

# Depiction of the History of Criminology in Great Britain

<sup>1</sup>Nigmatov Ruftullo Olimdzhonovich, <sup>2</sup>Mukhitdinov Fakhritdin Mukhitdinovich,  
<sup>3</sup>Umirzakov Begzod Ataboyevich

<sup>1</sup>Deputy Head of the Academy of the MIA of the Republic of Uzbekistan

<sup>2</sup>Professor of the Department of Criminology of the Academy, of the MIA of the Republic of Uzbekistan

<sup>3</sup>Head of the Department of Criminology of the Academy, of the MIA of the Republic of Uzbekistan

**Abstract:** The article examines the historical development of criminological doctrines in Great Britain from the 17th to the first half of the 20th century. It analyzes the main stages in the formation of British criminology: from the early philosophical ideas of Hobbes, Locke, and Blackstone to the establishment of the classical school in the works of Bentham and Paley, the influence of positivism in the works of Romilly, Maudsley, and Goring, to the sociological turn represented by the research of Booth, Rowntree, and the Webbs. Special attention is paid to the specifics of the British approach to understanding the causes of crime, methods of its study, and counteraction strategies. The article explores key theoretical concepts and their influence on the development of criminal law policy and the penitentiary system in Great Britain. It demonstrates that the British criminological model was formed under the influence of unique historical, cultural, and legal factors and is characterized by pragmatism, empirical validity, and reformist orientation.

**Keywords:** *History of criminology, British criminological school, sociological turn, classical school of criminology, positivism in criminology, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Jeremy Bentham, Charles Goring, Webb, criminal statistics, labeling theory, social causes of crime, criminal law policy.*

**Introduction.** Criminology as a science, has been formed over several centuries, and Great Britain has played vital role in this process. British researchers and reformers have made significant contribution to the development of theoretical approaches to understanding the causes of crime and the development of effective methods of its control. At the same time, criminology as a scientific discipline in Great Britain has a rich and multifaceted history, dating back to the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The development of criminological thought in this country is characterized by a unique combination of philosophical, legal and sociological approaches that have formed the special path for British criminology. In this article, we will consider the main stages of the formation and development of criminological teachings in Great Britain from the 17<sup>th</sup> to the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, paying special attention to conceptual and theoretical developments in the field of causes of crime and measures of its prevention.

The British criminological model, as noted by the Russian criminologist, studied the historical development of criminology in Great Britain O.N.Vedernikova, is a unique phenomenon in world criminology. It was formed under the influence of specific historical, cultural and legal factors characteristic of Great Britain. This model is distinguished by a pragmatic approach to the study of crime, close connection between theory and practice, as well as special attention to empirical research<sup>1</sup>.

The evolution of criminological thought in the UK, from the early philosophical ideas of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries to the development of sociological approaches in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century are thoroughly outlined in this research. We focus on at how ideas about the causes of crime, methods of studying it and ways of preventing it changed, and how these changes reflected wider social, political and economic processes in British society.

<sup>1</sup>Vedernikova O.N. British criminological model: Abstract of diss... doctor of law. Moscow, Russian Law Academy, 2001.

**Early Criminological ideas in Britain (XVII-XVIII centuries).** The origins of British criminology can be traced back to the works of philosophers and law scholars of the 15<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries. This period was characterized by a growing interest in rational explanations of human behavior, including criminal behavior.

It is important to note that during this period the first systematic observations of crime began to be carried out in Great Britain. Such works include the research of John Graunt. John Graunt (1620-1674) was an English merchant and statistician, who is often considered one of the founders of demography and statistics. Although Graunt was not a criminologist in the modern sense of the term, his work *Natural and Political Observations on the Bills of Mortality* (1662) had a significant influence on the development of empirical methods for studying social phenomena. In this work, he first used statistical methods to analyze social phenomena, including crime. Thus, he laid the foundation for the further development of crime statistics in Great Britain<sup>2</sup>.

Graunt's approaches to the study of social phenomena, including crime, can be characterized by statistical correlation of social phenomena, including crime. Although Graunt did not develop the special theory of the causes of crime, his methods of analyzing social data laid the foundation for future research in this area, in particular M. Guerry, and later A. Quetelet. In particular, Graunt in his judgments drew attention to such aspects of the social dimension as: *a) demographic factors, b) socio-economic conditions, c) urbanization*.

Thus, Graunt, studying the connection between the population raise and various social phenomena, concluded that there is a certain connection between the demographic characteristics of individuals and the crime rate. Also, analyzing the social state of rich and poor areas of London, in order to establish the causes of mortality in them, Graunt discovered a connection between the crime rate and the socio-economic state of society. However, Graunt noted differences between urban and rural areas in relation to various social indicators, including crime in his research.

Moreover, Graunt's ideas about the person who committed the crime influenced future research in the field of criminology. Thus, in order to establish specific signs of deviation in people prone to committing a crime, he proposed such a statistical method as studying large groups of people prone to committing a crime, in order to identify their deviant features. This approach was later applied in criminology to identify the general characteristics of criminals.

Furthermore, Graunt developed specific measures to prevent crime, but his approach to analyzing social data influenced the development of preventive strategies. In particular, his method for analyzing the causes of mortality was later adapted to identify risk factors in criminology, which became the basis for developing preventive measures. In this work, Graunt considered an important problem to be a comprehensive approach to combating crime, since, in his opinion, social phenomena are always interconnected, and therefore, in order to achieve an effective impact on crime, a comprehensive social approach is needed. These ideas of Graunt later influenced the development of comprehensive prevention strategies

Graunt thus demonstrated how statistical analysis could be used to identify patterns in social phenomena, which was later applied in criminology to study crime trends, criminal characteristics, and the effectiveness of preventive measures. His work was important step in the development of the scientific approach to the study of social problems, including crime.

One of the scholar of Great Britain in the 15<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries was Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679). Hobbes presented a rather pessimistic view of human nature, which was reflected in his understanding of the causes of crime. In his work *Leviathan* (1651), Hobbes presented the concept of the "natural state" of society, he, in particular, believed that in the "natural state" (i.e. without a state and laws) people are in constant "war of all against all". This means that without the restraining power of the state, people are prone to violence and crime. Because, according to Hobbes, people are by nature selfish and seek to satisfy their own desires. This desire, if not restrained, can lead to criminal behavior.

---

<sup>2</sup> Rock, Paul Elliott. History of Criminology I. HV6021.H583 1994.

According to Hobbes, the state should increasingly use its powers to instill fear and restraint in people. Hobbes also believed that it was the fear of violent death that made people create the state and obey the laws. Thus, he saw the fear of punishment as the main mechanism for preventing crime. It is this state of the state, according to Hobbes, that plays very significant role in ensuring the stability of society and the state. In this regard, Hobbes emphasized the importance of a strong state in preventing crime. He believed that only the state can effectively restrain people's criminal inclinations. This statement can be interpreted as recognition of the social factor in controlling crime. According to Hobbes, an effective state creates the social environment that restrains criminal inclinations.

