


ARTICLE

A Contribution to the Discussion of the Theory of Anomie

Filip Novaković 

The Institution of the Human Rights Ombudsman of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Corresponding Author: Filip Novaković, The Institution of the Human Rights Ombudsman of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina. E-mail: filipnovakovic.iur@gmail.com

(Submitted 9 September 2022; revised 17 December 2022; accepted 8 January 2023; first published online 13 March 2023)

Abstract

The paper analyses the notion of anomie through various theories presented in the works of classical Greek thinkers up to today's understanding of this notion. In this regard, the article will touch on some previous understandings of this phenomenon, and the beginnings of modern thought on anomie in the work of Jean-Marie Guyau, and the developed understandings of Robert Merton and Émile Durkheim as the two most prominent authors dealing with this topic. In addition, the attitudes of marginalized writers will be analysed, as well as neglected and underrepresented understandings in criminology and wider science. The purpose of this paper is to find common ground between all previous understandings of the theory of anomie, and to try to find a more specific meaning of the term in order to contribute to the discussion on this topic.

Keywords antisocial behaviour, criminal behaviour, criminological theory, suicide, crime, crime prevention, criminology

INTRODUCTION

By the theory of anomie, or as some authors state, theories of anomie, we mean a series of theoretical and empirical works of sociologists, criminologists and authors from other scientific disciplines created over a period of about two centuries, who treat the concept of anomie in different ways and in different contexts. The vagueness and abstractness of this notion have often resulted in its vagueness. It is stated that the notion of anomie is negatively defined and that it is often presented as the opposite of law, order, organization, peace, order and similar terms that describe an orderly and organized society or a certain collectivity. As this is a term that is rather vague, it is often replaced by other terms that denote similar social discord (e.g. disorganization, deviation, decentralization, etc.). In order to arrive at a more concrete definition of the concept of anomie, previous understandings of this concept must be analysed, and the different approaches of authors in the fields of sociology, psychology, criminology and related scientific disciplines must be understood.

The purpose of this paper is a thorough analysis and presentation of the understanding of the concept of anomie from the earliest times to the present day. The paper will focus on the work of two important sociologists, Émil Durkheim and Robert Merton, and compare their conclusions with the aim of overcoming variations and finding common characteristics.

PRELIMINARY DEFINITION OF ANOMIE

Expressing interest in order, justice and morality, as a framework within which the notion of anomie is located, is an important topic in the reflection of social reality and it is therefore understandable that this notion has long belonged to the social and humanistic heritage. In ancient Greece, the term anomie was used in three different meanings: (1) signifying a lack of human qualities in individuals, resulting in horror, violence, tragedy and inhuman behaviour; (2) signifying disrespect for religious norms or the order of God, which is the cause of unbelief and sinful deeds; and (3) signifying the rejection of unwritten rules of justice and traditional social customs and norms of appropriate conduct.

Xenophon uses the term anomie in terms of illegality, and non-existence of norms. Plato, for example, finds in anomie the root cause of social disorder, and identifies it with anarchy and the disorganization of society. For sophists, the problem of anomie is related to social change, and they associate it with various political (more precisely, ethical) positions (Jugović 2014:15).

Later, in the religious literature, the same term is considered in the context of religious topics and their inherent terminology. With the New Testament, a radical change takes place, because the law is no longer seen as something predominantly external, but as an internalized principle. In seventeenth-century English literature, anomie is equated with the violation of divine laws. It represents action against the divine will (Deflem 2015:718).

JEAN-MARIE GUYAU'S CONCEPT OF ANOMIE

The French philosopher and sociologist Jean-Marie Guyau is indispensable in reviewing the concepts of anomie for several reasons. The first reason is purely factual: contrary to the common understanding that Durkheim was the first sociologist to use the term anomie in his work, it should be mentioned that it was Guyau who first used this term in his works. The second reason lies in the fact that the main backbones of Durkheim's understanding of anomie are formed in opposition to Guyau's concept, and stand as a counterweight and alternative to him. The third and, it seems, most important reason is that Guyau's concept of anomie has many similarities (and can be considered a certain precursor) with some more modern notions of anomie that show a shift from dominant understandings of anomie with value-negative determinations (such as undesirable societies, social subsystems or individuals) towards a positive understanding of anomie, as a prerequisite and integral part of modernization (Deflem 2015:719).

According to this thinker, modern ethics should be autonomous, derived from the individual, and free from external rules. Guyau calls this characteristic "ethical

anomie". In that sense, he points to the progressive individualization of morals and moral rules. The same way of judging applies to Guyau's understanding of religion. People should not rely on religious beliefs and transcendental truths in their moral judgements; they must be replaced by modern beliefs significantly different from traditional ones. He calls this new type of religious individualism "religious anomie". As can be seen, anomie is a concept for Guyau, which on the one hand emphasizes individual freedom and autonomy in moral judgement and doubt and skepticism towards religious authorities, and on the other hand eliminates the imperative of ethical uniformity and eternal truth against the authority of social institutions and norms. Individuality extends as a source of values and guidelines for action. Thus, he does not consider anomie as an evil and a disease of modern society, but as a different quality of positive connotations (Deflem 2015).

