

## **1. Crime and Power: Introduction**

Crime and Power

Why Power is Important

Useful Terminology

The Case Study Approach

What is a case study?

The case for the case study in criminological research

Our case studies

The Layout

References

### **Crime and Power**

Welcome to *Crime and Power*. This is a unique textbook merging numerous criminological theories and concepts into an applied case study based learning and teaching guide. *Crime and Power* explores some of the central tenets essential to studying criminology at undergraduate level. These include:

- the processes of criminalisation and victimisation

- causes and organisation of crime at individual, group, family, community, institutional, and state levels
- the intersectionalities of crime, offending, harm, and victimisation
- official and unofficial responses to crime, deviance, social, and environmental harm
- social and cultural constructions and representations of crime, offending, and victims.

Although, like most textbooks, we investigate these central tenets, the scope of our textbook encompasses a wider conceptualisation of criminology than conventional mainstream books. A vast majority of textbooks (and scholarship) in criminology are solely focused on visible street crimes, for example. Our critical and victimological perspectives allow for a more far-reaching exploration and examination of explanations of a more expanded notion of harm and crime and approaches to their control. All of this is situated within a framework of power. Here, too, our perspective is unique and again allows for a more far-reaching exploration of the relationships and dynamics between offenders and victims. As we will detail in depth in Chapter 2, we propose power is multifaceted and specific; hidden and visible; individual and collective. It underpins many harms and crimes and is essential to understand in order to prevent victimisation as well as deter offending.

Woven into the framework of power are numerous other perspectives and theoretical underpinnings. An important recurring perspective is that the activities, behaviours, acts, and omissions of powerful ‘elites’ are not widely regarded as ‘crime’ (Croall 2011). In these instances, we draw on the key contributors who have challenged conventional notions of crime to be too narrow by mostly ignoring corporate crime in particular. These theorists

include Croall (2011), Shover (2001), Levi (2014) and Nelken (2012) on white-collar crime and fraud and Slapper and Tombs (1999) and Tombs and Whyte (2003, 2007) on corporate criminality and health and safety crimes. Their research supports the notion that will be evident in this textbook's cases studies that 'non conventional crime' rarely features as 'crime' or 'victimisation' in popular discourse, in political debates and in criminal justice processes.

Interlinked with power is theorising about the significance of patriarchal structures in society with reference to second wave feminism and the authors who explored the implications of this criminologically (see for example Gelsthorpe 2001, Heidensohn 2006; Heidensohn and Silvestri 2012, Smart 1977). We draw on feminist scholars in particular who have made important contributions such as Dobash and Dobash (1979, 1998, 2008) and, more recently Groves and Thomas (2013) and Mooney (2000). Further structural components to power are explored when examining race and ethnicity. The questions of urban unrest and racial inequality, racial discrimination and violence and hate crime are investigated with a focus on contemporary examples and illustrations (Ray 2011; Ray and Smith 2001, 2004; Ray et al 2003, 2004; Bowling 1990, 1993, 1999; Webster 2007, 2012).

Culture criminology informs our discussion around contemporary concerns regarding the culture of control, risk society, and security threats to understand some forms of crime and victimisation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We draw on the seminal work of Sen (2005) and Siddiqui (2005) as well as the contemporary work of A. Hall (2014). We also investigate crime and power through the age-power dynamic, which can be an illuminating lens through which to conduct criminological and victimological inquiry (see Hall 2015, Muncie 2014). We address the conundrums associated with young people and children as victims and offenders,

patterns and risks to offending and victimisation and theoretical explanations that have been postulated to account for the enduring age/crime curve to offending as well as the lack of attention given to the enduring age/victimisation curve to much victimisation.

The above perspectives and theoretical underpinnings by and large are applied to power in interpersonal more individual relationships. We utilise other perspectives and theories to support our discussion of power in relation to groups. For instance, we rely on the research of Pearce and Tombs (1998) and Croall (2001, 2007) when documenting the criminogenic nature of corporations. Corporate crime is an extensive and significant category of offending, so we also draw upon theorists contributing to the scholarship around green, health and safety, and financial crimes in the case studies explored (Beirne and South 2007; Levi 2014; Tombs 2014; White, 2008, 2009, White and Heckenberg 2014). Also in investigating group power, we analyse historical and contemporary stereotypes of organised crime and test the utility of criminological theorising (Abadinsky 2007; Rawlinson 2009 and others) that ignores the often invisible nature of organised criminality and victimisation as well as the power dynamics that contribute to its emergence and persistence.

