Sebahattin ZİYANAK[1]

ÇARPIKLIĞA, SUÇA, VEYA SOSYAL KONTROLE YÖNELİK GENEL TEORİLERİN İNCELENMESİ: DONALD BLACK'İN TERÖRİZME BAKIŞI

Özet

Düşünüş ve davranış bakımından normal kabul edilen durumun dışına çıkmanın açıklanması her zaman tartışmaya açık olmuştur. Çok sayıda çarpıklık ve suçla ilgili teoriler net bir dille genel teorilerin çarpıklıklığa, suça ve sosyal kontrole yönelik bakış açısını açıklamaya çalısmışlardır. Diğer kuralsal teoriler ile birlikte, sosyal öğrenme teorilerinin hepsi "Onlar nicin suç işlerler?" sorusuna cözüm aramaktadırlar. Başka bir deyişle, "Biz niçin yapmayız?" Bu çalışma çarpıklıklık / kriminology teorilerinin incelenmesi çabalarını sosyal kontrol ve genel teoriyi geliştirmesi bağlamında değerlendirilmiştir. Diferansiyel ilişki, düşük seviyede kendini kontrol etme, ve Black'in sosyal kontrol teorileri gibi bazı teoriler normaldan sapmış olma hali ile ilgili geçerli genellenebilir anlatımlar ortaya koydular. Bu teorilerde ileri sürülen fikirlerden, perspektiflerden, ve postülatlardan hareket ederek, bu çalışma çarpıklıklığın açıklanmasında diferansiyel ilişki, düşük seviyede kendini kontrol etme, ve Black'in sosyal kontrol teorilerini değerlendirir ve karşılaştırma yapar. İlâveten, başarılı olan bu çabalar detaylandırılmış, ve Donald Black'in şiddete ve terörizme bakışı Türkiye'ye ve genele uygulanarak ele alınmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Çarpıklık, diferansiyelilişki, kendini kontroletme, Black, sosyal control teori, terörizm

EXAMINING GENERAL THEORIES OF DEVIANCE, CRIME, OR SOCIAL CONTROL: DONALD BLACK'S VIEW ON TERRORISM

Abstract

The explanation of deviance has always been problematic.Numerous theories of deviance and crime have endeavored to articulate general theories of deviance, crime or social control. As with other normative theories, all accounts of social learning theory probe the question of "Why do they do it?". In other words, "Why don't we do it?" In this paper, the efforts of examining

---

[1] Ph.D., Instructional Coach – University of the Permian Basin (Social Sciences) Odessa TX, sebahattinziyanak@yahoo.com

deviance/ criminology theories are evaluated with regards to developing a general theory of deviance (and/or social control). Some theories, such as the differential association, low self-control, and Black's theory of social control have provided some validgeneralizable statements about deviance. Drawing on their proposed ideas, perspectives, and postulates, this paper assessesand compares the theories of differential association, low self-control, and Black's theory of social control for explaining deviance. Further, the success of these efforts is detailed, and Donald Black's view on violence and terrorism as applied to the case of Turkey and beyond is addressed.

Key words: Deviance, differential association, low self-control,Black, social control theory, terrorism

Differential association

Edwin H. Sutherland is credited with the development of the Differential Association theory, first discussed in 1939. In developing this theory, Sutherland attempted to explain how criminals commit acts of deviance. In the publication entitled "*Principles of Criminology*" Sutherland (1947) stressed the notion that deviant actions developas a result ofthe lack of disapproval of such behavior.

Answering the key question "is crime learned? "may thus help us to analyze the key constructs of the Differential Association theory. In response to this question, and according to this theory, people learn how to commit crimes. Their interaction with others through a process of communication is a must for the learning process. Similarly, learning criminal behavior occurs within primary groups, such as the family, friends, peers, intimates, acquaintances, and personal companions. The learning process that leads to criminal behavior is composed of motives, rationalizations, techniques, and attitudes. Considering the function of the learning process, differential associations may vary in frequency, societies, across groups, period of time, priority, and intensity according to Sutherland.

Nevertheless, Sutherland's theory points to the social background of persons as the basis forcommitting crimes.Yet, in Sutherland's theory, the causes of crime and deviance, such as biological determinism and the excessive individualism of psychiatry, as well as economic accounts of crime are excluded completely.In this regard, it appears that, Sutherland's notion deviates from both the pathological perspective as well as the biological perspective of crime.

In an article by Sutherland published in 1947, the author discussed how the idea of differential association and differential social association might possibly be helpful functional concepts in efforts to understand both individual and group level crimes, respectively.With this source of information, according to Sunderland (1947) differential social organization factors illuminate the causesof varying crime rates and how various social issuesvary or change.

