Space – the final frontier: Criminology, the City and the Spatial Dynamics of Exclusion

By Keith Hayward


Introduction

The city has always been a flickering presence within criminology, variously the source of immediacy, concern, visibility and inspiration. Yet, despite this interest, the concept of the city has rarely been fully integrated into developed analyses of crime. This tendency is even more pronounced today. The increased prevalence of so-called “scientific” methodologies within our discipline has ensured that, even though the majority of criminologists tend to study urban crime (in one form or another) seldom does their work overlap with related disciplines such as urban studies, urban geography or indeed even urban sociology. Even within contemporary criminological theory, the city is all too frequently lost in the moment of abstraction, appearing only as an afterthought, a sort of theoretical shadow or ‘sideshow’. Urban crime is thus torn free from its physical context - the city. Street crime, for example, exists not as in any way connected to street life (or, for that matter, the life of the street), but as an autonomous, independent act, divested of all the complexities and inequities that are such a feature of the daily urban round. Consequently, what has been lost to criminology is the great potential for understanding the relationship between urban space and urban crime signalled, for example, by Robert Park’s (1925) book *The City* - a monument to the city as a living, breathing socio-cultural entity.

In this chapter, I will argue that cultural criminology can provide a useful corrective - not least because of the way it prioritises questions and debates concerning the thematics of ‘postmodern’ space in its analysis. The constraints of a short chapter being what they are, I will limit my focus here to one specific example, namely the spatial dynamics associated with ‘social exclusion’.¹

Inside ‘outsider spaces’: criminology and spatial dynamics of social exclusion

The term ‘exclusion’ is everywhere so ubiquitous it seems self-explanatory. For Mike Davis (1990, 1998), the controversial chronicler of post-industrial Los Angeles, it is the death of public space in the dual city; in Jock’s Young’s *The Exclusive Society* (1999) it is social polarisation; and for Zygmunt Bauman (1987, 1998) it is as much about credit rating as spatial boundaries. This section seeks to stand back from the obviousness of exclusion in an

¹ For a more developed analysis of the notion of urban space within criminological theory see my recent work *City Limits: Crime, Consumer Culture and the Urban Experience* (Hayward 2004; see especially chapters 3 and 4).
attempt to explore some of its vagaries. My approach here is to pose exclusion in terms of space, specifically the dramas of the unravelling or fragmentation of modernist space.

In the work of the French cultural theorist, Michel de Certeau (1984), modernist space is identified with the idea of the ‘Concept-city’, the planner’s eye view, the rational, ordered modelling of the urban environment. Here, modernist space rests on a morphology of form and function (‘form dictates function; function follows form’). Modernist space is thus space that is continuous, gapless, and utilitarian; a purposive and semiotically unambiguous grid that maps onto social and economic hierarchies. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the discourse(s) of crime prevention and administrative criminology, the smooth functionalist flows of modernist space captured in the archetypal crime prevention diagrams and statistical accounts of urban crime. Unfortunately for crime prevention theorists, it is this ordered modernist space that is currently being destabilised by the shifting landscapes associated with post/late modernity. Here the picture is one of discontinuities, flows interrupted, islands and pockets of heterogeneity, spaces that are textured rather than contoured, a realm of ‘bricolage’, liminality and the semiotics of ambiguity. Exclusion at this level means nothing more or less than this breakdown of modernist space – even, for some (most memorably Mike Davis’s high octane account of metropolitan meltdown in Los Angeles), a return from Enlightenment ordering to mediaeval barbarism and disarray.