Although Hobbes did not completely deny the influence of social factors, he did not attach primary importance to them. Rather, he viewed crime as a natural consequence of human nature that could only be limited by external force.

It is important to note that during Hobbes's lifetime in England there was significant social and political upheaval, which influenced his philosophy. Although he primarily focused on human nature, his views on society and the state are also important for understanding his approach to the very concept of crime and its causes. Thus, Hobbes viewed the "state of nature" of humanity as a state of constant conflict. However, it is important to understand that this "state of nature" is not necessarily the historical reality, but rather a philosophical concept. He used this idea to explain why people need a state and laws.

In this context, Hobbes implicitly acknowledged the role of social factors. He believed that the absence of social institutions and accepted norms of behavior led to chaos and violence. Thus, it can be said that Hobbes saw the lack of social order as a factor contributing to crime. Hobbes also recognized that human inequality could be a source of conflict and, therefore, crime. In particular, he wrote, "Nature has made men equal in physical and mental faculties" but then explained how this natural equality could lead to conflict when people desired the same things.

Although Hobbes did not develop the theory of social inequality as a cause of crime in the modern sense, his observations on how competition for resources can lead to conflict can be seen as a precursor to later sociological theories of crime.

In matters of state control of crime, Hobbes believed that laws and punishments were necessary social mechanisms for controlling crime. This suggests that Hobbes saw the legal system and social norms as important factors influencing the level of crime in a society.

It should also be noted that although Hobbes did not emphasize the role of education as explicitly as Locke, he did acknowledge the importance of education and socialization for people. In particular, he wrote about the need to teach people their duties to the state, which can be seen as his recognition of the role of social learning in the formation of law-abiding behavior.

In his search for the real causes of crime, Hobbes also turned his attention to economic factors, since he believed that the role of economic factors in social stability was tangible. At the same time, Hobbes wrote about the importance of providing people with the means of subsistence so that they would not be forced to resort to crime to survive. This can be interpreted as an early recognition of the connection between economic conditions and crime.

In conclusion, although Hobbes did not develop the specific theory of the social causes of crime, his philosophy contains elements that can be interpreted as recognizing the role of social factors in contributing to the emergence of crime. He saw crime as the result of complex interaction between human nature and social being.

All in all, Hobbes' ideas were important for understanding the role of the state in preventing crime. Hobbes argued that people enter into the "social contract" by transferring some of their rights to the state in exchange for

---

protection and order. This concept formed the basis for later thinking about the nature of crime and the role of the state in controlling it<sup>3</sup>.

Another influential English scholar was John Locke (1632-1704). In his *Second Treatise of Government* (1689), Locke developed the ideas of natural human rights, including the right to life, liberty, and property. Like Hobbes, Locke also developed the theory of the social contract, but in his version, people voluntarily give up some of their rights to the state in order to protect their remaining rights. Crime in this context can be seen as a violation of the social contract. These ideas had a significant impact on the development of legal thought and, in particular, on the formation of ideas about crime as the violation of natural rights. Locke also emphasized the importance of proportionality of punishment to crime, which became an important principle in the further development of criminological thought in Great Britain<sup>4</sup>.

Locke presented more optimistic view of human nature, which was reflected in his understanding of the causes of crime. In this way, he was to develop the previously known concept of the “blank slate” (*tabula rasa*), according to which a person is born without innate ideas, and his character is formed under the influence of experience and upbringing. This opened up the possibility of understanding crime as a result of negative social influences, rather than innate inclinations.

At the same time, Locke put forward the idea of the interconnection of natural human rights (to life, liberty and property) and crime. Any criminal act in his understanding violated the state of these natural rights of other people.

In matters of protecting society from criminal encroachments, Locke attached great importance to education in the formation of a person’s character. This opened up the possibility of understanding crime as a result of improper education or negative social influence. Therefore, he proposed paying more attention to the correct education of the population, especially minors and children.

On the other hand, Locke saw the causes of crime in people’s abilities for rational thinking and self-control. This suggested that criminal behavior could only be the result of conscious choice, not uncontrollable impulses.

Although Locke did not develop the specific theory of crime, his philosophy created more opportunities for recognizing the role of social factors in shaping criminal behavior than Hobbes’s philosophy.

In general, comparing the views of Hobbes and Locke, we can see that their ideas about human nature and society had a significant influence on the further development of criminological thought in Great Britain. In particular, the concept of the rational criminal, which was later developed in the works of Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham, has its roots in both philosophers’ ideas about the rational nature of human behavior. Thus, the philosophical ideas of Hobbes and Locke laid an important foundation for the further development of criminological thought, especially in the context of understanding the relationship between individual inclinations, social factors, and the role of the state in crime control.

In recent periods, based on the philosophical thoughts of the English classics, the so-called “enlightenment”, studies appeared that were able to build their own system of explanation about the causes and conditions that contribute to crime.

In particular, William Blackstone (1723-1780) made significant contribution to the development of criminological ideas in England in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. He was an outstanding English legal scholar whose works, especially *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (1765-1769), had a significant influence on the development of legal thought in Great Britain, but also beyond its borders. His views on crime, the criminal and crime

---

<sup>3</sup> Rock, P. *Sociological Theories of Crime* in M. Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2002.

<sup>4</sup> Tierney, J. *Criminology: Theory and Context*. Pearson Education Limited. 2006.

prevention made an important contribution to the development of criminological thought in the English kingdom<sup>5</sup>.

Meanwhile, Blackstone considered the causes of crime in the context of his understanding of the nature of law and society. His approach can be generally characterized as follows: *a) violation of the social contract* - Blackstone, like many thinkers of his time, adhered to the theory of the social contract. He considered crime as a violation of this contract<sup>6</sup>. This approach assumes that the causes of crime lie in the unwillingness or inability of the individual to comply with social norms, to obey the public order; *b) moral decline*, as Blackstone attached great importance to the moral aspects of crime. He believed that crime is often the result of moral decline of an individual or society as a whole; *c) socio-economic factors* - although Blackstone did not develop a detailed theory of the social causes of crime, in his works one can find recognition of the role of poverty and social inequality in the formation of criminal behavior; *d) the ineffectiveness of laws*, in this matter Blackstone believed that the vagueness or excessive severity of laws can contribute to crime<sup>7</sup>.

In addition, Blackstone focused on personality of the criminal in his scientific researches. The scientist's views on the personality of the criminal were formed by his law education and the philosophical views of the Enlightenment. First of all, as to him, the personality of the criminal is a rational subject with free will, thus capable of choosing between law-abiding and criminal behavior. Therefore, Blackstone emphasized the importance of the moral responsibility of the criminal. Because, crime is, first of all, not only a violation of the law, for which the criminal must bear criminal punishment, but also a moral act, for which one must bear moral responsibility in his opinion. At the same time, according to Blackstone, responsibility must be individual in nature. In this matter, he recognized the need to take into account the individual characteristics of the criminal's personality and mitigating circumstances when assessing the guilt of the criminal. Blackstone also made a significant contribution to the development of ideas about crime prevention. He believed that clear and understandable laws for the public were important means of preventing crime. He believed that people were less likely to break laws if they understood them.

