

Global Criminology: A ‘news’ perspective for criminological inquiry?¹

John A. Winterdyk²

Abstract

Although the study of criminology and criminal justice in Pakistan have not received much attention over the years, this article presents a ‘new’ model of criminological and criminal justice inquiry that may offer some promise for enlivening the study of crime and criminal justice within a broader context that is more reflective of the complex world we live in today. By reviewing the evolution of the study of crime from a provincial to comparative and international perspective, it is suggested that academic criminology scholars in Pakistan (and elsewhere around the world) embrace a global criminology perspective in an effort to better understand, explain, describe, and predict crime trends not only within Pakistan but in relation to its role and place in the international community. Global criminology is offered as a new form of criminological inquiry.

Keywords: Global Criminology, International Criminology, Comparative Criminology, Pakistan Criminology

Introduction

Several years ago, one of Pakistan’s leading criminologists, Dr. Fasihuddin (2013) observed that as a subject area of study that criminology “doesn’t enjoy its deserved status in Pakistan” (p. 241). Fasihuddin attributed some of the apathy towards criminology and interest in the study of Pakistan’s criminal justice system to the countries colonial (i.e., British Raj) when, like India, Pakistan was under British rule. However, in 1947 when India gained independence the country was partitioned into India and Dominion of Pakistan (now the Islamic Republic of Pakistan).³ Ever since gaining its independence, Pakistan has struggled with various forms of social unrest and high crime rates. Even though violent crime declined slightly between 2011 and 2016, Pakistan’s overall crime rate still ranks the 10th highest in the world (World

¹This article is based on a contribution to a Festschrift for Prof. Hans-Jorg Albrecht (forthcoming), former Director of the Criminology Division of the Max Planck Institute in Freiburg, Germany.

²Department of Economics, Justice, and Policy Studies Mount Royal University Calgary, AB. CANADA T3E 6K6 jwinterdyk@mtroyal.ca

³The country of Bangladesh was also partitioned from India at the same time.

Bank, 2019).⁴In term of poverty rates, the World Bank (2019) ranked Pakistan the third worst country in the world with some 75.4% of people living on less than \$5.50 US/daily. Furthermore, in 2018, Pakistan was listed the 117th least corrupt nation out of 175 countries, according to the Corruption Perceptions Index reported by Transparency International – although improved considerably from its all time high in 2010 when Pakistan was listed 143rd (Transparency International, 2019).

Pakistan like most countries that undergoing transitional justice are typically characterized in a state of social, economic, and political flux (see, e.g., Murphy, 2017). Arguably, based on human rights and other international indicators, Pakistan is struggling to meet the 16th United Nations Sustainable Develop Goals (SDGs) of ‘peace, justice, and strong institutions.’ However, all is not doom and gloom. For example, Pakistan became the first country in the world to adopt SDGs (see Pakistan’s implementation..., 2019). This article offers a ‘new’ model by which those who strive to ensure that criminology and criminal justice (i.e., public safety, security, and stability) attain the disciplinary status they deserve. In so doing, the informed evidence that can be generated can be used to inform policy and move the country from a transitional justice status to a country that is more social, economically, and politically stable and secure.

As the founder of Canadian criminology in Montreal in 1960, Denis Szabo (1929-2018),⁵ once observed, the discipline and study of criminology is not only comparatively young, but criminology itself is also a ‘new profession’. Szabo further noted that the then-young field of study would need to demonstrate its scientific rigour for the discipline to be accepted within the social sciences. Szabo argued that criminology be sufficiently distinct from the more established disciplines (e.g., sociology, psychology, and law) having included courses on crime and criminality in their curriculums.

In 1918, the largely US-based sociologist Maurice Parmelee (1882-1969) published the first English-language textbook on criminology – aptly titled *Criminology*. Parmelee noted that criminology is “a hybrid science,” and hence, “many scientific methods can be applied in criminological research” (p. 4). Arguably, Parmelee’s book was ‘before its time’ because the textbook did not receive the same acclaim as Edwin Sutherland’s (1883-1950) book, also titled *Criminology*, published a few years later in 1924. The textbook was rewritten and re-released in 1934 under the title *Principles of*

⁴El Salvador has the highest *per capita* crime rate in the world while India had the 11th highest crime rate in the world (World Bank, 2019).

⁵For an overview of Szabo’s career and contribution to Canadian criminology, see Winterdyk (2017).

Criminology, however, and was co-authored by received wider acclaim. Despite its popularity, Sutherland's definition of criminology was much narrower and restrictive than Parmelee's. Of the eleven ensuing editions, the last seven were co-authored by the U.S. penologist and sociologist Donald R. Cressey (1955). They defined criminology as "the body of knowledge regarding crime as a social phenomenon" (p. 3).

Sutherland is widely acknowledged as the "father of American criminology", while Cressey (1919-1987) is considered the founder of the modern study of organized crime. His book *Theft of the Nation: The Structure and Operations of Organized Crime in America*, published in 1969, remains the most widely cited and perhaps also the most controversial scholarly book on organized crime."

However, the term criminology was coined in 1885 as *criminologia* by the Italian law professor Raffaele Garofalo (1851-1934), himself a former student of Cesare Lombroso (1835-1909). Meanwhile, in 1887, the French anthropologist Paul Topinard (1830-1911) was first to use the term in French -*criminologie* (Schafer, 1976). Over time, several different schools of thought endeavored to explain, understand, and predict crime, as well as to inform criminal justice policy. The two primary schools were the Classical School (generally associated with Cesare Beccaria) and the Positivist School (commonly associated with Cesare Lombroso) (see Winterdyk, 2020).