The theory of differential association asserts that a person becomes criminal because, after the learning process, her/his understanding of deviance alters, and, in turn, he/she favors the violation of the law. Accordingly, deviance arises when people express a certain human condition as an applicable occurrence for violating the social norms (Sutherland, 1947).

Taken as a whole, Sutherland considers that an individual's relations are shaped in a general way through social associations. As proposed in Sutherland's argument, differential association theory contributes very profoundly to helping us to understand the diverse factors

that influence crimes. However, the role of the victim is ignored. The theory also seems too comprehensive. Insulated from Sutherland's view, I sense that the differential association theory is germane to other noncriminal populations.

Low self- control

Gottfredson and Hirschi generated their General Theory of Crime. After only a short period of time, a number of assessments have generated a significant amount of support for this theory in explaining various types of deviance ranging from computer fraud to violence.A variety of studies on crime identify the claim of an underlying relationship between self-control and criminality(McGee and Newcomb, 1992; Pulkkinen and Pitkanen, 1993).

Gottfredson and Hirschi reject all other explanations of criminal behavior. Gottfredson and Hirschi suggest that only lack of self-control is truly consistent with the facts of the crime.According to Gottfredson and Hirschi, "low self-control is not the motivating force leading to criminal behavior and, in turn, the link between self-control and crime is not deterministic, but probabilistic, affected by opportunities and other constraints" (Hirschi and Gottfredson 1993, p.53).

Conversely, Longshore et al. (1998) affirm that self-control is a weaker determinant of crimes. They stated that "self-control seems not to improve predictive power or conceptual clarity regarding etiology of crime" (Longshore et al., 1998, p. 179).Besides, cross-sectional research shows that low self-control predicts participation in some forms of deviance or crimes of force and crimes of fraud, predominantly among men (Grasmick et al., 1993; Nagin and Paternoster, 1993).Hence, predicting low-control is important and can be due to poor parenting, as the possible key source of low self-control.

Low self-control theory applies to all crimes and a variety of self-determined actions. According to this theory, the origin of mostcrimes is low self-control. This, in turn is directly pertinent to unsuccessful socialization by parents early on in childhood. In turn, criminals seek to obtain internal pleasure due to their lack of self-control. Conversely, a person cannot learn to carry out a crime sincelearning is not requirement for this. Basically, criminals follow what comes naturally.

Ironically, the learning theories assert that low self-control is a basic element of the learning process. Low self-control is ineffective for explaining why someone with self-control deviates or why unsuccessful socialization in childhood is the only reason for explaining deviant behavior.

Black's theory of social control

Donald Black's pure sociology approach is grounded in a need to explain human behavior in relation to its social geometry. It persistently disregards the human mind and is exclusively free of psychology. Similar to psychology, it also entirely eradicates teleology. As well, human aspirations, thoughts, and feelings are totally disregarded in this approach (Black 1995, pp. 848-50, 861-64 and Cooney, 2009, p.18).

In the general approach to Black's pure sociology, Black (1995) applies pure sociology in order to explain the handling of right and wrong in answer to deviant behaviors.According to Black, social life cannot be directly discerned by anyone. He expresses the view that social life has no purpose, need or function. To me, Black's understandings of the laws of behavior are

methodically and theoretically deficient. Black only accepts the shape of social space and sees geometry as destiny.

As mentioned, Black's pure sociology uses a scientific approach to achieve thegoalof formulating a general theory that is totally contrary to any psychological explanation. According to Black's understanding of deviance and/or social control, social control is generally conceived of as a reality that appears in variable forms of quantity and style. Black (2009) proposes that "the law also varies in the styles of social control can be of various kinds, such as penal, compensatory, therapeutic, or conciliatory" (Cooney, 2009, pp. 20). In turn, the quantity of social control refers to the amount of prevailing social control.

From my own perspective, laws are universal. So is crime and deviance. According to Black, violence and homicide is close to universal (Cooney, 2009, p.21). To Black, violence occurs when the social geometry of a conflict -the conflict structure- is violent. Accordingly, it is the structure and geometry that generates violence. In turn, he rejects the idea that individuals or the collective can construct violentactions in all settings at any time. In other words, neither individualistic nor collectivistic theories can provide an accurate explanation of how or why violence emerges (Black 1995, pp. 852-58). Finally, Black claimed that forms of violence vary from structure to structure such as a beating structure, dueling structure, lynching structure, feuding structure, or terrorism structure (Cooney, 2009, p.57 and 58).