ÉMILE DURKHEIM AND HIS CRIMINOLOGICAL THOUGHT

The great French sociologist and thinker Émile Durkheim made a special contribution not only to sociological, but also to criminological thought. Durkheim enjoyed a great reputation in an intellectual milieu in Western Europe, especially in France, during the nineteenth century when he played a dominant role in many areas of the social sciences. He is said to have been a strong supporter of clear definitions, and he tried to define almost every field that he dealt with, including criminology and crime itself. Durkheim started from punishment as the most significant and, as he states, the only reliable external feature of crime (Milutinović 1979:212). He considered punishment the starting point for understanding crime (Durkheim 1963). According to him, society's reaction to a crime determines its criminal character. He concluded that crime is an act that provokes punishment, which is the real subject of the study of criminology as a science. He rebuked Raffaele Garofalo for his definition that a crime is an act that attacks only "universal moral values" (Miller 2014:377–9). However, Durkheim did not care about the internal character, i.e. the quality of this phenomenon (crime). He believed that this side of crime could only be expressed by a precise definition, which in turn started from collective consciousness (Durkheim 1963; Mladenović-Kupčević 1982; Pulišelić 1978).

Durkheim held the principle that the root of crime is in the very nature of society, in the social environment, and that it is the product of the interaction of people in society. Viewed from the aspect of society as a whole, crime springs from the social structure, and is therefore inherent in society. Durkheim's understanding was accepted by many authors with the statement that a new theoretical basis of criminology has been obtained, which definitely represents the most reliable general theory and method of studying criminology.

Starting from the previously given theoretical concept, Durkheim develops his theory of anomie, which is much respected in the sociological and criminological literature. Based on this theory, he explains the emergence of crime as a special social phenomenon. Durkheim states that over time and in the process of development, society increasingly loses the forces of social control and the forces that unite it, which are the basis of its solidarity and compactness. He believed that earlier norms and standards in society were becoming obsolete and gaining the character

of survival, which inevitably leads to disorganization of society, and its atomization and fragmentation. This all leads to the emergence of a state characterized by insecurity, lack of adjustment, disorder and ultimately chaos (Marković 2010:88). These are the conditions that lead to social isolation that increases with increasing social mobility, that is, individuals who live by themselves, in isolation, in a vacuum without obligations and consideration for others, or function in society. This social isolation takes its greatest forms in the centres of the metropolis (which Durkheim calls “strongholds of solitude”) and large cities where this isolation and shattering are replaced by tavern life, cocktails and various other similar pleasures (Milutinović 1979:112). Durkheim calls the previously described social state a state of “anomie”,¹ characterized by the appearance of lawlessness and the absence of social adjustment. From such an anomic social state in which lawlessness plays a dominant role, but also the absence of inhibitions, in which the cult of isolated man and individualism develops, various criminal actions and riots arise. Durkheim states that these crimes are acts or actions that offend the feelings of a society, which protects the legislature by criminalizing these wounds in its laws as prohibited conduct. In this regard, Durkheim concludes that “an act is criminal when it offends solid and defined states of collective consciousness” (Durkheim 1972). This definition is an expression of his concept of social solidarity, because he explains the crime by the disappearance of that solidarity and the emergence of a state that lacks homogeneous social norms and values (Šeparević 1987). Durkheim elaborates and concretizes this concept in the study of the aetiology of suicide and its classification (Mladenović-Kupčević 1982:89).

Durkheim published an extensive sociological study on the ecological and regional prevalence of suicide, and in particular dealt with the distribution of the same phenomenon in the framework of the general social structure. In his book *Samoubistvo* (“Suicide”) (Durkheim 1997), he emphasizes the great theoretical and practical importance of studying suicide in a social environment as a clear indicator of the prevalence of the most difficult conflicts within a society that are not resolved in any of the more positive ways. In emphasizing the causes of suicide, Durkheim starts from the degree of homogeneity in society, its internal cohesion, and claims that the percentage of suicides is lower in societies that have achieved a greater degree of unity and integration. On the contrary, in societies where internal cohesion is weakening and where the process of psychological and social isolation and division is more intense, suicide occurs more often. He states that there are four types of suicide: egoistic, altruistic, anomic and fatalistic (Konstantinović-Vilić and Nikolić-Ristanović 1992:110).

Selfish suicides most often occur in the ranks of the urban population, mainly within weakened family structures, among divorced persons and persons who are alienated from society due to various difficulties. In contrast, in societies ruled by cohesion, where individuals are attached to traditional standards, customs and other elements of monolithicism, and where there is a highly developed social consciousness, suicides of the altruistic (or selfless) type dominate (Durkheim 1997). Durkheim noted the phenomenon that people in homogeneous societies, with a

¹Anomie is a coin of two Greek words – *a*, which meaning no and *nomos*, which meaning law. Thus, in a literal translation, anomie would mean the lack of law, or lawlessness.

high degree of social solidarity, often sacrifice themselves very easily if required by general national interests or ethical values. He further states that in societies where there is a sharp decline in social cohesion and solidarity (in societies where ties of friendship and intimacy disappear, where isolation and insecurity occur) there are social declines that initiate the creation of an anomic suicide. Suicides of this type occur in societies that very easily abandon the traditional framework of collectivity or patriarchal type of society where the individual lives in alienation and a certain vacuum without warmth, love and solidarity (Durkheim 1997). Finally, as the fourth type of suicide, Durkheim cites the fatalistic type that occurs as an expression of various frustrations, unbearable discipline, and force, when people's goals, desires and aspirations are blocked (Mladenović-Kupčević 1982; Nedeljković 2007).