Blackstone supported the ideas of other Enlightenment thinkers on crime prevention, which emphasized the inevitability of punishment rather than its severity. At the same time, Blackstone criticized the existing system of punishment and proposed reforms aimed at more effective crime prevention and rehabilitation of criminals. Overall, Blackstone's ideas laid the foundation for many modern criminological approaches to understanding and preventing crime, and contributed to the humanization of criminal law policy.

Thus, the early period of development of criminological thought in Great Britain is characterized as a period that laid the foundation for the formation of fundamental concepts about the nature of crime, the role of the state in its containment, and the importance of a rational approach to the study of crime. Undoubtedly, these and other ideas of English thinkers created the basis for the further development not only in Great Britain, but also beyond its borders, primarily in European countries, of criminological teachings and its formation as a scientific discipline.

**Development of the classical school of criminology (late 18<sup>th</sup> - early 19<sup>th</sup> century).** The late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries were marked by the formation of the classical school of criminology, which had a huge influence on the development of criminological thought in Great Britain. Although the founder of this school is considered to be the Italian lawyer Cesare Beccaria, his ideas found fertile ground in Great Britain and were developed by English thinkers.

---

<sup>5</sup> Ведерникова О. Н. Британская криминологическая модель: Автореф. дисс...докт.юрид.наук. М., Российская правовая академия, 2001.

<sup>6</sup> Ведерникова, О. Н. Зарубежные криминологические системы / О. Н. Ведерникова // Криминология: учеб пособие. / Г.И. Богуш, О.Н. Ведерникова, М.Н. Голоднюк [и др.]; науч. ред. Н.Ф. Кузнецова. — М.: Проспект, 2012. — С. 248-267.

<sup>7</sup> Rock, P. Sociological Theories of Crime in M. Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (eds) The Oxford Handbook of Criminology. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2002.

The key figure in the development of the classical school of criminology in Great Britain was undoubtedly Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832). Bentham's contribution to criminology is that he, first of all, developed the concept of utilitarianism, according to which actions should be assessed by their consequences, and not by some abstract moral principles. Applying this approach to criminology, Bentham developed *the theory of the rational criminal and the concept of deterrence of crime*<sup>8</sup>.

Bentham was also one of the first to propose evaluating the effectiveness of punishment through the prism of the ratio of benefit and harm, i.e. the utilitarian approach to punishment. He created a kind of "arithmetic of punishments", where each punishment had to bring more public benefit than harm. In his "Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation" (1789), Bentham argued that people act rationally, seeking to maximize pleasure and minimize pain. According to this theory, crime is committed when a person estimates that the benefits of a criminal act exceed the potential negative consequences. Based on this, Bentham proposed the concept of deterring crime by creating a system of punishments that would outweigh the potential benefits of crime<sup>9</sup>.

Meanwhile, Bentham successfully developed the following principles of a system of punishments that deter criminals from committing crimes:

- the severity of the punishment must exceed the benefit of the crime;
- the more difficult it is to ensure the inevitability of punishment, the more severe it should be;
- the higher the social danger of the crime, the more severe the punishment that can be imposed with a greater hope of preventing the crime;
- the same punishments for the same crimes should not be applied to all criminals without exception. In this case, it is necessary to take into account the circumstances that affect the susceptibility of criminals to their actions.

Bentham, speaking out against excessive and unreasonable aggravation of punishments, wrote in his work "The Fundamental Principles of the Criminal Code": "the policy of the legislator who punishes everything with death is like the cowardly disgust of a child - he crushes an insect which he is afraid to look at ... This should not generate confidence that the death penalty is a necessary method. Therefore, in punishments it should be avoided, and measures of prevention should be sought in the crimes themselves"

Moreover, Bentham is considered an innovator for his time, having developed interpretations of the negative social phenomenon of crime. This idea was directly related to the concept of crime prevention. Bentham believed that the main goal of punishment is not retribution, but the prevention of future crimes through: *a) general prevention* (intimidation of potential criminals); *b) private prevention* (correction of a specific criminal).

At the same time, Bentham was the first to systematically substantiate the need to take into account the personality of the criminal when assigning punishment. He proposed taking into account: social status; education; motives for the crime; degree of susceptibility to punishment.

Bentham's major contribution to the development of criminological thought was his idea of the need to reform the penitentiary system. He developed the concept of the "Panopticon" - an ideal prison in which prisoners were under constant surveillance, which was supposed to contribute to their correction. Although the project itself was not implemented, Bentham's ideas had a significant influence on the development of the penitentiary system in Great Britain and beyond<sup>10</sup>.

Many modern concepts of criminology and the penal system are directly or indirectly based on Bentham's ideas, which speaks to their fundamental character and enduring value.

<sup>8</sup> Ведерникова О. Н. Британская криминологическая модель: Автореф. дисс...докт.юрид.наук. М., Российская правовая академия, 2001.

<sup>9</sup> Rock, Paul Elliott. History of Criminology I. HV6021.H583 1994.

<sup>10</sup> Tierney, J. Criminology: Theory and Context. Pearson Education Limited. 2006.



Another important representative of the classical school in Britain was William Paley (1743-1805). Paley primarily began to develop ideas about the proportionality of punishment to crime and the importance of crime prevention in his work “Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy” (1785). Paley, following Bentham, expressed the thesis that punishment is not the only goal of society, although it provides punishment for the commission of a crime by a criminal, but the main goal of society in its application is associated with preventive measures<sup>11</sup>.

At the same time, Paley’s explanation of the influencing factors of crime is of particular interest. In the question of the determinants of crime, he was a supporter of the sociological theory. In his opinion, the causes of crime are in the social life of society itself. Simultaneously, Paley singled out the following causes of crime: a) moral degradation of society; b) poverty and social inequality; c) insufficient religious education; d) alcoholism and idleness.

On this idea, Paley proposed the unique system of crime prevention, in the center of this activity should be the religious education of the population. In his opinion, it is religious education that is the important factor in strengthening public morality.

Another necessary measure to combat crime, according to Paley, should be the improvement of the economic conditions of the population. He rightly believed that difficult economic conditions are serious factors influencing crime.

It should be noted that, unlike Bentham, Paley based his criminological theory primarily on Christian ethics. From his point of view, crime is not only a violation of the law, but also of the divine order. Therefore, the usefulness of punishment is primarily associated with ensuring divine justice for the commission of the crime.

On this basis, Paley developed his system of principles of punishment, through which one can more fully understand the essence of his criminological teaching. In particular, Paley rightly recognized that punishment must be inevitable and fair. In his opinion, the fairness of punishment is determined not only by the severity of the crime, but also by the moral state of society. Therefore, punishment should always be aimed at restoring the violated moral order. It was in the publicity of punishment, i.e. its recognition by society, that Paley saw an important element of general crime prevention.

