit that is instilled from the neo-liberals, and celebrated in this climate; criminals use this spirit for self-progression, in a dog-eat-dog world, a spirit which they do not see in others:

> *'There is no point in grafting for somebody else, whatever your into you have to be your own boss, get rich by letting all the divvies do all the work and take all the risks'* (Taz, Criminal Identities, Hall *et al*, 2008, 40)

They believe in answering to no-one:

> *'I want good gear, but I don't want some shit job, I don't want some fucking training course. I don't wanna work for some prick. I want to get up when I want, have a smoke, have a few tots and do fuck all'*
> (Frankie, Shopocalypse Now, Treadwell *et al,* 2012, 13)

 Stopping at nothing:

> *'I promised myself I would do whatever I had to get what I wanted, that day I chose to become the best criminal I could be. I meant it. I spent the next five years doing masses of fraud'* (Diana, Criminal Identities, Hall *et al,* 2008, 39-40).

This entrepreneurial spirit was seen most plainly in the participants who dealt drugs, it was seen as an easy way to make money, generate income:

> *'I'd rather do time than sit on my arse like a lot of lads round here. They've got fuck all, and they're never going to have fuck all either. If worse came to worse, get a bag*

of coke laid on, and try and make some money' (Ray, in Violent Night, Winlow *et al,* 2006, 36).

Which shows how crime can 'functional economically' (Hall, 2012, 142) as money goes back into the capitalist economic system.

These behaviours have become normalised in their culture through the socialisation of being the best one can be, and increased individualism and competition. Stevie from criminal identities (2008) shown earlier stared by pinching from local shops in order to eat, as this behaviour became normalised, and he realised he could just take what he wanted as his criminal career progressed. This is the case for a number of participants; Tony started out taking sweets he wanted and then progressed, as it was getting him what he wanted:

> '*The shop lifting was the only way I could get sweets and that, then it developed into clothes and stuff, it was just really to get stuff for myself'* (Criminal Identities, Hall *et al,* 2008, 82)

For Buster it started as he was socialised and normalised from the age of 5 into drug dealing behaviour, he tells how it just progresses, how it is just a way of life:

> '*Brother had lots of friends who sold drugs.. I see them robbing people, selling drugs making lots of money. I was like 5. …. It's something I didn't expect, like once you do something you get deeper and deeper into things. It is fast cash, easy money, tax free'* (Buster, Reluctant Gangsters, Pitts, 2007, 87-92).

At first glance, it may seem that this would advocate Sutherlands strain theory and many other sub cultural theories, however it does not, it is because the desires and wants in the *id* have been manipulated, whilst the *superego* moralised and normalised the means to achieve these through the political social economy, this is demonstrated in the literature review, this manipulation affects the behaviour in the *ego* and thus the actions of the social actor:

> '*You know when you want something, really want it? I was desperate to have it [bike]….this older lad asked me to do a smash and grab with him… we ended up doing two….proper crazy stuff..I got my bike thou'* (Tony, Criminal Identities, Hall *et al,* 2008, 82-83)

Consumerism is used by capitalism to try and satisfy the wants of any social actor, and fill the void which Lacan claims is at the core of our being:

> '*When I get older, I'm after a proper flash house somewhere, a nice car, holidays, and the rest of it'* (Ray, Violent Night, Winlow *et al,* 2006, 36)

Ray shows how this has worked as items/commodities are used and desired, Diana however states how consumerism is like an addictive drug, which is omnipresent, although when she gained everything she wanted she still felt empty, the void that Lacan spoke of can never be filled and she shows, the effect of consumerism from manipulating desires and the effect of it being never ending:

> '*living the dream I had it all, all the best clothes, the most expensive make up, the newest trainers, the named jeans, I had everything… right down to designer fucking soap in my bathroom.*

I still didn't feel like I was "somebody". On the outside though people thought I was somebody, someone special someone good…..

Buying in the notion that having all the right things would mean I would have a good life. The endless search for that something that would make me feel like a somebody….

Im still fighting that particular addiction, to fight this image that's been planted into you, that what you have is who you are. It hits you from all sides, no escape, its subliminal' (Diana, Criminal Identities, Hall *et al,* 2008, 39-40).

