

# THE CAUSES OF CRIME IN IRELAND

Finbar McDonnell.

Crime is an issue which is of constant importance in our society. In the last few months we have had the issue of the 'general', debates about cross-border co-operation, and headlines about possible changes in the administrative structures of the Gardaí, and these are but the current topics in the area. It is not surprising that crime is considered important in our society. The aim of a society is to help the citizens to maximise the fulfillment of their lives, and if crime is widespread, or even if crime exists, then this is a strong indication that this is not happening. The people committing the crime aren't fulfilled, the victims certainly aren't pushed towards fulfillment, and fear of crime can affect everybody. If crime is particularly high in a certain type of society, we must ask if the benefits of the society outweigh the high crime, or are these benefits worth it at all? Would perhaps a different approach to crime yield lower crime rates (and more fulfilled lives for people) without having to alter the fabric of society? Either way, the criminal justice system now accounts for 2% of GNP, and so crime is certainly a subject which merits serious study. This paper looks at crime in the Republic of Ireland, and how the level of crime has increased dramatically in the last 25 years. It tries to discover what has caused this huge and unprecedented increase, and identifies six specific factors. The need for this sort of study is compounded by the fact that very little research seems to have been done in the area - two ESRI and one NESC report (all involving David Rottman who has now emigrated), and a handful of academic papers. Because of Rottman's preeminence, I shall refer to him several times.

To begin with, it is, I suppose, best to attempt a definition of 'crime'. Rottman outlines two approaches: The first, 'legalistic', approach defines crime as "an act punishable by law, as being forbidden by statute or injurious to public welfare."<sup>1</sup> However, this is really too broad a definition for our purpose, since it includes hundreds of thousands of offences each year of regulations designed to get people to do things in a specific way, regulations which have come increasingly to rely on criminal law, eg. traffic infractions (getting a parking ticket etc.), throwing litter on the ground and so on. It is really only the more serious offences against the law that we are concerned with. Again, the approach to defining 'serious' is legalistic - in Ireland, this is done through the Indictable\Non-Indictable distinction. Since

'serious' is approximated by 'indictable', it is this measure I will use as the true measure of crime in Ireland. The annual statistics are published in the Garda Commissioner's 'Report on Crime' to the Minister for Justice. The second approach tries to find the 'natural properties' of crime, and defines a crime as an action having these properties, regardless of legal definitions.

Therefore, a crime might be any action injurious to social welfare, and a criminal any person who commits an action which injures social welfare. There are two problems with this - firstly, who decides what is best or injurious for society? Obviously, sociologists will not be neutral about the type of society they want, and will judge accordingly. Secondly, these crime measures would be very difficult to quantify, and this is of course the main advantage of using 'Indictable Offences'; these are recorded through the criminal justice system.

Before continuing (using the legalistic definition), I should point out the problems associated with using this 'Indictable Offences' measure.

(1) The 'natural properties' approach has a point in arguing that the Indictable Offences measure is crude and rigid. Especially in a changing society, it is quite likely that the social good changes constantly, and cannot be legislated for. As an example, ten years ago, somebody selling contraceptives was a criminal, and could be jailed. Now, the Government are urging people to wear them! Similarly, workers who 'sit-in' in factories are also 'criminals', going by the present law. The law is usually only changed when there is already a need in society to do so, and it is inevitable that a time-lag will exist during which acts not injurious to society will be classified as being so.

(2) The Indictable\Non-Indictable distinction has not been kept up to date. Technically, the difference between them is that any person charged with an Indictable offence has the right to be tried by judge and jury in the Circuit court, whereas Non-Indictable charges are heard in the District court, and then by judge only. When offences were classified as one or the other, they may have been 'serious' and 'unserious', but now, stealing a box of matches (Indictable) should hardly be considered more serious than drunken-driving (Non-Indictable). Of course, for the most part, the measures are still fairly accurate.

(3) Crimes can only be recorded in the official statistics if they are reported and recorded. Many people choose not to report a crime to the Gardai, and they in turn sometimes ignore minor offences. As the NESC points out; "What is actually recorded as a crime is largely determined by the interaction between the Gardai and the wider society."<sup>2</sup> Victim surveys, where people are asked what crimes they were the victim of in the previous year

and if they reported them show an underestimation of true crime levels by up to 50%.<sup>3</sup> However, there are also doubts about victim studies, and besides, unless the public's confidence in the Gardai alters dramatically, the trend figures are still valid for any particular period. I don't think for example that anyone would argue that crime has not increased in Ireland since 1961, and that more is simply being reported.