Corporations are not the only groups theorised to be criminogenic. The state, with its many facets, is responsible for a range of crimes and victimisations. Green and Ward (2004), Doig (2010), and Rothe (2009) propose in different ways what states are as well as conceptualisations of organisational deviance linked to why states can be criminogenic. States' criminogenic nature is expressed in state corruption, state-corporate crime, natural disaster response, police crime, state terror, torture, war crime, and genocide (Green and Ward 2004; Short 2016). Other powerful groups committing crimes are seen in

contemporary examples, such as Boko Haram and the Lord's Resistance Army. In these instances, we interrogate the power relationship between the groups, the victims and the state, which, as with other examples, links back to the intersectionalities of individual characteristics that are linked to victimisation.

### **Why Power is Important**

We are not the first to propose that power is essential in the commission of crime or in the omission of certain acts from consideration as crimes. Much of our inspiration regarding power comes from Pearce's (1976) *Crimes of the Powerful*, a ground-breaking text exposing the role of power in capitalist societies, particularly the United States. In capitalist countries, the control systems in place favour the ruling class by and large because it is the ruling class who have control over the legal system and therefore what is and is not defined in the law as crime. This results in criminalisation and visibility of working class activities and not the harm brought about by the elite. In addition, the power of the elite maintains and reinforces their own domination and their values throughout larger society (Pearce, 1976). They are able to deflect attention from their own acts and class conflict through their power over institutions like the media (we reserve a fuller discussion of the media for Chapter 3). Pearce (1976) argues there are paradoxes and contradictions between the ruling class' rhetoric and their actions in that they speak of integrity for instance, but are unable to adhere to their own rules and regulations.

Pearce's description of how and where power existed was in contradiction to other scholars' perceptions of 1970s pluralism. Proponents of pluralism argued that there were no power elites and that power was actually widely distributed throughout communities in

society. Power was always observable and directly applied and only official people and political organisations should be the subjects of research into power (Pearce 1976). Yet, Pearce gave examples of clear power differentials in society. Different people in different groups dependent on their age, class, ethnicity, gender and so forth did not have the same ability to make rules or to apply them to other people. This was not isolated to the legal sphere, but to informal rules as well. Group social position, in part tied to these characteristics, imparts weapons and power to enforce their rules to different degrees.

Pearce criticised that attention was only given to those people who had broken the rules as defined by the powerful capitalist groups. So, only those labelled as ‘deviant’ by the ruling class were the focus of study. People, who manipulated laws, violated ethical and moral standards, harmed people and who were able to hide their actions and/or deflect the label and punishment went untouched. To reiterate, Pearce argued power was an essential aspect of perpetrating harm and that power enabled the elite to define crime, to enforce their dominant values, to keep the harm they committed hidden and to deflect scrutiny.

Pearce concentrated on this power dynamic in capitalist societies and advocated power was largely related to class. We, in contrast, propose power is not confined to the ruling class of capitalist economies. Power is a key component of harms and crimes in relation to capitalism, but also of other harms and crimes. We will provide evidence that power is also expressed in social, cultural and political ways that occur both inside and outside of capitalist societies and contexts. With respect to the latter—power imbalances in non-capitalist states—the pitfalls may not be the same in socialist states, but hierarchies have an uncanny prevalence across political systems. To understand fully global power relations, the nuanced elements of the class strata and potential for heightened internal class struggles in non-capitalist countries cannot be overlooked. Thus, we extend Pearce’s

analysis and expand upon the Marxist ideas of the sociological domination of the working class (See Chapter 4). We are signalling here, that our approach to the dynamics of power captures political processes and how democratic transformation attending to social and cultural features in societies is important.

In Part 1, we provide proof that power also exists and is expressed differently in different individuals. The characteristics of a person—their class, gender, race, religion and/or age (in addition to others)—and the complex interplay of these and our diverse identities result in each of us potentially having power or being powerless and equally important result in the potential for us to be the focus of power from another individual or from a group. These ideas are further examined in the introduction to the series of chapters that form Part 1 of the book. In addition, power exists and manifests differently in different groups depending upon their structure and function. For instance, corporations and states are both powerful, but in different ways. This dual expression of power at the individual and group level is our unique approach to power that we hope will help you to understand and conceptualise why and how some crimes and harms happen.