According to the fact that crime, according to Durkheim, originates from society itself, from a certain social organization, he puts it in the ranks of normal social phenomena. He believes that crime is a characteristic of all societies, and that a society cannot be found without crime (it can be expected in every community of people). Crime as a phenomenon is present in all societies and all forms of collective life. According to Durkheim (1963:69), "There is no society where crime does not exist." He believes, therefore, that crime is inevitable and that it is a normal occurrence. It is a phenomenon of "normal sociology", and it develops into a disease phenomenon only in cases when there is too much of it, i.e. when it is in the phase of excessive growth (Durkheim 1963:70). Durkheim distinguishes between normal and pathological phenomena and establishes criteria for distinguishing them in the spirit of his understanding of the relationship between sociological theory and practice, believing that mediocrity is a basic measure of normality, determined by the type to which a society belongs and its stage of development (Durkheim 1963; Marković 2010; Milutinović 1979; Vodopivec et al. 1966).

Durkheim states that crime is caused by social factors, and concludes that crime finds its roots in the nature of society itself and that it springs from social structure. Authors agree that this attitude represents his most significant contribution to criminological theory (Mladenović-Kupčević 1982:90). In his work, Durkheim also presented the view of the possibility of the disappearance of crime. Namely, he sees the disappearance of crime from society in the strengthening of collective feelings and the forces of internal solidarity of a society. Society in the true sense, says Durkheim, represents psychic unity. The tendencies, ideals and standards that the collectivity generally accepts shape and influence the members of that same collectivity. Accordingly, in reality, crime could disappear only when collective feelings reach such a level that all members of society fully agree with all social values without exception.

Starting from the view that crime is a normal socio-cultural phenomenon of any collective, Durkheim draws a conclusion about its usefulness from the aspect of social development. He believes that social progress requires the possibility of deviant behaviours that will indisputably prepare a certain path of social development. Therefore, he believes that crime is necessary for society's progress.

CRITIQUE OF DURKHEIM

Durkheim's claims about the usefulness of crime have met with much criticism in the sociological and criminological literature. Many authors state that these criticisms are

completely justified (e.g. Milan Milutinović, Rajka Mladenović-Kupčević). Although Durkheim's thesis justifiably states that crime is a normal social phenomenon, what is criticized is that Durkheim emphasizes the utility of crime for society in terms of its development.² He believes that in order for society to progress, it is necessary to allow all-round expressed action of the individual, which includes acting on the relations from genius to criminal. He believes that the existence of crime shows the presence of individual social freedoms and the tendency of social dynamic changes, which he considers the conditions of progress. The more solid society is and the stronger the structure of society, Durkheim believes, there will be no crime. This thinking led one eminent sociologist to the well-known postulate that states that "an offender is not an anti-social being and a parasite, but a regular agent of social life" (Mladenović-Kupčević 1982:91). Closely related to Durkheim's view is the thesis that the decline of crime below its usual and normal level suggests a deeper social disorder (Mladenović-Kupčević 1982). Those critical of Durkheim state that it would be wrong to conclude that Durkheim forgives crime, that is, that he is an apologist for crime, because in his works he absolutely emphasizes his disgust with crime. However, his understanding of the usefulness of crime should be taken with a "pinch of salt". It is considered that Durkheim's correct statement is that crime arises from certain conditions, as a kind of legality, not coincidence, but that he draws the wrong conclusion about its usefulness. This attitude about the social usefulness of crime is unacceptable from the modern perspective because crime is seen as an anti-social, harmful and negative phenomenon that society seeks to banish by various measures within the policy of combating crime in society.

Durkheim justified his view on the usefulness of crime for society through the example of the great Greek philosopher Socrates, whose only crime was his freedom of thought (for which he was executed); however, later development of society showed that Socrates was useful for his homeland, and for society as well. At the heart of this example, it is believed that Durkheim rightly observes that ingenious thoughts, but also freedom of expression, were often incriminated by society at certain moments of social development, only to later "realize their right to history" (Mladenović-Kupčević 1982). It should be noted that Durkheim mistakenly believes that any individual freedom can be a path of social development; however, certain behaviours (such as murder, rape and other sexual offences, etc.) cannot have a positive impact on society and must be incriminated as criminal offences. What is even more important is that this theorist insisted on the necessity of distinguishing the socio-criminological notion of crime and criminality from his criminal law notion.

We can say that Durkheim advocated a sociological concept of criminal activity. However, he does not dwell only on the sociological side of this problem, but also points out that crime is a phenomenon that springs from the organization of society, and at the same time is a product of interaction in society, and thus wants to emphasize its psychological side (Marković 2010).

Durkheim's concept of crime, and especially the theory of anomie, had a significant impact on later sociological and criminological thought. A special influence on criminological thought in the USA can be seen, where the theory of anomie has

²Durkheim believes that crime is important because of the development of other scientific disciplines dealing with the study of crime and its prevention.

become very popular, of course in different variants. Many American sociologists and criminologists have used this theory as a basis for studying the explanation of crime, delinquency and other forms of socio-pathological behaviour (Mizruchi 1960; Šram 2007).

ROBERT MERTON'S THEORY OF ANOMIE

In contemporary criminological thought and literature, in addition to the work of Émil Durkheim, the theory of anomie is mentioned several times, and many call it a popular theory of crime. It appears with different authors with different modifications, and certain discrepancies can be noticed. Accordingly, two directions in understanding the concept of anomie were differentiated: (1) sociological and (2) socio-psychological rights (Šeparević 1987:53).