The number of indictable crimes, as measured, has increased in the Republic of Ireland as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Indictable offences in the Republic of Ireland (selected years).

1961	14818
1971	37781
1981	89400
1983	102387 (peak)
1986	86574

(source: Annual Report on Crime)

In the 5 years 1957-1961, the average number of indictable offences committed was 15792; between 1982 and 1986 the average was 95,520. This means that crime in the latter period was 6.05 times that in the former. Moreover, this increase occurs in all categories of crime—offences against the person rose threefold, offences against property using violence rose elevenfold, and offences against property without violence rose elevenfold. Rottman, in a detailed analysis, found that every single offence has increased in frequency over the period, except for "larceny of pedal cycles"<sup>4</sup>. The effects of this huge increase in crime are very real:

- £350m a year is now spent in the criminal justice system
- in real terms, expenditure on the courts doubled between 1961 and 1981, that in the Garda Síochána trebled, and that on the prisons thirteenfold.
- crime is now a major current affairs and general election issue
- the number of houses with private security firms has hugely increased
- marches and vigils have been held against crime on Dublin's streets with an associated rise in vigilante activity.

It will be noted from the figures that crime has actually fallen since 1983, but the indications are that the decrease bottomed out in 1987 and there is no reason to believe that the overall trend is still not upward. The decrease seems to have been due to the decrease in drug related offences, since the country got to grips with the drugs problem which peaked in 1983. It also coincides with high emigration among young working class people, who, as we shall see, are those most likely to commit crime. It would

certainly be wrong to assume that crime will not increase in the coming decades—all the evidence is to the contrary.

Why crime has increased as it has in Ireland is an extraordinarily difficult question to answer. There are almost as many theories about crime as there are criminologists, and there always seem to be special factors at work anyhow—the random variable  $u$  is the only one that can be included with any certainty in an analysis of crime. My approach to the question is based on the following opportunities available to commit crime, and the propensity on the population to actually take advantage of these opportunities i.e.  $\text{crime} = \text{opportunities} \times \text{propensity}$ .

This might seem obvious, but just stating it would simplify a lot of criminology. Rottman, for example, divides criminology into two competing theories—the "Structural Perspective" and the "Social Disorganisation Perspective". The former basically corresponds to my "opportunities"—"Explanation..... is sought exclusively in terms of changes in circumstances; the questions of why particular individuals or which individuals will respond to these circumstances is not considered"<sup>5</sup>. Social disorganisation "emphasises the disruption and dislocation that inevitably accompanies change"..... "it refers to the absence of clear and agreed rules—a breach in the constitutive order of human activity"<sup>6</sup>. Since Rottman only works with these two perspectives, and chooses the first as the most relevant to Ireland, he neglects entirely to examine "propensity" in explaining why crime has increased. I agree that Social Disorganisation (certainly so described) is not particularly relevant to Ireland, but in asking which one of these two theories explains crime, he, in my opinion asks the wrong question.

I think looking at crime, as many criminologists do, purely in terms of a change in external circumstances, is a very blinkered view. The NESC made some brief comments on the matter, which I would agree with, but nobody seems to have followed through in an Irish context—"..... An individual makes decisions, including those to do with breaking the law, within a societal framework which structures the range and type of options open to that individual"<sup>7</sup>. The propensity to commit crime is very important, I think, and must be examined in asking why crime has increased. Therefore I shall examine first the changes in opportunities to commit crime, and second the changes in reasons why people would take advantage of them.

Since 1961, the opportunities to commit crime have increased greatly. This is for three reasons, first, the amount of property in Ireland has increased. This sounds almost too straightforward, but it is a factor nonetheless. Property crime accounts for (and always has) over 90% of all crime and the increases in property crime

can be seen in the following table, along with increases in the GNP, a proxy for the amount of private property in the country.

Table 2

Increases in GNP and in property crime(selected years)

	GNP(weighted)	Property crime(weighted)
1961	100	100
1971	145	258
1981	196	627
1986	203	611

(Source: National Income and Expenditure Accounts.)

