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OVERVIEW

Chapter 1 provides:

- A definition of globalization as a phenomenon of increasing interconnectedness of societies, as well as a number of other meanings and controversies raised by the term.
- An introduction of the main topics and theoretical concepts pertaining to globalization and crime, which will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapters.
- An introduction of the various aspects of global interconnectedness (economic, communicational, risk, etc.).
- A discussion of the multiple ways in which global inequality shapes contemporary crime control strategies and notions of relative deprivation and social exclusion.
- A discussion of the contested meaning of crime and criminalization.

KEY TERMS

- actuarial justice
- (late) modernity
- social exclusion
- Americanization
- neoliberalism
- space of flows
- crime
- neo-Marxism
- time-space compression
- globalism
- ontological insecurity
- glocalization
- relative deprivation

‘Huge trafficking organization smashed’, ‘Police ‘can’t cope” as Vietnamese flood drugs trade’, ‘New plans to tackle online perverts’, ‘Protect yourself from identity theft’, ‘EU crackdown on people smuggling’, ‘Suspected terrorists given citizenship’ – these are only some examples of headlines featured in the media in the past few years. The merging of global threats and local fears seems to have become a daily occurrence through milder and stronger forms of moral panics. At the same time, contemporary societies seem not only to be preoccupied with new forms of transnational threats, but are also developing new methods, new rationalities and solidarities in responding to these issues. The so far privileged position of the state and the national as the primary field of criminological reference is increasingly overshadowed by various transnational and sub-national configurations. ‘Siamo tutti Londinesi’ (‘We are all Londoners’), said the posters on the streets of Rome the day after the July 7 attacks in London in 2005. The message was similar to the one displayed on the cover of the French Le Monde.
in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks, proclaiming that ‘We are all Americans now’. As well as expressing global solidarity, the messages revealed shared feelings of fear and vulnerability between the Western capitals. The threat of the ‘foreign’ contaminating the perceived security of the local has become a common theme on political agendas and in media debates.

However, if we are to discern any deeper criminological relevance of the above phenomena, we need to turn our attention to underlying social transformations in the emerging, deeply stratified global order. Today, globalization is shaping contemporary life more than ever, influencing our perceptions of community, identity and culture. The globalizing world has been described as a ‘world in motion’ [Inda and Rosaldo, 2002], permeated by transnational networks and flows of goods, capital, images and cultural symbols, as well as potentially risky individuals, goods and substances. The aim of this book is to examine the implications of these phenomena for studying crime and social control in a ‘world in motion’. From the issues of organized crime, transnational policing, transfer of penal knowledge and policies, to a variety of trans-border sex industries (cyber and corporeal) – to name just a few – one could say that the criminological world is in motion as well. The purpose of this book is to go beyond the nation state and capture this emerging new level of criminological analysis – which in many ways we are only beginning to see the contours of – taking the global and transnational as the primary point of reference. My objective is to ask: what are the consequences of these transnational connections for criminology? How do we redefine and reorganize theoretical and methodological approaches in an increasingly interconnected world? The emerging global transformations have important implications, not only for what is commonly referred to as transnational crime, but also for local and national crime and security concerns. After all, globalization is not just an “out there” phenomenon’ but also an “in here” development [Giddens, 2000: 12], which is particularly applicable when it comes to penal policy.

What is globalization?

Globalization is a widely discussed topic and there are numerous definitions of the subject in the burgeoning globalization literature. In the popular imagination, the term is generally thought to describe the profound economic and technological developments which enable, for example, Western clothing manufacturers to produce their clothes using cheap labour from China, or companies to service their customers from a call centre in India. The term also refers to the politically charged issues of the great power of international corporations, privatization of state assets in order to meet IMF and World Bank requirements, the imperialist tendencies of Western media and culture, etc. The term globalization therefore
relates to a wide range of topics, not all of which will be touched upon in this book. Many have also noted a discomfort with using the term, since the debates about globalization in past decades have been highly polarized and divisive. Besides serving as a theoretical category of social science, the term globalization is also used in various contexts as a ‘political category of blame’, a ‘cultural category of fear’, and ‘an economic category of opportunity and enterprise’ (Ericson and Stehr, 2000: 30). Critics and proponents of globalization tend to see the phenomenon as either intrinsically bad or automatically good. Some therefore prefer not to use ‘globalization’ at all, and talk of ‘transnationalization’ in order to avoid over-generalization and to ‘suggest that transnational practices impact on human relationships in diverse ways in different places’ (Sheptycki, 2005: 79).

Nevertheless, as Giddens (2000: 25) points out: ‘Globalization may not be a particularly attractive or elegant word. But absolutely no one who wants to understand our prospects at century’s end can ignore it.’ For the purpose of this book, I shall start with a simple, yet useful, definition of globalization offered by Held, who describes globalization as ‘the growing interconnectedness of states and societies’ and ‘the progressive enmeshment of human communities with each other’ (Held, 2000: 42). ‘Over the last few centuries, human communities have come into increasing contact with each other; their collective fortunes have become intertwined’ (ibid.). Held’s definition is useful also because it points to the long history of the globalizing processes. Even though we may like to think of the present interconnectedness of the world as something new and unique, historians have outlined numerous modalities of globalization and de-globalization through time, exemplified by ancient ‘mini globalizers’ such as traders ‘like the Venetian Marco Polo, mobile warriors like Genghis Khan, and cross-border proselytizers like Saint Paul’ (Holton, 2005: 40).

In The Consequences of Modernity, Anthony Giddens suggests that the globalizing process is an essential part of late modernity. According to Giddens (1990: 63), ‘modernity is inherently globalizing’. He sees globalization primarily as a disembedding and stretching process

in so far as the modes of connection between different social contexts or regions become networked across the earth’s surface as a whole.

Globalization can thus be defined as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa. (Giddens, 1990: 64)

There have been numerous debates whether globalization can be described through the use of old terms such as modernity. Albrow argues that even those who recognize globalization as a profound contemporary transformation seek to assimilate it to modernity, thus ‘reviving modernity’s flagging
hold on reality’ (1996: 86). Globalization is therefore in danger of being seen as an ‘-ization’ term associated with modernity and having inevitable and predictable consequences (ibid.).

Critics have furthermore pointed out that Giddens offers a far too abstract definition of globalization. Robertson (1995) emphasizes that global interconnectedness is a cultural process unfolding through the development of global consciousness, rather than simply being a process of global expansion of capitalism and modernity. Consequently, some authors prefer to use the term *globalism*, emphasizing the ‘subjective, personal awareness that many of us share common tastes and interests and we are all likely to share a common fate’ (Cohen and Kennedy, 2000: 11). Furthermore, the globalist approach points out that there are many different types of globalization and that cultural globalization, for example, may unfold in different tempos and in different geographies from economic globalization (Held and McGrew, 2003). Others, by contrast, offer a much more sceptical view of globalization altogether, doubting both its novelty as well as its profound transformative impact (Hirst and Thompson, 1996). Capitalism has after all always functioned as a world economy.

