DE JURE NEXUS LAW JOURNAL

Author:

Sidhant Dudeja

Symbiosis Law School, Noida

1st Year, BA LL.B.

GREEN CRIMINOLOGY- A CRITICAL STUDY ON ENVIRONMENTAL HARM

ABSTRACT-

Here an introduction to green criminology is offered. This extensive literature is difficult to describe, however some key problems are discussed here: defining green crimes, the scope of green criminology, measuring green crimes, and empirical research of green crimes. A special emphasis is placed on political economic approaches to green criminology, which served as the foundation for green criminology. Environmental sociology, theories of metabolic rift and unequal ecological exchange, and empirical evidence on planetary boundaries and biological imprints are all mentioned.

There is a summary of examples of widespread human and nonhuman green victimization. In a period of anthropogenic caused worldwide ecological collapse, theoretical frameworks must focus more on ecological disorganization, habitat devastation, and excessive production/consumption, which is the proper subject matter of green criminology.

Keywords-

Green Criminology, Green crime, Green victims, Environmental harm, Environmental sociology

INTRODUCTION-

Green criminology is a subset of criminology that studies environmental harms and crimes generally defined, such as the study of environmental law and policy, corporate crimes against the environment, and environmental justice from a criminological perspective. This research discusses green criminology .This research addresses several significant concerns in green criminology and serves to educate those who are new with the subject. First, we must define "green criminality." Any field of study requires well-defined ideas, this has not been a strong feature in green criminology, since there are numerous conflicting definitions.

WHAT IS GREEN CRIME-

The term "green crime" refers to environmental crimes, Green Crime is defined as any illegal activity involving the environment, biodiversity, or natural resources. There are five major types of environmental crime: illegal logging, fishing, and mining, as well as crimes that harm wildlife and cause pollution. "Green criminologists" are concerned with the investigation of green crime. Green criminologists are transgressive criminologists in the sense that not all of the activities they are interested in would be of interest to traditional criminology: activities that cause harm, not just those that violate current laws. Green crime is expected to grow at a rate of 5-7 percent per year, which is two to three times the rate of the global economy.

A few sociologists argue that globalization is also an important factor in green crime. While some environmental crimes are of a local nature, many cross-national borders (such as pollution). This connects with Ulrich Beck's work on a global risk society (1992) in which he focused on problems like global warming and the way in which they pose a risk to the entire world. He contends that many of these risks are manufactured risks created by the way we organize modern society.

Green criminology was introduced for the first time in 1990. (Lynch, 1990). Thirty years later, there is still no agreement on what constitutes "green criminality." The term "green scholar" can mean a variety of things to different people. Indeed, there are so many and varied definitions that they cannot be adequately discussed here. Several concepts of green

crimes are based on morphological techniques. For instance, White (2008) posited separating environmental crimes into three categories: -

(1) Brown crime or environmental damage in urban areas

(2) white crimes related to new technologies

(3) green crimes, which he limits to environmental threats linked to wildlife protection and wildlife damage.

This concept, on the other hand, does not always match up with others. When new definitions are offered, the rationale must be investigated, and the old and new meanings must be contrasted. Green crime was originally defined as (a) harmful effects to living beings caused by the formation of environmental dangers, (b) occurring on a global and regional scale, (c) resulting from state and corporate crimes, (d) being the subject of radical criminology and political economic theory with a focus on class analysis.[1] [2] [3]

A BEGINNING STEP OF DEFINING GREEN CRIMINALITY-

Beirne's book has one of the most theoretically thoughtful and interdisciplinary formulations of green crime (1995, 1997, 1999, 2007, 2009, 2014). Beirne described one type of green criminology—non-speciesist criminology—in his widely cited 1999 paper, which would focus attention on animal mistreatment. To do so, you must first define animal maltreatment, as described by Beirne (1999). Multiple human actions endanger (nonhuman) animals. Creatures can be considered as sufferers of green crimes perpetrated by humans since they suffer pain and psychological anguish, even if we (as humans) do not know if animals can comprehend or define their experience as victimhood. Animals are subjected to a wide range of abuses. It's sometimes helpful to know what kinds of animals are being injured, because the types of animals, the types of injuries, and the explanations for those harms can all be linked. Human–animal interactions, on the other hand, are built around human needs and consumer preferences, as Sollund (2011) noted.

Carrying this stance a step further, Stretesky, Long, and Lynch (2013) stated that all offenses towards animals may be justified by the sociopolitical framework of human cultures, which would also clarify why, as Sollund proposed, crimes against animals are consumption-related (see also Beirne, 1999, 2014). Defining individual green crimes against animals has some utility, notwithstanding the broader causal link. Sollund (2013), for example, recognises the necessity to investigate green crimes involving companion animals, which involve a

---

[1] Nurse, A. (2017). Green criminology: shining a critical lens on environmental harm. *Palgrave Communications*, [online] 3(1). Available at: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-017-0007-2.