The idea behind this is simple enough—the amount of targets has increased. The following quote from a *MAGILL* article on crime gives the flavour of this argument "prior to 1965, there were the good old days. There was little crime. One reason there was little crime was because there was little of anything.....there were fewer burglaries because there was less to steal inside most houses. Today, there is a wealth of portable valuables in a much greater number of houses. There was nothing as valuable as a video worth stealing from a house back in the good old days, and so the height of a delinquent's ambition in the 1950s and the early 1960s was stealing apples from orchards."<sup>8</sup> Videos are an obvious example; cars would be another. The amount of cars has increased fourfold in the last 25 years—so car thieves have four times as many targets.

Rottman's detailed analysis suggests a most interesting relationship between the amount of property crime rate;

"about 1964, a basic transformation occurred in the seriousness of loss sustained through property crime. Before 1964, there is no evidence that property crime was increasing systematically in response to the opportunities available. This is reversed in the years after 1964, where the annual increases are so large as to more than merely compensate for the growing opportunities."<sup>9</sup>

Obviously, it is impossible to establish for definite a causal link between the amount of property in Ireland and the amount of property crime, but the following figures from Rottman show the trend he was talking about. He uses personal expenditure as opposed to GNP, and his figures aren't deflated by the GDP deflator.

Table 3

Value of property stolen and Personal Expenditure(selected years)

	Personal Expenditure	Property stolen
1951	100	100
1956	124	77
1961	153	91
1965	207	206

1966	219	259
1971	370	1036
1975(last year)	704	3333

(Source:ESRI paper no 102,p.76)

Up until the early 1960s,even though property increased,property crime fell in real terms.Between 1961 and 1965,the level of property crime caught up to the 1951 proportion of property,and since 1965,property crime has increased so much that by 1975,the last year of Rottman's survey the value of property stolen has increased 33 fold since 1951,whereas property value had only increased 7.fold.

This leads one to the belief that the increase in property was a necessary but not sufficient condition for the increase in crime and that after 1965 there are other factors at work.Whether one regards the relationship however as a simple causal one or as a more complex one the increase in property was undoubtedly one factor in increasing crime since 1961.

(2)The population has increased.

Again this is fairly straightforward.The increase in population increases firstly the number of potential criminals and secondly the number of potential victims.Since over 80% of crime is consistently committed by those under the age of 29<sup>10</sup>,and these are also most likely to be the victims of crime<sup>11</sup>,the following figures give some indication of the relevant increase in population.

Table 4.

Population aged 10-29,selected years.		
Year	Population	Weighted
1961	826,017	100
1971	954,528	116
1981	1,189,847	144
1986	1,225,936	148

(Source:Census of Population,Various years,1986 Summary population report)

Table 5.

While it is impossible to say how much of the crime increase was due to this population increase,as Table 5 shows,the overwhelming proportion of crime is committed by a relatively small proportion of the population.

Table 5.  
Age distribution of national population and of persons apprehended.

0-9	20.6%	1.9%
10-14	10.0%	17.5%
15-16	4.0%	19.3%

17-20	7.1%	23.6%
21-29	13.3%	22.3%
30+	45.0%	15.4%

(For the year 1979 for indictable crimes)

(Source NESC no.77,p115)

The increase in the 10-29 age group would therefore be expected to have caused a much larger proportional increase in crime. I think it is fair enough to assume that this is the case, but as with the property/property crime relationship, it is difficult to judge how straightforward the relationship is. The 10-29 population had fluctuated previously without drastic changes in the crime figures. Emigration in the 1950s, for example, mainly affected this age group, but crime was fairly constant. It is hard to know if the post 1961 increase in this age group was enough in itself to cause greater crime, and I shall examine other contributory factors later.

The other relevant change in population is the number of households, again representing opportunities to commit crime. This increased as follows.

Table 6.

Number of households in the Republic of Ireland.

1961	455,394
1971	726,000
1981	898,000
1986	976,304

(Source: Various Census of Population Reports)

### (3) Urbanization.

It may seem strange to include urbanization here as increasing the opportunities for crime but I think that while urbanization is certainly responsible for increasing people's propensity to commit crime, it also increases the opportunities. First of all, to look at the trend in urbanization:

Table 7

Population of towns and cities, selected years.