In order for the neo-liberals to be able enforce this manipulation, once traditional structures were destroyed, which affected notably the moralisation of up and coming generations, which in turn affects relationships within society:

'*I just can't see the point. You just get bored and when it gets like that with a bird, I can't see the point….. if you're bored with a lass why bother keeping it up?*
(Ray, Violent Night, Winlow and Hall*, 2006, 40).

In this society of the spectacle this is ever increasing:

'*Why bother getting tied down? … You can't trust them, the same way they can't trust us'* (Joe, Ibid, 46).

Trust is dissolved in this overly individualised society, with everyone, trust with each other, and trust in the political system and trust in a once sacred institution:

'*I know plenty of people who are unfaithful. It's all over the place'* (Michael, Ibid, 51).

The once traditional values have given way to self-protection:

'*You don't need to get married these days like you used to… the money and everything and then if you have to get divorced ….. Just get yourself out there and enjoy it'* (Fred, Ibid, 46).

These are the celebrated values which the neo-liberals have grinded into society in order to further capitalist movements, in order to break the collectivism which could challenge their power. When destroying collectivism they dissolved notions of family, religion, and for the new generations, attitudes have fundamentally changed demonstrated by Donna:

'*I don't think there is much stigma attached to sex these days'* (Ibid, 48).

These attitudes have changed as a result of the manipulation of the *id* and the *superego* which in its original state is almost lost, because these have changed the socialisation has surpassed being Schizoid (Hall, 2012), but it is now solely an individualised and self-progressive process, where values of looking after yourself and not worrying about anyone else is encouraged, whilst an older nostalgic generation are at a lost trying to understand and operate in this current sociological climate. They do not comprehend any of the societal processes are taking place including crime and criminal behaviour, this is because 'our civilisation is built upon our willingness to accept rules and curtail the pursuit of our individual interests out of difference to the needs and interests of others' (Heath and Potter, 2005, 342), it is a case of the new generation – of the lost- being more willing to accept these things and go further to

get what they want, than those of an older more traditional social time and place, which is indefinitely exhibited through the participants and the literature review.

Conclusion

This paper has investigated the birth of criminology and consumerism, by tracing the history of both these phenomenon's it has highlighted the short comings within them from conception and evaluated their contribution to society, whilst tracing this it is apparent that they are intertwined and should be studied as such, as well as interrelation between these areas and individual actions, which is lacking in current sociological and criminological theory:

> '*At the core of all intellectual inquiry in the humanities and social sciences is the ontology of the subject, and this is where we have experienced the greatest failure*'
> (Hall, 2012, 185).

It has revealed that history should be viewed as an evolutionary process, and not in separate epochs of history, one cannot explore history without placing it into the context of social and power relations of that time, and although Valier (2002) does note that there is power struggles she does not go into detail on these (Hall, 2012). This is true for all social constructs including criminology: 'the intellectual history of criminology shows that academic work in the fields is shaped by an institutional power base' (Luna-Feclices, 2010, 253). This is best displayed with the formation of the classical school of criminology, where the early philosophers wished to form a power base that was independent from all other power based institutions such as politics and the economy. This fatal flaw is still present in contemporary studies into criminal behaviour and crime control these are not placed into wider social context; For example the riots of 2011 were not placed into the wider social context of exclusion from the economic market. They were followed by the positivist school who transformed criminology into a more scientific study that attributed initially biological factors where responsible for criminal activity, although thoroughly discredited against rigorous ethical standards and cultivated social research methods, this paper has shown they have been the closest to actually uncovering criminal motivation. 'We cannot deny our existence as biological beings' (Hall, 2012, 185), and although in an entirely different capacity it is as this paper and current theories of pseudo pacification, biological makeup that is responsible for criminal motivations. If positivism had not have ignored the psychological theories of the time, this may have been discovered before the innate biological systems, with the aid of social constructions, manipulated the actions of the social collective psyche.

However they did not which allowed the growth of functional criminality, with the odyssean trickster excelling and promoting non-virtuous values which started to fragment socialisation of the up and coming generations. Which can be paraelled to cybercrime, which is shown is this paper as the modern odyssean playground. Where the original trickery is now manifested as online fraud, which the current criminal justice system is ill-equip to deal with. This aided the creative ways in which distinction administered desire amongst all classes of society. Displaying that desire created consumerism not production, without the desire for the products in the first instance there would have been no need to manufacture them. The desire for the products were manipulated in the psyche of the collective individual started by Bernays to create the advertising industry, and continued by the Neo-Liberals to ensure the growth of the markets, which had been established by this point.