The theories of anomie that developed in the second half of the twentieth century represent nothing more than a continuation and elaboration of the theory established by Émile Durkheim. The theory of anomie presented in the work of the famous American sociologist Robert Merton proved to be especially significant. According to the theory of anomie and the relationship between anomie and social structure established and developed by Merton, crime occurs in certain groups, whose criminal career promises prospects for acquiring economic means and other social values, which they cannot reach through legal processes. This theory of anomie is defined in detail in the work "Social Structure and Anomie" (Merton 1938). Merton believes that in contemporary culture (primarily American), achieving certain social goals is extremely important, that is, that there are certain goals that society strives for. He cited the acquisition of financial power and material wealth as the most important social goal, and the means by which this goal is achieved are not important to society as long as it is achieved. So, it does not matter if it is legal or criminal (Marković 2010:112). These social goals are imposed by the power of culture, and, as Milutinović states, society lays "moral rights" on them (Jašović 1991:30; Milutinović 1979:130–1).

Merton says that there are certain rules for achieving certain social goals, which represent the most important values of society at that time. A society that understands the importance of a certain goal sets rules that the participants in that "social match (or game)" must follow. At the same time, it determines which behaviours do not allow the achievement of a certain social goal (that is, which behaviours are criminal acts). However, although society has proclaimed certain goals, the means to achieve them are not available to all members of society.³ Entities that have limited access to the means to achieve social goals resort to others, i.e. they have tendencies to develop deviant behaviours. In this way, Merton believes, society forces certain individuals to resort to non-conformist behaviours (Merton 1949:125–6). Merton thus formulates his theory of goals and means, according to which the achievement of social goals depends on the position one has in the social structure.

In those cases when there is no possibility of achieving a social goal, a social situation arises in which there is non-compliance with established norms and a decline

³It often happens that they are inaccessible to the poorer strata of society, members of society of a certain ethnic or racial origin, and the like.

in cultural regulation of social behaviour, i.e. there is a lack of legality. Merton calls this condition “anomie” from which four types of deviant behaviour are born: (1) innovation; (2) ritualism; (3) withdrawal; and (4) rebellion. According to Elmer H. Johnson, he elaborates a typology of various reactions to conflicts between cultural goals and institutional norms (Johnson 1964). Innovation is a form of reaction that is characterized by the acceptance of social goals, but not the rules for achieving them. The authors believe that it is special to the lower social strata who use crime as a means to achieve a social goal. Ritualism is believed to be best characterized by the middle class. The authors state that they reject the proclaimed goals, aware that they cannot achieve them legally, and strictly adhere to the norms of the society to which they belong (for example, children belonging to this class learn to adapt their goals to their abilities). The third type of behaviour, i.e. withdrawal, is a characteristic of individuals who reject set goals but also the allowed means to achieve them (it is believed that this happens because they failed to achieve the result, so they reject both the goal and the means). The last type is rebellion, which is a form of reaction to an anomic state characterized by rejection of imposed cultural goals and means to achieve them, while accepting new cultural goals and demanding a change in social structure (e.g. this type characterizes certain revolutionary or rebellious groups and similar) (Ignjatović 2005:192; Inderbitzen, Bates, and Gainey 2016:135–6). In addition to these deviant behaviours, Merton cites conformism as a starting point. A conformist is characterized by acceptance of social goals and adaptation to social change (Featherstone and Deflem 2003:479).

Merton makes a theoretical approach to anomie by studying the delinquency of youth belonging to lower social classes, where he points out that young people belonging to lower social structures find it very difficult to achieve social goals legally, and primarily the material wealth they strive for. Merton’s whole context of inquiry is based on five elements, i.e. he proposes five elements to confirm his hypothesis: (1) openness to the goal and norms of culture that regulate behaviours directed towards that goal; (2) appropriation of goals and norms as moral mandates and intrinsic values; (3) relative accessibility towards that goal (life chances in the structure of possibilities); (4) the size of the discrepancy between the accepted goal and its achievability; and (5) the degree of deviant behaviour presented in the typology of forms of adaptation (Šeparević 1987:53).

According to Merton, the lowest class should be the most animated because its possibility for achieving goals is the most limited. However, empirical analyses do not confirm this as a whole. Anomie is not closely related to the lowest class, but, as Zvonimir Šeparević states, it can be closely connected to the middle class. On the other hand, Ivanka Marković states that Merton’s theory of anomie explains only cases of property crime, while there is no basis for explaining violent crime or the “white-collar” phenomenon.

CONTEMPORARY THEORIES OF ANOMIE

During the twentieth century, different oscillations in terms of the acceptance of the theory of anomie can be seen, and these oscillations can be observed through waves of understanding from the beginning of the twentieth to the beginning of the twenty-first century. Thus, Robert Merton published the first modern theory of

anomie in 1938, and it reached its culmination in the 1950s and 1960s (Merton 1938).⁴ After a 30-year rise, there was a sharp decline in interest in Merton's paradigm of anomie theory. Ruth Kornhauser and Robert Agnew believed that empirical confirmations justified abandoning the theory of anomie (Agnew 1992; Metsueda 2015), while its complete abandonment was advocated by Hirschi (Hirschi 1969; Metsueda 2015). There were a number of authors who supported similar views. The reason for this in the opinion that the theory of anomie had become an exhausted field for researchers, and that empirical studies had poorly confirmed the model of classical theory of anomie.⁵ Many believe that even a conservative political climate, such as the one that prevailed after the 1960s, does not suit a single understanding of the dysfunctionality of society at its core. In addition, according to Frank E. Hagan and Bill McCarthy, the theory of anomie did not correspond to social reality, that is, that economic growth was not accompanied by a decline in crime (Reinarman 2000).

