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| 11. Globalisation and crime, green crime and state crimes | | |
| **Globalisation and crime (also use material on green crime and state crimes)** | **Green crime – crimes against the environment** | **State crimes** |
| * Crime has become globalised – interconnected across national borders. * **Castells** (1998) argues the global crime economy or transnational organised crime is worth over £1 trillion per year. Examples include: * 1352103619_c9f531f132_oTrafficking of women and children – often linked to prostitution. * Drugs trade – estimated to be $400bilion each year. * Cyber-crimes – e.g. identity theft and child pxxrnography. * Green crimes – damage to the environment, e.g. illegal dumping of hazardous wastes. * International terrorism – ideological links made via the Internet and other ICT. E.g. al-Qaeda. * Sex tourism – Westnerners travelling to third world countries for sex, sometimes involving minors   **Evaluation** ☹ – as research is very difficult in these areas there are very few ‘hard’ facts on the extent of global crime.  **Global risk consciousness (minimum of first two points)**   * The globalisation of crime has created new fears, insecurities and ‘risk consciousness’, where risk is seen as global rather than local. For example, concerns and anxieties about crime and disorder by migrant workers and asylum seekers, threats from al-Qaeda. * Much risk consciousness is artificially created by moral panics set off by the media. E.g. the media often stereotype immigrants as ‘terrorists or scroungers flooding the country’. This in turn has given rise to hate crimes against immigrants. * Risk consciousness has increased social control by nation-sates (countries). E.g. many European countries with land borders have fences, CCTV, and thermal imaging to prevent illegal crossings. * Risk consciousness has also increased international cooperation and control – e.g. ‘wars’ on terror and drugs especially since 9/11.   **Causes of the growth in global crime (must do point 7 and at least three other explanations)**  1. Spread of new ICT – internet, mobiles etc. created cyber-crimes.  2. Cheap air travel – created green harms such as air pollution.  3. Demand – huge demand from the rich West e.g. sex from prostitutes, illegal music and film downloads.  4. Supply – poor nations (e.g. Columbia and Afghanistan) willing to grow drugs, to escape poverty. Cocaine outsells all of Columbia’s other exports combined.  5. Difficult to police as it crosses national boundaries. This creates problems identifying where the crime has been committed and who is responsible for policing it. Cyber crimes involve crimes with anonymous or virtual identities and are therefore difficult to combat.  6. Growth of international terrorism – terrorist groups commit crimes such as drug and sxx trafficking and money laundering to fund terrorist training and activities.  **Evaluation** ☹ the above explanations lack theoretical explanatory power. They are a discreet set of explanations. Taylor theorises the causes of global crime using a neo-Marxist conflict approach.  7. **Taylor** (1997) argues a globalised capitalist economy has created greater inequality and rising crime.  a) Crimes of the powerless (**at least first two points**)   * Transnational corporations have created job insecurity, unemployment and poverty in the West by switching manufacturing to low wage countries (de-industrialisation). * With corresponding cuts in welfare certain social groups (e.g. working class, blacks) in the UK are faced with widening inequality which encourages the poor to turn to crime e.g. drug dealing. * In LA de-industrialisation has led to the growth of drugs gangs numbering 15,000 members, with gang related killings running at one a day.   b) Crimes of the powerful (**at least first two points**)   * Deregulation of financial markets (not controlled by governments) – increased opportunities for insider trading (e.g. Nick Leeson) and the movement of funds around the world to avoid paying taxation. * Creation of transnational organisations – e.g. the European Union pays out $7 billion in fraudulent claims for subsidies each year. * New patterns of illegal working – subcontracting flexible illegal immigrants, working for below the minimum wage or breaking health and safety laws.   {5359A232-D1DC-41F1-946D-146BDFD9F93F}Img100  **Evaluation of Taylor**  ☺ Links global trends in the capitalist economy to changes in the extent and nature/patterns of crime.  ☹ Does not adequately explain how the changes above make people behave in criminal ways – not all poor people who have insecure jobs turn to crime.  **Extension - McMafia**   * **Glenny** (2008) argues that the fall of communism in Russia and Eastern Europe (in 1989) and the deregulation of the worlds financial markets gave rise to McMafia (organisations in former communist countries). * Oligarchs (former KGB & communist leaders who became the capitalist class) – made money by buying oil, gas, diamonds etc. at old communist prices and selling them for huge profits on deregulated world financial markets. * Oligarchs formed an alliance with new mafia organisations such as the ruthless ‘franchised’ Chechen mafia to protect and move their billons of wealth out of the country.   **Extension - patterns of criminal organisation**   * Globalisation and de-industrialisation have given rise to new criminal opportunities and patterns at a local level. * ‘Glocal’ organisation - **Hobbs and Dunningham** (1998) claim that although new criminal organisations have international links, especially with the drugs trade, crime is still rooted in a local context. Thus crime is less large scale and hierarchical (mafia like) and more ‘glocal’ – locally based with flexible opportunistic criminals having global connections. * For example, drug dealing is influenced by suppliers from countries such as Columbia and Afghanistan but the form/pattern of dealing is shaped by local conditions/networks.   **Evaluation** ☹ **Hobbs and Dunningham** exaggerate change. Local criminal networks have always existed and the power and control of larger mafia style organisations still dominate the criminal underworld e.g. McMafia. | **The globalisation of green crime**   * Threats to the eco-system are global not just local. * Illegal industrial pollution in one country can lead to acid rain in another, destroying forests etc. * The Chernobyl disaster in the Ukraine (1986) spread radioactive waste over thousands of miles. * The Bhopal gas disaster (1984) led to between 5,000 and 10,000 deaths (see notes from video).   **‘Global risk society’ and the environment**   * **Beck** (1992) claims late modern society has created new global ‘manufactured (human made) risks’. For example, CO2 emissions from industry have created global warming and climate change.   r259216_1076020**Are green crimes illegal?**  Traditional criminology   * Has not been concerned with green crimes as often no laws have been broken. * However, this approach too readily accepts official definitions of what environmental problems and crimes are.   Green criminology (**White**, 2008)   * Focuses on harms (to the environment, animals and humans) rather than criminal law. This is for three reasons: * Some of the worst environmental harms are not illegal. * Different countries have different laws on what counts as an environmental crime. * Powerful groups, nation-states and transnational corporations (multinational businesses) are able to define in their own interests what counts as unacceptable environmental harm. They tend to be ‘anthropocentric’ (economic growth before the environment) rather than ‘ecocentric’ (environment before economic growth). * Green criminology sees both humans and the environment as liable to exploitation, by global capitalism. * **South** (2008) primary green crimes – crimes that result directly form the destruction of the earth’s resources (**at least two examples**). * **Air pollution** – the burning of fossil fuels by governments, business and the public adds 3 billion tons of carbon into the atmosphere each year – creates global warming. * **Deforestation** – forests such as the Amazon are destroyed by governments, cattle ranchers and logging companies (often illegally). (Environmental protestors are often shot by gunmen employed by the logging companies etc.) * **Species decline and animal rights** – 50 species a day are becoming extinct. Up to 95% of the earth’s species live in the rainforests, which are under severe threat (see deforestation). Many animals or animal parts are trafficked. * **Water pollution** – 25 million people die each year from drinking contaminated water. Marine pollution threatens 58% of the worlds ocean reefs and 34% of its fish. Businesses that dump toxic waste and governments that discharge untreated sewage into rivers and seas are to blame. * **South** (2008) secondary green crimes – crime that grows out of the breaking of rules aimed at preventing environmental disasters (**at least one example**). * **State violence against oppositional groups** – in 1985 the French secret service blew up the Greenpeace ship ‘Rainbow Warrior’ which was attempting to prevent a green crime – nuclear weapons testing in the south Pacific. * **Hazardous waste and organised crime** * Because of the high costs of safe waste disposal business often employ people to dump toxic wastes illegally. * 28,500 rusting barrels of radioactive waste lie on the seabed of the Channel Islands, dumped by UK authorities and corporations. * Illegal dumping is global – e.g. hazardous wastes in the West are often shipped to be processed in Third Worlds countries where costs are lower ($2,500 v $3 a ton) and health and safety laws often non-existent.   **Evaluation of green criminology**  ☺ By moving from legal definitions of crime, green criminology can develop a global view on environmental harm which recognises the risks of environmental damage both to humans and non-human animals.  ☹ Green criminology is subjective. By focusing on harms rather than crimes it makes subjective value judgements on what is regarded as wrong or deviant. | * State crimes are examples of crimes of the powerful. * the-killing-fieldsThey are all forms of crime committed on behalf of states (countries) and governments in order to further their policies. * **McLaughlin** (2001) identifies four types of state crimes: * Political crimes – e.g. corruption and censorship. * Crimes by security and police forces – e.g. genocide, torture and disappearance of dissidents. * Economic crimes – e.g. violation of health and safety laws. * Social and cultural crimes – e.g. institutional racism.   **The scale of state crime**   * The power of the state enables it to commit crimes on a large-scale with widespread victimisation. * E.g. between 1975 and 1978 the Khmer Rouge government of Pol Pot killed up to two million people. * The power of the state also allows it to conceal (hide) crimes or escape punishment. * Recently Britain and America have been guilty of crimes such as military use of torture in Iraq. * The principle of national sovereignty makes it difficult for organisations such as the United Nations to intervene against nation states.   **Evaluation** ☹ – as state crimes are often hidden/complex there are very few ‘hard’ facts on the extent of the problem.  **The state is the source of law**   * As the state has the power to make the law it is able to avoid defining its own harmful actions as criminal. * For example, in Nazi Germany, the state created laws permitting it to persecute Jews and sterilise disabled people against their will. * State control of the criminal justice system also means it can persecute its enemies.   **Defining state crime: (Domestic law)**   * Can be defined in terms of breaking the laws of the counrty in which the crime takes place.   **Evaluation**  ☹ Ignore the facts that states have the power to make laws and so they can avoid criminalising their own actions  ☹ They can make laws allowing them to carry out harmful acts. For example, the German Nazi state passed a law permitting it to compulsory sterilise the disabled.  **Defining state crime: (International law)**   * Law created through through treaties and agreements between states. For example, Rothe and Mullins (2008) define a state crime as any action by or on behalf of a state that violates international law and/or states own domestic law.   **Evaluation**  ☹ International law is a social construction involving the use of power.  ☹ International law focuses largely on war crimes and crimes against humanity, rather than other state crimes such as corruption.  **Defining state crime: (Human rights)**  •Human rights such as the right to vote and a fair trial protect the individual against the power of the state.  •Schwendinger (1970) argues that crime should be defined as an action that breaks human rights rather than laws.  •According to this definition states that deny individuals human rights would be criminal.  •For example, those that inflict racism and sexism or exploitation on their citizens.  **Evaluation**  ☹ The Schwendinger’s offer a subjective view on crime which is very value laden. Cohen (2001) accepts that violations of human rights such as genocide and torture are clearly crimes. However, he argues other acts, such as economic exploitation are not evidently criminal.  **Explaining state crime**  •Sociologists argue individuals who commit state crimes are socialised into it.  •Kelman and Hamilton (1989) explain crimes of obedience such as the My Lai Massacre in Vietnam in terms of:  Authorisation – following the orders of those in authority.  Routinisation – once the act is committed it is seen as a routine that one can be detached from.  Dehumanisation – enemies are presented as sub-human e.g. described as animals.  (Milgrams study on obedience)  **Evaluation**  ☺ an improvement on explanations that state crimes such as torture and massacres in terms of psychopathic tendencies. Instead Kelman and Hamilton locate such acts in terms of social factors.  Extension - Bauman (1989) argues that modern societies create the conditions for state crimes. E.g. he argues the holocaust was a product of modernity as this allowed the de-humanising of victims and turned mass murder into a routine administrative task.  **State crime and the culture of denial**   * Cohen argues states conceal (hide) and legitimate (make seem acceptable) their human rights crimes. * Dictatorships deny committing human rights abuses. * Democratic states legitimate their actions in more complex ways :   1 – states often start with denial, but human rights organisations, victims and the media show an event such as a massacre did happen.  2 – states then claim it is not what it looks like e.g. self-defence.  3 – states justify action to protect national security e.g. fight the war on terror.  **Techniques of neutralisation**   * Cohen argues states and state officials (e.g. army) justify human rights abuses in terms of techniques of neutralisation. For example (**at least one**): * Denial of injury – they started it, we are the real victims. * Denial of responsibility – I was only obeying orders, doing my duty. * Appeal to higher loyalty – defence of the free world, Islam, state security.   **Evaluation** ☺ Cohen draws attention to the similarity between crimes of the powerful and powerless. This is because governments use the same types as justifications for crime as working class juveniles do for their crime and deviance. |
| In conclusion as the world has become more globalised opportunities for transnational crime have increased – green crime/cyber-crime/state crimes cause harm on a global scale. Globalised crime shows how crime is committed by the powerful - nation states and large corporations have the power to inflict serious damage to the environment. The state also has great power to cause, conceal and legitimate crimes against its own and other countries citizens. As a consequence such crimes go unpunished or are defined as something other than crime. Global crimes such as green crimes also raise important questions about re-defining criminology so that it studies acts that are harmful as well as breaking criminal laws. | | |