It will be argued here that the literature of exclusion (and crime prevention) has failed to recognise that there is more than one dynamic at play in this contemporary spatial transformation. On one hand, there is the classical modernist attempt to recapture order, re-colonise, re-condition and discipline these emergent unruly zones – essentially to re-integrate the abandoned post-industrial spaces left in the wake of a superceded Fordism and repair the broken net of the modernist project. On the other hand, the literature points to the appearance of a new and distinctive mode of social control in which overt exclusion is precisely the crucial mechanism, the ‘solution’ not the problem. Under these circumstances, ‘social control’ is no control except at the boundary (à la Bauman and Mike Davis). Here it is a matter of abandoned zones, guarded perimeters and secure cordons separating this world from the world of the gated community and the heavily surveyed mega mall/entertainment zone (see Hannigan 1998). Where the only modernist response is to de-exclude, to fill up empty spaces with the useful functional world of the productive citizen. In this new dynamic, wastelands are left to go to waste, excess to requirements. This contemporary strategy is a lockout not lock in, a world that in some ways evokes John Carpenter’s (1981) film Escape from New York. I now wish to explore these conceptual conflations through two examples of contemporary social theory.

**Discipline denied: modernist recuperation ‘versus’ exclusionary separation**

If it is true that the grid of ‘discipline’ is everywhere becoming clearer and more extensive, it is all the more urgent to discover how an entire society resists being reduced to it, what popular procedures (also “minuscule” and quotidian) manipulate
Over the last two decades, many scholars of urban space have drawn careful attention to the way in which powerful structures of social control have been skilfully and often surreptitiously woven into the fabric of the city (e.g. CCTV surveillance cameras and street lighting, face recognition software and other digital techniques of control). Stressing the extent to which the ‘fear factor’ is now a major constitutive element of the contemporary metropolis, these practices are typically described as new and subtle strategies of disciplinary control and surveillance – which, in turn, are often glibly characterized as tools of exclusion and repression.

No doubt such practices are proliferating but does it make sense to twin security with exclusion in this way? From the above discussion it should now be obvious that disciplinary surveillance is a classic example of the modernist attempt to recapture the dangerous spaces within our midst. The space of surveillance is precisely structured and seamless, the disciplinary grid the perfect match of form and function. In other words, in order for such controlled environments to operate, they must be spaces of inclusion not exclusion. For surveillance to manage its wayward subjects, to mould, shape and ultimately ensure conformity of conduct, those subjects must be inside the perimeter not outside. And, far from being covert, the entire effectiveness of surveillance rests upon its overtness (i.e. on the subject’s awareness of being (potentially) ever under scrutiny). Put bluntly, modern space is all about maximum visibility - Haussman’s destruction of the old Paris, and the demolition of London’s infamous rookeries provide two classic examples of the creation of the very conditions for disciplinary hygiene and civic surveillance. Finally, ‘disciplinary spaces’ classically operate within a marked perimeter. Thus while many commentators see these new exclusionary techniques as further expressions of disciplinary forms – at the same time they fail to recognise that this conflicts with the trope of social exclusion. Surely the point is that, in today’s world, both modernist recuperation and late/postmodern separation are occurring simultaneously in contemporary developments. Not to recognise this is to conflate their fundamentally distinct dynamics.

While most of mainstream criminology seems oblivious to this point, there is one current analysis within urban sociology that beautifully illustrates this distinction - Nikos Papastergiadis’s concept of ‘parafunctional’ space (Papastergiadis and Rogers 1996; Papastergiadis 2002). The parafunctional is an attempt to describe city spaces that are ‘abandoned’, ‘condemned’ or ‘ruined’, ‘in-between wastelands’ that appear to have ‘given up’ the struggle of shaping time and space, and where the discarded objects and refuse of an earlier mode of production accumulate. The parafunctional, Papastergiadis claims, refers to ‘all those corners which lurk at the edge of activity, or in the passages where activity occurs but the relationship between use and place remains unnamed. These are places in which names do not matter because the need for communication or the passage of time spent is already deemed to be insignificant, minimal, empty’ (Papastergiadis and Rogers 1996: 76)

---

(see Fig 1). Here even the most fundamental of modernist linkages is severed -- the (functional) link between use and space as operationalised by names.