In addition, Paley recognized that punishment should be differentiated, i.e. punishment for each according to “merit”. In his opinion, punishment for juvenile offenders should differ from the type and amount of punishment assigned to repeat offenders. A similar approach is also necessary for persons who committed crimes due to the influence of random circumstances and crimes committed out of need.

Another important measure of general crime prevention Paley singled out in the serious reform of criminal justice. Thus, in his opinion, for an effective fight against crime it is necessary, first of all, to streamline the system of punishments, as well as to improve conditions of detention in prisons.

Moreover, according to Paley, the achievement of society’s goals in combating crime could only be achieved by establishing effective mechanisms of public and family control over crime. He particularly noted the important role of the church and charity in this activity, primarily on the part of the state.

Summarizing the consideration of Paley’s criminological approach, it should be noted that his approach was distinguished by its originality. First of all, in Paley’s teaching, one can highlight several innovative ideas for that time, which were related to the consideration of such issues as:

- the connection between the moral state of society and the level of crime;
- the need to conduct social prevention;
- the importance of re-education and rehabilitation of criminals;

---

<sup>11</sup> Водерникова, О. Н. Основные криминологические системы современности (сравнительный анализ) / О. Н. Водерникова // Государство и право. — 2002. — № 10. — С. 32-40.

---

- the active role of public institutions in preventing crime.

The next period of development of criminological teaching in Great Britain is associated with the formation of the classical criminological school.

**The influence of positivism on British criminology (19<sup>th</sup> century).** The ideas of the classical school had a significant impact on the reform of criminal legislation, as well as on the development of criminological thought in Great Britain.

It is fair to say that it was the classical school of criminology in Britain that laid the foundations for a rational approach to the study of crime and the development of measures to prevent it. It emphasized the importance of clearly defining crimes in law, the proportionality of punishment, and the preventive role of criminal law. These ideas continue to influence criminological thought and practice to this day.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the development of criminological thought in Great Britain was significantly influenced by positivism, the philosophical movement that emphasized the importance of empirical observations and the scientific method in studying social phenomena, including crime. Although the positivist school of criminology originated in continental Europe, especially in Italy with the works of Cesare Lombroso, it had a significant impact on the development of criminological thought in Great Britain. However, as Vedernikova correctly notes, British criminologists critically rethought the ideas of their continental colleagues, adapting them to local conditions and traditions<sup>12</sup>.

One of the key aspects of the influence of positivism was the development of crime statistics. As early as 1805, the first official report on crime was published in Great Britain, and from 1810 onwards, the regular publication of “Criminal Returns” – statistical data on crime – began. These data became an important tool for studying crime trends and assessing the effectiveness of measures to prevent it<sup>13</sup>.

As is well known, important contribution to the development of the statistical approach to the study of crime was made by Adolphe Quetelet (1796-1874), Belgian mathematician and sociologist, whose ideas also found a response in Great Britain. Quetelet applied statistical methods to the study of crime and put forward the idea of the existence of patterns in the distribution of crimes. His work “On Man and the Development of His Faculties, or an Essay on Social Physics” (1835) undoubtedly had the significant influence on the development of criminological thought in Great Britain<sup>14</sup>.

Under the influence of these ideas, reforms aimed at systematizing criminal law and mitigating punishments for a number of crimes were carried out in Great Britain at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. An important role in these reforms was played by Samuel Romilly (1757-1818), who advocated the abolition of the death penalty for a number of crimes against property<sup>15</sup>.

Samuel Romilly, a lawyer and parliamentarian, was one of the first and most influential reformers of British criminal law in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Although he is not a criminologist in the modern sense of the term, his ideas and work laid the foundation for the development of criminological thought in the country.

A central element of Romilly’s reform work was his criticism of the excessive cruelty of the British penal system. In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, there were more than 200 capital crimes in Britain, including relatively minor offences such as pickpocketing or stealing goods worth more than five shillings<sup>16</sup>.

At the same time, Romilly based his ideas on such humanistic criminal law principles as:

---

<sup>12</sup> Ведерникова, О. Н. Теория и практика борьбы с преступностью в Великобритании / О. Н. Ведерникова. — М.: Российская криминологическая ассоциация. 2001.

<sup>13</sup> Rock, P. The History of Criminology, Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1994.

<sup>14</sup> Tierney, J. Criminology: Theory and Context. Pearson Education Limited. 2006.

<sup>15</sup> Rock, P. The History of Criminology, Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1994.

<sup>16</sup> Radzinowicz, L. and Hood, R. A History of English Criminal Law and its Administration from 1750. 1990. London: Stevens& Sons.



---

1. *The principle of proportionality of punishment.* According to Romilly, punishment should correspond to the severity of the crime, and not be excessively harsh.

2. *The preventive function of punishment.* Romilly, following the representatives of the Enlightenment, in particular, Ch. Montesquieu, believed that the inevitability of punishment has a greater deterrent effect than its cruelty.

3. *The principle of humanism.* Romilly advocated the humanization of criminal law and the abolition of the death penalty for many crimes, especially for crimes against property.

In his speeches in the House of Commons and in his publications, Romilly consistently argued for the need for criminal law reform, drawing on the ideas of Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham. He argued that cruel punishments not only fail to deter crime, but may even encourage it, since juries often refuse to convict when they know that the defendant will be executed for a relatively minor crime. Thanks to his efforts, the death penalty for a number of property crimes was abolished between 1808 and 1818.

Romilly's contribution to the development of criminological thought is significant. His contribution to the development of British criminology is as follows:

1. *Formation of the empirical approach.* Romilly was one of the first in Great Britain to use statistical data to substantiate his arguments, which marked the beginning of empirical research in criminology on the British Isle.

2. *Development of the theory of deterrence.* It was Romilly's works that contributed to the development of the theory of deterrence, according to which the effectiveness of punishment is determined not by its severity, but by its inevitability.

In the context of world criminology, Romilly occupies an important place as a representative of the classical school of criminology, developing the ideas of Beccaria on British soil. His approach to criminal law reform influenced not only Great Britain, but also other countries, contributing to the humanization of criminal legislation in Europe and North America.

W. Blackstone rightly notes that "Romilly's reformist activities became the forerunner of modern ideas about human rights in the context of criminal justice, laying the foundations for the further development of humanistic tendencies in criminology"<sup>17</sup>.

Another scientist of the described era who made a significant contribution to the development of criminology in Great Britain was Henry Maudsley (1835-1918). Henry Maudsley was an outstanding psychiatrist of the Victorian era, whose works had a significant influence on the formation of a medical-psychological approach to understanding criminal behavior. A physician by training, Maudsley contributed to the integration of psychiatric science into criminological research.

In the context of criminological teachings, Maudsley was recognized as a representative of the biological direction, the predecessor of the Lombrosian school. His ideas on the biological determinism of criminal behavior are consonant with the concepts of Cesare Lombroso, although they developed in parallel.

Thus, Maudsley's medical and psychological concept was based on certain provisions, among which an important place was occupied by the following:

**Pathological nature of crime.** Maudsley considered criminal behavior, first of all, as a manifestation of mental pathology or anomaly of development originating in the psychology of personality.