This book will look at this emerging world of global interconnections and the debates surrounding it, particularly as they pertain to issues of crime, punishment and social control. Often, global interconnections and foreign influences on our local lives tend to be described as *Americanization*, ‘McDonaldization’ and Westernization. In many ways, these characterizations are to the point; also when it comes to the case of crime control and criminal justice. Chapter 9 will discuss penal policy transfers, and the spread of ‘zero tolerance’ policing will be named as one example of Americanization. However, we should also be aware of the fact that when describing the globalizing process as primarily a ‘top down’ process of Western dominance, one may be in danger of overlooking numerous ‘bottom up’ global initiatives and interconnections. There is therefore also a need to explore ‘globalization from below’ (Hall, 2006). In fact, resistance to globalization is essentially dependent on various global interconnections (Stiglitz, 2002; Polet, 2004). The anti-globalization protests in Seattle in 1999 involved 1,300 organizations from more than 80 countries. On that day, there were also parallel demonstrations in many US and other cities around the world, from Paris to Manila and Seoul (Sheptycki, 2005). The global interconnections therefore offer a complex picture, involving multiple processes such as Westernization, the global spread of consumerism and the predominance of Western multinationals, as well as growth of the transnational sex industry, the popularity of Bollywood films across the globe, global resistance and political action. Furthermore, we will also look at the absence of these phenomena; the territories and social groups which have been left out and disconnected. Both the multiple and complex connections and the disconnections are an essential part of globalization and shall be a subject of our discussions.
Criminology and the global, the local and the ‘glocal’

The challenges for criminology may lie not simply in mapping the emerging global interconnections, but also in examining how people and social institutions adjust to these developments locally, through culturally specific strategies. Zero tolerance policing, mentioned above, is quite different in Oslo than in New York or in Mexico City (Lundgaard, 2011), although people use the same term often without even translating it from English. The study of globalization needs to keep in mind this dialectic of the global and the local. As Giddens writes:

> Local transformation is as much a part of globalisation as the lateral extension of social connections across time and space. Thus whoever studies cities today, in any part of the world, is aware that what happens in a local neighbourhood is likely to be influenced by factors – such as world money and commodity markets – operating at an indefinite distance away from that neighbourhood itself. (1990: 64, emphasis original)

If we are to develop an adequate concept of globalization we need to take into account not only the stretching of social relations, but also the increasing intensity and speed of global interconnections as well as their increasing impact on local developments (Held et al., 2003: 67). Our lives and identities, including our values and perceptions of security, crime and punishment, are formed by a growing flow of international and global signs and activities. These flows include innumerable flows of people who are on the move; even those who have never moved beyond their local town or village are now transformed by the global flows. In a world of expanding media and communication technologies, ‘the sitting room is a place where, in a variety of mediated forms, the global meets the local’ (Morley, 2000: 2).

Robertson’s (1995) term *glocalization* is often used to describe the intertwining of the global and the local. Seen from this perspective, they cannot be treated as two distinct entities: they are a new synthesis, involving both transnational and local elements. One such example, discussed in Chapter 6, is Hobbs and Dunnighan’s (1998: 289) argument about the relevance of ‘glocal organised crime’, emphasizing ‘the importance of the local context as an environment within which criminal networks function’. As Hylland Eriksen writes, global process and phenomena

are only brought into being in so far as people invest them with content, [that] they are only activated through social processes. The point may seem trivial, yet it is easily overlooked if one sees ‘the global’ as a kind of Hegelian world spirit looming above and beyond human lives. The global only exists to the extent that it is being created through ongoing social life. (2003: 5)
This approach may have much to offer when we look at the contemporary complexities of social action, as well as the modalities of cultural and penal policy transfers and other adaptations to global change.

**The social and time-space compression**

Globalizing processes force us to analyse society from a new perspective. Increasingly, people find out that their lives are influenced and ordered by events and social institutions spatially far removed from their local contexts. Social life takes place ‘at a distance’ (Giddens, 1990). In his seminal work *The Condition of Postmodernity*, David Harvey (1990) described one of the vital dimensions of globalization, the transformation of time and space through a process of *time-space compression*. Harvey points out that globalization is fuelled by the increasing speed of communication and movement of capital, resulting in the ‘shrinking’ of space and the shortening of time. It is not only Wall Street traders who watch and take part in events happening on the other side of the globe. Most of us, more or less frequently, follow global events ‘as they happen and where they happen’, to borrow CNN’s catchy slogan. From the euphoria of the fall of the Berlin Wall, to the triviality of Michael Jackson’s trial and, of course, the tragedies of Beslan, the London terror attacks and 9/11, ‘when the whole world watched the surreal and stranger-than-Hollywood event as planes with live passengers flew into and demolished two of the largest buildings in the world’ (Urry, 2002a: 57). A vital aspect of the globalizing process is therefore the movement of cultural images, information and ideas, which enable us to visit – physically or virtually – distant places almost anywhere in the world.

Consequently, there is a need to adjust our notions of society to these transformations.

The undue reliance which sociologists have placed upon the idea of ‘society’, where this means a bounded system, should be replaced by a starting point that concentrates upon analysing how social life is ordered across time and space – the problematic of time-space distanciation. The conceptual framework of time-space distanciation directs our attention to the complex relations between local involvements (circumstances of co-presence) and interaction across distance (the connections of presence and absence). (Giddens, 1990: 64, emphasis original)

We need to acknowledge that we no longer live in discrete worlds, even though the worlds of national state societies never have been completely discrete. There is a need to challenge the ‘belief that national political communities can be relatively autonomous because they have the capacity to control their own destinies’ (Ericson and Stehr, 2000: 32). This belief is strong in much of the present political discourse on crime, where it seems as
if politicians, having acknowledged their limited capacities to influence economy, or having given up the responsibility for doing so, are showing their determination to act by various measures to ‘combat crime’ (Bauman, 2002; Christie, 2004).

