Zemiology

HILLYARD ET AL (2004)

States that criminology is inadequate for studying global crimes, a new discipline is needed; zemiology:

1. Problems with criminology- many global crimes outside the definition of ‘crime’ eg using sweatshop labour in a country where this is not illegal + many global crimes are committed by the powerful and cause serious harm; e.g. environmental damage.
2. Zemiology: the study of harms- studying harms rather than crimes allows a wider range of harmful activities to be studied and allows researchers to study why some harms are defined as crime and some are not against the law

Green Crime- Crime and/or harms to the environment, including to animals


The productivity that sustains global society is harming the environment, most threats to human wellbeing and the eco-system are now human-made rather natural disasters. E.g. climate change/global warming. This occurs in late modernity due to increased productivity in technology.

Anthropocentrism: The philosophical view that humans are different from and superior to other species therefore the environment is there for humans to use and manipulate

Ecocentrism: The philosophical view that all species rely on each other and the environment to survive. The environment must be preserved first and foremost as without it no species will survive.

WHITE (2008) Dominant philosophy

Global capitalism adopts a anthropocentric view. Economic growth, profit and consumerism are put first. This must change if global society it to tackle manufactured risks.

Green Criminology

It’s a transgressive criminology; like zemiology, interested in harmful actions including those that are not defined as crimes. However when pollution that causes global warming is actually legal, is this a matter for criminologists?

Traditional Criminology: only studies the patterns and causes of law-breaking so if the pollution is legal then they are not concerned with it.

Green Criminology: take ecocentric stance, harm to the environment is crime. They are more radical. Legal definitions can’t provide constant global standards on environmental crime as it varies from place to place; many of the worst environmental harms are not illegal