As harms and crimes committed by the powerful, both individuals and groups, often remain hidden, research into them can be particularly challenging. With that in mind, the text utilises a case study approach that allows for examination of incidents and examples of crime and power, which are hard to gather information on. The reason for this approach is outlined below. First, however, a number of key words are foregrounded here as they recur throughout the chapters. Providing short uncontested definitions of these words/terms is not straightforward given the topic of this text features the conjoined dynamics of ‘crime’ and ‘power’. Take the first word in the title of this book – perhaps the most common and key word in criminology—‘crime’ as an example. Definitional issues abound and what

constitutes crime is vehemently contested across time, space and place. Who constructs dominant definitions of crime, is, we contend, of huge significance. Notwithstanding the caveats of doing so however, we attempt to lay down some direction for the readers' understanding of several key words. The reader will find these terms defined in context in the relevant chapters.

### **Useful Terminology**

**Power** – for criminologists and readers of this textbook, the word power ought to conjure up synonyms such as ‘control’, ‘dominance’, ‘rule’ and ‘supremacy’. However, with your criminological imagination in full swing, you will appreciate there are many facets to the concept of power and this textbook helps you unpack some of the key power dynamics at work in society that produce and reproduce crime, harm, and injustice. See Chapter 2 ‘What is Power and Who are the Powerful?’ for a fuller discussion.

**Invisible Crime** – criminal acts that are not visible. Different crimes have different degrees of visibility and invisibility. Many criminology texts refer to the so-called ‘dark figure’ of crime, which refers to unreported and unrecorded crime and these factors have a bearing on what crime is transparent, what crimes are relatively visible and what crime is hidden. The factors giving rise to the different degrees of visibility and invisibility of crime are further discussed in Chapter 3 ‘The Invisibility of Crimes of the Powerful’.

**Gender** – a cultural concept relating to the social classification of ‘masculine’ and feminine’. Gender is part of our identity and alludes to the differences between men and women that are socially constructed and sustained. For further discussion, see the introduction to Part 1 of the book ‘Individual Characteristics and Power Dynamics’, and Chapter 7 ‘Gender and Power’.

**Environmental Crime and Green Crime** – the former is mostly used as a legal term for crimes against the environment. The crime element involves the application of state sanctions for illegal activity (acts and omissions determined to be criminally harmful under the law). See Chapter 9 ‘Corporations’ for an extended discussion of environmental crime and power. The latter may also be used to discuss environmental crime, but is also used to refer to environmental *harms* that may incorporate wider definitions of crime than are provided by strictly legal definitions. Examples of green harm include animal rights abuses and state-corporate land grabs, through to the victimisation of indigenous peoples, environmental injustices and the consequences wrought by extractives industries. The study of green crime covers environmental harms, environmental laws, and environmental regulation and crime prevention.

**Corporate Crime** – sometimes also called organisational crime, corporate crime can take on many forms, the common feature is the making use of the workplace and legitimate employment to maximise rewards for illegal profit. The illegality might include illegal acts or omissions, punishable by the State under administrative, civil or criminal law. In Chapter 9, ‘Corporations’, the criminogenicity of corporations is examined using case studies to illustrate the uses and abuse of power in the commission of corporate crime.

**State** – a much disputed and contested term in general and for criminologists likewise. A definition of *the state* is often synonymous with the government or a kingdom/country. Chapter 11 begins by exploring what a state is and what state crimes are in a fuller exposition—through case study examples—of various dimensions of state power. See also war crime below.

**Genocide** – genocide is often thought to be the extermination of a whole group of peoples.

In Chapter 11, ‘State Crime’, a section on Genocide explains that though this may be the end goal, genocides are more complex than this and may also include cultural genocide and ecocide.

**Victim** – can be considered a label or identity. As such, ‘victim’ is a social artefact, constructed by different actors in different contexts. However, it is usually associated with crime and relates to someone suffering some kind of misfortune. See our caveats with regards to the term victimisation below.

**Victimisation** – whilst a typical dictionary definition is likely to refer to the action of singling someone out for cruel, ill or unjust treatment, context is important as is the *who* and *what*. Criminal victimisation narrows the definition of victimisation to human individuals as criminally victimised. In this text, we adopt a broader and more expansive understanding of the term victimisation such that humans, non-human species and environments can experience persecution, degradation and harm that constitutes victimisation. For a follow up discussion, see Chapter 3 ‘The Invisibility of Crimes of the Powerful’.