Global flows traverse national boundaries, creating a constant flux between the inside and the outside, resulting in hybridity of what before appeared to be relatively stable entities. Increasingly, the boundaries between the inside and outside are being blurred, and we are faced with the question of how to deal with the constant influx of sometimes unfamiliar and undesirable people, ideas, images, objects and activities, in our midst. The meanings of home, community, nation and citizenship become transformed beyond recognition by the global, creating hybrid identities and ‘glocal’ belongings. Minority youth across the world have to juggle multiple belongings, not only to the nation states they live in but also to the places of their and their parents’ origin as well as other cultural and political influences. This does not mean, as anthropologist Arjun Appadurai (1996: 34) points out, that there are no relatively stable communities and networks, but that these stabilities are ‘shot through with the woof of human motion, as more persons and groups deal with the realities of having to move or the fantasies of wanting to move’. Communities and societies are no longer (though they hardly ever were) systems with clear territorial and membership boundaries. The speed of contemporary communication and interaction across great distances are radically transforming the nature of almost all aspects of social life. According to Appadurai (1996: 33), modern life is lived in various transnational scapes: ethnoscapes, technoscapes, mediascapes, financescapes and ideoscapes. ‘The suffix -scape allows us to point to the fluid, irregular shapes of these landscapes, shapes that characterize international capital as deeply as they do international clothing styles’ (ibid.). The point here is that our worlds, their economic, cultural and numerous other aspects, are moving. Our jobs, friendships and family patterns, cultural symbols and leisure activities, all seem to be transformed by this mobility. We spend much of our work and leisure activities in cyberspace, we travel more than ever, consume products produced in distant places, and live increasingly surrounded by people of different nationalities, ethnicity and race.

In line with other authors mentioned above, John Urry (2000) argues that sociological inquiry needs to take account of these multiple and diverse mobilities. He outlines the need to take ‘sociology beyond societies’; for a sociology that goes beyond the static notion of a society and nation-state in a ‘pre-global’ order to examine the various mobilities of people, images, capital, objects, information and risks. Urry thus invites us to move beyond the comparative research of nation states and to look at the level of global flows and explore the ‘global complexity’ (Urry, 2003). However, rather than seeing the global as the new structure – an assumption frequently made by eager globalization analysts – we
shall follow Urry’s (2002a: 59) more modest suggestion and envision it as an unfinished process, ‘which problematises the fixed, given and static notions of social order’. A global perspective can be seen as an encouragement to transcend boundaries and to expand the territorial as well as thematic scope of conventional criminology.

The network society, global economy and neoliberalism

Looking at material aspects of the new social ordering, Manuel Castells’s seminal work on the network society (1996) has established the concept of flows and networks as a central tool and metaphor of sociological inquiry. The network society is ‘a new society, based upon knowledge, organized around networks, and partly made up of flows’ (Castells, 1996: 398). Money, information, objects and people move through flows, creating ‘a society in which the material basis for all processes is made up of flows, and in which power and wealth are organized in global networks carrying information flows’ (Borja and Castells, 1997: 12). These social changes have been to a large extent facilitated by the profound technological revolution in information and communication technologies, and by subsequent changes in production, employment and social organization patterns. A result is a global economy with the capacity not only to accumulate capital across the world, but also ‘to work as a unit in real time on a planetary scale’ (Castells, 1996: 92). The network society is a society where ‘[b]oth space and time are being transformed under the combined effect of the information technology paradigm’ (ibid.: 376). Castells outlines a new notion of space as the ‘space of flows’, rather than a ‘space of places’. The new spatial organization of society has profound consequences for how life is lived and how power is distributed in the globalizing world. We will explore the issue further in Chapter 3, where we will see how some cities and regions, due to their participation in information networks and flows of capital, gain great advantage over the disconnected, ‘switched off’ territories. The so-called ‘information revolution’ has had a profound effect on all aspects of social life. If we compare this development to the industrial revolution, the communication networks replace the factory as the main unit of production, creating new, flexible work and production models such as ‘subcontracting, the decentralization of production, outworking, job sharing, part-time work, self-employment and consultancy’ (Borja and Castells, 1997: 11). The new technological developments have by no means led to a decline in industrial production: quite the opposite. There has been an unprecedented wave of industrialization, particularly in the developing countries, yet ‘the new industrialization already functions in accordance with the patterns of flexible model from the outset’ (ibid.: 11), thus combining the older models of industrial exploitation with the new paradigms of global competition.
Looking at the working conditions in Asian factories, one is struck by the fact that the works of classic thinkers – such as Karl Marx on commodification of labour and Michel Foucault on discipline – still have much explanatory power. However, there has clearly also been a fundamental shift from the past, described by many authors in recent years as a move from industrial to post-industrial economies, or to use another term, from Fordist to post-Fordist economies (Harvey, 1990). While the Fordist economy of mass production was based on rigid arrangements between employers, workers and the state to maintain high levels of employment and stability, the post-Fordist system is unstable and rests on flexibility with respect to labour processes, labour markets, products and patterns of consumption (Harvey, 1990). Similarly, Lash and Urry (1994) describe the end of nationally focused organized capitalism, which marked most of the 20th century, and a move towards ‘disorganized capitalism’, characterized by global reach and flexibility at all levels.

These economic developments have been accompanied by a certain political and economic discourse, which often tends to be equated with globalization itself – namely, neoliberalism.

Neoliberalism refers to an economic and political school of thought on the relations between the state on the one hand, and citizens and the world of trade and commerce on the other. Because it espouses minimal or no state interference in the market and promotes the lifting of barriers to trade and business transactions across regional and national borders, it certainly becomes a motor of globalization. (Passas, 2000: 21)

Neoliberalism, however, can be described as more than a ‘motor of globalization’, or in any case, a motor of economic globalization. The word also represents the crux of the heated discussions about globalization and its consequences. Neoliberalism is often used to denote all that is condemned by the critics of globalization: privatization of state assets, deregulation and giving free rein to market forces, greater emphasis on individual responsibility, the dismantling of welfare state systems, etc.

For the purpose of this book, the question has to be asked, of course, what kind of relevance do the above-mentioned transformations have for studies of crime and crime control? The new canon of neoliberalism, flexibility and personal freedom has had profound implications for the nature of work, family relations and life patterns, as is powerfully described in Bauman’s (2000) outline of the transformation of modernity from solid to ‘liquid modernity’, leading to profound conditions of insecurity. Furthermore, the neoliberal approach to governance has had profound effects on how the state and social institutions govern and address issues of crime and crime control, a topic that will be discussed in greater detail below.
Towards a world risk society?