Or, consider this alternative interpretation of parafunctional space, as glossed by the teaching team at The School of Architecture and Design, University of South Australia.

Liminal spaces exist in-between - perhaps they've been abandoned or ruined, perhaps they are a set or constellation of surfaces, perhaps they are named 'waste', perhaps they are 'condemned'. These spaces do not 'function' as we might think 'function' functions - as meaning. These spaces do not do as they are told. (This is a sentence to imagine with: place an emphasis on 'do' and 'told', for example.) That is, they do not serve or operate "the kind of action or activity proper" to their form, shape, (original) intention. While they function, the functional cannot have an exact relation to design as these spaces are marked by the yet-to-be...

[INSERT FIG 1. AROUND HERE]
Caption: Parafunctional Space, photo by Keith Hayward

The important thing here is that these functionless, evidently non-modernist, parafunctional spaces also represent the exact opposite of discipline. Not only do they lack any formal surveillance mechanisms, they are also typically devoid of any mechanical or human systematized watching. In short, parafunctional spaces represent the anonymous, and seemingly meaningless spaces within our midst – the places on the (metaphorical) edge of society.

It is just such paradigmatically criminogenic spaces – the run-down playground, the unsupervised car park, the troublesome block of flats or public house, the abandoned lot or badly lit side street etc. – that are the subject of attention from within the administrative criminology discourse of situational crime prevention (SCP). Under this rubric, the aim is clear: to bring these ‘criminogenic’ pockets of urban space (or more evocatively ‘wild zones’, see Stanley 1990) back in line with ‘the objective processes of ordered territorialization’. Indeed, in a statement that, in turn, is highly reminiscent of administrative criminology’s various attempts to implement a micro-architecture of ‘exclusion’, Papastergiadis describes ‘how state and council authorities try to keep specific spaces to their specificity: seating is changed in railway waiting rooms and on platforms to discourage sleeping by the homeless, just so they do not ’sink’ into a parafunctional state of ambiguity and contamination’ (2002: 45). Yet, once again, the use of the term ‘exclusion’ is misleading, for administrative criminology/SCP essentially seeks to return space that has lost its function back within the ordered planner’s fold of the modernist grid. To re-link ‘space’ and ‘use’ in one unequivocal functionality is thus a project of semiotic disambiguation – the attempt to close down an object/place’s spatial reference so that it has only one unique meaning. Seats are only for sitting on - not for sleeping, skateboarding,

4 For a definition of SCP see Hough et al (1980: 1); and for a general introduction see Clarke (1997).
partying or busking on. Under this rubric, controlling crime becomes as simple as mapping place, function and meaning so that the rational utility-seeking subject no longer has to deal with any form of complexity whatsoever. However, as anyone who takes the time to walk or cycle through the city will surely tell you, city spaces are rarely, if ever, equivocal – or as Papastergiadis comments, spaces tend not to ‘do as they are told’.

Equivocal non-functionalities: place, meaning, resistance

The built environment is seen as literally the terrain upon which ... cultural knowledge is created, transformed, challenged and represented. The landscape is not simply a collection of buildings, streets, parks, fire hydrants, billboards, and other elements, but also a social construction that reflects and refracts both everyday knowledge and macro structures; in other words, it is also a way of seeing.... Cultural activities form an integral component of the socially constructed landscape by acting as channels of discourse, sometimes symbolic and sometimes concrete, that mediate people’s relationship with their surroundings and allow opportunities to consider, contest, and come to terms with economic, political and social aspects of place (Warren 1996: 549).

Kids don’t see the world the same way adults do. They see a beautiful marble ledge as being a great thing to jump off of! (Editor, Transworld Skateboarding quoted in Ferrell 2001: 75)

Streets are always complex places, where meaning is contested and forms of cultural resistance occur (Ferrell 1997, 2001: chapter 2; Creswell 1998; Lees 1998; Winchester and Costello 1995). I now want to explore some of the ways in which street scenes challenge the assumed primacy of modernity and its adjuncts - criminology and the market among them. Recent developments in ‘the new cultural geography’, urban sociology, and certain branches of anthropology have all signposted the often hidden spatial practices and cultural differences that are such a vital component of the urban landscape. In this body of work, urban space is understood almost as if it were a living thing, a multi-layered congress of cultural, political and spatial dynamics.