**War Crime** – a war crime has ‘official’ definitions. As criminologists, we ask questions about from where and whom do such definitions come. One such example is that adopted by the United Nations, which defines war crimes as violations of international humanitarian law. In Chapter 11, ‘State Crime’, a section on ‘War Crime’ considers the military arm of the state and its use of force in armed conflict and war.

**Militias and Insurgents** – small groups of non-state actors that are challenging the state. Other terms used to refer to militias and insurgents are rebels, guerrillas and terrorists. In

Chapter 12, the subtle distinctions between militias and insurgents are examined through case studies that tap into the particular power dynamics at work.

### **The Case Study Approach**

The case study is a unique, versatile, and we argue, necessary approach to studying and uncovering crimes of the powerful. This is because traditional sources of data around crime, such as police statistics and victims surveys, are not available or appropriate to this avenue of inquiry. In addition, research into powerful people and entities may not be research that would receive funding, so other more costly methods of research may not be possible. A case study—an in-depth use of a single incident to critically explore theoretical and conceptual frameworks—is therefore essential to bring to light the range of powerful offenders and invisible victims.

Case study designs have been used across a number of disciplines, but particularly in the social sciences (Schwandt and Gates 2018). Their use in social sciences has a long and varied history, with a growing reputation as an effective methodology to investigate and understand complex issues in real world settings. Case study research is a complex and far-reaching approach to doing criminological research and there is not one way to deliver it.

Case studies can be assembled utilising a range of methods and types of data collection (interviews, observations, focus groups, artefact and document review, questionnaires and/or surveys) and analysis (methods of analysis vary and depend on data collection methods and cases) to bring depth and breadth to the topic area under review. With a background in the emerging Chicago school of criminology, utilising a range of data,

methods of investigation and approaches to analysis and interpretation, sociological and criminological case study research usually focuses on a detailed case or cases. The case is the object of the case study, the entity of interest or unit of analysis. The case might be an initiative or programme, an individual, a group, a social situation, organization, event, phenomena or process. Sometimes the case or cases are deliberately selected as studies of deviant individuals, groups or *cause celebre* inspired through activist interest groups as part of the pressure to generate maximum impact for the cause. Other case studies might be very personal and sobering and based on oneself or the impact on communities. See for example Davies's (2011) case study of the impact of a child protection investigation and her more recent case study examination (2014) of the closure of an aluminium plant in the north-east of England serving to illustrate the contemporary tensions around social and environmental justices and victimisations. Case studies may focus on life changing experiences of individuals. For example, Alice Sebold, a victim of rape, laid out the core of her experience in *Lucky* (1999) and Susan Brison was a victim of rape and attempted murder. *Aftermath: violence and the remaking of the self* (2002) is the book in which Susan draws on her experience of rape and living through the consequences. She also invokes the testimonies of other survivors of violence, rape, genocide and the Holocaust.

Kathleen Daly (2018) has recently examined the use of case study methods in criminological research. By way of contextualisation, her discussion refers to three authors and their use of the case study method in education (Yazan 2015). The first, Yin, is an oft cited author of the case study with his text on this topic having moved into its sixth edition in 2018 (1984/2018). This approach to case study research is positivist; he recommends a well-

prepared design at the start of the research, which focuses on testing a theory or hypothesis. This deductive approach to case study research is well-suited for programme or policy evaluation. Daly goes on to explain that, by comparison, texts by Merriam (1998) and Stake (1995) view knowledge as constructed or interpreted rather than discovered. Thus, case study researchers have different assumptions about how best to study the social world and build knowledge. Nevertheless, despite variation in the approaches of the different exponents of a case study, there are characteristics common to most of them. Case study research is consistently and, as illustrated in this section, aptly described as a versatile form of qualitative inquiry most suitable for a comprehensive, holistic, and in-depth investigation of a complex issue (a phenomena, event, situation, organization, programme, individual or group) in context.