The transnational connections discussed in this book crucially transform the governance of what was previously designated as nation states’ ‘internal’ security. The transnational nature of various threats that societies face today is, like global interconnections themselves, nothing new. The environmentalist movement has been among the first to put the mutual vulnerability of societies on the public agenda. The second part of this chapter presents the changing dynamics of crime control in late modern societies, particularly through the emphasis on risk, insecurity, fear and social exclusion. Some of the major theoretical contributions on the topic have come from the growing body of work on the risk society, strongly influenced by the work of Ulrich Beck. The German edition of Beck’s book The Risk Society came out in 1986, providentially, only shortly after the Chernobyl catastrophe, and it became an immediate success even beyond academic circles. The book describes late modern societies as risk societies, constantly debating, managing and preventing risks they have themselves produced. In fact, he argues that risks and hazards are the results of ‘successful’ modernization, an inevitable dark side of progress. He outlines a transition from the relative stability of the 1950s and 1960s class societies (high employment, stable family life and stable gender roles) to the instability and insecurity of late modernity. In risk societies social inequality is individualized, and the focus is on fear and safety rather than on issues of class and social justice. Beck argues that

\[\text{class societies remain related to the ideal of equality in their developmental dynamics (in its various formulations from ‘equal opportunity’ to the variants of socialist models of society). Not so the risk society. Its normative counter-project, which is its basis and motive force, is safety. The place of the value system of the ‘unequal’ society is taken by the value system of the ‘unsafe’ society. Whereas the utopia of equality contains a wealth of substantial and positive goals of social change, the utopia of the risk society remains peculiarly negative and defensive.} \]

(1992: 49, emphasis original)

One can think of terrorism alerts, bird flu reports, ‘mad cow disease’, transnational organized crime and other frequently reported transnational risks as potent symbols of the spirit of our times. The fact that the world is in some respects becoming a ‘smaller place’ has been deeply connected to insecurity through the proliferation of the images of dangers that are perceived to threaten the national and the local. For example, through global media reports about crime a murder of a child in England is ‘immediately flashed around the world – and at the same time turned into a local possibility’ (Pratt, 2002: 175).

Beck (1999) later boldly introduced the notion of a ‘world risk society’, which, with the highly publicized threat of terrorist attacks, is becoming increasingly
palpable. In the world risk society, the various threats such as terrorism, ecological disasters and financial crises, are marked by their borderless and de-territorialized nature. The issue of mobility and globalization of risk was also acknowledged by Giddens (1990), who suggested that the globalizing process affects the nature of risk in at least two ways: in the sense of intensity of risk, exemplified by the possibility of nuclear disasters, as well as in the sense of the 'expanding number of contingent events' which affect everyone or at least large numbers of people on the planet' (1990: 124, emphasis original). Through the globalizing process risks are potentially magnified, as well as disembedded and taken out of the hands of individuals and local communities. One may justifiably ask though whether the idea of a world risk society simply responds to the feelings of Western citizens who are beginning to feel now the effects of global social conflicts and environmental disasters in their, previously seemingly untouched, enclaves of security?

Fear of crime and the perilous quest for security
Concerns about fear and insecurity have been central to much criminological writing in the past two decades. Our time has been described as a 'culture of fear' (Furedi, 2002), and it has been persuasively argued that fear and insecurity have been a potent factor behind a variety of criminal justice policies and discourses (Sparks and Hope, 2000; Zedner, 2003). Sparks and Hope (2000: 5) note that the issue of fear of crime and insecurity needs to be situated within the context of wider social and cultural transformations. ‘Fear of crime’ thus intersects with the larger consequences of modernity, and finds its lived social meaning among people’s senses of change and decay, optimism and foreboding’ (ibid.). The issue relates to the aforementioned transformations towards late and ‘liquid’ modernity, the end of certainty and stability, the liquidity of social bonds. Some have theorized the shift as a move towards postmodernism and the end of a homogeneous and structured narrative about crime and punishment, mirrored in the present media barrage of crime news and images of violence and devastation (Jewkes, 2004; Morrison, 1995). Addressing the question of terrorism, Jewkes observes:

Terrorist attacks on ‘innocent’ civilians chime with the postmodernist idea that we are all potential victims. Postmodern analyses reject traditional criminological concerns with the causes and consequences of crime, pointing instead to the fragmentation of societies, the fear that paralyses many communities, the random violence that seems to erupt at all levels of society, and the apparent inability of governments to do anything about these problems. This concern with a lurking unpredictable danger is fortified by an omnipresent media. (2004: 28)
The current concern about terrorism is only one in the array of global threats. It has been pointed out that the globalizing process fosters insecurity. The transition from relatively stable Fordist economies to flexible post-Fordist systems has, according to a number of analysts, been a breeding ground for social insecurity. Globalization and the late modern condition are frequently credited with exacerbating what is often referred to as ‘ontological insecurity’. According to Giddens, ontological insecurity refers to a lack of ‘confidence that most human beings have in their self-identity and the constancy of the surrounding social and material environments of action’ (1990: 92). The notion is embodied in a series of sociological and criminological explorations (see, for example, Sennett, 1998; Young, 1999). In the global economy, not only the working classes, but also those who seemed to have succeeded, live under a constant threat of ‘flexible work’ and redundancy due to downsizing and perpetual restructuring of the economy. Consequently, ‘anxiety, fear and self-interest become the new emotional responses to life in advanced capitalism’ (Hall and Winlow, 2005: 32).

In a somewhat nostalgic tone, global transformations tend to be blamed for the demise of the ‘golden age’ of the welfare state and for creating societies that are anxious about crime, lack confidence in the state and are more punitive by nature (Young, 2003; Baker and Roberts, 2005; Pratt, 2007). Although the heightened focus on security resonates with the themes of risk society, it contradicts the idea that governments and institutions respond rationally in order to minimize risk. Several commentators have pointed out that the narrative of the risk society needs to be balanced by taking into account the more emotional aspects of social reactions to risk. As Mythen and Walkate (2006b: 388) suggest: ‘Far from a global politics of risk which emphasizes responsibility and equality, what is emerging instead, it seems, is a politics of fear and vengeance.’ The issue is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4, where we shall see how the tone of contemporary penal discourse has become in many ways more emotional, vindictive and punitive. The prospect is clearly acknowledged by Beck, who argues that the risk society contains an inherent tendency to become a scapegoat society.

The very intangibility of the threat and people’s helplessness as it grows promote radical and fanatical reactions and political tendencies that make social stereotypes and the groups afflicted by them into ‘lightning rods’ for the invisible threats which are inaccessible to direct action. (Beck, 1992: 75, emphasis original)

Furthermore, while security fears may be high on the present political agenda, critics of the risk society thesis have argued that people are by no means equally affected by various risks (Mythen and Walkate, 2006b: 388). Beck’s statement that ‘poverty is hierarchic while smog is democratic’ needs to be juxtaposed
with the pervasive social inequalities within risk societies. This is acknowledged by Beck (1992: 41) himself, who indicates that there ‘is a systematic “attraction” between extreme poverty and extreme risk’, exemplified by the export of hazardous industries to the Third World. Therefore, while certain social risks or ‘bads’ may appear to threaten everybody, other ‘bads’ and ‘goods’ are clearly unequally divided – both nationally and globally.