Such approaches, in turn, implicitly represent a different take on the exclusionary dynamics as analyzed so acutely in the work of Zygmunt Bauman (1987). Yet, unlike Bauman (or, for that matter, Jock Young), this growing body of work urges us toward what one might call an appreciation rather than a denunciation of the dynamics of ‘exclusionary space’. This is not to say that they reject Baumanesque concerns but, rather, that they see in these spaces sparks of oppositional practices and the green shoots of future urban possibilities. Two interconnected themes link this otherwise diverse and

---

5 See, for example, Cosgrove (1983, 1989); Cosgrove and Jackson (1987); Massey (1991, 1993); for a brief introduction to the ‘new cultural geography’ see Warren (1996: 549-553; 1994). See also Urban Geography (1996) for geography more generally.

6 See, for example, Stacy Warren’s (1996) interesting article on the underground cultural practices that take place in and around Disney theme parks. Warren charts how, beneath Disney’s much vaunted veneer of safety and nostalgia, a catalogue of transgressive and exploitative acts take place, including inter alia armed robbery, stabbings, gang fights in the car park, acid trips in Sleeping Beauty’s castle, the regular fondling of Mini Mouse, a violent assault on Alice in Wonderland and the rape of at least two Snow Whites in the parking lot! (see Koenig 1994; Schultz 1998).
multidisciplinary raft of work: the distinction between place and space and the notion of cultural resistance.

As noted above, Papastergiadis implores us to shake off our standard perceptions of outsider spaces as simply abandoned, lost wastelands. For this is merely the ‘view from above’, from the perspective of de Certeau’s ‘Concept-city’. He asks us instead to consider how such spaces appear when glimpsed from street level; the view one has when walking or cycling through the city, a view cluttered by the sorts of street level interaction and inter-subjectivity that never feature in the plans and maps of the ‘official’ city. . Urban terrain from this perspective is thus to be understood in terms of distinct spatial biographies, relationships (or non-relationships) with surrounding space, intrication with different temporalities, intrinsic social role(s) – both perceived and actual – and networks of feelings and semiotic significance. These are the characteristics that many writers have mobilised in a bid to distinguish place from space.

Buchannan goes some way towards capturing this in his account of de Certeau, when he speaks of ‘the life of the city’ exceeding the ‘concept of the city’, the unmappability of urban lives and day-to-day experience, the ‘something that always slips away’ (Buchanan 2000: 110). This, alas, is merely how it looks ‘from above’. More recent writings on place nuance de Certeau’s duality in a potentially more sophisticated way, going further than merely filling in more of that elusive street life. Rather, place and space are seen as occupying different registers: they are simply not on the same scale. Consequently, there can be no simple reversal of top down and bottom up. There is literally no space for place in the urban cosmology. Place can only be occupied, not mapped.

Within criminology, there are signs of an emergent engagement with these themes of place and locale. In A Tale of Two Cities: Global Change, Local Feeling and Everyday Life in the North of England (Taylor et al 1996), Ian Taylor and his colleagues focused on the specific relationship between space and locality – particularly important, they argue, in what are increasingly globalised times - in two industrial cities in the North of England (Manchester and Sheffield). Taking their methodological lead from Raymond Williams (the renowned commentator on culture) and in particular his work on ‘local structures of feeling’ (Williams 1973), Taylor et al utilize personal biographies, focus groups and cultural narrative to produce an undeniably sensitive reading of urban space that considers in great detail place, people, ritual, history, structure, gender, age, not least in relation to strategies of coping and resistance (see also Taylor 1993, 1997). This reinvestment in the elements that constitute the very fabric of towns and cities is thus especially significant for areas described as ‘socially excluded’. Ignoring such components of urban locales – what makes them local places and not just segments of grid space – can lead to serious policy errors. Consider, for