1961	1,330,000
1971	1,556,000
1981	1,915,000

(Source: Various Census of Population Reports. )

This increased opportunities in the following way. As we have seen, over 60% of crimes are committed by those under 20. These are not professional criminals, and they are not particularly mobile. Therefore, much of this crime is simply these young people availing of opportunities which come their way. If the population

was rurally based there would be fewer houses, fewer shops, and fewer targets in general presenting themselves. In other words, if property and population increase ( as they did ), crime would be expected to increase everywhere ( as it did ), but the increase could be expected to be larger in urban areas ( as it was ) because of the increase in targets within range of the people committing offences . This is shown in Table 8 , which gives crimes committed per 1000 people in the Dublin Metropolitan Area and the Rest of the Country ( figures are not kept on an Urban\Rural basis , and even the present figures were not kept before 1974 ) . Table 8 clearly shows a link between urban areas and the level of crime.

Table 8

Crime per 1000 people , DMA , Rest of Country ( specific years )

	D.M.A.	Rest
1974	27.2	8.2
1981	51.9	15.1
1986	47.9	14.7

(Source ; Reports on Crime , various years )

Rottman urges caution however - " Though the contribution made by urban areas , and particularly in Dublin , to the national crime level trends was clearly greater than that made by the non-urban areas , the differential is not dramatic . "12 Only for housebreaking and larceny of vehicles is there a definite link between urbanization and crime , he concludes .

Having examined how the opportunities for crime have increased , I shall now examine how ( I believe ) the propensity to commit crime has also increased . Much of this increased propensity is based on the modernisation of our society , but I must make clear that I am not saying either that modernisation is bad , or that modernisation must inevitably lead to crime increases . What I am saying is that the speed with which the process occurred in Ireland , combined with our traditional inability to plan for the long term , made crime increases inevitable . Japan and Switzerland are two countries where modernisation has not increased crime ; in fact Japan has seen a substantial decrease in crime .

Modernisation can be defined as the process of change a country undergoes in evolving from a pre-industrial to an industrial society . Its primary characteristic therefore is industrialisation , and this is accompanied by urbanisation ( less dependance on agriculture ; more economies of scale for business ) , smaller family size ( more mobility needed , bigger emphasis on



17-20	7.1%	23.6%
21-29	13.3%	22.3%
30+	45.0%	15.4%

(For the year 1979 for indictable crimes)

(Source NESC no.77,p115)

The increase in the 10-29 age group would therefore be expected to have caused a much larger proportional increase in crime. I think it is fair enough to assume that this is the case, but as with the property/property crime relationship, it is difficult to judge how straightforward the relationship is. The 10-29 population had fluctuated previously without drastic changes in the crime figures. Emigration in the 1950s, for example, mainly affected this age group, but crime was fairly constant. It is hard to know if the post 1961 increase in this age group was enough in itself to cause greater crime, and I shall examine other contributory factors later.

The other relevant change in population is the number of households, again representing opportunities to commit crime. This increased as follows.

Table 6.

Number of households in the Republic of Ireland.

1961	455,394
1971	726,000
1981	898,000
1986	976,304

(Source: Various Census of Population Reports)

### (3) Urbanization.

It may seem strange to include urbanization here as increasing the opportunities for crime but I think that while urbanization is certainly responsible for increasing people's propensity to commit crime, it also increases the opportunities. First of all, to look at the trend in urbanization:

Table 7

Population of towns and cities, selected years.

1961	1,330,000
1971	1,556,000
1981	1,915,000

(Source: Various Census of Population Reports. )

This increased opportunities in the following way. As we have seen, over 60% of crimes are committed by those under 20. These are not professional criminals, and they are not particularly mobile. Therefore, much of this crime is simply these young people availing of opportunities which come their way. If the population

was rurally based there would be fewer houses, fewer shops, and fewer targets in general presenting themselves.

In other words, if property and population increase ( as they did ) , crime would be expected to increase everywhere ( as it did ) , but the increase could be expected to be larger in urban areas ( as it was ) because of the increase in targets within range of the people committing offences . This is shown in Table 8 , which gives crimes committed per 1000 people in the Dublin Metropolitan Area and the Rest of the Country ( figures are not kept on an Urban\Rural basis , and even the present figures were not kept before 1974 ) . Table 8 clearly shows a link between urban areas and the level of crime.

Table 8

Crime per 1000 people , DMA , Rest of Country ( specific years )

	D.M.A.	Rest
1974	27.2	8.2
1981	51.9	15.1
1986	47.9	14.7

(Source ; Reports on Crime , various years.)