‘The wasteful, rejecting logic of globalization’

Contemporary insecurities need to be situated in the context of the deepening social divisions between the ‘winners’ and ‘losers’ in the new world order. In what follows we shall look at the social divisions and inequalities, as well as the changing dynamics of social exclusion caused by the emerging global transformations. The neoliberal economic model is marked not only by its great productive dynamism, but also by the way it excludes large social sectors, territories and countries. As Borja and Castells (1997: 9) point out, what characterizes the new global economic order is ‘its extraordinarily – and simultaneously – inclusive and exclusive nature’. The network society is a society where the creation of value and intensive consumption are concentrated in segments that are connected throughout the world, while other populations are ‘moving from the previous situation of exploitation to a new form of structural irrelevance’ (ibid.). The process of exclusion, of ‘switching off’, takes place both on the global level, by creating regions that are disconnected from the global flows, and on the national and local levels, by creating ‘switched off’ regions, cities and parts of cities. Globally connected and locally disconnected, global networks and flows introduce qualitatively different experiences of social ordering and exclusion, where the dynamic territories and segments of societies anywhere in the world gain over those who have become irrelevant in the global economy. As a result, we see ‘consolidation of black holes of human misery in the global economy, be it in Burkina Faso, South Bronx, Kamagasaki, Chiapas, or La Courneuve’ (Castells, 1996: 2). The ‘global village’ is a deeply divided village.

In his extensive and critical opus, sociologist Zygmunt Bauman describes the process as ‘the wasteful, rejecting logic of globalization’ (2000: 205). Pessimistically, Bauman (2004) sees globalization essentially as a process of production of ‘human waste’, of people who have been rendered redundant by the global spread of modernity. The populations which were before marked by their condition of exploitation, such as blue-collar workers in the industrialized North, are now in many ways rendered irrelevant in the new economic order as they find themselves out-competed by far cheaper labour forces in the developing world. And while previously in history there existed lands that were able to absorb the surplus populations produced by modernization, this is no longer the case.
Needless to say, these developments have had a profound social impact and are of great relevance for studies of crime and social control. As we shall see in Chapter 2, the large global inequalities have created immense pressure on the borders of the affluent world, visible for example in daily reports about desperate attempts by African migrants to enter Europe. Furthermore, we shall see in Chapter 3 how Bauman’s argument resonates with Wacquant’s (2001) description of the black American ghetto as a mere ‘dumping ground’ rather than a reservoir of disposable industrial labour.

These examples point to the criminogenic impact of globalization and neoliberal policies. The collapse of the socialist bloc has been widely credited as the breeding ground for organized crime, and the poorest countries in Europe, such as Moldova and other ex-Soviet republics, have become major ‘exporters’ of sex work. Afghanistan, one of the poorest countries in the world, derives its livelihood by providing over 90 per cent of the world opium production [UNODC, 2010]. Several critics have taken up the issue of ‘globalization and its discontents’ (Sassen, 1998; Stiglitz, 2002). Stiglitz, a former World Bank economist, argues that, particularly in the case of the ex-Soviet bloc, the new economic system has far from brought unprecedented prosperity and a ‘trickle-down effect’ as its neoliberal proponents had suggested. Instead, for many of world’s populations, the transformations have resulted in poverty and social and political chaos.

Others have pointed out that the issue in question is not only one of undeniable poverty, which often cannot be attributed to global transformations alone, but also a question of the growth of spatial and social global inequality. Of the world population, about a third live on incomes of less than one dollar a day. At the beginning of the new millennium, the richest 1 per cent of adults in the world owned 40 per cent of the planet’s wealth, and the richest 10 per cent of adults accounted for 85 per cent of the world total of global assets. However, the emerging global divisions defy the simplifications of the North–South, developing–developed world divide, although they certainly are pervasive. In the United States, for example, the income inequality has grown steadily since the 1980s. Today, the top 10 percent of the households earn about half of all income.

Social polarizations are also taking place on the national, regional and urban levels between highly paid knowledge workers and low-paid industrial and service professions (Perrons, 2004). A wave of industrialization in the Third World has contributed to large-scale migrations from the countryside, creating large populations of urban poor. We shall see in Chapter 8 that global income inequalities are

---

1Source: www.guardian.co.uk/money/2006/dec/06/business.internationalnews/print (accessed November 2012).

2http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/i/income/income_inequality/index.html
partly mirrored in the access that disadvantaged populations have to information and communication technologies, which are the essential element of the new economy. There is a global digital divide between the ‘haves’ and ‘have-nots’, which has profound implications for possibilities for economic, social and cultural inclusion of these populations (Castells, 2001; Perrons, 2004).

Adverse economic deprivation and inequalities of wealth and power have a long history of being studied as causes of crime, particularly by Marxist and neo-Marxist thinkers. Marx’s writing on the criminality of the proletariat may still resonate with the conditions of many peasant populations living in the sprawling slums of contemporary metropolises (Davis, 2006). However, critics have often pointed out the failacies of simple extrapolations from poverty and economic deprivation to crime. Currie (1998) proposes a distinction between the ‘market economy’ and the ‘market society’. Market society is, according to Currie (1998: 134), a society in which ‘the pursuit of private gain increasingly becomes the originating principle for all areas of social life’, and where ‘all other principles of social or institutional organization become eroded or subordinated to the overarching one of private gain’. He argues that the spread of market societies promotes crime through a number of mechanisms, among others, by increasing inequality and concentrating economic deprivation, by eroding the capacities of local communities, by withdrawing public services from the most needy, and by glorifying a culture of ‘Darwinian competition’ (ibid.).

Yet other observers have noted that one should be careful to avoid economic determinism, and should show sensitivity to the cultural and value aspects of market societies, a topic explored further in Chapters 4 and 5, when we examine the notion of anomie. Furthermore, while there may be no doubt about the existence of the great structural divides pointed out by the Marxist and critical left critique, others highlight the fact that the globalizing world is not only marked by social exclusion, but simultaneously by intense forms of social and cultural inclusion. Young (1999, 2003) suggests that while late modern societies are more exclusive than the welfare states of the post-war period, the term social exclusion, although clearly palpable and real, may no longer be adequate for describing the situation of inner city youth in the West or the situation of the deprived populations of the developing world. Young thus describes late modern societies as ‘bulimic’: they are inclusive, they culturally absorb massive populations; however, they simultaneously reject, ‘vomit up’ and structurally exclude these same populations.

Since societies no longer are discrete islands, the disadvantaged populations have become more aware of their marginalization by the constant presence of wealth in their sitting rooms through television and other media. A striking sight, while driving through poor neighbourhoods in a Third World city, is not only the dilapidated houses and the density of the population, but the overwhelming presence of satellite dishes on the rooftops. Through the consumption
of images of distant places, people’s experience of their localities is radically changed (Morley, 2000). In Chapter 4 we shall discuss in greater detail the emergence of global consumerism, global media and the globalization of culture, in general. We shall explore how global flows influence the production of identity and how local context becomes only one of many ‘channels’ of identity production. Globalization is therefore not only a material force, but also a cultural one. The pervasive social inequalities are magnified by the constant display of wealth and consumer goods in the media, reflecting not only conditions of absolute but also relative deprivation. Global transformations create a combustive mixture of connections and disconnections.