---

7 Drawing on the work of the ‘sentiments school’ of social history, Williams originally described structures of feeling as ‘the particular quality of experience and relationship, historically distinct from other particular qualities, which gives a sense of a generation or period’ (Williams 1973: 131 quoted in Taylor et al 1996: 312). However, Taylor et al extend the concept to include an implicit sense of the local social and class structures. In short they are attempting to understand the ‘impact of local place’ on ‘individual personality formation’ and ‘orientation to the world’.
example, how the policing practices advocated by administrative criminologists and right realists ignore local community particularities in favour of national policies of risk and resource management. Zero tolerance policing might be readily acceptable in Teesside, but roundly rejected in Toxteth.

There is one major problem, which, unfortunately, is axiomatic to the way, that place has been interpreted by Taylor and others who have adopted a similar approach (see Girling et al 1996, 1997, 1998). Essentially, the problem is that place here has become identified with lost tradition, even a thinly veiled nostalgia for some of the forms of ‘industrial capitalism’, at least as a mark of the city. In *A Tale of Two Cities*, for example, the authors’ conception of city life and urban space at times reads like a paean to the demise of the industrial centres of the North of England. Certainly, there is a palpable sense of loss for the shared cultures associated with working-class struggle. The significance of locality (as opposed to the national or the global), is so heavily invested with class-orientation that the very idea of place in this account seems to be defined in terms of the past, of history, of what has gone before -- as if place could never have a future or occupy a postmodern present. (It might be an palatable thought for some, but the forms of identity and collective practical logics shared by those individuals who spent their lives wedded to the productivist process associated with the classic formulations of industrial capitalism are soon – at the mass level at least – to be lost forever.) This misplaced nostalgia seems rooted in the sociology of tradition, running against the tide of a ‘world in transition’ and the inevitability feelings of ontological insecurity that late modern society throws up (see Young 1999: 97-104; see also Chris Greer’s chapter, this volume). In short, what this body of work presents us with is a vision of city-life that is frozen in time. It tells us much about the past but little of real value about ongoing developments (cf. Hall and Winlow, this volume).

If resistance is always resistance to change, there is no way of understanding our urban futures. Once again Papastergiadis is inspiring. For, parafunctional spaces re-approached not as deficient modernist empty spaces but with all the uniqueness and specificity of place can, at the same time, be seen in terms of what de Certeau calls ‘minuscule micro-cultural practices’ of cultural resistance - ‘zones in which creative, informal and unintended uses overtake the officially designated functions. In parafunctional spaces social life is not simply abandoned or wasted; rather it continues in ambiguous and unconventional ways’. (Papastergiadis 2002: 45)

Important, cultural criminology is already present within these exclusionary/parafunctional spaces, describing a triumphant resistance through redeployment (e.g. Ferrell 2001: chapter 2; see, relatedly, Dery 1993): 8

Both skaters and [graffiti] writers view the environment different from everyone else. Staircases, handrails, curb cuts, train tunnels, truck yards, and city streets have become the new playground for the next generation.

---

We find value in what others deem useless. (‘Cycle’, quoted in Thrasher 209, June 1998, quoted in Ferrell 2001: 75 emphasis added)

Like the skaters who employ parking garages and [swimming] pools, the ‘useless artifacts of the technological burden [are employed]… in a thousand ways that the original architects could never dream of’. (Ferrell 2001: 81)

When I was younger, I spent many nights grinding curbs, carving banks, shooting hills, and skating my city’s streets aimlessly... This mission has brought me to strange and beautiful places that average citizens will never see. Whether lying in a snowbank watching a maze of monstrous freights crash and roll or taking in the desert sky at an old drainage ditch in the middle of Nevada, I’ve gained a lot from this quest. I’ve found parts of who I am in long stretches of train tracks, in abandoned parking lots with makeshift quarterpipes on banks, under bridges, on rooftops... alone, with the view of the entire city beneath me... (‘Crisis’, quoted in Thrasher 209, June 1998, quoted in Ferrell 2001: 78)