Within Germany, the history and evolution of criminology are equally as diverse. Landecker (1941) provides a thorough account of the development of criminology in Germany. Tracing its long and enduring influence within a legal context, Landecker details how such eminent German philosophers as Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) and Georg W.F. Hegel (1770-1831), among others, helped forge the purpose and meaning of punishment (i.e., imposed by an authority such as the state, involving some loss of freedom by the offender, considered a rational response to anti-social behaviour/crime and the notion of accountability). Meanwhile, Landecker also points out that from a psychological perspective, German-speaking scholars such as Sigmund Freud, Ernest Kretschmer, and Alfred Adler all helped to inform and forge the German identity of criminology. Arguably, German criminology was not only eclectic but both multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary in its evolution.

Nonetheless, it was the German sociologist Franz Exner who helped (rightly or wrongly) introduce the American sociological perspectives unfolding circa 1920-30s to German scholars (Landecker, 1941). However, as the former Indiana University School of Law professor Jerome Hall (1949) once pointed out, "criminology is

synonymous with the sociology of criminallaw” ...as its meaning is given by “the rules of law” (p. 559).

A review of these early works on criminology reflects what the venerated Canadian criminologist and founder of the School of Criminology at Simon Fraser University in British Columbia, Ezzat Fattahonce noted: that crime is both *relative* and *evolutive* (see Winterdyk, 2017). These principles are due, in large part, to the fact that the concept of crime is a social construct. As Fattah and others have made profoundly clear, what constitutes a crime is subject to the prevailing norms and values of society. For example, during my formative years, marijuana was illegal, and the punishment for possession, let alone trafficking, was severe. The prohibition of marijuana in Canada originated in 1908 with the *Opium Act*, an act partially motivated by racist attitudes towards Chinese immigrants associated with opium use at the time (Fearon, 2016). Regardless, after almost a century of controversy as to whether criminalizing it was socially, morally, or ethically right, Canada became the second nation to decriminalize cannabis in October of 2018, following the lead of Uruguay, which had legalized the sale and consumption of marijuana in December 2013.⁶

Comparative Criminology: Relative and Evolutive

Within the English context, the concept of comparative criminology can be traced to the work of German-born Gerhard Mueller (1926-2006)⁷ who, in addition to many other accomplishments,⁸ was a pioneer in comparative and international criminology (Bassiouni, 2006). Harry Dammer (2014) describes Mueller as the “father of international/comparative criminal justice.” However, somewhat ironically, there is a shortage of textbooks on comparative/international criminology.

Nonetheless, most of the comparative/international criminology textbooks that do exist have evolved into multiple editions. American scholars such as Dammer and Albanese (2014), Pakes (2015), and David Nelken (2010) have authored or edited some of the more notable and enduring comparative criminology/criminal justice

⁶It is perhaps ironic to note that as early as 1973, the LeDain Commission published a report “on the non-medical use of drugs and recommended decriminalizing cultivation and possession of marijuana for personal use. Instead, what followed was nearly thirty years of prohibition” (Fearon, 2016). Part of the Final Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the non-medical use of drugs (Gerald LeDain) is available at <https://archive.org/details/LeDainCommissionIntroTofCToPg62>

⁷ The International Section of the Academy of Criminal Justice Science (ACJS) has a long-standing (Mueller) award for a scholar who has demonstrated excellent and original work in the area of comparative and international criminal justice.

⁸ See <https://www.cairn.info/revue-internationale-de-droit-penal-2006-1-page-9.htm#>

books.⁹ Perhaps one of the more successful textbooks is one by Philip Reichel, who published his seventh edition in 2018: *Comparative criminal justice systems: A topical approach*. Another important comparative justice textbook, which went into its ninth edition in 2015 is Richard Terrill's *World Criminal justice systems: A comparative survey*. Although this is not an exhaustive list, a final textbook worth mention is *Comparative criminal justice systems: Global and local perspectives* by Shahid Shahidullah (2012), another American-based scholar, who in 2014 published *Comparative criminal justice systems: Global and local perspectives*.

Although most comparative criminology and criminal justice textbooks are quite recent (i.e., postmid-1990s), one of the first comparative criminology books was published in 1965. The book was written by one of the leading criminologists of his time, the British scholar Hermann Mannheim (1889-1974).¹⁰ Despite its richness, the book is difficult to source. However, by comparing sociological and legal perspectives, Mannheim helped lay the groundwork for the study of comparative criminology. Mannheim (1965) acknowledged that "our indebtedness to American criminology is immense and lasting, but non-American criminology possesses... [its] own criminological literature" (p. x).¹¹ Throughout the textbook, Mannheim makes a concerted effort to introduce European-based research and literature, thereby offering a comparative lens to the full range of topics covered. Meanwhile, another comparative textbook by Brunon Holyst, published in 1982, never received much attention or acclaim; yet, it represented another early foray into situating the subject of comparative criminology within the sphere of criminological inquiry. Finally, a somewhat nuanced comparative approach is found in an edited collection, *Comparative Criminology in Asia*, by Liu, Travers, and Chang (2017). The book has thirteen chapters over four main sections and begins with a fundamental question: "Why compare"? While considered substantial contributions to the criminological literature, none of these works have received much of a following among the criminological or criminal justice academic community.

⁹Nelken is a European-based scholar. For a more personal insight into the academic life of David Nelken, see Winterdyk and Cao (2004).

¹⁰Mannheim was also one of the co-founders of the *British Journal of Criminology* in 1960. As Mannheim describes in the Preface to his book, the genesis of the book was, in part, prompted by "a young girl student who" (upon visiting after class and seeing the extensive reading list for the course said) ... "I am quite willing to read a book on criminology, but it must be only one, in which I can find everything required" (p. ix).

¹¹The influence of American criminology is reflected in Mannheim's edited reader titled: *Pioneers in criminology*, 1973.

