

SIMON I. SINGER

(Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Northeastern University, Boston, Ph.D.)

STEPHEN SCHAFER REMEMBERED

February 22, 2020

Professor Stephen Schafer enabled generations of criminological scholars. Schafer did so in one publication after another first in his native Hungarian language, and then later in English to a wider reading audience. It did not take him long to become perfectly fluent in both languages. He wrote every morning, and published frequently—often a book a year. He led the life of a dedicated scholar, routinely advocating for the fine art of critical thinking, not just in his publications but in how he mentored students who cared to listen. I was fortunate to be one of those students, and it is with much appreciation to Professor Miklós Lévay for this opportunity to say a few words in honor of my first criminology professor.

It all began in the fall of 1973 when I first met Professor Schafer, upon entering Northeastern University's first class in the College of Criminal Justice's newly created Master's degree program. I managed to be admitted without ever having taken a crime or justice course. My acceptance was based more on a series of post-college part-time jobs in criminal justice. I came in with an interest in how policing policed and corrections corrected. Schafer taught the required Master's Criminology theory course. The first day of class was a life-changing event. I was meeting the author of required books I had purchased prior to the semester start. Here he was—there in front of a crowded classroom, sitting and lecturing about the reasons for crime without a single note. It was a more of a dialogue, seeing a scholar in action, questioning, challenging and in turn making each of us think.

One Schafer class led to another. I was inspired in ways that I could never have imagined. So for each of the College's quarter system I would take every course that Schafer offered. In addition a directed study allowed me to work up readings and have meetings that went beyond the course curriculum. Back then we could do a Master's thesis and I asked Schafer if he would be my supervising chair. Knowing of his 1967 book *The Victim and his Criminal*, I picked a topic that I thought he might find of interest—the elderly as victims of crime. And indeed he was quite enthusiastic, drawing me into his file of victimology research and asking me to become involved with several of his research endeavors.

Soon after my first semester Schafer encouraged me to apply to doctoral programs. In particular he wanted me to go to the University of Pennsylvania where his friend Marvin E. Wolfgang had established a premier criminology program within the department of sociology. I was a bit intimidated by the thought, but went ahead and applied to Penn along with several other programs that Schafer recommended. The first offer I received happen to be

from the University of Pennsylvania. I told Schafer immediately, and he told me to accept without hesitation and not even wait for the others. He even insisted that I arrange to visit to arrange for housing and to meet with Wolfgang. Soon after doing so I received a generous assistantship which made my doctoral studies highly affordable.

Schafer made it happen, and I remain eternally grateful! He set the stage for a trajectory of studies that enabled me not only to enter a doctoral program, but produce the kind of scholarship that could not have happened if not for Schafer's own publications. It wasn't until I arrive at Penn and began studying the writings of Wolfgang that I realized the intellectual bond between them. It was a friendship that was built on their mutual supportive scholarly endeavors. Schafer could not be far from my thoughts. The notion of victimization, victims and the overlap with offenders would later lead to my articles on the National Crime Victim survey, *Victim Categories of Crime* (with Marvin Wolfgang) and then a dissertation on *Victims in a Subculture of Crime*, and more articles on the victim-offender overlap.

One scholar inspires another, Schafer and Wolfgang both wrote about the victim-offender relationship and inspired each other, as well as the students that they would continually mentor. In cataloging how Schafer made a difference, we now know more today about the victim as an object of study, because he enabled a multitude of early day scholars to consider the how and what of victimization. The how comes through in Schafer's writings on the victim-offender relationship, and how it matters to subsequent criminal behavior. The "what" is the meaning of being a victim, and how the concept of victimization can play a distinct criminological role.

The how and what in Schafer's scholarship can be traced not only to his vast encyclopedic knowledge of criminological theory, but also to his European intellectual roots. He was well aware of American sociology's discovery of criminology and its Chicago schools of thought. But this is not where law and crime intersected. Early American criminologists were first sociologists who cared more about explaining delinquency—adolescent offending. What they took for granted was the law and the actions of officials that might have determined an adolescent's status as a delinquent. Theories of social disorganization could be cited as explanations with a focus on the troubled adolescent because of a troubled neighborhood. The point would be extended to the familial in the shape of dysfunctional family instead of dysfunctional neighborhood. Others would take the mantle of education, and the failure of schools to properly teach. And still others would find other reasons to suggest that the juvenile delinquent or the adult criminal was lacking in one or more particular attribute.