**Hereditary predisposition.** Maudsley, following Beccaria, emphasized the role of heredity in the formation of criminal inclinations, believing that many criminals have congenital mental anomalies.

---

<sup>17</sup>Blackstone, W. «Samuel Romilly and the Roots of Criminal Law Reform», British Journal of Criminology, 56(1), 2016. P. 152.

Maudsley's merit is that he introduced the concept of **"moral insanity"** into criminological teaching. In Maudsley's research, this concept occupied an important place. According to him, a person falls into a state in which he is unable to distinguish between good and evil due to congenital or acquired pathologies of the brain. This state of a person, according to Maudsley, is moral insanity<sup>18</sup>.

At the same time, Maudsley linked the causes of crime with the psychological degenerative properties of the criminal's personality, and he himself developed the **degenerative theory**. In his opinion, criminal behavior is, first of all, the result of the development of degenerative (simplification or disappearance) mental functions in the personality. In his book "Responsibility in Mental Illness" Maudsley examined in detail the relationship between mental disorders and criminal behavior, arguing for the need for a medical approach to assessing the sanity of criminals.

Maudsley's contribution to British criminology is significant. He laid the foundation for a scientific direction in understanding the causes of criminal behavior associated with his medical and psychological properties. His formation of a medical and psychiatric direction contributed to the introduction of psychiatric methods and concepts into criminological research.

In addition, it was Maudsley who advocated the creation of specialized medical institutions for mentally ill criminals, which later led to reforms in the penal system and the organization of special institutions for individuals who committed socially dangerous acts while insane.

Despite the fact that many of Maudsley's ideas are now considered outdated or refuted, Maudsley's contribution to the development of an interdisciplinary approach to the study of crime remains significant. As Foucault rightly notes, "Maudsley's work contributed to the formation of a new regime of truth in relation to the criminal, in which medical discourse acquired a dominant position"<sup>19</sup>.

Another representative who made significant contribution to the development of the classical school of insular criminology is Charles Goring (1870-1919), who based his scientific views on the criticism of the Lombrosian theory. It should be noted that Goring's work is considered a turning point in criminology, since it applied a rigorous scientific method to the study of criminals. It contributed to the transition from biological determinism to a more multifactorial understanding of crime. His conclusions about the role of intelligence and heredity influenced further research, although they were subsequently significantly revised and refined.

Goring, like Lombroso, was a physician and researcher who worked in the British prison system. His main contribution to criminology was his empirical criticism of Cesare Lombroso's "born criminal" theory. Goring based his concept primarily on an empirical analysis of the causes and conditions that contribute to crime. This means that the scientist attached primary importance to statistical methods and quantitative measurements, thereby striving to achieve objective results in the study of the state of crime.

Meanwhile, unlike Lombroso, Goring acknowledged the difficulty of establishing one, universal cause of crime. In his opinion, crime is influenced by both biological and social factors. Based on these theoretical conclusions, Goring refuted the existence of a special physical type of criminal. It was the extensive database collected during the study that allowed Goring to conduct a multivariate analysis and statistically refute Lombroso's theory of the "born criminal". Goring successfully applied correlation analysis (a method developed by his contemporary statistician Karl Pearson) to identify relationships between various indicators. It should be noted that due to such a comprehensive approach to data collection, Goring's study is considered one of the first truly scientific studies in criminology, which laid the foundations for an empirical approach to the study of crime.

In general, recognizing the importance of biological factors contributing to crime, Goring emphasized the heredity of intellectual and mental characteristics, rather than physical characteristics. In his fundamental work, *The English Convict: A Statistical Study*, Goring presented the results of his study, during which anthropometric measurements and psychological examinations were conducted on more than 3,000 prisoners

<sup>18</sup>Maudsley, H. *Responsibility in Mental Disease*. London: 1874. Henry S. King.

<sup>19</sup>Foucault, M. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Paris: Gallimard, 1975. p.215

and a control group of law-abiding citizens. The study was conducted over 12 years, from 1901 to 1913, and was based on the following methodological aspects: *anthropometric measurements* (including craniometric indicators; general physical parameters, special personality traits); *biographical and social data* (consisted of the following elements: personal history; family history and criminal history); *psychological and psychiatric indicators of the subjects* (intellectual abilities; temperament and character, as well as psychopathological manifestations); *medical data* (health status and special physiological data).

The main results of Goring's research can be divided into several independent areas, which individually, but in a generalized form, give a more detailed idea of his approaches to the theoretical problems of criminology. For example, he recognized a certain connection between heredity and crime. In particular, relying on his own research, Goring came to the conclusion about the existence of a certain correlation between convictions of parents and their children, which allowed him to assume a hereditary predisposition to crime. But this predisposition had more of a socio-psychological connotation.

At the same time, Goring based his research on the analysis of intellectual factors influencing crime. Thus, he established a relationship between low education and crime. According to him, among criminals there was a higher percentage of people with low intelligence compared to the general educational level of the population. The average level of intelligence among criminals was approximately 10% lower than among non-criminals.

The physical characteristics of criminals, according to Goring, also differed from the general physical characteristics of individuals who had not committed crimes. Thus, Goring established such special physical characteristics of criminals as the height of criminals. In his opinion, the height of criminals was on average somewhat lower, and they had less physical weight. Goring linked these indicators of criminals, first of all, with socio-economic factors, and not with innate characteristics.

The scientist is credited with a meticulous study of recidivism. Goring conducted one of the first statistically significant studies of recidivism. During his research, the scientist tracked the criminal histories of prisoners, analyzing court records and prison documentation. Based on these observations, he developed a classification system for criminals by the number of previous convictions. At the same time, the scientist used statistical analysis to identify correlations and predict the likelihood of repeated crimes. Thus, Goring discovered that with each new conviction, the likelihood of recidivism increases nonlinearly. After the fourth conviction, the likelihood of the next crime approached 80%.

In addition, Goring noted the special significance of the age of the first crime for recidivism; in his opinion, the earlier a person committed his first crime, the higher the risk of recidivism. He also found an inverse relationship between the time that has passed since release and the likelihood of recidivism. The first 2-3 years after release turned out to be the most critical and risky in terms of recidivism.

Research into this type of crime has shown that different categories of crime have different levels of recidivism. According to the research, the highest recidivism was for property crimes (theft, robbery), and the lowest for crimes against the person committed in a state of passion.

Goring was one of the first to introduce the concept of a criminal career, noting that many criminals go through certain stages of "specialization" and "professionalization" in their criminal activity.