Even though all these comparative-oriented textbooks have considerable merit and are noteworthy contributions to the field, apart from Nelken's book, they tend to align themselves along conventional lines and are mainly descriptive. Furthermore, when they do provide discussion around crime rates, patterns and trends, they (almost by necessity) rely on official data, which raises questions-concern about reliability and validity for comparative assessment(s) (see Nelken, 2010). What is more, several of the books tend to be American centric, hence limiting or skewing the implications of some of the comparisons made (see, generally, Carrington, Hogg, and Sozzo, 2019). However, according to Field and Nelken (2007), the very essence of comparative study is to avoid provincialism and 'self-sealing cultural logics.' Yet, as James Robertson, a well-recognized American scholar of comparative criminal justice wrote in the Foreword to Shahidullah's 2012 book, "comparative criminal justice (criminology) initially received an indifferent reception in the United States" (p. ix). On measure, most of the material identified above can be divided into one of two categories. First are those books that tend toward a structural and procedural orientation (e.g., Pakes and Reichel) with the authors presenting a comparative overview of the justice system by reviewing how police, courts, and the correctional system might operate differently across countries. Using illustrative examples, the authors describe how the various criminal justice systems operate in their respective countries. Meanwhile, some of the books in the other category approach the comparative analysis differently, applying a 'template' to a series of different countries and describing their criminal justice system elements (e.g., Terrill and Rounds). Although none of these books offer analytical comparisons, they provide a rich overview and insight into the criminal justice system of the respective countries.

The lack of any reflective comparative analysis therein may be somewhat justified if one accepts the arguments put forward by Casey, Jenkins, and Dammer (2018) in the second edition of their book, *Policing the world: The practice of international and transnational policing*. Casey et al. suggest that given the challenges of engaging in comparisons (e.g., language barriers, different reporting and recording methods and styles, etc.), correlations can be methodologically significant on several levels. The fact remains, however, that crime is universal –with 'crime control' (i.e., crime prevention) being the fundamental objective of any criminal justice system, every country strives to ensure a sustainable sense of public safety. Additionally, every country seeks to create a healthier society through crime prevention and social justice systems. To achieve a sustainable community of security, it is paramount to engage in research that is not solely evidence-based but - to varying degrees -also

based on international comparative perspectives and at times even on international comparisons.

While we might think that comparative criminal justice and comparative criminology are relatively new ideas, the celebrated French sociologist Emile Durkheim (1858-1917)¹² wrote in 1895 that comparative sociology is not only *not* a branch of sociology, it is sociology itself! In fact, Durkheim reasoned there is no comparative method *per se* since any research method can be used to engage in comparisons of any issue - including those pertaining to crime or criminal justice. Similarly, given the influence of sociology on criminology (e.g., the “Chicago School of Criminology,” which used the macro-sociological theory of social organization to explain and understand crime, see Fine, 1995) and criminal justice, parallels can be drawn. Yet, criminology was slow to emerge as a recognized discipline¹³ exactly because it was not seen to be part of a sociology program or a law school program; it may have been accounted for in a few specific classes in a psychology program.

Still, the concept of criminology, let alone comparative perspective criminology, was nevertheless heavily influenced and informed by some of the pioneers of criminological inquiry. For example, while Franz von Liszt (1851-1919) is widely acknowledged as one of Germany’s leading legal and criminological scholars, it was the preponderance of his work on criminal law that influenced the direction and perspective that has dominated most ‘criminology’-oriented programs in Germany. On this point, Liszt’s *Textbook of German Criminal Law* reached the lofty status of twenty editions by 1919! Very few criminology or criminal justice textbooks can lay claim to such longevity.¹⁴

The point of my descriptive overview is to illustrate that while we know the meaning and focus of criminal justice and criminology has evolved; its meaning and context is

¹² Durkheim is widely acknowledged as the founder of the French school of sociology, although his counterpart, the French philosopher Auguste Comte (1798-1857) is credited as the founder of sociology and of positivism (i.e., knowledge is based on observable and measurable ‘facts’).

¹³For example, Canada’s first criminology program was not established until 1970 at the University of de Montréal, in Québec, Canada and Washington State University in Pullman, Washington, is credited with establishing the oldest criminal justice department in the United States. The department was established in 1943 by V.A. Leonard and was named the Department of Police Science. Then in 1982 and 2011 respectively, it became the Department of Criminal Justice, and in 2011, the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology (Washington State University, 2019).

¹⁴For example, Jeffrey Reiman and Paul Leighton’s semi-classic book *The rich get richer, and the poor get prison* ‘only’ went into its 11th edition in 2016. Meanwhile, Sue Titus Reid’s almost iconic introductory textbook *Crime and Criminology* went into its 15th edition in 2018.

somewhat relative to geographical location and disciplinary orientation(s). Therefore, it should come as no surprise that the nomenclature used has been and continues to remain inconsistent. However, academicians are increasingly recognizing that the terminology used to reflect the rapid changes happening within respective fields might not be keeping pace with the growing complexity and nuances of globalization.

Before I venture into a call for *global criminology* to become part of mainstream criminological inquiry, I will use this opportunity to enliven my proposition briefly by commenting on another ideological perspective that has potentially limited any wholehearted movement towards an embrace of global criminology as a viable alternative for describing the evolving nature of criminological inquiry. I am referring specifically to a confluence of the terms *interdisciplinary criminology*, *multi-disciplinary criminology*, and the occasional use of *trans disciplinary criminology*.

‘Trying to find the right terminology’

A survey of criminology and criminal justice journals since the early 1960s will reveal that an increasing number are using the term *comparative* or *international* and *interdisciplinary* somewhat interchangeably. Of course, this recalls Durkheim’s point that comparative sociology IS sociology and not simply a unique or specific branch. Regardless, as Hall (1933) observed over eighty years ago, although there is a considerable body of literature on the topics of criminology, comparative criminology, and international criminology, the discipline is still fraught with semiotic challenges. This is because the terminology used in criminology is not as exact as the terminology used in the formal and natural sciences. While precision alone is not obligatory, a degree of consistency in the use of terminology is required, and there is a need for a more standardized language reflective of the informed evidence (i.e., research) and not the personal goal of criminology – the desire to control crime.¹⁵ For example, while Winterdyk and Cao (2004) focused on some of the pioneers in comparative and international criminology/criminal justice, they also conflated them when they state: “it is never too late to embrace or expand ones’ provincial interests into a broader **global** (emphasis added) context” (p. 4).