### *What is a case study?*

Above, we state what a case study is understood to be in the context of studying crime and power. A recent definition of a case study appears in a textbook on doing criminological research. In that text, such a study is described as an approach that uses in-depth investigation of a single ‘case’ or several ‘cases’. Data may derive from individuals, social activities, groups or organisations. (Davies and Francis 2018). An even shorter definition suggests a case study is ‘the detailed examination of a single example of a class of phenomena’ (Abercrombie et al 1984, p. 34). Abercrombie and colleagues (1984) propose that such studies are useful in the early stages of research to generate hypotheses and whilst such studies cannot provide reliable data that can be applied to the broader category or phenomena under study, they can be tested by gathering many more cases. The point

about reliability signals there are limitations. Flyvbjerg (2006) offers a detailed assessment of case studies arguing they have very particular strengths, whilst acknowledging that they do indeed have limitations. Before exploring what these are however, we have some further justifications for adopting the case study throughout the pages of this book. In this section, so far we have begun to stress that *context* is important to understanding the case in the study. A common feature to the case study method is studying the case/s in context, in its real life setting or natural environment. Contextual variables include political, economic, social, cultural, historical, and/or organisational factors. Let us now consider how these contextual factors are captured by the case study approach by further exploring the merits of the case study given that application of the case study method is a major feature of this book.

### *The case for the case study in criminological research*

Case study research ‘has gained a spotlight within social science’ (Yin 2018: xv). However, as Flyvbjerg (2011) has noted the case study has not always been held in high regard within the academy. Flyvbjerg uses this as a spur to counter the criticisms and misunderstandings about the case study method and to build the case for its wider use and acceptance. He commences his dismantling of the paradox of the case study method by confronting head on what counts as knowledge. General theoretical knowledge (context-independent theory) has been valued more than concrete practical knowledge (context-dependent) (Flyvbjerg (2006). Social science research may be considered less valuable because it has not generated context-independent theory. A context-independent theory would be a theory that explained a phenomenon regardless of the specific circumstances. This is true of

criminology as well. No single theory exists to explain all the causes of crime. There is not even a theory that is absolutely 100% accurate in a small number of cases. This should not be taken as a criticism or as a weakness of the social sciences or of criminology. The lack of context-independent theory is more a reflection that human behaviour is not bound by simple rules (Flyvbjerg 2006). We need research techniques that enable us to unpick reality in nuanced complex ways. The strength of social sciences and of the case study approach in criminological research is to develop concrete, context-dependent knowledge, which can strive to make sense of the nuance and the complexity. Flyvbjerg (2006, 2011) argues this is the very heart of becoming an expert. We are not saying that quantitative, rule-based or context-independent knowledge is not valuable (nor is Flyvbjerg), but that for research into areas such as those explored in this textbook the case study provides the best method.

We have already alluded to the problem that case studies cannot provide reliable data that can be applied to the broader category or phenomena under study (Abercrombie et al 1984). This speaks to the problem not only of reliability, but also generalisability. The lack of generalisability means that case studies alone do not contribute to scientific knowledge (Flyvberg 2006). Yet, it is possible to generalise in some instances from one example. More important perhaps is that the ability to generalise is over-valued and the knowledge of specific examples may be equally valuable (Flyvberg 2006, 2011). Furthermore, as we have also mentioned above, the case study is useful to generate hypotheses and to test hypotheses as well as perform other research functions such as comparative analysis and primary data collection.

Perhaps the biggest misunderstanding of case studies is that they are biased towards the researcher's preconceived beliefs about the topic under examination. Flyvberg (2006, 2011)

argues that there is no evidence that case studies are any more biased than other forms of research. In fact, they may be more prone to rejection of preconceptions rather than verification of them. Finally, case studies can be difficult to summarise. Flyvberg (2006) counters this too, arguing that summarising is not always warranted, but many phenomena should be captured in their entirety.

And so, to cement our case for the case study in criminological research, we briefly return to the useful chapter by Kathleen Daly (2018) that we drew on earlier. Within this chapter, Daly reminds us of some evocative examples of classic case studies including: Erving Goffman's *Asylums* (1961), which examined 'the inmate's situation' from different vantage points, Carol Stack's (1974) *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*—a case study of poor black families in a US Midwest city in late 1960s, and Stanley Cohen's (1972) *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*—a case study of the emergence and decline of the Mods and Rockers as a social phenomenon in 1960s England. Daly also provides a rich variety of examples of contemporary case studies on topics linked to crime, disorder and justice and readers are directed to this resource for further inspiration.

### *Our case studies*

As indicated, for our purposes, a case study is the study of a discrete harm or crime or group of harms or crimes. The harm or crime is usually large-scale in nature. This may be that it has caused a significant financial loss or resulted in a large number of victims. These victims may be consumers, employees and/or local residents. It is likely that the harm or crime may have some symbolic, political or popular effect. For instance, from the late 1950s through

the 1960s, the birth defects stemming from proscribing Thalidomide to pregnant women could be used as a case study; from the 1970s, the poor design of the Ford Pinto petrol tank; from the 1980s, the explosion of the Union Carbide factory in Bhopal, India; from the 1990s, the Rwandan genocide and from 2010, the Deepwater Horizon oil spill caused by British Petroleum in the Gulf of Mexico.