Contrary to these tendencies to abandon the theory of anomie, in modern sociological and criminological theory a current can be seen that would like to keep it as one of the relevant theories of these two scientific fields (e.g. Nikos Passas and Thomas J. Bernard). It can be said that the development of modern theories of anomie takes place in three different directions. Proponents of the former reconsider previous empirical research that should confirm classical theories of anomie (Durkheim's and Merton's), and which generally hold the view that the theory of anomie should be rejected. They believe that crime is more the result of pressure from society than the inability to achieve social goals in a legal way. Authors defending the theory of anomie resent critics for ignoring some of the revisions of the theory of anomie in the second half of the twentieth century, and lightly conclude that the theory of anomie is worthless for the further development of sociological and criminological thought (primarily Cloward, Cohen, Mizruchi, Vaughan and others). They believe that later revisions of theories have contributed to a shift from initial and simplified or unrealistic relations. That is, revisions of the theory began to point to the micro level of these theories, which were also ignored by critics. The third group of authors states that it is necessary to prove the theory of anomie in a far more sophisticated and complex way, by applying modern and more complex methodology and tests. They believe that anomie should be dealt with at the individual level but also at certain micro levels⁶ (such as Bernard, Burton and Culen, Burton and Dunaway and others). They say that opponents of this theory are not mistaken about allegations that criminality is the result of social pressure, but they believe that this pressure in connection with anomie leads to crime and other forms of deviant behaviour (Deflem 2015:721).

In the 1990s, considerable attention began to be paid to the problem of populations and patterns, in order to make them as appropriate as possible to the theoretical assumptions of the concept of anomie. What stands out in this period is the various revisions and extensions of the classical paradigm of anomie theory.

⁴From the 1930s to the end of the 1960s, Merton's theory of anomie manifested itself through a series of theoretical and empirical studies.

⁵Durkheim's and Merton's theories of anomie and their immediate versions can be conditionally considered classical theories.

⁶E.g. criminal groups or organizations.

New categories were introduced, such as the integration dimension. The theory of anomie is beginning to be questioned in other social groups and organizations. In this regard, it can be said that from the 1990s until today, there have been many significant changes in the concept of anomie theory with the aim of achieving greater adaptability and a broader concept. The importance of these changes was best highlighted by Robert Agnew and Nikos Passas in their work *The Future of Anomie Theory* where they say that “these revisions have comprehensively and better defined the nature and determinants of pressure and anomie, more precisely specified the conditions under which pressure or anomie lead to crime, and extended the scope of the theory to new types of crime or deviation, and to new populations” (Agnew and Passas 1997:6).

Contemporary theories present anomie through a wider range of social pressures, and focus on multiple social groups. Other areas of study that were not the subject of classical research are also connected with anomie.⁷ Today’s theories also pay more attention to macrosocial conditions that cause individual pressure (such as social capital in the function of economic position, the importance of social support, reference groups, the role of relative deprivation, etc.).

PSYCHOLOGICAL VERSION OF THE THEORY OF ANOMIE

In psychological versions, anomie is the mental state of a person that is stimulated by certain social conditions. One part of the reason for the psychologization of the theory stems from the need for its empirical verification, which is in line with the preferences of the Anglo-Saxon cultural intellectual milieu. There are several directions to this understanding.

The first direction follows Durkheim’s path, i.e. it defines anomie as the unintended integration of individuals in the social group or community to which they belong. Anomie is understood as a variant of alienation or disintegration of certain systems. By directing, or rather moving, anomie from the purely sociological and criminological field to the psychological, so that anomie itself is not presented exclusively as a theory of deviations, but as a concept that slowly abandons the intention to offer solutions to deviant behaviours, the psychological version of the theory of anomie focuses on topics related to the notion of alienation. The most significant representatives (e.g. Srole 1956) of this version shift the focus of interest from the empirical scale of anomie beyond its structural determinants according to its consequences on the attitudes and mental states of individuals. In this way, as Marco Orrú says, “theorists remain empty-handed, and the anomie is tied to the answers of individual respondents. The phenomenon of anomie, which has been explained before, is set as an explication variable.” (Orrú 1987:127) Similar to Merton, an instrumental (rather than normative) feature of this concept is observed. This psychological version considers the anomic situation problematic due to the dysfunctionality of the relationship between social systems (and sub-systems) or the relationship of the individual to the system. However, they do not find classical capitalist competitiveness as a problem, but rather the inability of components of the social system, and also of

⁷Representatives of the upper classes, the emancipation of women, various ethnic groups, scientific institutions, corporate crime, non-Western societies and more.

individuals to balance each other. They believe the problem is in instrumental rather than normative adequacy. As with Merton, the authors who advocate these views take the assessment of consequences as a scientific criterion.

Authors belonging to the other direction continue on Merton's theory of anomie. The focus of their interests is within the goal–means matrix, and they are deeply focused on the psychological gap between aspirations and expectations, and aspirations and social status. In the literature, this version of the psychological theory of anomie is called the theory of disjunction.⁸ Thus, anomie is a disjunction between individual goals and individual expectations or possibilities. They believe that deviation is more likely in those cases where aspirations are high and opportunities or expectations are low. From the mentioned disjunction, it is stated that an individual follows the motivation towards illegal options in order to achieve the goal. This is considered a basic scheme, and variations are primarily in the content categories (material success, educational and professional aspirations, etc.). However, some weaknesses inherited from Merton's understanding are also mentioned here, and that is the division into means and ends. In this regard, the disjunction itself often fails to explain individual deviant behaviours.