Rottman urges caution however - " Though the contribution made by urban areas , and particularly in Dublin , to the national crime level trends was clearly greater than that made by the non-urban areas , the differential is not dramatic . "12 Only for housebreaking and larceny of vehicles is there a definite link between urbanization and crime , he concludes .

Having examined how the opportunities for crime have increased , I shall now examine how ( I believe ) the propensity to commit crime has also increased . Much of this increased propensity is based on the modernisation of our society , but I must make clear that I am not saying either that modernisation is bad , or that modernisation must inevitably lead to crime increases . What I am saying is that the speed with which the process occurred in Ireland , combined with our traditional inability to plan for the long term , made crime increases inevitable . Japan and Switzerland are two countries where modernisation has not increased crime ; in fact Japan has seen a substantial decrease in crime .

Modernisation can be defined as the process of change a country undergoes in evolving from a pre-industrial to an industrial society . Its primary characteristic therefore is industrialisation , and this is accompanied by urbanisation ( less dependance on agriculture , more economies of scale for business ) , smaller family size ( more mobility needed , bigger emphasis on

materialism, ) , growing individualism ( less need for communities , high level of international culture ). In looking at how these trends have increased the propensity to commit crime however , I will first look at the effect of another supposed characteristic of modernisation - the changing of a society into a meritocracy . In all , there are three reasons the propensity has increased .

(1) People are more dissatisfied with their lives

It seems obvious that a primary determinant of the level of crime in a society is going to be peoples' happiness or otherwise with their lives . If everybody is perfectly contented , then there will be no motive for anyone to engage in criminal activities . While it is very hard to gauge the level of peoples' satisfaction with their lives , it is an almost universal assumption that contentment is a function of material possessions , and if people are materially better off , they will be more satisfied and less likely to commit crimes . But at a time when the traditional values of progress and social justice are seemingly being fulfilled to a degree never before experienced , crime has been increasing at an alarming rate in many Western countries ; in Ireland , just when long standing problems of development and employment had apparently been resolved , crime came to be regarded as a major social problem . It is , in fact , my impression that the last 25 years , despite the increased material wealth , have not brought greater contentment for many people . Why this may be the case is an extraordinarily difficult question to answer . What I think may have happened is that people changed their expectation of what they 'deserved' from life by quite a lot , and the reality changed by a lot less . I will try to explain this .

Fifty years ago in Ireland, there was almost no class mobility whatsoever. If a young person was growing up as the son of a small farmer, he got the farm or he emigrated. Similarly, the daughter married or emigrated. The cities were no different - the working class stayed working class and the richer classes stayed richer. Since the divisions were so institutionalised (and there is no doubt that huge divisions existed) most people accepted the social order as given. This attitude was reinforced by the high level of religious devotion in Ireland, with the willingness to accept as God's wish the valley of tears as a short run sacrifice for the next.

With modernisation however, the old system was recognised as bad for society as a whole and the post modernisation Ireland is supposedly founded on the principle of meritocracy. The shift to industry from agriculture has caused far more jobs to be gained by interview and the extension of free secondary schooling to all students is intended to allow the best people to do best. Religion

has declined in importance so there is no spiritual basis for not doing well. The new system is, in summary, intended to evaluate each person on their merits, no matter what their background.

Despite the ideal, in reality social mobility is barely better than it ever was. The poorer areas get the worst housing, which causes large problems raising and educating children. The Irish educational system is itself severely biased towards the middle class and exam results and backgrounds of university students are biased accordingly. Even if someone manages to overcome these barriers, allegations are often made that job discrimination exists on the basis of home residence.

There does not exist therefore any sort of meritocracy but instead a largely self-perpetuating class system which does not rely on inherited wealth any longer but on more complex, but no less effective methods. The richer sections and poorer sections of the population have even clustered in separate areas to an extent never before seen, and boundaries in cities are almost defined by social class differences.

These are not my opinions but the findings of almost all studies on Irish society. Clancy found "a close relationship between social class and educational achievement"<sup>13</sup> and accused the government of "a distinct lack of commitment to meritocratic principles". Hannan, who studied the area for the ESRI found "....the basic trend for the universities is for a more efficient use by the middle class...to recreate itself"<sup>14</sup>. The Institute of Public Administration found that "....the incidence of unemployment, underemployment and low paid employment are clearly related to social class and occupational structures and they therefore compound other class based deprivations"<sup>15</sup>.