This desire was swayed by the Neo-Liberals into the economic market to cash in on the desires of the collective society, they created an omnipresent narrative which could not fail, people partake in consumption to be a part of the collective, but also to be distinctive from the masses, which started individualisation. People wished to be set out from the crowds to better the Joneses therefore they needed the latest emblems of identity to prove their illusory social status, a theme which encouraged non-collective actions. Aided by the drumming of bettering oneself and being informed that there is no such thing as society resulting in 'separated individuals and communities from their shared history, ushering us all into a post-political present' (Treadwell *et al*, 2012, 10).

Socialisation as a result stopped being schizoid and was surpassed by individualisation, increased competitiveness was instilled from birth and collectivism is a nostalgic notion. Therefore the political system dissolved into a sea of individuals as traditional class structures collapsed and now 'the social does not exist as such' (Ibid). In this society of the spectacle any reference to the once real is lost and reality is increasing subjective to the social actors circumstances.

Whilst this evolution was taking place the criminological arena was debating over strain theory and sub cultural learnt behaviours, without actually paying attention to any of the power institutions and what effect they had on criminal behaviour. If they had realised that the economy was a critical part of social life their analysis and studies of criminal behaviour may have penetrated more into criminal motivations rather than being skin deep and ignoring many social factors. Furthering these criminal actions became the result of a mere thrill seeking activity and studies shown that crime is exciting. However as shown in this paper there is no logic in this analysis as the participants state, in fact crime is about money, as is everything else. Criminal actions have been proved to be logical to the criminal, which is where criminology has failed, it has tried to frame criminal activity in non-criminal logic whilst ignoring the factors which would aid this understanding.

Whilst criminology ignored the social construct and importance of money the neo-liberals excelled in making it more easily available with credit which drove capitalism in to light speed momentum. The non-social collective was happily buying their identities on borrowed money whilst crime rates were on the rise to be included in this shopping expedition: 'in these marginalised spaces, crime is now an instrument for achieving imaginary positions of social distinction and respect' (Treadwell *et al*, 2012, 11). Consumerism is unavoidable as it became a necessity for people to use it to try and fill the Lacanian void biologically present in us all, shown in the adaption of Maslow's hierarchy of needs, it is inescapable as is the need for money to fund the inclusion in the market. However as this need increased and desires were manipulated true value was lost as it became ever more subjective to the individual. In this sense we lost all *real* value of money and commodities and society became fluid. Historical evolution pacified the psyche of the individual, and the neo-liberals added the final piece of the puzzle by engineering this psyche into capitalism and economic progression.

The individual in this climate has no traditional standing sense of collectivism to refer back to, as the once fundamental institutions such as religion has been evaded from its significance, and the generation from Thatcher who have experienced pure homo calculus and hedonistic socialisation have where left to turn other than to the high street brands who offer them comfort, meaning and identity. These are the generation of the lost in a society of the unreal. With traditional structures long gone the generation of the lost have no collective action to change their position in society, for example Politics is a traditional institution which has been dissolved, therefore when the economic bubble burst 2008 they had no way

to express their dissatisfaction and fear that threatened their socially constructed world, in which their survival hung on credit which was removed. In this sense the Riots of 2011 proved a shift forward: an excluded generation came together to express their despondency with the current sociological climate, although many businesses were destroyed, and lives were lost, the rioters acted as a community almost, in which there was meaning in their actions. They targeted the most powerful social institution: Consumerism, which once would have been politics. This generation had no choice but to target high street stores because of the manipulation of needs within they psyche which the neo-liberals achieved with ease: 'it is possible to detect a deeper context: a common ideological background of neo-liberal triumph' (Treadwell *et al,* 2012, 2). This is because the 'fullness of consumer enjoyment means fullness of life. *I shop therefore I am*' (Bauman, 2011, cited in Treadwell *et al*, 2012, 13).