The third psychological version of the theory of anomie is based on Agnew's theory of pressure. The theory of pressure is in one, as it is stated, ambivalent position compared to the classical theory of anomie. The ambition of the proponents of this version is to provide a theoretical explanation of the deviation, within which, in addition to the types of pressure in accordance with the theory of pressure, there would be pressures from other sources, not only anomic ones. Agnew says these are conflicts, psychoanalytic categories, aggression, frustration and similar concepts belonging to conflict theory, feminist theory, social disorganization theory and others. He, unlike proponents of disjunction theory, introduces a number of intermediate variables (especially negative emotions such as frustration, anger, rage) and argues that this is the basis of pressure leading to negative consequences in the outside world such as deviant behaviours. Agnew thus revises the classical theory of anomie and expands the anomic paradigm. He tries to synthesize all previous knowledge and thus get one, unique, i.e. general theory of pressure. Many believe that this concept is more of a socio-psychological theory than a purely psychological one, and that certain elements of the "anomie tradition", such as social sources or microanalysis, are therefore considered incompatible with it.

INSTITUTIONAL THEORY OF ANOMIE

One of the most significant contemporary attempts is the 1994 institutional theory of anomie by Steven Messner and Richard Rosenfeld. Their main idea was based on the actualization of the micro-level theory of anomie, which is omitted in their psychological versions, but also the so-called general theory of pressure. In addition,

⁸Disjunction means separation, dissociation, separation. In logic, it represents a type of composed judgement of traditional logic in which two or more predicates are pronounced about the subject. It is usually understood in an exclusive sense, "either *P* or *Q*". A disjunctive judgement is true if, and only if, true is either *P*, or *Q*, and not both. In Kant's work, it is a kind of judgement according to the relationship where parts of a cognition are mutually exclusive and complementary, forming a whole of cognition, e.g. "The world exists either by blind chance or by internal necessity or by external cause." Disjunctive judgement can also be understood in an inclusive sense, which is given an advantage in modern logic.

they wanted to expand Merton's concept by deepening the role of social structure in generating criminal behaviour. This was to be a counterbalance to the dominant individualistic tendencies in the field of criminology as a science. Messner and Rosenfeld believe that "the main epistemological premise of a broader sociological analysis of any phenomenon is that the analysis must be expressed in terms of the basic elements of social organization, and that is the field of culture and social structure" (Rosenfeld and Messner 1997:212).

According to the authors, individualization and psychologization have compared the general question of why the crime rate varies in different social systems, i.e. the question of the typology and topography of crime at the micro level. The authors of the institutional theory conceive of it through three pervasive segments: (1) the relationship of key institutions in society arising from the dominant features of the socio-economic system; (2) the characteristics of the central ideology of the American dream and the reflection of these values on social institutions; and (3) rates and structures of criminal behaviour.

This theory singles out economic, educational and political institutions, and also the institution of the family. Every institution in society has a certain function. The economic ones are certainly the most important, in accordance with their dominance and determination over other institutions. They believe that it is primarily a reflection or an integral part of the American social and economic system. It is capitalist by nature, and in this regard it is logical that it cultivates a competitive and innovative spirit, of course with an overemphasis on material and monetary success (Rosenfeld and Messner 1994:84–5). The dominance of economic institutions is reflected in the devaluation of non-economic functions and roles. Non-economic functions are subordinated and adjusted to economic ones and allow economic institutions to stay deep in their essence, which leaves a certain mark in terms of economic norms on non-economic institutional relations. All this makes non-economic institutions more difficult to perform their functions. This theory actually develops the implications of Merton's concept by describing specific historical moments that lead to a particular social imbalance. The creators of the institutional concept of the theory of anomie point out that the crime rate not only shapes anomie in economic institutions, but also reduces control over other social, non-economic institutions. This intense pressure for monetary, material success weakens the strength of non-economic standards that regulate the behaviour of people in society (Chamlin and Cochran 1995; Rosenfeld and Messner 1997).

The institutional theory of anomie was created for the area of the USA, and speaks more about the relationship of power between institutions in American society. Since the creation of the USA, all institutions in American society have grown out of the economic background, while in other, somewhat older and more traditional societies, social, non-economic institutions are trying to find balance with economic ones. The focus of institutional theory shifts from the contradictions of social structure and culture (which is the legacy of Robert Merton) to the structural imbalances of fundamental social institutions of an economic and non-economic nature.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Evaluating previous understandings of the theory of anomie, it can be concluded that they are subtly diverse. The conclusion was reached that many anomie theorists

do not always use the term in the same sense and with the same content, that they do not rely on traditional understandings, and that their ideas collide with the general understanding of deviance and crime. This ambiguity is most likely the basis of the fact that the phenomenon of anomie is analysed from the aspect of sociology, criminology, psychology, psychiatry, law and other scientific disciplines.

Analysing the work of Émil Durkheim, and assessing the importance of his concept of crime, it can be said that, as a whole, it had a significant impact on the development of criminological and sociological thought (especially the theory of anomie). Many of today's authors, not only sociologists or criminologists, but also psychologists, lawyers and members of other related scientific disciplines, notice the exceptional scientific value of Durkheim's contribution. In his scientific analysis, he emphasizes the basic problems that the collectives are facing, and the most important are certainly the fragmentation and disorganization of society. These two phenomena, which Durkheim explained in his theory of anomie, give great importance in understanding the real consequences of social isolation and, as it is called, "collective memory" in society, which is a significant contribution to understanding crime as a social phenomenon.