[2] Karp, B. (n.d.). *Green Crime and Anti Money Laundering: The Threat and Consequences of Crimes Against the Environment*. [online] guidehouse.com. Available at: https://guidehouse.com/insights/financial-crimes/2020/green-crime-aml [Accessed 17 Feb. 2022].

[3] South, N. (2017). *Green Criminology*. [online] obo. Available at: https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195396607/obo-9780195396607-0161.xml [Accessed 17 Feb. 2022].

variety of crimes such as companion animal abuse/exploitation in the home, in the breeding/commodity marketplace, and the "abduction" of wildlife for the companion animal trade.

IDENTIFICATION AND DEFINITION OF GREEN CRIMES-

Green crime can be counted in a variety of ways at the local, national, and international levels. These data sources are not addressed in traditional criminological literature, and some green crime indicators necessitate access to scientific literary works.

Assessing green crimes is more difficult than monitoring robberies since there is no single site where green crimes are aggregated, and data must be gathered from a variety of sources at various levels of analysis and places. It is also vital to clarify what is being counted and why it is being tallied. Green crime counts can sometimes only be measured via conviction or sentence data, keeping questions about the dark figure of green crime unanswered.

Since green crimes are various, efforts to effectively measure them must also be diverse. This is a difficult task that necessitates aggregating, for example, counts of air, water, and waste pollution violations; violations of very specific laws related to nuclear waste and radiation, fossil fuel well (fracking) contamination, or other hazardous waste counts (eg- abandoned contaminated brownfields, or waste sites on remediation lists); and various measures of animal harms, including those described previously (eg-companion animals, wildlife, trafficked animals). At the broadest level, assessing the extent of green crimes includes finding effects such as climate change, anthropogenic species loss. These scientific, statistical, and analytical notions have been incorporated sparingly into green criminology and are essentially absent from orthodox criminological literature. Following is a brief exposition of these topics, as well as an illustration of how companies and states contribute to these crimes.

CLIMATE CHANGE-

Climate change has been addressed in a variety of ways in green criminology. The most important of these investigates the consequences of social, environmental, and economic injustice for both human and nonhuman species. Unlike environmental sociologists, green criminology has ignored using the Effect of Inhabitants, Affluence, and Technology (IPAT) model, a modification of the IPAT model (ImPACT), and the "Stochastic Impacts by Regression on Population, Affluence, and Technology" (STIRPAT) models to investigate human impacts on ecosystems and the global environment. These models take into account climate change as well

as other aspects of human EF. STIRPAT models may evaluate political economic hypotheses connected with the treadmill of production and metabolic rift approaches, and they generally reject conservative/mainstream ecological modernization and the Environmental Kuznets Curve hypotheses in green criminology.[4]

GREEN CRIME VICTIMS-

The majority of environmental victims are low-income people and people of colour. According to research, minority and low-income neighborhoods are more vulnerable to environmental pollution. Walter Fauntroy, chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus, examined data stored in the EPA District IV on the racial distribution and financial standing of citizens living near dangerous substances in a study conducted by the general accounting agency.

The findings showed that African Americans were far more likely to live near dangerous pollutants than other races. According to the findings, African Americans made up the majority of the population in "three of the four hazardous sites" examined in the study. It was also stated that the sociological and criminological literature clearly shows that low-income people of colour are more likely to be exposed to environmental risk. The analysis revealed that economic class played a role in the distribution of environmental hazards as rates of poverty increased as one moved closer to the facility spatially and the relationship appeared perfectly linear.

Kramer (2016) investigated whether there was a relationship between fines levied against polluters and the status of people who lived near facilities based on race and social class between 2007 and 2011. In environmental crimes, defendant profiles do not always correspond to the stereotypical victim. Due to the victims' low economic background, jurors and judges may be lenient toward polluters.

CONCLUSION-

As a result, we can conclude that restoration criminologists have demonstrated the utility of various types of environmental data in evaluating criminological hypotheses. Despite the fact that there is a vast amount of research on those subjects that can be conducted, there are few researchers involved in that activity. The majority of quantitative green criminology has been conducted by American-based or trained criminologists. To be sure, the United States has some of the richest and oldest empirical environmental data, and as a result, the vast majority of empirical green crime research uses data from the United States. As a result, data from many countries has gone untapped. However, empirical data can be discovered in different countries, and green criminologists must learn how to use them in order to promote green criminology and widen its readership.

---

[4] Lynch, M. J. (2020) 'Green Criminology and Environmental Crime: Criminology That Matters in the Age of Global Ecological Collapse', *Journal of White Collar and Corporate Crime*, 1(1), pp. 50–61. doi: 10.1177/2631309X19876930.