Although we have lost the sense of collectivism, it is starting to peek through in small bursts within society, some examples would be; the actions of the riots, the actions after the riots wherein communities pulled together to clean up, it is starting to come through in advertising also where the new Tesco Mobile advert encourages collectivism to decrease the cost of communication through such ploys as Family Perks. As the advertising industry is starting to promote collectivism it may have more of an impact on the societal mood as it is proven to alter the psyche of individuals.

What criminology has failed to achieve since its conception is to evaluate the importance of other social areas in relation to crime and until that is accomplished it will struggle as a discipline to successfully explore and examine criminal behaviour and motivations:

> '*Until criminology, and social science in general, make an effort to incorporate more completely a critical analysis of consumer culture and post-political ideology, it will experience difficulty in fully contextualising its understanding of the further eruptions of depoliticized disorder that await us in the 21st century as the economic growth on which capitalism's prosperity and socio-economic inclusion depend reaches on its objective limit*' (Treadwell, *et al¸* 2012, 15).

This paper has attempted to lay the foundations for further study into this area whilst endeavouring to bridge the gap in popular criminological theory to actual criminological motivations. It is my no means a full scale study into this as it is only a small scale project yet it has provided a readily accessible account of the turbulence romance shared by consumerism and criminal motivation. It has pulled together the all the fragmented parts of social science theory to try and create the start of a comprehensive true account of crime and consumption. Due to time and resource limitations it has only looked at street crime, however the foundations for the further study into white collar and sexual crime have been set, as they are one of the same. Treadwell *et al* (2012) claim that 'criminology can enhance its ability to explain this important aspect of contemporary social unrest by placing a little more centrally in its theoretical cannon' (1-2), which is what this paper has accomplished.

References and Bibliography

Agger, B. (1991) 'Critical Theory, Post Structuralism, Postmodernism: Their Sociological Relevance', *Annual Review of Sociology,* 17, pp. 105-131.

Arrigo, B. & Barrett, L. (2008) 'Philosophical Criminology and Complex Systems Science: Towards a Critical Theory of Justice', *Critical criminology,* 16, pp. 165- 184.

Barnett, Clive; Clarke, Nick; Cloke, Paul and Malpass, Alice (2005) 'The political ethics of consumerism', *Consumer Policy Review*, 15(2), pp. 45–51.

Baudrillard. J. (1998) *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*. Sage: London.

Bauman, Z. (2007) *Consuming Life*. Policy Press: Cambridge.

Bauman, Z. (2005) *Work, Consumption and the New Poor.* Open University Press: Berkshire.

Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1966) *The Social Construction of Reality: a Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Penguin Books: Middlesex.

Bertens, H. (1995) *The Idea of the Postmodern: a History*. Routledge: London.

Bootzin, R. *et al* (1991) *Psychology Today: An Introduction*. 7th rev. edn. McGraw-Hill, Inc: London.

Bryman, A. (2008) *Social Research Methods*. 3rd rev.edn. University press: Oxford.

Burton, J. & Lamme, M. (2011) 'The Evolution of an Idea: Charting the Early Public Relations Ideology of Edward L Bernays', *Journal of Communication Management,* 15, (3), pp. 223-235.

Carlen, P. (2012) 'Doing Critique, Doing Politics', in Hall, S and Winlow, S. (eds.) *New Directions in Criminological Theory*. London: Willan/Routledge

Craib, I. (1992) *Modern Social Theory: from Parsons to Habermas*. Harvester and Wheatsheaf: London.

Crow, I. & Semmens, N. (2008) *Researching Criminology.* McGrawHill Open University Press: Berkshire.

Cullen, F. (2011) 'Beyond Adolescence-limited Criminology: Choosing our Future- the American society of criminology 2010 Sutherland address', *Criminology,* 49,(11), pp. 287-330.

Currie, E. (1997) 'Market Crime and Community: Towards a mid-range theory of post-industrial violence". *Theoretical Criminology,* 1, (2), pp. 147-172.
Dale, A. *et al* (1988) *Doing Secondary Analysis*. Unwin Hyman Ltd: London.

Davis, M. (2008) *Freedom and Consumerism: A Critique of Zygmunt Bauman's Sociology*. Ashgate: Hampshire.