In today's age of a multipolar, nuclear world, Durkheim's contribution to the understanding of complex social relations is once again becoming more relevant, but also significant. All this is shown by contemporary trends in world criminological thought based on the theory of anomie. By far the greatest influence is seen in Anglo-American criminological thought, where theories developed by sociologist Edwin Sutherland (theory of social disorganization) and criminologists Mabel Elliott and Albert K. Cohen are predominant, who hold the same views.

According to all the above, it can be said that the essence of Merton's theory of anomie is the understanding that criminal activity occurs as an expression of contradictions between culture and the structure of society, i.e. between goals that symbolize cultural values (such as possession of material goods) and the possibility of achieving them, and the conditions provided by the social structure to which they belong. Unlike Durkheim, Merton emphasizes the constant conditions of society, instead of crises and sudden changes, as the French sociologist points out.

According to the fact that the theory of anomie developed on two different sides of the world, on two continents, it can be said that it is one of the causes of the divergence of the understanding of a given concept. It is believed that various historical events, social and economic development, but also social consciousness, structure and different ethical views contributed to this.

Today, anomie as a concept (and therefore its theory) is a symbiosis of all earlier understandings (at least to some extent). But this symbiosis can be subtly dangerous in that the theory itself may lose its original potential for the explanation of deviations, but also a multitude of special details that set it apart from other theories of deviation. Without the help of other theories, we are left with a fairly simple concept of anomie, and thus crime. Simplicity has its advantages, and we support it specifically in this case, regardless of the fact that most of today's theories must go hand in hand in order to give a more complete picture of a certain phenomenon.

References

- Agnew, R. 1992. "Foundation for the General Strain Theory of Crime and Delinquency." *Criminology* 30(1):47–88.
- Agnew, R. and N. Passas. 1997. *The Future of Anomie Theory*. Boston, MA: Northeastern.
- Chamlin, M. B. and J. K. Cochran. 1995. "Assessing Messner and Rosenfeld's Institutional Anomie Theory: A Partial Test." *Criminology* 33(3):411–29.
- Deflem, M. 2015. "Anomie: History of Concept." Pp. 718–21 in *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed., edited by J. D. Wright. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Durkheim, É. 1963. *Pravila sociološke metode*. Belgrade: Savremena škola.
- Durkheim, É. 1972. *O podeli društvenog rada*. Belgrade: Prosveta.
- Durkheim, É. 1997. *Samoubistvo*. Belgrade: BIGZ.
- Featherstone, R. and M. Deflem. 2003. "Anomie and Strain: Context and Consequences of Marton's Two Theories." *Sociological Inquiry* 73(4):471–89.
- Hirschi, T. 1969. *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ignjatović, Đ. 2005. *Kriminologija*. Belgrade: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.
- Inderbitzen, M., K. A. Bates, and R. R. Gainey. 2016. *Deviance and Social Control: A Sociological Perspective*, 2nd ed. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publishing.
- Jašović, Ž. 1991. *Kriminologija maloletničke delinkvencije*. Belgrade: Naučna knjiga.
- Johnson, E. H. 1964. *Crime, Correction and Society*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Jugović, A. 2014. *Zapisi iz anomalije, Ogledi iz nauke o društvenim devijacijama*. Belgrade: Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja.
- Konstantinović-Vilić, S. and V. Nikolić-Ristanović. 1992. *Osnovi kriminologije*. Niš: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Nišu.
- Marković, I. 2010. *Osnovi kriminologije*. Banja Luka: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Banjoj Luci.
- Merton, R. 1938. "Social Structure and Anomie." *American Sociological Review* 3(5):672–82.
- Merton, R. 1949. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press.
- Metsueda, R. L. 2015. "Social Structure, Culture and Crime: Assessing Kornhauser's Challenge to Criminology." Pp. 117–43 in *Challenging Criminological Theory: The Legacy of Ruth Rosner Kornhauser*, edited by F. T. Cullen, P. Wilcox, R. J. Sampson, and B. D. Dooley. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Miller, J. M. 2014. *The Encyclopedia of Theoretical Criminology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Milutinović, M. 1979. *Kriminologija*. Belgrade: Savremena administracija.
- Mizruchi, E. H. 1960. "Social Structure and Anomia in a Small City." *American Sociological Review* 25(5):645–54.
- Mladenović-Kupčević, R. 1982. *Kriminologija*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Nedeljković, Z. 2007. "Doprinos Emila Dirckema konstituisanju sociologije morala." *Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta u Prištini* 36:235–46.
- Orrú, M. 1987. *Anomie: History and Meanings*. London: Routledge.
- Pulišelić, S. 1978. *Osnove sociologije*. Zagreb: Infromator.
- Reinarman, C. 2000. "The Future of Anomie Theory by Nikos Passas, Robert Agnew." *Contemporary Sociology* 29(1):252–3.
- Rosenfeld, R. and S. Messner. 1994. *Crime and the American Dream*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Rosenfeld, R. and S. F. Messner. 1997. "Markets, Morality, and an Institutional Anomie Theory of Crime." Pp. 207–24 in *The Future of Anomie Theory*, edited by N. Passas and R. Agnew. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Šeparević, Z. 1987. *Kriminologija i socijalna patologija*. Zagreb and Belgrade: Pravni fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu i Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.
- Šram, Z. 2007. "Anomija, depresivnost i antizapadna orijentacija." *Revija za sociologiju* 38(3–4):103–18.
- Srole, L. 1956. "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries." *American Sociological Review* 21:709–16.
- Vodopivec, K., M. Kobal, L. J. Bavcon, and V. Skalar. 1966. *Kriminologija, I dio*. Zagreb: Narodne novine.