As sometimes happens, with time, the term ‘comparative’ failed to attract much attention and was consigned to an ancillary position (Larsen and Smandych, 2008).

¹⁵A long-standing debate about how to resolve the ambiguity concerning the terminology used in criminology is to pair it with law. Interesting, many of the continental countries of Europe offer criminology in their law programs, thus ensuring that the administration informs the study of crime in criminal law. By contrast, most other countries; in particular, North America criminology is separated from law and resulting in the establishment of numerous perspectives by which to inform our understanding of crime. However, it is this very axiom that confuses the terminology used.

However, during the 1960s, interest in comparative criminology and criminal justice gained traction among a growing number of academic scholars. Support for comparative inquiry (re)emerged in the 1960s with such noteworthy journals as the *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, and *International Comparative Jurisprudence*, among many other. However, while this terminology continues to dominate most of the discourse where international comparisons are made, the term today is limiting as it implies that criminological or criminal justice issues are ideologically and conceptually different in different countries around the world. Overall, as Jenks and Fuller (2017) and others suggest, traditional comparative approaches are limiting in this era of globalization. What is needed, they argue, is new terminology that is more reflective of the social, cultural, political, and economic changes in the world and how they relate to criminology and criminal justice. As will be discussed in the next section, what is needed is the concept of ‘global criminology’, but I will first offer some commentary on another long-standing term that has dominated criminological discourse: ‘international criminology.’

International Criminology: The old and the new

According to Varona and de La Cuesta (2019), international criminology 'can be described as the set of activities related to crime prevention and control, coming from the academia, public and private institutions and agencies, to join efforts to debate and publish and make policies, addressed to a global audience beyond a single country' (p. 1). The authors note the process of internationalism began in the early 19th century through various important congresses and meetings, mostly in Europe. The International Society of Criminology (ISC), for example, was established in Rome on July 16, 1937, and its co-founders included Agostino Gemelli and Arturo Rocco.¹⁶ As time passed and certain crimes became more global or international, the concept of international criminology became more pliable and dynamic. For example, Varona and La Cuesta observed that “international crimes (e.g., genocide, crimes against humanity, crimes of war and, to a lesser extent, aggression as crime against peace), and transnational crimes (e.g., corruption, financial crime, terrorism, organized crime, and its different modalities of illegal trafficking, cyber-attacks, and crimes against the environment)... are the subject matter of international criminology” (p. 29).

¹⁶The ISC held its 19th World Congress in Doha, Qatar, in October 2019 and celebrated the organization’s 80th anniversary.

Varona and de La Cuesta go on to point out that there are two distinct trends within this perspective. One trend is “how to balance the cultural differences among all the countries and the myriad of interests involved in the construction of an international criminology” (p. 1). Arguably, one could add social, economic, and political differences as well since they help to define and describe ‘what is’ as opposed to ‘what ought to be.’ However, this then seems to beg the question, ‘who says what ought to be?’

Secondly, Varona and LaCuesta argue that international criminology attempts to contend with “the increasingly diffuse borders between police, intelligence agencies, and military forces; crime control and war; or internal and external security” (p.1). However, they go on to point out that an international criminology remains a relevant form of criminological inquiry even when limited to describing criminological or criminal justice events and activities (e.g., crime prevention, crime control, and the administration of justice, as well as to inform policy), but such topics as 'war and economic abuse of power across borders have been quite forgotten' (p. 2). Hence, with the increase of such global threats, there is a need for a globalization of justice that can be best addressed by embracing a global criminology framework.

In the latest edition of their book *Policing the World*, Casey, Jenkins and Dammer (2018) discuss how policing has dramatically changed, in the eight years following the first edition (2010) of *Policing the World*, to have become more concerned and involved with international and transnational crimes since the first publication of their book. In their Introduction to this latter, the authors point out that “human institutions are ever-globalizing” (p. xv). Yet, almost ironically, in their second edition, the authors point out that the book focuses on “the globalization of policing and not the globalization of crime” (p. 6). Although the book is international in scope, the book embraces a comparative framework as it by highlighting the policing systems of three countries: Belize, Norway, and Uganda. However, about in relation to the concept of internationalism, the book remains mostly descriptive and normative.

Finally, Casey et al. (2018) conclude their Introduction by declaring they have used “the twin terms of international and transnational purposely to avoid these definitional debates” (p. xxii). This is a trend found in several other comparative-international scholarly works (e.g., Reichel and Albanese, 2014), which further reinforce the observation made several decades earlier by Jerome Hall (1933) about the (unintentional) confusion of terminology used to describe criminological research that transcends a local or national focus.

Just as with the term ‘comparative criminology,’ an abundance of journals use ‘international’ in their journal titles, such as, among other, the *International Criminal Justice Review*, the *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, the *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, and the *International Review of Victimology*. Similarly, there is no shortage of textbooks and reference works that include ‘International’ in their titles: *Routledge Handbook of International Criminology*, *International Criminology: A Critical Introduction*, *International Crime and Justice*, and *Routledge International Handbook of Sexual Homicide Studies*, *Routledge International Handbook of Human Trafficking*, *The Palgrave International Handbook of Human Trafficking*, among a growing list of others.