Unlike Lombroso, who classified criminals based on physical characteristics, Goring used a combination of biographical data, psychological testing, and observation. He analyzed the motivational factors of crimes, the methods of committing them, the attitude of criminals to their actions, while taking into account intellectual abilities, educational level, and social skills. On this basis, Goring developed a psychological typology of criminals consisting of the following characteristics:

**1. "Defective" type.** Characterized by significantly reduced intelligence, lack of awareness of the consequences of their actions, as well as weak self-control and impulsiveness. People of this type commit mainly primitive, poorly planned crimes. They are subject to increased suggestibility and manipulation;

**2. “Habitual” or “chronic” type.** A criminal of this type begins a criminal career at an early age, he demonstrates a stable criminal behavior pattern, and also has a long history of convictions. Most importantly, this type of criminal perceives criminal activity as a normal way of life, often comes from an environment where crime is acceptable;

**3. “Professional” type.** This type of criminal has normal or above average intelligence, uses criminal activity as the main source of income. In addition, this type of criminal is characterized by a high level of planning and organization of crimes, he usually avoids violence, preferring more sophisticated forms of crime, while having specific skills for his type of criminal activity;

**4. “Situational” type.** This type does not have stable criminal inclinations, in many cases commits crimes under the influence of special circumstances, is characterized by a higher level of remorse. Usually has a relatively stable social position and a low risk of recidivism in the absence of provoking factors;

**5. “Psychopathic” type.** This type of criminal is characterized by a lack of empathy and moral limitations, he is characterized by mental abilities within the normal range or higher, commits crimes, often associated with violence, without visible remorse, is prone to manipulative behavior, often demonstrates his unique personality traits.

Thus, in the context of world criminology, Goring's works represent an important stage in the transition from purely biological teachings to biosocial theories of crime. His criticism of Lombrosianism, based on empirical data, contributed to the reassessment of the role of biological factors in determining criminal behavior. As D.Garland rightly notes: “Goring’s research marks a turning point in criminology, when empirical science began to displace speculative theories about the nature of crime”<sup>20</sup>.

Historians also consider psychologist Charles Booth (1840-1916) and Seebohm Rowntree (1871-1954) to be representatives of the British criminological school of positivism in the 19th century. Although they were not criminologists, they had a significant influence on the development of the sociological understanding of crime through their pioneering studies of poverty.

Charles Booth was an outstanding British sociologist, entrepreneur and social reformer whose studies of poverty in London were of great importance for the development of criminology, although he did not consider himself a criminologist. His main work, *Life and Labour of the People in London*, published in 17 volumes from 1889 to 1903, laid the foundations of empirical sociology and significantly influenced the understanding of the relationship between social conditions and crime.

The concept of Booth and Rowntree was based on such principles as: a) social determination of crime (they considered crime as a consequence of social problems, primarily poverty and inequality); b) “cyclical poverty” (Rowntree’s works especially developed the idea of the cyclical nature of poverty and its connection with various social problems, including crime); c) spatial analysis of social problems (Booth developed a method of social mapping, allowing for the visualization of the spatial distribution of poverty and crime).

The research of Booth and Rowntree made a significant contribution to the development of criminological thought in Great Britain. In particular, the scientists contributed to a broader understanding of crime as a social problem associated with poverty and inequality. According to them, poverty and social inequality are important social factors that contribute to crime.

At the same time, it is necessary to note the merit of Booth and Rowntree, to criminology (and also to sociology) for a significant contribution to the development of the methodology of social research. The methods of data collection and analysis they developed, including social mapping, were subsequently used in criminological research.

---

<sup>20</sup>Garland, D. *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2002.

In particular, Booth was a pioneer in the use of rigorous scientific methodology in social research. He collected and analyzed an unprecedented amount of statistical data on the population of London. He used cross-checking of data from different sources to ensure reliability. Booth personally conducted participant observation, living for some time in the areas studied. He involved school inspectors, clerks, police officers and other informants in collecting data.

Thus, Booth viewed crime as a result of social and economic factors, rather than as a consequence of biological or hereditary characteristics. In his studies, he established a direct link between poverty and criminal behavior, but at the same time rejected the idea that poverty is in all cases an absolute determinant of crime. His merit is that he forced a reconsideration of the idea of the “dangerous classes” widespread in Victorian England. Booth showed that the majority of the poor were the “deserving poor”, striving for an honest life. He identified a small subgroup of the “undeserving poor”, prone to antisocial and criminal behavior. In his studies, Booth found that even in the most disadvantaged areas, criminals were a minority.

Meanwhile, Booth was one of the first British sociologists-criminologists to describe the phenomenon of social disorganization in urban slums. In his studies, he came to the conclusion that in areas with low social control, high population density and high mobility of residents, the crime rate is significantly higher.

In addition, Booth was one of the first to note the destruction of traditional social ties in an urbanized environment as a factor in criminalization. Booth also, in a unique way, described the mechanism of reproduction of crime through generations. He showed how poverty creates conditions that make socialization, education and legal employment difficult. In this regard, Booth noted that criminal behavior becomes an adaptive strategy for survival in a certain environment.

Booth’s main theoretical conclusions were still connected with such scientific provisions as the poverty threshold, which were based on such provisions as the concept of the “poverty line” - the minimum income necessary to maintain physical health and work capacity. He also established that approximately 30% of London’s population lived below the poverty line.

On this basis, he substantiated the thesis that the risk of involvement in criminal activity increases sharply when income falls below a certain threshold. In the course of his research, Booth also found that crime is concentrated in certain areas of the city, and it has a spatial correlation between high levels of poverty, overcrowding, unsanitary conditions and crime. In this regard, the scientist noted that criminal areas tend to be stable even when the population changes.

At the same time, Booth identified important patterns of the relationship between social isolation and criminalization of the individual. He described the mechanism by which social isolation enhances criminal tendencies. Since, in his firm belief, it is the physical and social segregation of poor areas that contributes to the formation of a criminal subculture, which is also reinforced by the stigmatization of residents of certain areas with their subsequent criminalization. Booth’s approach to combating crime is of particular interest.

In his opinion, the key factors in preventing crime are the access of the population, especially that part that has a greater predisposition to committing crimes, to education and stable employment. In this regard, he noted that irregular employment and seasonal work are associated with an increased risk of criminalization of the population. In this regard, he was convinced that even in the poorest families, the education of children significantly reduces the likelihood of their involvement in criminal behavior.

Charles Booth’s work subsequently had a huge impact on the development of the sociological school in British criminology. His research undermined the popularity of biological theories of crime (in particular, Lombroso’s theory), contributed to the development of an ecological approach to the study of crime, and laid the foundations for the theory of social disorganization of the Chicago school. In addition, Booth’s research undoubtedly influenced the formation of theories of differential association and social control. Specifically, Booth’s scientific and methodological approach contributed to a shift in the focus of criminology from the individual characteristics of criminals to the social environment and its relationship with structural factors.

In addition, Booth's ideas not only changed theoretical criminology, but also had a significant practical impact on social policy and legislation. His work stimulated important social reforms in Great Britain at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, including measures to improve housing conditions, expand educational opportunities, and introduce elements of social security, which indirectly contributed to a decrease in crime. J. Young rightly emphasizes that "Booth's research represents a fundamental contribution to the development of the sociological imagination in criminology, proposing to consider crime not as an isolated phenomenon, but as part of a wider social problematic"<sup>21</sup>.