TRANSLATED ABSTRACTS

Abstracto

El artículo analiza la noción de anomia a través de diversas teorías presentadas en la obra de los pensadores griegos clásicos hasta la comprensión actual de esta noción. En este sentido, el autor tocará algunos entendimientos previos de este fenómeno, y los comienzos del pensamiento moderno sobre la anomia en el trabajo de Jean-Marie Guyau, y los entendimientos desarrollados por Robert Merton y Émil Durkheim como los dos autores más destacados que se ocupan de la anomia. Este tema. Además, el autor analizará las actitudes de los escritores marginados, así como los conocimientos descuidados y sub-representados en nuestra ciencia y en otras más amplias. El propósito de este artículo es encontrar un terreno común entre todas las interpretaciones previas de la teoría de la anomia y tratar de encontrar un significado más específico del término para contribuir a la discusión sobre este tema.

Palabras clave conducta antisocial, conducta delictiva, teoría criminológica, suicidio, delito, prevención del delito, criminología

Abstrait

L'article analyse la notion d'anomie à travers diverses théories présentées dans les travaux des penseurs grecs classiques jusqu'à la compréhension actuelle de cette notion. À cet égard, l'auteur abordera certaines compréhensions antérieures de ce phénomène, et les débuts de la pensée moderne sur l'anomie dans l'œuvre de Jean-Marie Guyau, et les compréhensions développées de Robert Merton et Émil Durkheim en tant que deux auteurs les plus éminents traitant de ce sujet. En outre, l'auteur analysera les attitudes des écrivains marginalisés ainsi que les compréhensions négligées et sous-représentées dans notre science et au sens large. Le but de cet article est de trouver un terrain d'entente entre toutes les compréhensions antérieures de la théorie de l'anomie, et d'essayer de trouver une signification plus spécifique du terme afin de contribuer à la discussion sur ce sujet.

Mots-clés comportement antisocial, comportement criminel, théorie criminologique, suicide, crime, prévention du crime, criminology

摘要：

本文通过古希腊思想家作品中提出的各种理论,分析失范的概念,直至今天对失范概念的理解。在这方面,作者将谈及以前对这一现象的一些理解,让·玛丽·居约(Jean-Marie Guyau)的著作中关于失范的现代思想的开端,以及罗伯特·默顿(Robert Merton)和埃米尔·杜尔凯姆(Émil Durkheim)作为处理失范问题的两位最著名的作家的发展理解。这个话题。此外,作者将分析边缘化作家的态度以及我们和更广泛的科学中被忽视和代表性不足的理解。这篇论文的目的是在所有先前对失范理论的理解之间找到共同点,并试图找到该术语的更具体含义,以有助于对该主题的讨论。

关键词：反社会行为, 犯罪行为, 犯罪学理论, 自杀, 犯罪, 犯罪预防, 犯罪学。

الخلاصة

تحتل الورقة فكرة الشذوذ من خلال النظريات المختلفة المقدمة في أعمال المفكرين اليونانيين الكلاسيكيين حتى فهم اليوم لهذه الفكرة. في هذا الصدد، سيتطرق المؤلف إلى بعض المفاهيم السابقة لهذه الظاهرة، وبدايات الفكر الحديث حول الشذوذ في أعمال جان ماري جياو، والتفاهات المتطورة لروبرت ميرتون وإميل دوركايم كأبرز مؤلفين يتعاملان مع هذا الموضوع. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، سيحلل المؤلف مواقف الكتاب المهمشين بالإضافة إلى التفاهات المحتملة والمثلية تمثيلاً ناقصاً في علمنا وعلى نطاق أوسع. ألغرض من هذه الورقة هو إيجاد أرضية مشتركة بين جميع المفاهيم السابقة لنظرية الشذوذ، ومحاولة إيجاد معنى أكثر تحديداً للمصطلح من أجل المساهمة في المناقشة حول هذا الموضوع.

الكلمات المفتاحية: السلوك المعادي للمجتمع، السلوك الإجرامي، النظرية الإجرامية، الانتحار، الجريمة، من الجريمة، علم الإجرام

Filip Novaković, LL.B., is a Bosnian–Herzegovinian historian jurist, a member of several international and national non-governmental organizations (East West Bridge, Association “Education Builds BiH”, Student Union of Law Faculty and others), a former Student Vice Dean and former member of the Scientific-Teaching Council of the Faculty of Law, University of Banja Luka. In the period of 2021–2023 he was Executive Editor of *Banja Luka Criminal Law Review*. He has published about 20 bibliographic references in international and national scientific journals and one book. His areas of interest include theory and philosophy of law, criminal law, constitutional law, international law, and Roman law and legal history. He has participated in a large number of scientific and professional conferences in Bosnia Herzegovina and abroad. He actively affirms human and civil rights, as well as the rule of law, and advocates the full realization of a democratic and just society and modern democratic values in his country. He is currently a master’s student at the Faculty of Law of the University of Sarajevo (narrow field: Criminal Law) and at the Faculty of Law of the University of Banja Luka (narrow field: International Law).