Denscombe, M. (2010) *The Good Research Guide: For Small Scale Social Research Projects.* McGraw Hill: Berkshire.

Docherty, T. (1993) *Postmodernism: A Reader*. Wheatsheaf: London.
Elliott, A. (2009) *Contemporary Social Theory: An Introduction*. Routledge: London.

Elliot, A & Turner, B. (2001) *Profiles in Cotemporary Social Theory*. Sage: London.

Eski, Y. (2011) 'Port of call: Towards a criminology of port security', *Criminology and Criminal Justice,* 11, (5), pp. 415-431.

Fadaei-Tehrani, R. & Green, T. (2002) 'Crime and Society', *International Journal of Social Economics,* 29, (10), pp. 781-796.

Farrell, G. (2010) 'Situational Crime Prevention and its Discontents: Rational Choice and Harm Reduction versus Cultural Criminology', *Social Policy and Administration,* 44(1), pp. 40-66.

Featherstone, M. (2007) *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. 2ⁿᵈ rev.edn. Sage: London.

Featherstone, M. & Hepworth, M. & Turner, B. eds. (1991) *The Body: Social Processes and Cultural Theory*. Sage: London.

Greener, I. (2007) 'Choice and Voice: A review', *Social policy and society,* 7, (2), pp. 255-265.

Grover, C. (2011) 'Social Protests in 2011: Material and Cultural Aspects of Economic Inequalities', *Social Research Online,* 16, (4), pp. 18.

Guthrie, W. (1958) 'Pretty Boy Floyd', http://www.woodyguthrie.org/Lyrics/Pretty_Boy_Floyd.htm Accessed 10/10/12.

Haines F. (2008) *Crime and Criminology*. 4ᵗʰ rev.edn. University Press: Oxford.

Haines, F. & Sutton, A. (2000) 'Criminology as a Religion? Profane thoughts about Sacred Values', *British Journal of Criminology,* 40, pp. 146-162.

Hall, S. & Winlow, S. & Ancrum, C. (2008) *Criminal Identities and Consumer Culture: Crime, Exclusion and the New Culture of Narcissism*. Willan Publishing: Devon.

Hall, S. (2012) 'Consumer Culture and the Meaning of the Urban Riots in England', in Hall, S and Winlow, S. (eds.) *New Directions in Criminological Theory*. London: Willan/Routledge

Hall, S. & Winlow, S. (2012) (Eds). *New Directions in Criminological Theory.* Routledge: London.

Hall, S. (2007) 'The Emergence and Breakdown of the Pseudo-Pacification Process', in Watson, K. (ed) *Assaulting the Past,* Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Press.

Hall, S. (2012) *Theorizing Crime and Deviance: A New Perspective.* London: Sage.

Hall, S. (2012) 'The Solicitation of the Trap: On transcendence and transcendental materialism in advanced consumer-capitalism', *Human Studies Special Issue on Transcendence and Transgression*, 35(3), pp. 365-38.

Hallsworth, S. (2005) *Street Crime*. Willan Publishing: Devon.

Hayward, K. (2004) *City Limits: Crime, Consumer Culture and The Urban Experience*. Glasshouse Press: London.

Hayward, K. (2007) 'Situational Crime Prevention and its Discontents: Rational Choice Theory versus the 'Culture of Now'', *Social Policy and Administration,* 41, (3), pp. 232-250.

Heath, J. & Potter, A. (2005) *The Rebel Sell: How the Counter Culture Became Consumer Culture.* Capstone Publishing Limited: Sussex.

Heinberg, R. (2011) *The End of Growth: Adapting to our new Economic Reality*. New Society Publishers: Canada.

Henham, R. (1998) 'Human Rights, Due Process and Sentencing'*, British Journal of Criminology,* 38, (4), pp. 592-610.
Herman, M. (2007) 'The (R)evolution of Public Relations: Controlling the Uncontrollable', *Public Relations Strategist,* 13, (4), pp. 12-15.

Herrnstein, R. & Wilson J. (1985) *Crime and Human Nature: The Definitive Study of the Causes of Crime.* Touchstone: New York.

Hobbs, D. (2012) 'It was never about the Money: Market Society, Organised Crime and UK Criminology', in Hall, S and Winlow, S. (eds.) *New Directions in Criminological Theory*. London: Willan/Routledge.