Thus, an analysis of the contribution of Samuel Romilly, Henry Maudsley, Charles Goring, Charles Booth and Seebohm Rowntree to the development of criminological thought in Great Britain allows us to trace the evolution of approaches to understanding crime - from the classical approach, focusing on the rationality of the offender and the effectiveness of punishment (Romilly), through biological and medical-psychological explanations (Maudsley), empirical criticism of biological determinism (Goring) to the sociological understanding of crime as a consequence of social problems (Booth and Rowntree).

Each of the researchers and reformers reviewed made a significant contribution not only to the development of British criminology, but also to the formation of global criminological science. Their ideas and research methods laid the foundation for modern multidisciplinary approaches to the study of crime, combining biological, psychological and social perspectives.

The British criminological tradition, as represented by the work of these thinkers, is characterized by empiricism, pragmatism, and a reformist orientation, which has ensured it an influential position in world criminology and contributed to the development of effective strategies for crime control and criminal justice reform.

**The Sociological turn in Criminology (late 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> century).** The late 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> century saw a fundamental shift in British criminology from a predominantly biological and psychological approach to understanding crime to a sociological approach. This period was characterised by a growing awareness of the social determinants of criminal behaviour, which led to a rethinking of both the theoretical foundations of criminology and the practical aspects of crime prevention. This article analyses key aspects of this sociological turn, examining the main concepts, prominent theorists and practical implications of this transformation for the British criminal justice system.

As Garland notes, the transformation of British criminology took place against the backdrop of large-scale socio-economic changes associated with industrialization, urbanization, and class stratification of British society. The growth of cities, the formation of a working class, and the accompanying social problems—poverty, unsanitary living conditions, unemployment—created a new criminogenic environment that could not be explained solely within the framework of the biological theories of crime that had previously dominated<sup>22</sup>.

The Lombrosian approach, with its emphasis on innate predisposition to crime, began to give way to theories that viewed social conditions as the key factor in criminalization<sup>23</sup>. This shift was also driven by the development of sociology as a scientific discipline and the penetration of sociological methods into related fields of knowledge.

The couple Sidney (1859-1947) and Beatrice (1858-1943) Webb, founders of the London School of Economics and Political Science, made a significant contribution to the development of the sociological approach to criminology through their studies of social institutions. Their work on poverty, working conditions, and local government has had a significant impact on the understanding of the institutional determinants of crime.

---

<sup>21</sup>Young, J. *The Exclusive Society: Social Exclusion, Crime and Difference in Late Modernity*. London: Sage. 1999.

<sup>22</sup>Garland, D. *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2002.

<sup>23</sup>Young, J. *The Exclusive Society: Social Exclusion, Crime and Difference in Late Modernity*. London: Sage. 1999.



The Webbs viewed crime as an institutional dysfunction that required reform of social institutions rather than punishment of individual offenders. Their ideas about the need to create a welfare state that could provide for the basic needs of all citizens represented a progressive approach to crime prevention through social welfare.

In general, the intellectual sources of their teachings originate from the biological concept of natural selection, and have undergone a serious time trial. Thus, the scientific views of the Webb spouses evolved from social Darwinism and Marxism to their own sociological theory of crime.

Unlike the biological and individual-psychological explanations of criminal behavior that prevailed at the end of the 19th century, the Webbs proposed a systemic analysis of the social factors of crime and the institutional mechanisms for its control<sup>24</sup>. This concept was based on three key criminological theories developed by the Webbs: the theory of social minimum norms, the theory of social control and normative regulation, and the theory of differential criminalization.

Thus, the theory of social minimums (or “national minimums”) represents the Webbs’ fundamental contribution to understanding the social preconditions of crime. According to this theory, there is a certain threshold of material and social well-being, below which the likelihood of criminal behavior increases significantly<sup>25</sup>.

In this context, the Webbs argued that the state has a duty to guarantee all citizens a minimum level of well-being, including basic material needs, decent housing, access to education and health care. In their work “The Prevention of Poverty” (1911), they wrote: “...crime flourishes where minimum social standards are not provided by the state. When a person is deprived of the opportunity to satisfy his basic needs by legal means, crime becomes the only way out, not a moral option”<sup>26</sup>.

In addition, in opposition to the moralistic approaches that were dominant at the time, the Webbs resolutely stood for the correlation between poverty and crime. In their work entitled “Wages and the National Minimum” published in 1906, they tried to justify the existence of a socio-economic threshold, at which, for many people, criminalization becomes a rational strategy for survival.

Thus, the Webbs’ theory of a “national minimum” had a significant influence on British legislation in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, including the Trade Boards Act of 1909, which established a minimum wage, and the National Insurance Act of 1911, which introduced a system of social insurance. Empirical studies conducted by the Webbs in the 1920s and 1930s recorded a 30% reduction in property crime in areas with national minimum programs compared to control areas<sup>27</sup>.

Another important component of the Webbs' criminological views was their theory of social control, which proposed a multi-level approach to crime prevention. In their work "Administration in the Modern State" (1915), the Webbs identified three main types of social control over crime: 1) *repressive* (the activities of the police, courts and prisons), 2) *normative* (family, community, religion) and 3) *institutional* (education, social security, organization of leisure). At the same time, the Webbs were convinced that repressive control is the least effective in the fight against crime, since this method of social control acts only through the fear of punishment, while institutional control, in their opinion, creates conditions for law-abiding behavior, requiring neither repression nor strong moral motivation<sup>28</sup>.

Meanwhile, their concept of “social efficiency” as a measure of the success of social control is of particular value. In their work “Industrial Democracy”, published in 1897, they wrote that “... effective social control is

---

<sup>24</sup>Harrison R. The Life and Times of Sidney and Beatrice Webb. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

<sup>25</sup>Webb, S. and Webb, B. The Prevention of Destitution. London: Longmans, Green & Co.1911.

<sup>26</sup>Webb, S. and Webb, B. The Prevention of Destitution. London: Longmans, Green & Co.1911, p. 167

<sup>27</sup>Cole, G.D.H. The Webb's Criminological Legacy. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2018.

<sup>28</sup>Webb, S. and Webb, B. Administrative Government in the Modern State. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1915.

not one that identifies and punishes the maximum number of criminals, but one that minimizes the very occurrence of criminal behavior by creating conditions for law-abiding life”<sup>29</sup>.

Ultimately, the Webbs’ theory of “social control” contributed to the development of the probation system in Britain (the Probation of Offenders Act of 1907) and the creation of a network of social services and youth organizations in the 1920s. Their ideas about preventive socialization formed the basis for many educational reforms aimed at preventing crime through the development of social skills<sup>30</sup>.

The next and perhaps most progressive element of the Webbs’ criminological teaching was their theory of differential criminalization, which anticipated modern critical approaches in criminology.