This is a precursor of a new genre of criminology that approaches so-called ‘criminogenic space’ in the same way that the new cultural geography approaches ‘postmodern space’, a criminology that, like cultural geography, is infused by a strong inter-disciplinary approach and an ability to think beyond superficial interpretations – whether theoretical, structural or spatial. The era of understanding urban space from a purely rational (as in the discourse of crime prevention) or structural perspective has past. Our complex, contradictory social world -- ‘a world in transition’ – made more opaque by the muddiness of human action, demands more. It is hoped that a (culturally-inspired) criminology can help focus attention on both sides of the exclusionary coin – those who can afford to protect themselves and those who for whatever reasons are forced onto the margins of society. That this is the current situation is not in question, but what we must strive for now are theoretical analyses that can help us work through (perhaps even with?) such a situation – analyses with the ability to look forward as well as back, while at the same time avoiding broad generalizations that fail to take into consideration the specificities of locality, culture and nation.

[INSERT FIG 2. AROUND HERE]


Unfortunately for criminology, a countermove has already gathered considerable disciplinary traction. If one pauses to consider some of the various illustrations that frequently accompany the SCP literature, one cannot help but notice that, in these stylized representations, ‘criminogenic spaces’ typically appear as strangely undangerous, sanitised, even clinical spaces (see Fig 2). These diagrammatic representations of ‘semi-private through-

---

9 See also the work of nocturnal urban protest artists such as Krzysztof Wodiczko and Zhang Dali.
routes’, neighbourhood ‘sight lines’ or ‘points of entrance and egress’ are remarkable only in their blandness and homogeneity. To the extent that they are marked out, ‘situational spaces’ exist only as uncomplicated, unconnected, isolated islands in the sea of the city. Rarely understood as part of a wider social network, the buildings and streets in these diagrams are occupied only by individuals whose spatial and temporal trajectories are assumed and who have the characteristics of ‘situational (wo)man’ (both victim and offender) projected onto them. Indeed, confirming David Garland’s (1997) account of the way the new ‘space-target’ displaces ‘the individual offenders and legal subjects that previously formed the targets for crime control’, it is not uncommon for the human actor to be removed from the picture altogether, leaving an image of urban space eerily reminiscent of the opening scene of Robert Wise’s film *The Andromeda Strain* (1970) or, more recently, Danny Boyle’s *28 Days Later* (2002). In this sense, these illustrations bear a striking resemblance to the architectural plans of the modernist city planners – the lived reality of urban space simply does not feature in the design remit.

In this sense, for all the alleged subtlety of SCP thinking (e.g. Felson 1988) it is a discourse that operates in much the same way as environmental criminology with its very rigid formalised geography of crime (e.g. Wikstrom 1991): i.e. both ultimately translate so-called crime ‘hot spots’ into the same homogeneous modernist space. Such an approach represents nothing less than the deformation of public space, the *hollowing out* of the urban environment. Complex urban social dynamics are not easily integrated into the type of managerialistic postcode-specific framework that underpins the new space of crime intervention/prevention, and as a result, the various micro processes and cultural specificities that manifest themselves at street level are stripped of their inherent diversity and serendipity.