Yet, Black's view on terrorism in Turkey does not clearly explain the emergence of the (Kurdish Worker Party (PKK) terrorism acts in the southeastern region of Turkey. Moreover, a higher degree of cultural discourse does not explain it. Nor does degrees of inequality or conflicts between the ethnic Kurdish populace, and the Turkish people, who have lived peacefully in the same region for thousands of years. Additionally, it does not include the condition of "social polarization" between the Turkish and Kurdish people. The PKK and a small group Kurdish relativeswho rebel against Turkey are universally labeled as terrorists(Black 1990, pp. 75-79; Ziyanak, 2014).

Considered by many as one of the best, and now a greatly missed President of Turkey, was TurgutÖzal. He grew up and was reared in the southern region of Turkey. President Özal was a highly esteemed and a much admired Kurdish President in Turkey. This example of Kurdish respect can be extrapolated into numerous fields. High rank military officials and government bureaucrats were supportive of his regime. Likewise, President Özal was respected by Turkish and Kurdish people. Turkish residents had loved him, and were devoted to him.

The nature of pure sociology disregards persons since they explain nothing whereby the social issue is of consequence. But pure sociology addresses the behaviors of the social system in the sense of the behavior of the laws, science, and art. In this regard, pure sociology explains these phenomena neither by the characteristics of individuals, nor by its distribution of collectivities.

On the basis of a pure sociological framework, and according to Black's testable propositions, social control varies directly with stratification: societies with higher degrees of stratification have more social control than those with lower degrees of stratification. Law and social control also vary directly with culture: simpler societies have fewer laws and social control strategies in place than more differentiated societies (Cooney, 2009, pp.36-39). Contrary to Black's understanding of deviance and/or social control, such diverse forms of social control

are reduced to the common schemata. Western law and Turkish law, Canadian Law, The Romans law and the law as practiced in Iran (Islamic Country ruled with Islamic law and democracy) have many differences when compared to the lawspracticed in Saudi Arabia (Islamic Country ruled with Islamic law and "no"democracy).

Concluding Remarks

With regards to the effectiveness and validity of Sutherland's theory, Sutherland's effect on micro-level theorizing in the sociology of deviance was feasibly even more general than was Merton's impact on macro-level methods.In reference to that view and according to this approach, some way or another you are in the process of becoming deviant due to social, cultural, religious, and traditional differences. Low self-control theory poses a dilemma in defining deviance. The issues surrounding the definition of deviance are ignored. Self-control cannot be simply based on socialization in childhood. Black is interested in formulating a general theory of law and social control. His claim is to create a coherent general theory. His methodology is partially helpful for explaining human behavior in terms of the law and social phenomena. However, he totally eliminates the people and completely refuses to consider human subjectivity. Along with psychology Black also denies other sciences. Overall, for Black reality cannot be recognized from a personal perspective or personal knowledge. In fact, he proposes that reality is to be understood geometrically.

REFERENCES

BLACK, D.(1995). "The Epistemology of Pure Sociology."Law and Social Inquiry20:829-70

BLACK, D.(1990). "The Elementary Forms of Conflict Management." Pp. 74-94 in The Social Structure of Rightand Wrong, by D. Black. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

COONEY, M. (2009). Is Killing Wrong? A Study in Pure Sociology. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

GOTTFREDSON, M. and HIRSCHI.T. (1990).A General Theory of Crime.Stanford University Press.

GRASMICK, H., G., CHARLES, R. Ti., BURSIK, R. B. and ARNEKLEV. J. B.(1993). "Testing the Core Empirical Implications of Gottfredson and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime."*Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 30*:5-29.

HIRSCHI, T., & GOTTFREDSON, M. (1993). Commentary: Testing the general theory of crime. *Journal ofResearch in Crime and Delinquency*, *30*, 47-54

LONGSHORE, D., TURNER.S., and. STEIN, J. A. (1998). "Reliability and Validity of Self-Control Measure: Rejoinder." *Criminology,34*:175-182.

MCGEE, L, & NEWCOMB, M. D. (1992). General deviance syndrome: Expanded hierarchical evaluations at four ages from early adolescence to adulthood. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, *60*(5), 766-776.

NAGIN, D. S., and PATERNOSTER, R. (1993) Enduring Individual Differences and Rational choice Theories of Crime. Law and Society Review 27(3):467-496.

PULKKINEN, L and PITKANEN, T. (1993)."Continuities in Aggressive Behavior from Childhood to Adulthood."*Aggressive Behavior19*:249-263.

SUNDERLAND, E. (1947). Principles of criminology. 4th ed. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott.

SUNDERLAND, E. (1974). Criminology. J.B. Lippincott Company

ZIYANAK, S. (2014).*Analyzing Delinquency among Kurdish Adolescents: A Test of Hirschi's Social Bonding Theory*.(Unpublished dissertation). University of North Texas, Denton, TX.