My point is that hundreds of thousands of people in Ireland are living on material standards lower than those they were led to expect they would get and lower than those which they deserve to get if the system worked properly. When one considers how much success and its trappings are emphasised in modern Ireland, I feel there is good reason for many of these people, in the lower socio-economic groups, to have a right to feel aggrieved. This happens to coincide with the confirmed fact that the overwhelming majority of crime is committed by people from lower socio-economic groups. Rottman's report for NESC covered the socio-economic characteristics of Dublin residents apprehended in connection with crime. He discovered "....a pattern of early school leaving and marginal employment—as unskilled or semi-skilled labourers—or unemployment is present. Only 37% of those aged less than 17 were still in school, while 54% of that age group were listed as unemployed...8 out of 10 males aged 17 or over brought into the criminal justice system are listed as unemployed...Overall, the

educational and labour force disadvantages of persons entering the criminal justice system are very substantial" 16.

Given these shocking statistics, I don't think there is any doubt but that a link exists between socio-economic circumstances and the crime level. Absolute poverty cannot be blamed, since absolute standards of living are higher than ever before. My proposed link, as I've outlined is on the basis of the unfairness of the system, which makes people frustrated and dissatisfied with their lives.

This could lead to crime in three ways-(i) the frustration itself could cause people to react in a criminal manner (ii) Crime could be looked upon as a way to beat the unfair system—allowing an individual to reach the material standard which he deserves, albeit by resorting to unfair means himself. Crime could be looked upon as an expression of social protest, which might have taken the form of a direct protest in the last century when the constraints on working class life chances were more obvious but now takes the form of crime, against the more subtle constraints of the post modernisation era.

Whatever the specific causal relationship I believe this link must be explained and could well be responsible, for example for the property crime trend examined earlier (Table 3). Remember that property crime accounts for over 90% of total crime so it is of central importance to explain the property crime increase. We saw that from 1951 to 1965 the real level of property crime did not increase at all, but remained at or below the same proportion of total property it had been in 1951. After 1965, however property crime increased at a far more rapid pace, increasing 16 fold in value in 10 years whereas total property value rose only 3.5 fold. Before 1965 this can be explained as simply the reaction to increased opportunities, but after 1965 the relationship obviously changes. In my view, the alienation, frustration and discontent caused by modernisation have to have played some part in this increase.

I must reemphasise that I am in no way arguing against modernisation, or against post modernisation capitalist industrial democracies. Quite the contrary—I am saying that the failure to make the new system work as it is meant to is responsible for increasing crime—the problem is not the new system, but the way it was introduced.

(2). Constraints on people have lessened.

There are two sides to this argument—on the one hand, there is more individualism, and on the other, morality and community are less important as opinion formers. Individualism is, of course, another by-product of modernisation. Greater education encourages people to think for themselves, as does greater access

to the media. People are far more likely now to make up their own minds about whether or not to commit a crime, and far more likely to follow it through.

This is especially true of the 15-21 age group who account for over 50% of national crime and who according to NESC "are at a crucial stage in the life cycle, when occasional adolescent rebellion, unless dealt with carefully, can develop into adult criminal roles"<sup>17</sup>. Individualism means that if people in this age group feel like committing crime, they are buttocks far more likely to go ahead and do so than they once would have been. According to Röttman, "In Ireland, as in other countries, the ordinary process of transition from adolescence to adulthood brings a growing attachment to conventional institutions and responsibilities, particularly work and marriage"<sup>18</sup>. In other words, before people make attachments with society, they commit most crime.

This is where several of the causes of crime tie together. The 17-21 population has increased, as can be seen from Table 4. Their dissatisfaction and alienation has also increased, especially in the lower socioeconomic groups. Finally, they are far more willing to express themselves. The three factors have come together to cause the explosion of crime committed by young working class people, as shown in the available statistics. The only wonder is that the "attachment to conventional institutions and responsibilities" is so strong that it reduces crime by so much as people get older.

The flip side of this new individualism is that people feel less inclined not to commit crime now because the church or community says they shouldn't do so. The close knit communities of old did not allow for much crime, since everybody knew everybody else, and strangers stuck out. Since modernisation, a far greater proportion of people travel to work everyday, so people don't know their neighbours as well, and strangers in an area are not noticed. This is compounded by many people not caring anyway whether their neighbours are victims of crime; "community spirit" not being what it was. Rottman eloquently describes the process - "consensus and homogeneity which forged social solidarity within the communal village become displaced by the functional interdependence that characterises the complex and segmented division of labour in modern society"<sup>19</sup>.