When compiling a case study, it is beyond just stating the facts of the chosen research area. Case study designs address a wide range of questions that ask why, what, and how of an issue allowing criminological researchers to explore, explain, describe, evaluate, and theorise about complex issues in context. It may be helpful to think of it as a social science reconstruction of events and processes (Flyvbjerg 2006) surrounding a particular harm/crime or group of harms/crimes. Within the reconstruction, the case studies presented within this textbook focus on the power dynamics between the ranges of actors who were involved. We analyse the relationships and structures that enable the harm or crime to take place as well as to remain hidden. As there is more often than not a lack of official data and statistics to support research into crimes of the powerful, often the information used is based on intimate accounts of witnesses, whistle blowers or journalists (thus, many of our sources are not from academia). The result is a detailed case history that enables the understanding of the process by which harms and crimes emerge, occur and are responded to and how power is critical to that process. The collective outcome of the case studies is that they lead to a critically informed in-depth understanding of behaviours, processes, practices, and relationships.

## The layout

The textbook has three sections. This introduction, Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 make up the first section that provides the rationale for the content and structure of the textbook as well as all of the background information that underpins the analyses in the remaining chapters. There are then Part 1 and Part 2, which explore individual and group power respectively. Each chapter explores case study or case examples and contains a reference list as well as suggestions for further reading. In addition, there are boxes and tables of highlighted information to make them easy to refer to. There are also summaries and study questions at the end of each chapter. An overview of these parts and the individual chapters are as follows.

This first substantive chapter – ‘What is Power and Who are the Powerful?’ begins to unpick the core theoretical and conceptual frameworks, which the book is based upon. It focuses on power and its relationships to crime, offending, criminalisation, crime control and the regulation and responses to crime, harm and offending. After reading Chapter 2, we want you to be able understand

- what power is (the ability to influence and/or control)
- who has power (individuals such as men, the upper class and so forth as well as corporations and other groups)
- where power is concentrated (behind closed doors, historically embedded in some groups, North vs South and so forth)
- why power is located in certain places (historical and institutional explanations) and;
- how power manifests (what crimes do the police focus on and record, and as further discussed in Chapter 3, what does the media cover and so forth).

Then in Chapter 3, ‘Invisibility’, we present one of the core theoretical underpinnings of our perspective on power. We explain that the enabling potential of power is expressed in the seven features of invisibility (Jupp *et al* 1999). These seven features make it possible for powerful individuals and groups to avoid detection, prosecution, punishment and accountability. In this chapter, first, we draw on this framework (Jupp *et al* 1999), which proposes that the relative absence of knowledge, statistics, research, theory, control, politics and panic (as compared with more traditional crime types and offenders) enables powerful entities to remain hidden. The broader role of the media is further examined in relation to the seventh feature alongside Cohen’s conceptualisation of moral panics. Second, invisible crimes can be categorised into typologies with similar characteristics (Davies *et al* 2014). These spatial typologies are: the body, home, street, environment, suite, state and virtual space. Together, these conceptualisations of the features of invisibility and spatial typologies provide a framework for the investigation of the range of crimes of the powerful in the individual chapters belonging to Part 1 and Part 2.

Reflecting our unique perspective on power being expressed by both individuals and groups, our textbook is broken down into two parts exploring specific examples of this. Part 1—‘Individual Characteristics and their Power Dynamics’—investigates the existence of power in interpersonal relationships. The personal characteristics of an individual can play a role in their offending and victimisation, and the visibility of both. The preamble to this part of the book also expands on the important sociological concept of intersectionality and the theoretical construct class-race-gender and the significance of these formulations in the context of criminology.

We discuss the following individual personal characteristics though there are others as well:

- class and status (Chapter 4),
- race and ethnicity (Chapter 5),
- religion and oppressive power (Chapter 6),
- gender (Chapter 7) and
- age (Chapter 8).

We investigate each of these characteristics in relation to power and the resulting crime and victimisation through theoretical and conceptual exploration as well as in-depth case study examination through contemporary examples.