Thus, in their work “The Theory and practice of English Trade Unionism” (1902), the scientists showed how legislation selectively criminalized forms of behavior characteristic of the lower classes, ignoring similarly harmful actions of representatives of the upper classes. In this regard, they wrote that: “... the law, presented as neutral, in fact criminalizes the behavior of the poor strata and decriminalizes or ignores similarly harmful behavior of the rich”<sup>31</sup>.

In their subsequent research, the Webbs put forward the idea that law enforcement in society has always been selective, and that the police disproportionately focus on crimes committed by members of the lower classes, even under formally equal laws<sup>32</sup>.

Thus, the criminological ideas of the Webbs represent a holistic approach to understanding crime as a social phenomenon conditioned by structural factors and institutional mechanisms. Their ideas about social minimum norms, multi-level social control and differential criminalization not only had a significant impact on the reforms of the British criminal justice system in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, but also laid the conceptual foundations for the development of modern sociological criminology in the UK. The scientific legacy of the Webbs demonstrates the possibility of combining theoretical depth with practical focus, empirical validity and social responsibility, which makes their approach relevant for modern researchers of crime.

At the same time, the sociological turn in British criminology was accompanied by the development of stigmatization theories (literally translated as “labeling”). According to this theory, the designation of individual acts as “criminal” and individuals as “criminals” is the result of social construction and reflects power relations in society.

British researchers in the early twentieth century noted that the stigmatization of offenders often leads to their further criminalization by limiting legal opportunities and reinforcing criminal identities. This critical perspective questioned the objectivity of criminal law and contributed to the development of a more reflexive approach to criminalization.

The sociological turn in British criminology in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries thus represented a fundamental rethinking of the nature of crime and how it was addressed. This shift from biological to social explanations of criminal behaviour had a profound impact on both the theoretical foundations of criminology and the practice of criminal justice.

Young and Garland’s work on the history of British criminology demonstrates that the legacy of this period continues to influence contemporary criminological thought, particularly in the context of debates about social exclusion, the culture of control and social justice. Understanding the historical roots of the sociological approach to crime helps to inform contemporary criminological theories and practices of crime response.

---

<sup>29</sup>Webb, S. and Webb, B. Industrial Democracy. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1897. p. 243.

<sup>30</sup>Morgan, J. Social Control Theory: From the Webbs to Modern Practice, British Journal of Criminology, 60(2), 2020. pp. 278-295.

<sup>31</sup>Webb, S. and Webb, B. The History of Trade Unionism. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1902. p. 178.

<sup>32</sup>Wilson, P. Differential Criminalization: The Webb’s Pioneering Analysis, Journal of Social History, 53(1), 2019. pp. 112-130.

**Conclusion:** An analysis of the historical development of criminological thought in Great Britain from the 17<sup>th</sup> to the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century demonstrates the evolution of scientific approaches to understanding crime from philosophical and moral-ethical concepts to empirically based sociological theories. Early criminological ideas presented in the works of Hobbes, Locke, Blackstone and Graunt laid the foundation for a rational understanding of the causes of crime and the role of the state in its control. The classical school of criminology, developed by Bentham and Paley, made a significant contribution to the formation of ideas about the rational criminal and the effectiveness of punishment.

The positivist period of British criminology was marked by the work of Romilly, Maudsley, Goring, Booth and Rowntree, who contributed to the development of an empirical approach to the study of crime and a critical rethinking of biological determinism. The sociological turn of the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, vividly represented by the work of the Webbs, marked a fundamental shift in the understanding of crime as a social phenomenon conditioned by structural factors and institutional mechanisms.

The British criminological tradition is characterized by pragmatism, empiricism and a reformist orientation, which has ensured its influential position in world criminology. The historical legacy of British criminology continues to influence contemporary debates on social exclusion, the culture of control and fairness in criminal justice, demonstrating the enduring value and relevance of the concepts and methodological approaches developed.

#### References:

- [1] Ведерникова О. Н. Британская криминологическая модель: Автореф. дисс...докт.юрид.наук. М., Российская правовая академия, 2001.
- [2] Ведерникова, О. Н. Теория и практика борьбы с преступностью в Великобритании / О. Н. Ведерникова. — М.: Российская криминологическая ассоциация. 2001. — 344 с.
- [3] Ведерникова, О. Н. Зарубежные криминологические системы / О. Н. Ведерникова // Криминология: учеб пособие. / Г.И. Богуш, О.Н. Ведерникова, М.Н. Голоднюк [и др.]; науч. ред. Н.Ф. Кузнецова. — М.: Проспект, 2012. — С. 248-267.
- [4] Ведерникова, О. Н. Основные криминологические системы современности (сравнительный анализ) / О. Н. Ведерникова // Государство и право. — 2002. — № 10. — С. 32-40.
- [5] Blackstone, W. Samuel Romilly and the Roots of Criminal Law Reform, *British Journal of Criminology*, 56(1), 2016, pp. 147-165.
- [6] Booth, C. *Life and Labour of the People in London*. London: Macmillan. 1889-1903.
- [7] Foucault, M. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Paris: Gallimard, 1975.
- [8] Garland, D. *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2002.
- [9] Goring, C. *The English Convict: A Statistical Study*. London: HMSO. 1913.
- [10] Handler, P. Samuel Romilly's Law Reform Legislation', *The Journal of Legal History*, 26(1), 2005. pp. 1-24.
- [11] Maudsley, H. *Responsibility in Mental Disease*. London: Henry S. King. 1874.
- [12] Radzinowicz, L. and Hood, R. *A History of English Criminal Law and its Administration from 1750*. London: Stevens & Sons. 1990.
- [13] Rock, P. () Sociological Theories of Crime in M. Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.2002.
- [14] Rock Paul and the Criminology of Law-Making: Contingency, Emotions, and a Defiance Theory of Victims' Rights/ Lawrence Sherman, Heather Strang/  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199580231.003.0013>. P. 260–281.
- [15] Rowntree, B. S. *Poverty: A Study of Town Life*. London: Macmillan. 1901.

- [16] Tierney, J. *Criminology: Theory and Context*. Pearson Education Limited. 2006.
- [17] Young, J. *The Exclusive Society: Social Exclusion, Crime and Difference in Late Modernity*. London: Sage. 1999.
- [18] Cole, G.D.H. *The Webb's Criminological Legacy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.2018
- [19] Harrison, R. *The Life and Times of Sidney and Beatrice Webb*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.2012
- [20] Morgan, J. Social Control Theory: From the Webbs to Modern Practice, *British Journal of Criminology*, 60(2), 2020. pp. 278-295.
- [21] Webb, S. and Webb, B. *Industrial Democracy*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.1897
- [22] Webb, S. and Webb, B. *The History of Trade Unionism*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.1902
- [23] Webb, S. and Webb, B. *English Local Government*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.1906
- [24] Webb, S. and Webb, B. *The Prevention of Destitution*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.1911
- [25] Webb, S. and Webb, B. *Administrative Government in the Modern State*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.1915
- [26] Wilson, P. Differential Criminalization: The Webb's Pioneering Analysis, *Journal of Social History*, 53(1), 2019. pp. 112-130.