**Conclusion**

Let us finish by considering a recent and highly informative example of this pronounced shift in emphasis toward a more sustained focus on highly abstracted ecological and environmental concerns. I refer here to the recent document produced by the US National Institute of Justice entitled *Mapping Crime: Principle and Practice* (Harries 1999). Promoted as an introductory guide to the ‘new and innovative’ science of crime mapping (using GIS technology) and aimed largely at ‘crime analysts and other people interested in visualizing crime data through the medium of maps’, *Mapping Crime* offers

---

10 According to Garland, Governments increasingly rely upon ‘action at a distance’ in evaluating not just the efficacy of localized crime prevention/reduction initiatives (both public and private) but also various other aspects of the criminal justice system. Under such a system, urban space - like the school, the courtroom, and the prison - becomes a focus solely of statistical analysis, at once a place of audit and a testing ground for new initiatives and policy implementation. In other words, so-called ‘criminogenic space’ simply ‘constitutes a new site of intervention for government practices, a new practicable object, quite distinct from the individual offenders and legal subjects that previously formed the targets for crime control. Moreover, the criminogenic situation is like ‘the economy’ or ‘the population’ in being a domain with its own internal dynamics and processes’ (Garland 1997: 187: see also Garland 2001 more generally).
us a somewhat disconcerting glimpse of the future: a world of ‘global satellite orientation’, ‘scatter diagrams’, ‘crime moments’, ‘stick streets’, and ‘choropleth maps’. This (literally) is criminology’s ‘out of this world’ future. The space satellite as all-seeing eye, the panoptic gaze extended to the nether reaches of space.

Such high abstraction is, of course, acknowledged. Indeed, Harries even poses the question: ‘how much abstraction can we tolerate?’ The flawed logic of his answer is enlightening. While initially he accepts that ‘more abstraction equals less information’, he neatly sidesteps this problem by claiming later that one can view this trade-off another way:

More abstraction equals greater simplicity and legibility (more effective visual communication). [While] Less abstraction equals greater complexity, less legibility (less effective visual communication) (ibid: 10).

The unfortunate thing for Harries and his fellow ‘crime analysts’ is that crime, incivility, and transgressive behaviour are very complex, multi-faceted, ever-changing socio-cultural phenomena. Consequently, while the techniques outlined in *Mapping Crime* might well prove useful in enhancing ‘visual communication’, they will undoubtedly be of no use whatsoever in helping us understand the complex and diverse social and cultural motivations and individual experiences behind a great many criminal offences.

It is worth considering at this point just how much arch-positivists (and the original precursors of ecological mapping in the mid nineteenth-century) Adolphe de Quételet and André-Michel Guerry would have relished such technology - for lest we forget that these early ecologists also looked to the heavens for inspiration about crime and deviance (see Beirne 1993: chs 3 and 4; Hayward 2004: 88-93). Drawing on a series of early nineteenth century breakthroughs in statistics, the theory of probability, celestial mechanics - emerging especially in the study of astronomy - Quételet and Guerry set about mathematizing everyday life. Steering a path navigated by ‘the starry heavens above’ these early mappers transformed observations, ‘mere’ statistics, dead facts, into ‘faits sociaux’ (‘social facts’, to use Quételet’s term). In today’s ‘new’ discourse of crime mapping the global information satellite is simply the latest (celestial!) calculative instrument for interpreting ‘the deviations of the observed’!

In conclusion, this chapter should not be read as an attempt to divorce city-life from essential spatio-environmental questions, or for that matter, those of social structure, rather its aim has been to highlight the need for criminology to develop certain theoretical links between individual experience and the key environmental, structural, and (increasingly important) cultural determinants that shape our lives and determine both our place within and our relationship to society. Given the social context in which we now find ourselves - not least what I have described elsewhere as ‘the dilemmas of transition’ (Hayward 2004) and the notion of the late modern ‘subject adrift’ - this is a vitally important task. Since its emergence as an academic discipline, criminology has typically fallen some way short of gaining a full and inclusive understanding of urban crime in modernity, the task it now faces is to try and devise new ways of looking at the problem under the even more inchoate conditions of late modernity. Not least it must find answers to a whole new set
of questions about the thematics of ‘postmodern’ space and its affects on the ‘subject adrift’. Only when this task has been completed can we then begin to understand the processes and motivations that contribute to much contemporary criminality.
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