In Part 2—‘The Power of Groups and the Doing of Crime’—we explore crime and victimisation that are not carried out by individuals upon other individuals, though, as we have mentioned, this is often the focus of conventional criminology. We argue that much crime—and a significant amount of it that is hidden—is perpetrated by four main groups and/or institutions that injure numerous people (though other groupings may be feasible, we propose these four categories account for the majority of hidden victimisations). As we explore, this is possible because of the power of these groups to remain outside of the law, to construct and influence what crime is, and to distract and deflect attempts to hold them accountable. Those that they victimise may be targeted for their individual characteristics, thus linking the intersectionalities of Part 1 to the discussion of victimisation in Part 2. The groups that we will investigate are:

- corporations (Chapter 9),
- organised crime (Chapter 10),
- the state (Chapter 11), and
- militias and insurgents (Chapter 12).

The final chapter is a summary of the key themes that underpin the case study examples and illustrations that we have explored in Chapters 4 through to 12. We summarise these in the context of power, the powerful and in connections with our ‘invisibility’ thesis as well as our newer conceptualisations surrounding spatial typologies of victimisation and harm (Davies *et al* 1999 and 2014). In concluding this text, we take a glimpse into the future and consider the terrain of the crimes of the powerful in the local, regional, national, international and global contexts of the 21<sup>st</sup> century world.

## References

- Abadinsky, H. (2007) *Organized Crime*, 8th edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Abercrombie, N., Hill, S. and Turner, B. (1984) *The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology*. London: Penguin.
- Beirne, P. and South, N. (eds) (2007) *Issues in Green Criminology*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Brison, S.J. (2002) *Aftermath: Violence and the Remaking of the Self*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bowling, B. (1990) ‘Conceptual and methodological problems in measuring ‘Race’ differences in delinquency’. *British Journal of Criminology*. 30, 4: 483-493.

Bowling, B. (1993) Racial harassment and the process of victimisation: conceptual and methodological implications for the local crime survey. *British Journal of Criminology*. 33, 1: 231-50.

Bowling, B. (1999) *Violent Racism: Victimisation, Policing and Social Context*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cohen, S. (1972) *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*. London: Granada Publishing Limited. Croall, H. (2001) *Understanding White-collar Crime*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Croall, H. (2007) Victims of White-Collar and Corporate Crime. In Davies, P., Francis, P. and Greer, C. (eds). *Victims, Crime and Society*. London: Sage.

Croall, H. (2011) *Crime and Society in Britain, Second edition*. London: Longman.

Daly, K. (2018) Using Case Study Methods in Criminological Research in Davies, P. and Francis, P (eds) *Doing Criminological Research* 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London: Sage. Pp 475 – 498.

Davies, P. (2011) 'The impact of a child protection investigation: A personal reflective account', *Child & Family Social Work*, 16:201-209.

Davies, P. (2014) 'Green crime and victimisation: Tensions between social and environmental justice, *Theoretical Criminology*. Vol.18(3) 300-316.

Davies, P. and Francis, P. (eds) (2018) *Doing Criminological Research*. Third edition. London: Sage.

Davies, P., Francis, P. and Jupp, V. (eds) (1999) *Invisible Crimes, Their Victims and Their Regulation*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.

Davies, P., Francis, P. and Wyatt, T. (eds) (2014) *Invisible Crimes and Social Harms*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dobash, R. E. and Dobash, R. P. (1979) *Violence Against Wives: A Case Against Patriarchy*. Shepton Mallet: Open Books.

- Dobash, R. P. and Dobash, R. E. (1998) *Rethinking Violence Against Women*. London: Sage.
- Dobash, R. P. and Dobash, R.E. (2008) Women's violence to men in intimate relationships: working on the puzzle. In Evans, K. and Jamieson, J. (eds). *Gender and Crime: A Reader*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Doig, A. (2010) *State Crime*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006) Five Misunderstandings about Case Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*. Volume 12, Number 2: 219-245.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2011) Case study. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp.301-316). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 341-358.
- Goffman, Erving (1961) *Asylums*. Garden City, New York: Anchor books.
- Green, P. and Ward, T. (2004) *State Crime: Governments, Violence and Corruption*. London: Pluto Press.
- Groves, N. and Thomas, T. (2013) *Domestic Violence and Criminal Justice*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, A. (2014) 'Honour Crimes. In Davies, P., Francis, P. and Wyatt, T. (ed). *Invisible Crime and Social Harms*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan: 81-101.
- Hall, M. (2015) Older People, Crime and Victimisation. in Davies, P., Francis, P. and Greer, C. *Victims, Crime and Society 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. London: Sage.
- Heidensohn, F. (2006) *Gender and Justice*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Heidensohn, F. and Silvestri, M. (2012) Gender and crime. In Maguire, M., Morgan, R. and Reiner, R. (eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology, 5th edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levi, M. (2014) Regulating Fraud Revisited. In Davies, P., Francis, P. and Wyatt, T. (ed). *Invisible Crime and Social Harms*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan: 221-243.