One can hardly deny the fact that crime has evolved and expanded to become increasingly more transnational and international (see, for example, van Dijk, 2008). Likewise, we have also been witness to the proliferation not only of international law enforcement agencies (e.g., Europol, Interpol, UNPol, etc.) but also international judicial bodies (e.g., the ICTY, ICTR, the Special Court for Sierra Leone, the Special Tribunal for Lebanon, and the ICC, to name but several of the key ones). Finally, there are also several specialized international prison facilities, such as the U.S.-held military prison at Cuba’s Guantanamo Bay and a growing number of (illegal) migration detention facilities around the world (see <https://www.globaldetentionproject.org>).

Clearly, not only is the discipline of criminology evolving, but also the language used to describe crime and the different cooperative, collaborative, or joint processes being employed to address its growing complexity is also changing. To date, as described above, we have tended to rely on the conventional terms of international and transnational when examining crime or criminal justice systems (or sub-components of the system). However, as has been well documented by most comparative/international/transnational scholars, traditional comparisons must also contend with several other practical challenges, including the following:

- Varying definitions of crime between countries.
- language barriers. Although an obvious limitation and challenge, it is a real concern when trying to ensure accurate international comparisons. Unless multilingual partnerships are formed or unless the researcher is multilingual, the research is – by default - limited in scope. In a recent study by Sharapov (2019), his survey had to be translated into six different languages, and, he has acknowledged in personal communications that this presented several fundamental methodological challenges.

- Reliability in the collection and measurement of crime. Not only do the detection and recording practices of crime vary between countries, but - depending on the available resources, definitions and ideological barriers, reporting and recording methods, and administrative variations - comparative studies too can be confronted with practical challenges (see, for example, Marmo and Chazal, 2016; Nelken, 2010).
- Expert fallibility. When engaging in criminological or criminal justice research outside of one's own country, you often must contend with the varying quality of work and reliability of research by foreign scholars. As the distinguished British scholar David Farrington (2004) once warned, "for those who are contemplating comparative cross-national studies... choose your collaborators carefully" (p. 102).
- The general limitation of the methodology itself. Although scholars like Richard Bennett (2004) have developed several types of international and comparative research methodologies that are in use, there are no standardized methods in the extant literature, thereby limiting the reliability and generalizability of each one's findings.

Finally, in examining the controversy and confusion surrounding the terminology used to describe non-traditional criminological inquiry, Bayley (1996) argued that comparative criminology is a misnomer because the term comparative "has been made synonymous in academic circles with 'foreign'" (p. 241). Meanwhile, Friday (1996) proposed that the term comparative could carry a pejorative connotation and value judgement, as reflected above in the discussion of some of the leading comparative textbooks. Consequently, both Bayley and Friday preferred to use the word international, which arguably implies that if one finds a difference at the international level, then there is a difference! An interesting 'compromise' to the relative merit of using the term 'international' or 'comparative' was given by the title of the now-defunct journal, *International Journal of Comparative Criminology*.

In the next section, we will shift the focus to globalization and crime. Besides, although not without its limitations, it will be suggested that in addition to a need to refine the terminology we use in criminology, there is a clear justification for 'global criminology' to become part of the criminological lexicon.

Globalization and Crime¹⁷

The term globalization,¹⁸ used to describe the rapid social and cultural changes in our contemporary world, has become omnipresent. The term has become synonymous with the process as much as what it represented (Jeffery, 2002); however, it has also tracked polarized opinions. Those in the anti-globalization movement - such as environmentalists, anarchists, unionists, the hard left, and those campaigning for equitable development in poorer countries - tend to view the globalization movement as a mechanism by which wealthier countries exploit weaker nations. Their solution to the perceived negative consequences of globalization is to dismantle it. Conversely, those who support the spread of globalization do so on the basis that it promotes the notion of free markets and free trade into the developing world. This, in turn, is seen to be the best way to address poverty (i.e., the first Sustainable Developmental Goal of the UN). According to data provided by the World Bank, the number of people living in extreme poverty has been declining since the late 1990s (World Bank, 2016). Whether this can be attributed to globalization is uncertain, but it may well be contributing to the trend.

Globalization has also impacted criminology in that while international and comparative textbooks and articles still dominate the national or continental approaches, the focus of global criminology as a field of inquiry is to look at crime and criminal justice issues that are not only foreign in their scope, but also include multiple legal jurisdictions. The spirit of global criminology should be to offer a worldly perspective. However, a review of the literature reveals that - as with international, comparative, and transnational crime - global criminology lacks a clear and universal definition. Given the social and cultural changes that have been attributed to the effects of globalization, there is a need for a refined interpretation of the term so that it can become a mainstay perspective by which to examine global and transnational crime.

The call for a global criminology perspective is not new. In the late 1960s, the renowned American scholar Leonard Joseph Hippchen (1978) suggested we adopt the term “world criminology” in order to capture the growing spirit of interest in

¹⁷Although this chapter limits its focus to the effects of globalization, several other competing theories have been created to explain comparative criminal justice models and comparative criminological issues. They include the modernization theory, civilization theory, and world-system theory (see Shahidullah, 2014) for further clarification.

¹⁸Although most might think that globalization is a relatively new term, it was first coined in the 1930s and popularized by former Harvard Business School professor Theodore Levitt in 1983 (Levitt, 1983).

comparative criminology. Hippchen indicated that the nuanced social and political influences as well as the impact of globalization behooved criminology and criminal justice to “discover and develop new approaches of inquiry” (p. 95). Although a subjective assessment, it is unfortunate that the terminology was never widely embraced. However, around the same time, the term ‘comparative criminal justice’ started to gain more traction with the emergence of several international and comparative journals (see above). Given the relative newness of criminology as an independent discipline and our understanding of the complexity of crime and criminal justice systems, the notion of a world criminology was arguably constrained by the fact that most of the extant literature and theories of crime were profoundly influenced by American viewpoints and American scholars. An observation by the esteemed American scholar Piers Beirne would appear to support this assertion. In the Foreword to a book edited by Larsen and Smandych (2007), Beirne commented on the need for a global criminology outlook and pointed out that the way comparative research was being conducted could be characterized as America “trying to sell their findings” and promote their ideas.