The changing role of the state and the neoliberal penalty

The changing role of the nation state is a central aspect of contemporary globalization debates. One of the main points of the debate is the argument that the globalizing process puts into question the role of the nation state as the cornerstone of political community, social theory and governance. The so-called first wave of globalization theories in particular was very sceptical about the ability of nation states to resist the ‘globalization juggernaut’ (see, for example, Ohmae, 1990; Reich, 1991). The perception was that the nation state was ‘withering away’ and that its sovereignty was irreversibly challenged by the powerful world of global economy (Bauman, 1998). Some saw the development as the beginning of a ‘new world disorder’ (ibid.), while Hardt and Negri (2000), influentially, saw the nation state order replaced by a new order of a ‘global empire’.

The challenges to state sovereignty come, significantly, not only from the increasingly interconnected and autonomous global economy, but also from the global illicit economy. The growth of illegal and illicit opportunities has been, according to several observers, an essential part of globalization and the deregulation of national economies (Castells, 2004; Naim, 2006). The triumph of neoliberalism resulted in a massive privatization of state-owned enterprises across the world. This transformation from strong state regulation to privatized market solutions has been most visible, and problematic, in the ex-socialist economies. Castells’s description of the ‘pillage of Russia’ (2004) outlines a tragic triumph of turbo-capitalism, built on systematic illegality and a damaging lack of state regulation. The systematic weakening of state regulatory controls ‘opened the way for a wild competition to grab state property by whatever means, often in association with criminal elements’ (2004: 187). In this case, the boundaries between state institutions and illegality are increasingly hard to discern, as corruption and organized crime become pervasive aspects of social organization. The penetration of the state by the illicit and illegal economy has been described as the problem of failed states (discussed further in Chapters 6 and 7). What is important at this
point is that the neoliberal tenets of state privatization and deregulation, on the one hand, and the autonomy and lack of transparency of the world financial systems, on the other, both contributed to the weakening of central state functions, particularly in the ex-socialist countries and in the developing world. The ‘pillage of Russia’ also reveals a more fundamental linkage between market economies and crime: an ongoing conflict that ‘pits the rigidity of state-formulated rule systems against the exigencies of the market’ (Whyte, 2007: 178).

However, when it comes to issues of crime control, the role of the state seems full of contradictions that defy simple categorizations. On the one hand, the state seems to be increasingly incapable of managing the crime problem, even in the prosperous West. On the other hand, we have, for example, seen a renewed show of states’ ‘muscle power’ through the so-called ‘war on terror’, visible in the intensification of border controls and the expansion of state surveillance and bureaucracy (see Chapter 5). It would therefore seem that far from ‘withering away’, the nation still has a number of tasks, particularly in the context of controlling the ‘darker sides of globalization’ (Urry, 2002a: 58). As Beck (2002: 47) points out, ‘the seemingly irrefutable tenets of neoliberalism – that economics will supersede politics that the role of the state will diminish – lose their force in a world of global risks’.

The complex and changing role of the state is best exemplified in the demise of the welfare state and the related rise of mass imprisonment and the spread of punitive control strategies in many Western societies. In his seminal history of Anglo-American penality Garland (2001a) outlines a shift from penal-welfarism to a more punitive penal state and a ‘culture of control’. Garland situates this transformation in the context of late modernity with its changing social structures, patterns of mobility, restructuring of the labour market and the rise of neoliberalism. The demise of inclusive penal strategies was also influentially outlined via Feeley and Simon’s (1992) concept of actuarial justice. The authors powerfully argued for the emergence of a new penology, which ‘divorces crime policy from concern with social welfare’. ‘Increasingly, crime policy is conceived of as a process of classification and management of populations ranked by risk; in need of segregation not integration’ (Simon and Feeley, 1995: 168). Rather than being a response to individual criminal acts, the penal system is designed for management of those who are seen to be beyond inclusion and are marked by the condition of ‘advanced marginality’ (Wacquant, 1999). The development seems to have been particularly pronounced in the United States and has been described as the ‘era of hyper-incarceration’ and mass imprisonment (Simon, 2000; Garland, 2001b). For certain groups in the population, particularly young, black urban males, incarceration becomes a predictable and normal part of their lives. Penal exclusion has been thus ‘layered on top of economic and racial exclusion, ensuring that social divisions are deepened, and that a criminalized underclass is brought into existence and systematically perpetuated’ (Garland, 2001b: 2).
The idea that neoliberal ideologies foster a particular form of penalty – one that is more openly punitive and exclusionary and with a clearer racial and class bias – has been in recent years articulated in several important contributions on the so-called ‘neoliberal penalty’ (Reiner, 2007; Wacquant, 2009a, 2009b, Harcourt, 2011). In The Illusion of Free Markets, Bernard Harcourt (2011) describes the ‘curious incendiary combination of free market efficiency and the Big Brother state’, where freedom and lack of regulation within the realm of economy has been accompanied by intense governmental intervention in the punitive sphere.

Neoliberal penalty facilitates the expansion of the penal sphere. It makes it easier to resist government intervention in the marketplace and to embrace criminalizing any and all forms of ‘disorder’. It facilitates passing new criminal statutes and wielding the penal sanction more liberally because that is where government intervention is perceived as legitimate, effective, and necessary. (Harcourt, 2011: 196)

Most notably, the neoliberal penalty has been outlined in Loic Wacquant’s (2009a, 2009b) extensive work. Rather than situating penal change in the context of late modernity and the changing cultural climate, Wacquant places political processes at the centre and proposes that ‘the ongoing capitalist “revolution from above” commonly called neoliberalism entails the enlargement and exaltation of the penal sector’ (2009b: 305; emphasis original). Moreover, Wacquant suggests that under conditions of neoliberalism, labour market flexibility and cutting down of welfare, the penal apparatus becomes ‘the core organ of the state, expressive of its sovereignty and instrumental in imposing categories, upholding material and symbolic divisions’ (ibid.: 304; emphasis original). An understanding of the American punitive upsurge thus offers a broader insight into the changing nature of social, racial and class relations, not only within the domestic US context, but also internationally. And namely, Wacquant proposes that ‘neoliberalism correlates closely with the international diffusion of punitive policies in both the welfare and criminal domains’ (ibid.: 305). ‘American realities’, such as zero tolerance policing and hyper-incarceration, can thus become ‘European possibilities’ (2009a).