- Merriam, S. B. (1998) *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mooney, J. (2000) *Gender, Violence and the Social Order*. London: Macmillan.
- Muncie, J. (2014) *Youth & Crime 4<sup>th</sup> Edition*. London: Sage.
- Nelken, D. (2012) Chapter 21 White Collar and corporate Crime, in Maguire, M., Morgan, R. and Reiner, R. (eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology, 5th edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pearce, F. (1976) *Crimes of the Powerful*. London: Pluto Press.
- Pearce, F. and Tombs, S. (1998) *Toxic Capitalism: corporate crime and the chemical industry*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Rawlinson, P. (2009) 'Understanding Organised Crime', in Hale, C. Hayward, K. Wahidin, A. and Wincup, E. *Criminology Second Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 323-342.
- Ray, L. (2011) *Violence & Society*, London: Sage.
- Ray, L. and Smith, D. (2001) Racist offenders and the politics of 'hate crime'. *Law and Critique*. 12: 203-21.
- Ray, L. and Smith, D. (2004) Racist offending, policing and community conflict. *Sociology*. 38(4): 681-99.
- Ray, L., Smith, D. and Wastell, L. (2003) Understanding violent racism. In Stanko, B. (ed). *The Meanings of Violence*. London: Routledge.
- Ray, L., Smith, D. and Wastell, L. (2004) Shame, rage and violent racism. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44(3): 350-68.
- Rothe, D. (2009) *State Criminality: The Crime of All Crimes*. Lanham: Lexington Books.

- Schwandt, T. A. and Gates, E. F. (2018) Case Study Methodology. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed., pp.301-316). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sebold A. (1999) *Lucky*. New York: Scribner.
- Sen, P. (2005) 'Crimes of Honour', Value and meaning. In Welchman, L. and Hossain, S. (eds). *Honour: Crimes, Paradigms and Violence against Women*. London: Zed Books: 42-63.
- Short, D. (2016) *Redefining Genocide: settler colonialism, social death and ecocide*. London: Zed Books.
- Shover, N. (ed). (2001) *Crimes of privilege: readings in white-collar crime*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Siddiqui, H. (2005) There is no 'honour' in domestic violence, only shame! Women's struggles against "honour" crimes in the UK, in Welchman, L. and Hossain, S. (eds). *Honour: Crimes, Paradigms and Violence against Women*. London: Zed Books.
- Slapper, G. and Tombs, S. (1999) *Corporate Crime*. London: Longman Criminology Series.
- Smart, C. (1977) *Women, Crime and Criminology: A Feminist Critique*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Stack, C. (1974) *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. New York: Basic Books.
- Stake, R. E. (1995) *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Tombs, S. (2014) Health and Safety 'Crimes' in Britain: The Great Disappearing Act. In Davies, P., Francis, P. and Wyatt, T. (ed). *Invisible Crime and Social Harms*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan: 199-220.
- Tombs, S. and Whyte, D. (eds) (2003) *Unmasking the Crimes of the Powerful: scrutinizing states and corporations*. New York: Peter Lang.

- Tombs, S. and Whyte, D. (eds) (2007) *Safety Crimes*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Webster, C. (2007) *Understanding Race and Crime*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Webster, C. (2012) The discourse on 'race' in criminological theory. In Hall, S. and Winlow, S. (eds). *New Directions in Criminological Theory*. London: Routledge.
- White, R. (ed). (2009) *Environmental Crime: A Reader* Cullompton: Willan.
- White, R. (2008) *Crimes Against Nature: Environmental Criminology and Ecological Justice*. Cullompton: Willan.
- White. R. and Heckenberg, D. (2014) Green Criminology: An Introduction to the Study of Environmental Harm. London: Routledge.
- Yin, R. K. (1984/2018). *Case study research and Applications*: (1<sup>st</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> editions.) London: Sage.
- Yazan, B. (2015) 'Three approaches to case study methods in education: Yin, Merriam, and Stake', *The Qualitative Report* 20(2): 134-52.