However, with the passage of time and a growing body of discourse and research around the evolving nature of crime (e.g., conventional, non-conventional, transnational, & global), global criminology has the potential to offer a transnational examination of both deviance and social control around the world (Jenks and Fuller, 2017). Borrowing from the ideas of the American physicist and philosopher Thomas Kuhn (1962), the discipline is clearly ready, if not overdue, for a ‘paradigm shift’.

Global Crime – transnational context

As already discussed, the evolving nature of crime has fostered the emergence and recognition of what is sometimes referred to as ‘global crime’. The term global crime appears to have evolved from the broader term ‘transnational organized crimes’ (see Nelken, 2010). The terminology originated in the mid-1970s when the United Nations used the term to identify certain criminal activities that transcend national jurisdictions (Peace Palace Library, 2019). Then in 1995, the UN recognized 18 different types of transnational crime and, independently of the UN initiatives, established the journal *Transnational organized crime*, which kept its name from 1995 until 2004 when it was changed to *Global Crime*. The journal publishes four issues per year, but each issue tends to have fewer than five articles and has an impact ranking of 1.18 in 2018.

As Jenks and Fuller (2017) point out, the concept of global crime recognizes that crime is varied in its expression and that its various expressions (i.e., extent and

nature) are influenced by geography, political systems, varying levels of economic development, as well as climate and culture among other factors. Because of the myriad of variables, Jenks and Fuller suggest it may be “difficult to compare across borders” (p. xvii). Similarly, Jaishankar and Ronel (2013) note that global crime is “an emerging field covering international and transnational crimes that have not traditionally been the focus of mainstream criminology or criminal justice.” Such crimes have also been referred to as 'non-conventional' crimes since they typify crimes that at some point in history had either not yet been recognized or did not exist. Such crimes include, among others, cybercrime and terrorism. Yet, Giddens (1990), among other scholars in the early 1990s, began to discuss how 'globalization' (i.e., referring to the growing interconnectedness of social life and social relationships throughout the world) helped to draw attention to the fact that the increasing interdependence of countries, cultures, and societies created a fertile ground for what is now commonly referred to as 'global crime'. In the late 1990s, Castells (1998) identified four primary forms of global crime. They included:

1. The drugs trade
2. People trafficking
3. Cyber crimes
4. International terrorism

However, as we try to grapple with the ever-expanding nature and diversity of crime (see van Dijk, 2008; Jenks and Fuller, 2017; Reichel and Albanese, 2014), we have increasingly recognized that although most criminal justice systems still focus on conventional-type crimes, the growing awareness and significance that transnational-global crime has on global economy, politics, and public safety has rightfully garnered both national and international attention. For example, illegal drug trade and people trafficking are among the top three most profitable crimes in the world. Meanwhile, cybercrime is rapidly (see Grabosky, 2016) growing as well and given the power of technology is increasingly becoming a means by which many other types of crime are being committed, such as identity theft, fraud, recruitment of people for the purposes of radicalization or trafficking, smuggling, trafficking in counterfeit goods, and transnational environmental crimes.

While criminology and criminal justice scholars are increasingly embracing comparative criminology as a subject area worthy of research and instruction, ironically, most graduate and undergraduate criminology programs only offer these courses as electives - if they even offer such courses - as opposed to being required courses. Furthermore, comparatively few schools specialize in comparative

criminology or comparative criminal justice programs, one of the oldest such programs being the International Centre for Comparative Criminology (ICCC) at the Université de Montréal in Québec, Canada. Meanwhile, Bangor University in northern Wales offers an MA and post-graduate courses in comparative criminology and criminal justice, while the University of London offers an MA in comparative criminal justice policy. In addition to there being but a smattering of such programs around the world, comparatively, there is also a dearth of comparative textbooks, let alone global crime textbooks, to help fill the void and growing appetite for this sub-field of criminology and/or criminal justice and thus risking further entrenching the noted terminology ill.

Global criminology: Is it the way forward?

Although the movement towards a global criminology may be slow to evolve, we can find several examples that suggest that the paradigm shift or an expansion of the ‘criminological imagination’ as Barton et al. (2006) calls for, is (finally) happening in criminology. For example, Utrecht University in the Netherlands offers a Master’s in global criminology. The curriculum includes, among other, critical reflections on criminology; cultural criminology; human trafficking; mobility; migration and organized crime; and research and thesis trajectory in global criminology. The program has a healthy cohort of instructors and an international group of students. Another European university that offers studies in global criminology is the University of Copenhagen in Denmark. The university has a Centre for Global Criminology. In addition to providing an array of transnational crime courses (e.g., genocide, human trafficking, state crimes, and crimes of the powerful), it has a focus on green criminology – one of the relatively new and emerging global crime concerns.

Then, in addition to several of the global criminology books that have been referenced in this chapter, there is the newly launched *Global Journal for Criminological and Criminal Justice Research*. Though at the time of preparation of this chapter, the publication had not yet published its first issue, the title of the journal is suggestive of the growing awareness and implication of globalization. While international and comparative criminological research has been with us since the early-mid 1980s, these fields are no longer able to accommodate or address the growing, and dramatic, shift towards the substantial changes in the world(’s) crime – see above.