(3) Greater chance of success.

The final reason I believe the propensity to commit crime has increased is because an offender in 1988 has a lot lower likelihood of getting caught than an offender in 1961 had. This means, I feel, that the criminal justice system now acts as a smaller deterrent than before. The number of people convicted and

punished has increased. The number imprisoned has increased. The number of Gardai has increased. The resources devoted to combatting crime have increased. However, I believe that what affects a potential offender is not the absolute numbers, but the chances of him getting clean away, or caught, if he commits an offence. The following table shows how his chances of escaping detection have improved.

Table 9.

% chance that a crime is not detected.

1961	33.6%
1971	53.6%
1981	63.4%
1986	68.4%

(Source: based on detection rates in "Report on Crime"-various years)

It is difficult to know what effect this had on the crime rate, but it had certainly had some effect. It is important to note that the actual numbers of criminals caught increased, but there was such an explosion of crime that the percentage caught dropped. Therefore, while the level of absolute deterrents increased the real deterrent fell. No country could afford to keep security levels in proportion with crime, this would now mean over 40,000 Gardai in Ireland for example.

Therefore, if the other causes of crime were to be alleviated in the future, and crime fell, then the real deterrent would rise and push crime down further. Concentrating purely on this cause of crime, as the "law and order brigade" do, is shortsighted. International research has shown this doesn't work and in Britain the crime rate has risen by more than 50% since Mrs. Thatcher came into power, on a policy of increased law and order 8 years ago.

To summarise then, I have tried to analyse what the factors are that caused such a massive increase in crime in Ireland in the last 25 years. I decided that the increase in crime was due both to an increase in the opportunities for crime and an increased propensity of people to commit crime. The former was examined by looking at the increase in property, the population growth and urbanisation. All three seemed to have caused an increase in crime. The propensity was examined by looking at the increased level of frustration of many people in Irish society with both their own lives and the way society has dealt with them, the breakdown of constraints on people, and the increased chances of a crime not being detected. I believe I have given strong intuitive reasons for crime to be dependent on each and all of these variables.

This paper then, simply looked at the causes of crime in our country. It is a lot easier to examine the causes than propose solutions, and I won't attempt to do that here. However I must say that the first step towards any solution is always a clear identification of the problem, and I feel that the amount of time and resources we devote to this in Ireland is far too small. Much of what has gone above represents my striking into unknown territory, because nobody else seems to have done research in these areas. Compared to the amounts spent on security and law and order, the amount spent analysing where and how money should be spent is minimal. Ireland is no different from many other countries in this respect but this is hardly an excuse. There is (as ever) some cause for hope—the recent promotions in the Gardai have brought several analytical minds into senior positions. It is to be hoped that they will encourage more thoughtful approaches to combatting crime than those who have gone before.

#### Bibliography.

- David Rottman, Crime in the Republic of Ireland: Statistical Trends and their Interpretation, ESRI Paper no. 102.  
NESC, The Criminal Justice System: Policy and Performance.  
Rottman and Breen, Crime Victimization in the Republic of Ireland, ESRI no. 121.  
Clancy et al. (eds.): Ireland, a Sociological profile.

#### Footnotes.

1. Oxford English Dictionary, 1964, p. 423.
2. NESC, Report no. 77.
3. This is an approximation, for a general discussion see ESRI no. 121, Crime Victimization in the Republic of Ireland, pp. 88-91.
4. David Rottman, Crime in the Republic of Ireland, Statistical Trends and their Interpretation, ESRI no. 102, ch. 4
5. *ibid.*, p. 16
6. *ibid.*, p. 18
7. NESC, p. 22
8. Magill, April 1985, p. 12
9. Rottman, p. 75
10. NESC, p. 115
11. ESRI, no. 121, p. 74, Table 5.1
12. Rottman, p. 115



13. Clancy, "Socialisation, Selection and Reproduction in Education", p.128 in Clancy et. al. (eds.)
14. ESRI, The Distribution of Income in the Republic of Ireland (1982).
15. IPA, Poverty and Social Policy, p.74
16. NLSC, no. 77, p.119.
17. *ibid*, p.20
18. *ibid*, p.115.
19. Rottman, p.18.