Wacquant’s work joins a series of recent criminological explorations into the influence of political economy on imprisonment and levels of punitiveness (Cavadino and Dignan, 2006; Lacey, 2008). Building on Espig Anderson’s distinction between liberal market economies, conservative corporatist and social democracies, this body of comparative research has shown that, at least among Western societies, neoliberal countries are those with highest imprisonment rates. Societies with more inclusive regimes of economic production and welfare regimes also favour more inclusive penal policies. However, while it would seem...
that these contributions to some extent support the thesis that neoliberal societies are also punitive societies, they also present an important modification of the claim and introduce nuance into the debate in which ‘the USA, the UK, South America and Europe are all too often lumped together in an undifferentiated global order’ (Lacey, 2013: 272; also Nelken, 2010b). What data from these comparative studies show is that there is a great level of variation among societies commonly described as neoliberal. While the United States clearly stands out with a prison population rate of 730 per 100,000 inhabitants, Australia, with a rate of 124 prisoners, is a far less clear example. Moreover, the levels of punitiveness do not seem to be connected only to the regimes of economic production, but are also in important ways influenced by the nature of political systems and the institutional modalities of criminal justice (Lacey, 2008). In light of these arguments, Lacey (2013) questions not only the validity of the neoliberal penality thesis but also the explanatory value of neoliberalism as a concept:

[T]he conceptual vagueness of neoliberalism, and the institutional deficit which characterizes the neoliberal penality thesis, dooms it to failure as an explanatory account of contemporary punishment. (2013: 277)

The debate about the nature and consequences of neoliberalism can offer some useful lessons, which can be kept in mind when reading the rest of this book. One of the most common misconceptions of globalization is, as Hylland Eriksen (2007) points out, its equation with homogenization and/or economic imperialism. Much of the critique levelled at Wacquant’s thesis was addressed precisely at his suggestion that also Europe and Latin America are and will be following in the footsteps of the US neoliberal penality. Globalization ‘does not spell convergence’ (Lacey, 2011) and we should keep in mind the national and local variations that persist despite, or even because of, globalization. It is therefore essential to balance the generalist accounts with specific local studies, a topic that will be discussed further in the final chapter. Worldwide there are more than 10 million people in prisons, almost half of them in the great incarcerators – the United States (2.29 million), Russia (0.81 million) and China (1.65 million) (Walmsley, 2010). Their living conditions are highly diverse and sustained by different rationalities and historic developments.

The above discussion about the role of the state points to the fact that globalization is by no means an either–or process, but a complex set of developments with multiple modalities. We need to be aware of the erroneous and simplistic picture of globalization, often painted by both pro- and anti-globalization analysts, as an inevitable and deterministic process. What tends to be forgotten is that there are limits and paradoxes inherent in the globalizing process. As we shall see in the next chapter, it may seem as if we live in a ‘borderless’ world, yet this is the case only for inhabitants of a small number of Western nations,
while global mobility for others is increasingly restricted. Similarly, the new technologies, much credited with the intensification of globalization, are in fact available only to a relatively small stratum of the world population. In Chapter 5 we shall see how global surveillance practices and technologies are creating a new visibility, at the same time as the methods used in the so-called war on terror have been marked by an extreme lack of transparency. The study of globalization therefore needs to keep in mind not only the intensity of transnational connections, but also the paradoxes, unevenness, concrete modalities and disconnections. In fact, one is tempted to suggest that unevenness is an intrinsic aspect of the current global transformations – that we live in a world of global capital that continues to rely on nation states, in a world that is borderless for some and full of fences for others, and where the language of freedom and opportunity goes hand in hand with pervasive structural inequality. On a more positive note, we shall see in the last chapter, that although eroding the fundamentals of state sovereignty and justice, global interconnections are also creating alternative frames and forums of justice, thus revealing globalization’s often forgotten potential for empowerment.

Crime, wars, war crimes and crime wars

The discussion so far has broadly outlined some major themes in contemporary global transformations and their possible relevance for the field of criminology and crime control. Late modern societies have been described as exclusive societies (Young, 1999) as well as ‘elusive societies’ (Bauman, 2002), where the notion of strong nation states and stable social entities is destabilized by various flows and mobilities, and where boundaries between the inside and the outside become unclear. However, I shall proceed now to suggest that a student of global transformations is faced not only with the fluidity of the concept of society, culture and government, but also with the inherent fluidity and instability of the concept of crime itself.

The concept of crime, and its intricate and problematic nature, has been at the crux of many, or to some extent most, criminological debates. Crime is, as Zedner concludes,

> a problematic category used routinely to describe a set of behaviours that, beyond a central core, are highly contested. Legal definition alone cannot adequately recognize the historical development, social relationships, practices, ideologies, and interests that determine what, at any given moment, is designated criminal. (2004: 69)

Crime therefore cannot be simply seen as an act defined as criminal by the law; it is also an act whose definition as criminal depends on a number of social,
cultural and historic circumstances. A long tradition of criminologists has explored the issue of social construction of crime. From labelling theorists such as Howard Becker to critical left theorists, the argument has been that crimes are not qualities inherent in certain acts, but that one should focus on the ability of the state and certain social groups to punish according to their own interests and to impose their definitions of crime and deviance on the rest of society. Hence, there has been a lack of attention to the so-called crimes of the powerful (white-collar crime, states and their military apparatus, male violence against women, etc.), and predominance of focus on the crimes of the powerless and those who are seen to be different – ‘the others’ – drug users, youth subcultures, immigrant youth. Others have emphasized that definitions of criminality essentially depend on types of social settings and relations between those involved in the process. Christie, radically, concludes that

> crime does not exist. Only acts exist, acts often given different meanings within various social frameworks. Acts, and the meaning given them, are our data. Our challenge is to follow the destiny of acts through the universe of meanings. Particularly, what are the social conditions that encourage or prevent giving the acts the meaning of being crime. (2004: 3)

However, while these may be well-trodden paths for criminologists, and there may be no need to re-tell them, the transnational aspects of the contemporary condition clearly add new dimensions to the topic. In a world that is increasingly shaped by transnational and non-state actors, we are faced with a myriad of situations that escape clear categorizations of traditional, nation state criminal law. The difficulties of conventional concepts of criminality and deviance become even more apparent from a global perspective and seen in the light of global social divisions. The question of accountability for abuse committed by private security personnel in the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan is one example. The unequal reach of criminal justice is magnified on the global scale when it comes to ensuring responsibility of global corporate and other state and non-state actors.