Globalization and the proliferation of transnational crime have blurred the former distinct boundaries that limited criminological enquiry to local, regional, and to some extent, comparative and international research. Furthermore, there is growing discourse among various scholars, especially outside of the northern hemisphere and western world, calling for a paradigm shift in how we view, study, and research crime. For example, Liu (2018) has somewhat convincingly argued and demonstrated through research that the dominant western perspectives used to explain, understand, and predict crime do not work well within an Asian context. Similarly, Carrington et al. (2016) not only offer a similar assessment but also promote what they refer to as southern criminology, which they claim might be useful in contributing to informed responses to global justice and security. Finally, former Stockholm Prize in Criminology winner (2012) and former President of the World Society of Victimology (1997-2000), Jan Van Dijk (2008) suggests that global criminology and criminal justice “is not only a priority for developmental reasons. It is, of course, also dictated by the increasingly global nature of conventional and emerging security threats” (p. 318). With the world at risk of victimization by the growing prevalence of transnational crime, these threats need to be addressed not by the conventional means we have relied on for centuries, but by embracing a global perspective. For example, it is commonly said that the 'rule of law' is the cornerstone for any civilized and safe state. However, with the spread of globalization and the blurring of borders, it raises serious concern about our capacity to ensure the conventional rule of law's ability to address global crime. Nonetheless, global criminology is an approach that allows us to examine the fundamental contradictions between globalization and national sovereignty (Jenks and Fuller, 2017). In doing so, it creates international and transnational criminal justice processes (see Warren and Palmer, 2015). Furthermore, as Mannheim (1965) pointed out, being a non-legal discipline, criminology warrants a global approach while the study of criminal law is still largely “parochial in its outlook” (p. 21).

Conclusion

In this article, I began by pointing that academic scholars in Pakistan have noted that criminology and criminal justice do not have the status that when compared to the attention that the subject areas receive in other parts of the world. It was observed that in terms of public safety and security that although Pakistan has improved in several areas, that overall it remains a country with considerable crime and safety issues. The country was described as a state that is still experiencing

transitional justice and in terms of the 16th United Nations goal “peace and justice, strong institutions”, despite its commitment and initial efforts, Pakistan still has room for improvement.

The balance of the article attempted to provide a justification for (all) criminologists to recognize global criminology as an essential perspective within the discipline. As an emerging field of inquiry, global criminology remains on the fringe of most criminology and criminal justice programs. I advocated that the concept of crime and the social context in which crime currently expresses itself has transcended the more convention approaches of comparative and international criminology. Not that these perspectives do not still have value, because they do have a dynamic role to play. However, given the impact of globalization and the rapid growth and diversification of international and transnational crime, a new ‘paradigm’ should play a more significant role in the sphere of criminological inquiry. Hence, global criminology can no longer be a fringe sub-category or be a “luxury for those who have achieved sufficient status to enable them to travel or as a perk...for some other activity” (Adler, 2011, p. xxix).

Hence, a call for greater recognition of global criminology was framed within the context that most formal/conventional initiatives for dealing with international and transnational crime involve attempts to forge co-operation between established sovereign justice institutions in different nations. Furthermore, the prosecution of foreign nationals¹⁹ reveals the human impacts of this complex and legally technical structure. As Jones (2012), among others, points out, these prosecutions expose those accused to unaccustomed police investigative procedures, legal processes and possibly unfair punitive forms of punishment. Therefore, since global criminology discusses the relationship between the ICC and domestic justice in dealing with dire types of atrocity crimes, it is a more pragmatic and logistical perspective by which to explain, describe, understand, and ultimately inform relevant policy.

Finally, the debate of whether global criminology can or will become a mainstay perspective in criminology remains to be seen. Part of the challenge will be whether we can operationalize the different modes of inquiry that currently populate the discipline. It is not only essential to be more precise in what we mean by international, comparative, transformative criminology but to also understand how they are not as comprehensive in their approach as global criminology and they are less adapt at accounting for the effects of globalization on crime. Global criminology

¹⁹For further details about the relative impact of the International Criminal Court (ICC) see the *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, available at https://academic.oup.com/jicj/pages/special_issues . For a controversial assessment of the ICC see Jones (2012).

has the potential to not only understand and explain global and transnational crimes, but to ultimately inform effective policy that will reduce crime - be it local, regional, national, or transnational. To this point, reputable scholars such as John Muncie (2005) have called for the globalization of crime control, while other well-recognized scholars such as Adler, Mueller, Laufer, and Grekel (2008) have also encouraged us to be more globally minded.

In closing, I would like to paraphrase the venerated American criminologist and founding 'father' of CPTED (crime prevention through environmental design), Clarence Ray Jeffery (1921 – 2007): the Classical School said, "reform the law" while the Positivist School said, "reform the man." Global criminology might say, "reform the global community."

References

- Adler, F.* (2011): Foreword. In C.J. Smith, S.X. Zhang, & R. Barberat (eds.). *Routledge Handbook of International Criminology*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Adler, F., Mueller, G.O., Laufer, W., & Grekel, J.* (2008): Canadian Edition: *Criminology*. Toronto, ON: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.
- Barton, A., Corteen, K., Scott, D., & Whyte, D.* (2006): *Expanding the Criminological Imagination*. London: Cullompton Willan.
- Bassiouni, M.C.* (2006): In memoriam. Gerhard O.W. Muller March 15, 1926 – April 21, 2006. *Revue Internationale de Droit Penal*, 1-2(77): 9-10.
- Bayley, D.H.* (1996): Policing: The world stage. *J. of Criminal Justice Education*, 7: 241-251.
- Carrington, K., Hogg, R. & Sozzo, M.* (2016): Southern criminology. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 56(1): 1–20.
- Casey, J., Jenkins, M., & Dammer, H.* (2018): *Policing the World: The Practice of International and Transnational Policing* (2nd ed.). Carolina Academic Press.
- Castells, M.* (1998): The global criminal economy. In E. McLaughlin, J. Muncie, & G. Huges (Eds.), *Criminological perspective: Key readings*. London, UK: SAGE Pub.
- Dammer, H. & Albanese, J.* (2014): *Comparative criminal justice systems* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Cengage Learning.
- Durkheim, E.* [1895] (1982): *The rules of sociological method: and selected texts on sociology and its method*. London: Macmillan Education.