Hogg, M. & Vaughan G. (2008). *Social psychology.* 5th rev.edn. Person education Limited: Harlow.

Hopkins- Burke, R. (2001). *Introduction to Criminological Theory*. 3rd rev.edn. Willan Publishing: Devon.

http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-18770783 Accessed 10/10/12.
https://www.gov.uk/income-support/what-youll-get Accessed 10/10/12.
https://www.gov.uk/child-benefit/what-youll-get Accessed 10/10/12.
http://women.timesonline.co.uk/tol/life_and_style/women/body_and_soul/article2452928.ece Accessed 1/12/10.
http://www.payscale.com/research/UK/Country=United_Kingdom Accessed 10/10/12.
http://www.canterburypeople.co.uk/Homeless-teen-admits-shoplifting-food-Canterbury/story-17099747-detail/story.html Accessed 23/10/12.
http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2086227/Antony-Worrall-Thompson-Pub-shoplifting-chef-owns-share-goes-bust.html Accessed 23/10/12.
http://www.ic3.gov/media/annualreports.aspx Accessed 26/09/12.
http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/rereferencetables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-226727

Accessed 4/4/12.

Hudson, B. (1987) *Justice through Punishment: A Critique of the 'Justice' Model of Corrections*. Macmillian Education: Hampshire.

Huey, L. & Pare, P. (2010) 'Bridging divides in Canadian Criminology: Some thoughts on a possible future.' *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice.*

Jones, P. (2003) *Introducing Social Theory*. Polity: Cambridge.

Kemshall, H. (2000) 'Conflicting Knowledge's on Risk: the Case of Risk Knowledge in the Probation Service', *Health, Risk & Society,* 2, (2), pp. 143-158.

Kollewe, J. (2012) 'Unemployment falls to 15-month low' http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2012/oct/17/uk-unemployment-falls-lowest-ons Accessed 17/10/12.

Kubrick, S. (1972) *A Clockwork Orange,* Warner Bros: United Kingdom.

Kumar, K. (1995) *From Post-Industrial to Post-Modern Society: New Theories of the Cotemporary World*. Blackwell: Oxford.
Lehtonen, M. (2010) 'Mission Impossible? Neo-Liberal Subjects and Empowerment', *Nordicom-Information,* 32, (2), pp. 9-17.

Lee, M. (2000) (ed). *The Consumer Society Reader.* Blackwell Publishers: Oxford.

Luna-Felices, M. (2010) 'rethinking criminology(ies) through the inclusion of political violence and armed conflict as legitimate objects of inquiry.' *Revue canadienne de crimologie et de justice penale,* 52, (3), pp. 249-269.

Lury, C. (1999) *Consumer Culture*. Polity Press: Cambridge.

Marazzi, C. (2010). *The Violence of Finical Capitalism*. Semiotext(e): LA.

Marlowe, C. (1620) *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus.* Broad water Press: Kent.

McAuley, R. (2007) *Out of Sight: Crime, Youth and Exclusion in Modern Britain.* Willan Publishing: Devon.

McDonald, L. (1982) 'Theory and Evidence of Rising Crime in the Nineteenth Century', *The British Journal of Sociology,* 33,(3), pp. 404-420.

McLeod, S. (2012) 'Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs' http://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html accessed 10/10/12.
Merton, R.K. (1938) 'Social Structure and Anomie', *American Sociological Review* 3,(5), pp. 672-82.

Miles, S. (1998) *Consumerism As a Way of Life*. Sage: London.

Mirchandani, R (2005)' Postmodernism and Sociology: from the Epistemological to the Empirical', *Sociological Theory*, 23, (1) pp. 86-115.

Moxton, D. (2011) 'Consumer Culture and the 2011 Riots', *Sociological Research Online,*16,(4), pp. 19.

Mucchielli, L. (2010). 'Are We Living in a More Violent Society? A Socio-Historical Analysis of Interpersonal Violence in France, 1970s-Present'. *British Journal of Criminology, 50(5)* , pp. 808-829.
Mythen, G. & Walklate, S. (2012) 'Global Terrorism, Risk and the State', in Hall, S and Winlow, S. (eds.) *New Directions in Criminological Theory*. London: Willan/Routledge.