One of the central critiques raised by critical criminologists has been the narrowness of the concept of crime, which does not incorporate wider social injuries and harms committed by powerful social actors (Hillyard et al., 2004). Several authors have criticized criminology as a discipline for not incorporating state crime as an integral part of its subject matter, and for focusing instead on crimes and punishments within nation states (Green and Ward, 2004; Morrison, 2006). Crimes committed outside the bounded nation state territories, although enormous by comparison, do not penetrate the mainstream criminological discourse and are also seldom subjected to punishment. Morrison thus concludes that
[t]he biggest non-punitive area we inhabit is the global inter-national system. The century just concluded perhaps saw the greatest amount of inter-human slaughter, rape, and destruction of property of any century; in partial recognition of which we even created a new crime, genocide, but in the face of which extremely few persons were ever punished. (2005: 290)

Green and Ward (2004) argue that not only acts of genocide, but also other types of state-sponsored crime, such as corruption of state officials and elites, torture, state terror, police crime, avoidable ‘natural’ disasters and war crimes, should be incorporated into the criminological discourse. They report, for example, the case of the late Nigerian dictator Sani Abacha, accused of stealing $4 billion from his country, which is considerably more than the annual amount stolen and damaged in all residential and commercial burglaries in England and Wales. Whyte (2007) suggests that the recent ‘reconstruction’ of Iraq can also be seen as an example of massive state-corporate criminality, where

an unknown proportion of Iraqi oil revenue has disappeared into the pockets of contractors and fixers in the form of bribery, over-charging, embezzlement, product substitution, bid rigging and false claims. At least $12 billion of the revenue appropriated by the coalition regime [i.e. the Anglo-American government] has not been adequately accounted for. (2007: 177)

And while national prison systems are overfilled, accountability is considerably more difficult to establish on the international level and in cases when states, state actors or international organizations are the culprits. Friedrichs (2011: 172–3) thus proposes the term ‘crimes of globalization’ to refer to policies and practices of international financial institutions, such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization, that have had ‘demonstrably harmful consequences, disproportionately on large numbers of people living in developing [or Third World] countries’.

The question is, therefore, what is crime and what, after all, is the subject of this book? As boundaries between the inside and the outside become blurred, as it grows difficult to distinguish between inter-state and intra-state conflicts, it is less clear than ever what is to be the subject of criminological research and discourse. Are we only to focus on ‘openly criminal’ acts, represented in the popular imagination by terrorists and cynical trafficking networks, or are we also to address more ambiguous, but often no less harmful, acts of state and corporate irresponsibility and environmental damage? The Chernobyl catastrophe, for example, displaced 400,000 people and had a devastating impact on their lives and the environment (Papastergiadis, 2000). Increasingly, criminologists are beginning to turn their attention to these topics, for example, through the emerging field of green criminology.

Young (2003: 392), on the other hand, observes the ‘striking similarities between the violence of conventional crime and the violence of war’ and the
‘parallels between the war against crime and war itself’ as well as to the ‘surprising ignoring of war by conventional criminology’. Throughout this book we shall see that the metaphor of war is often used in combating the crime problem and that militarization of crime control is becoming a salient aspect of several crime control measures. We shall encounter several ‘crime wars’ in the book: the ‘war on drugs’, the ‘war on terror’ and even the ‘war on trafficking’. The terminology of war can be a dangerous metaphor in several ways, justifying extreme means in order to defend the perceived enemies of the state and therefore endangering traditional civil rights and liberties. The discussion that ensued in the aftermath of 9/11, on whether these attacks were acts of war or whether they were criminal acts, mirrors the dilemma. As Hayward and Morrison observe:

The discourse of crime and criminal justice places limits on the power of the state to investigate, and lays out rules to structure the game of investigation and proof. Some of the moves to call September 11 an act of war, and responding to it as a state of war, are designed to specifically avoid the rules of criminal justice. (2002: 153)

Mythen and Walkate (2006b) suggest that from the present concerns around terrorism, criminologists can ‘learn something about changing definitions and notions of what counts as crime, the criminal, the victim and “fear”’. The relativism of the concept of crime is particularly apparent when it comes to terms referring to transnational concepts, such as terrorism, transnational organized crime, the Mafia, etc. which at times become political categories of blame and are used ‘more as an ideological weapon than as an analytical tool’ (Ruggiero, 2003: 25). Unfortunately, this book also needs to acknowledge its limitations, since because of the lack of space it will not be able to cover a variety of acts and phenomena which due to their harmfulness could, and should, be the topic of criminological discourse. Furthermore, crime is only one in a line of circumstances affecting human security, although inevitably the one that news headlines tend to focus on.

Summary

This chapter has provided an outline of discussions about the numerous and contested meanings of globalization. For the purpose of this book, we shall consider globalization simply as the manifold process of increasing transnational interconnectedness of societies. Globalization is not a historically new phenomenon, although it has gained powerful momentum with the progressive development of global capitalism, information and communication technologies, patterns of mobility and cultural exchange. Five aspects of global transformations were given particular consideration, as they inform our further discussions in this book:
Disembedding of social relations refers to a process, described by Giddens (1990) as a general trait of modernity, by which social practices are ordered across space and time. The social space is no longer limited to the boundaries of physical space. Globalization intensifies the ‘stretching’ of social relations across time and space – the time–space compression (Harvey, 1990) – at times creating an impression of the world as a ‘global village’.

The role of the modern nation state is fundamentally transformed under the influence of global transformations. Some commentators have described the development as the ‘withering of the state’. When it comes to the governance of crime and security, the picture is far more complex and contradictory. The abdication of state responsibility in some areas goes hand in hand with increased state surveillance and the expansion of the criminal justice and prison systems.

Global inequality is a pervasive trait of the contemporary world order, which is magnified by the globalization of media and consumer culture. The global ‘have nots’ are incessantly bombarded with images of the lifestyles of the privileged. The development has been analysed as conducive to crime and deviance, due to the increasing feelings of relative deprivation, social exclusion, disintegration of communal life and value systems (anomie).

The topic of the risk society marks a progressive shift in social organization towards the management and neutralization of various types of risk, rather than the achievement of more positive goals of social justice. Risk societies are prone to be scapegoat societies: this is particularly visible when it comes to political and media discourses about crime and punishment.

The contested nature of the concept of crime is one of the central criminological topics. Crime is not an objective quality, but depends on a series of political, historic and social processes which lead to criminalization. Globalization has been a breeding ground for the new forms of criminalization that will be discussed throughout this book, such as criminalization of various aspects of migration, global resistance and Internet-related behaviour.

**STUDY QUESTIONS**

1. What is globalization? Discuss its negative, and potentially positive, social effects.
2. What is ontological insecurity? How does globalization in your view contribute to people’s sense of insecurity?
3. Which global threats are shaping the political and media discourse in your country?
4. Discuss the relationship between neoliberal ideologies and punitiveness.

*(Continued)*
FURTHER READING