- Farrington, D.* (2004): Reflections on a cross-national criminological career. In J. Winterdyk and L. Cao (eds.), *Lesson from international/comparative criminology/criminal justice*. Willowdale, ON.: deSitter Pub.
- Fasihuddin* (2013): *Criminology and Criminal Justice System in Pakistan*. In: Liu J., Heberton B., Jou S. (eds) *Handbook of Asian Criminology*. Springer, New York, NY. Pp.: 247-281.
- Fearon, J.* (2016, August 16): Reasonable doubt: the history of marijuana law in Canada. Now. Retrieved from <https://nowtoronto.com/news/history-of-marijuana-law-in-canada-from-opium-dens-to-shoppe/>
- Field, S. & Nelken, D.* (2007): 'Early intervention and the cultures of youth justice: a comparison of Italy and Wales', in V. Gessner and D. Nelkens (eds.), *European Ways of Law*. Oxford: Hart Pub. pp. 349-74.
- Fine, G.A.* (1995): *A Second Chicago School? The Development of a Postwar American sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Friday, P.* (1996): The need to integrate comparative and international criminology into the traditional curriculum. *J. of Criminal Justice Education*, 7: 227-239.
- Giddens A.*(1990): *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford University Press: Stanford, CT.
- Grabosky, P.* (2016): *Cybercrime*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, J.* (1933): "Some basic problems in criminology." Articles by Maurer Faculty, Paper 1467. Retrieved from www.repository.law.indiana.edu/facpub/1467
- Hall, J.* (1947): *General principles of criminal law*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co.
- Hippchen, L. J.* (1978): Some Assumptions and Objectives for a World Criminology *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 2(2): 95-105.
- Holyst, B.* (1982): *Comparative criminology*. New York, NY: Lexington Books.
- Jaishankar, K. & Ronel, N.* (2013): *Global Criminology: Crime and Victimization in a Globalized Era*. Boca Raton, FL, United States.
- Jeffery, S.* (2002, Oct. 31): What is globalization? *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/oct/31/globalisation.simonjeffery>
- Jenks, D.A. & Fuller, J.R.* (2017): *Global crime and justice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Landecker, W.S.* (1941, Winter): *Criminology in Germany*. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 31(5): 552-575.
- Larsen, N. & Smandych, R.* (eds.). (2008): *Global criminology and criminal justice: Current issues and perspectives*. Peterborough, ON., Canada: Broadview Press.

- Levitt, T.* (1983): The globalization of markets. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/1983/05/the-globalization-of-markets>
- Liu, J., Travers, M., & Chang, Y.C.L.* (eds.). (2017): *Comparative criminology in Asia*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Marko, M. & Chazal, N.* (2016): *Transnational crime & criminal justice*. London, UK: SAGE Pub.
- Muncie, J.* (2005): *Criminology* (3 volume set). London, UK: SAGE Pub.
- Murphy, C.* (2017). *The Conceptual Foundations of Transitional Justice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Nelken, D.* (2010): *Comparative criminal justice*. London, UK: SAGE Pub.
- Pakes, F.* (2015): *Comparative criminal justice* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pakistan's Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Voluntary National Review.* (2019). Retrieved from https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/233812019_06_15_VNR_2019_Pakistan_latest_version.pdf
- Peace Palace Library.* (2019): *Transnational crime introduction*. The Hague, NL: The Peace Palace. Retrieved from <https://www.peacepalacelibrary.nl/research-guides/international-criminal-law/transnational-crime/>
- Reichel, P. & Albanese, J.* (2014): *Transnational crime and justice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Pub.
- Schafer, S.* (1976): *Introduction to criminology*. Reston, VA: Reston Pub. Co.
- Shahidullah, S.M.* (2012): *Comparative criminal justice systems: Global and local perspectives*. Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- Sharapov, K.* (2019): 'Public Understanding of Trafficking in Human Beings in Great Britain, Hungary and Ukraine', *Anti-Trafficking Review*, 13: 30-49.
- Sutherland, E.H. & Cressey, D.R.* (1955): *Principles of criminology* (5th ed.). New York, NY: J.B. Lippincott Co.
- Szabo, D.* (1962-1963): *Criminology and criminologist: A new discipline and a new profession*. *Canadian J. of Corrections*, 17(1): 13-22.
- Transparency International.* (2019). Retrieved from https://www.transparency.org/news/feature/corruption_perceptions_index_2019
- Van Dijk, J.* (2008): *The world of crime: Breaking the silence on problems of security, justice, and developments across the world*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Pub.
- Varona, G. & de la Cuesta, J.L.* (2019): *International Criminology: Concept, History, Developments, and Institutions*. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*. Cambridge, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Warren, I. & Palmer, D.* (2015): *Global criminology*. Australia, Law Book Co.: Thomson Reuters.
- Washington State University.* (2019): Retrieved from <https://crmj.wsu.edu/about-us/>
- Winterdyk, J.* (2020): *Canadian criminology* (4th ed.). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Winterdyk, J.* (2017): *Pioneers in Canadian Criminology*. Oakville, ON: Rock's Mills Press. (Ch. 2).
- Winterdyk, J. Reichel, P., and Dammer, H. (eds.).* (2009): *A guided reader to research in comparative criminology/criminal justice*. Bochum, Germany: Universitätsverlag Brockmeyer.
- Winterdyk, J. & Cao, L. (eds.).* (2004): *Lessons from international/comparative criminology/criminal justice*. Willowdale, ON.: deSitter Pub. Ch. 9.
- World Bank.* (2016 January 13): "Principles and Practice in Measuring Global Poverty." The World Bank. Washington, DC.: World Bank.
- World Bank.* (2019, December 08). Retrieved from <http://datatopics.worldbank.org/world-development-indicators/>