The criminal justice system is administered through various ideologies that shape the enforceability of laws and how people treat them within the system. For this discussion, I have picked up "Crime Control Model v. Due Process Model" and "Crime Victimisation". Together, these philosophies show how the system stabilises public safety, individual rights, and safeguards victims.

Crime Control Model v. Due Process Model

The crime control model outlines the competence and the defence of society. The ultimate idea for crime control theory is to control the crime rate by rapid identification of criminals, arresting and punishing them. The model asserts that the criminal justice process should act more firmly, and the law enforcement agencies should gain more wide-ranging power to put a ban on crime. Policing, like mandatory minimum sentencing, aggressive policing, and expanded police power, exemplifies crime control thinking (Kubrin & Tublitz, 2022). I appreciate this model for its aim at public safety and requirement for diminishing the crime rate, especially in crime-prone areas.

Contrarily, the due process model prioritises accuracy, fairness, and the defence of individual rights. According to this model, the power of government must be cautiously restricted to warding off wrongful convictions and abuses of authority. It highlights constitutional safeguards like the presumption of innocence, the right to legal counsel, and fair trial procedures (Lubis, 2023). The due process works like a decisive reminder that safeguarding the innocent ones should be as necessary as punishing the offenders. There are so many legal safeguards, like the Miranda warning and the exclusionary rule, depending on this approach. This model is slower than any other judicial process, yet very effective for those who can serve with reliable evidence.

I enjoyed this concept as the crime control and due process model alerts about the continuous tension between fairness and competence in the criminal justice system. Knowing these models clarified my understanding of why policies prefer one approach, and also clarified court decisions, policing controversies and sentencing. I also valued how these models underlined the miscellaneous layer of justice and stabilised crime control and civil liberties.

Crime Victimisation

Criminal victimisation pertains to the experience of being harmed by criminal behaviour and is analysed via the studies relating to victimology. The research on victimisation elucidates why people or groups are more prone to be victims of crime than others. Two well-practised ideologies on crime victimisation are “lifestyle-exposure theory” and “routine activities theory” (Berg & Schreck, 2022). Lifestyle-exposure theory recommends that for daily activities of an individual, unclosing their social engagement and routines can make them more risk-prone. On the other hand, routine activities theory shows that crime takes place when a self-encouraged offender finds a suitable victim, who lacks capable guardianship at the same time and place.

All these theories alluding to crime victimisation are most competent to me, since I find them more demanding to understand due to the probability of appearing to blame victims for crimes committed against them. I think it is necessary to identify the obligations that lie with the offender. Victimisation studies are greater measures to upgrade preventive mechanisms, like community policing, victim support services, etc., instead of guilt-trapping the victims.

I picked up crime victimisation due to its tough-to-understand structure and application. I realize these ideology pertains to patterns and ways to stop further crime, but differentiating between the reason of crime and assigning blame is not always smooth. It is hard for me to see how the

criminal justice system can overwhelm victimisation rates without limiting individual autonomy. This principle raises ethical concerns, especially regarding the fairness of the responsible person.

References

Kubrin, C. E., & Tublitz, R. (2022). How to think about criminal justice reform: Conceptual and practical considerations. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *47*(6), 1050-1070.

Lubis, A. F. (2023). The right to a fair trial: Comparative analysis of international human rights standards. *The Easta Journal Law and Human Rights*, *1*(03), 116-126.

Berg, M. T., & Schreck, C. J. (2022). The meaning of the victim–offender overlap for criminological theory and crime prevention policy. *Annual Review of Criminology*, *5*(1), 277-297.