This was all fine and good to Schafer who would cite the literature in his textbooks. But his citations would all be with a question, as to more that needed to be said. And indeed he said it in terms of the law and a missing element to the then textbook view of offending. Where could he draw on that missing ingredient to more fully understand the dynamics of crime? Surely not in the Chicago school, but in the minds of Schafer's generation of European criminologists. In particular, the German criminologist Hans Von Hentig (1948) would become a source of inspiration for relating the dynamics driving the victim-offender relationship. That dynamic would be taken a step further by Schafer when he would write the first major scholarly book titled the *Victim and his Criminal*. Subsequently, a new

branch of criminology would emerge, taking the term victim to be a study in itself. Wolfgang would also draw on the relationship in writing his classic *Patterns in Criminal Homicide*. The whole notion of a victim-precipitated crime could have entered criminological discourse, if not for the Schafer-Wolfgang dualities of scholarly thought.

But the victim was never to be a study in itself, because the victim could not exist without the offender. A point that is well taken in criminal law, which recognizes levels of responsibility based not only on the actions of the offender but also on the actions of victim. The line between victim and offender could easily be crossed when the victim was actually the first to shoot, stab, or punch. The emotional as well as the physical dynamics of the offense needed to be taken into account. Wolfgang would show empirically the high proportion of homicides that were classified as victim-precipitated crime. Here too care must be taken for a fine line can be crossed between blaming the victim and trying the how and the want of victimization.

Other scholars would subsequently cite Schafer for leading a refocus on the victim as not only a necessary ingredient to understanding the dynamics of crime, but also to considering the force of law. Victim-compensation, restitution, and restorative justice programs can all credit Schafer in a way of starting us all to think beyond the offender. Schafer noted the need for balance not just because the focus was on the offender, but because justice called for bringing the victim into all that was required for a rehabilitative form of justice. I say this because Schafer believed in corrections—the rehabilitative ideal while assuring that the victim played a role. Victim impact statements is one way to bring the victim into having a say, but another is through the rehabilitative mandate that is expressed through restorative justice. Victims confront their offenders not just for the purpose of instilling punishment, but for seeing genuine remorse and only then meeting the rehabilitative ideal of taking responsibility for the offense.

Victim-restitution by the offender and victim-compensation by the state are all policies that Schafer advocated. The offender had a responsibility to the victim to make amends; payback what was lost, repair the damage, and so forth. The state had a responsibility to protect its citizens, and when it went failed to keep them safe, compensation was due. To recognize the needs of the innocent is to recognize the victim of a crime whose suffering due to injury and financial loss could be devastating. The state had an obligation to step in and provide relief.

So Schafer made a difference not only in my life, but also in the lives of others who followed his path of critically thinking the dynamics of crime, and how those dynamics should not be overly simplified. Reasons he emphasized could not be the *real* reasons, unless we consider more than just the characteristics of those offend. To fully explicate meant to critically think the victim-offender relationship and the meaning of victimization—not in isolation of the law, but because of the law. And the law that matters is a law for justice, which would not mean endless punishment but rather a criminology that corrects, preventing crime rather than allowing it to perpetuate itself. Professor Stephen Schafer enabled my initial academic pursuits and will perhaps impact your own pursuits by considering his own published words and the words of others who followed in his scholarly path.

References

- Schafer, Stephen. 1967. *The victim and his criminal: Victimology*: President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.
- Schafer, Stephen. 1971. The concept of the political criminal. *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science* 62 (3):380-387.
- Schafer, Stephen. 1975. The proper role of a victim-compensation system. *Crime & Delinquency* 21 (1):45-49.
- Singer, Simon I. 1977. The concept of vulnerability and the elderly victim in an urban environment. *Criminal Justice Planning, New York: Praeger*:75-80.
- Singer, Simon I. 1981. Homogeneous victim-offender populations: A review and some research implications. *J. Crim. L. & Criminology* 72:779.
- Schafer, Stephen. 1986. Victims of serious violence and their criminal behavior: Subcultural theory and beyond. *Violence and victims* 1 (1):61.
- Singer, Simon I. 1988. The Fear of Reprisal and the Failure of Victims to Report a Person Crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 4 (3):289-302.
- Singer, Simon I. 1996. *Recriminalizing Delinquency: Violent Juvenile Crime and Juvenile Justice Reform*: Cambridge University Press.
- Singer, Simon I. 2014. *America's Safest City: Delinquency and Modernity in Suburbia*. New York: New York University Press.
- Von Hentig, Hans. 1948. *The criminal & his victim: Studies in the sociobiology of crime*. Shoe String Pr Inc.
- Wolfgang, Marvin, and Simon I. Singer. 1978. Victim Categories of Crime. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 69:379-394.
- Wolfgang, Marvin E. 1958. *Patterns in criminal homicide*. Philadelphia,: University of Pennsylvania.