Pitts, J. (2008) *Reluctant Gangsters: The changing Face of Youth Crime: The Changing Shape of Youth Crime.* Willan Publishing: Devon.
Rawlings, R. (1999) *Crime and Power: A History of Criminal Justice 1688-1998.* London: Longman.

Reiner, R. (2012) 'Political Economy and Criminology: The return of the Repressed', in Hall, S and Winlow, S. (eds.) *New Directions in Criminological Theory*. London: Willan/Routledge.

Reynes, B. *et al* (2011) 'Being Pursued Online: Applying Cyber lifestyle-Routine Activities Theory to Cyber stalking Victimisation', *Criminal Justice and Behaviour,* 38, pp. 1149-1171.

Roshier, B. (1989) *Controlling Crime: The Classical Perspective in Criminology*. Open University Press: Milton Keynes.

Sassatelli, R. (2007) *Consumer Culture: History, Theory and Politics.* Sage: London.

Slater, D. (1997) *Consumer Culture and Modernity*. Polity Press: Oxford.
Smart, B. (2010) *Consumer Society: Critical Issues and Environmental Consequences.* Sage: London.

Smart, B. (1999) ed. *Resisting McDonaldization*. Sage: London.

Southwood, I. (2011) *Non-Stop Inertia*. Zero Books: Hants.

Standing, G. (2011) *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class.* Bloomsbury: New York.

Stiegler, B. (2010) *For A New Critique of Political Economy*. Polity Press: Cambridge.

Sumner, C. (2012) 'Censure, Culture and Political Economy: Beyond the Death of Deviance Debate', in Hall, S and Winlow, S. (eds.) *New Directions in Criminological Theory*. London: Willan/Routledge.

Sumner, C. (2004) *The Blackwell Companion to Criminology*. Blackwell publishing: Oxford.
Talyor, P. & Walton, P. & Young, J. (1973) *The New Criminology: for a Social Theory of Deviance.* Routledge: London.

Thorsen, D, E. & Lie, A. (2006) *What is neoliberalism?*
http://folk.uio.no/daget/What%20is%20Neo-Liberalism%20FINAL.pdf (accessed Febuary 2011).

Tierney, J. (2003) *Criminology: Theory and Context.* 3rd^d rev.edn. Harlow: Longman.

Tierney, J. (2006) *Criminology: Theory and Context*. Harlow: Longman.

Treadwell, J. *et al.* (2012) 'Shopocalypse Now: Consumer culture and the English Riots of 2011', *British Journal of Criminology Advanced access published,* 8/12, pp.1-17.

Uhls, J. (1999) *Fight Club,* 20th Century Fox: United States.

Valier, C. (2002) Theories of Crime and Punishment. Longman: London.

Wachowski, A. & Wachowski, L. (1999) *The Matrix,* Warner Bros. Pictures: United States.

Walsh, A. & Ellis, L. (2006) *Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Approach.* Sage: London.

Wilson, E. (2012) 'Crime Against Reality: Parapolitics, Simulation & Power Crime', in Hall, S and Winlow, S. (eds.) *New Directions in Criminological Theory*. London: Willan/Routledge.

Wilson, E. (2009). *Government of the Shadows: Parapolitics and Criminal Sovereignty.* Pluto Press: London.

Winlow, S. & Hall, S. (2006) *Violent Night: Urban Leisure and Consumer Culture.* Berg: New York.

Yar, M. (2006) *Cybercrime and Society*. Sage: London.

Young, J. (1990) 'Thinking Seriously about Crime', in Fitzgerald, M., McLennan, G. and Pawson, J. (1990) *Crime and Society: Readings in history and theory,* Routledge/ Open University Press.

Young, J. (1990) 'Thinking Seriously about Crime', in Fitzgerald, M., McLennan, G. and Pawson, J. (1990) *Crime and Society: Readings in history and theory,* Routledge/ Open University Press.

Young, J. (1999) *The Exclusive Society*. Sage: London.

Zendner, L. (2007) ' Pre-crime and post criminology?', *Theoretical criminology*, 11, pp. 261-282.

Zizek, S. (2011) *Living in the End of Times*. Verso: New York.