

Singapore Management University

Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University

Research Collection Yong Pung How School Of
Law

Yong Pung How School of Law

11-2005

Globalisation and Urban Crime: Mean streets or lost suburbs

Mark FINDLAY

Singapore Management University, markfindlay@smu.edu.sg

Follow this and additional works at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/sol_research



Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Citation

FINDLAY, Mark. Globalisation and Urban Crime: Mean streets or lost suburbs. (2005). *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*. 17, (2), 291-304.

Available at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/sol_research/2037

This Journal Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Yong Pung How School of Law at Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Collection Yong Pung How School Of Law by an authorized administrator of Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. For more information, please email cherylds@smu.edu.sg.

Globalisation and Urban Crime: Mean streets or lost suburbs?

Introduction

This paper introduces notions of contemporary globalisation and the manner in which crime and globalisation¹ interrelate. In particular, the importance of analysing crime and control at both local and global levels is emphasised. Issues of crime and space are addressed in the context of urbanisation. The tendencies of the city to marginalise, and the consequential criminal outcomes from this environment of modernisation (and the modern city) are discussed. Urban planning has had a crucial part to play in humanising and at the same time distinguishing the global push towards urbanisation, and crime prevention is now a recognised feature of globalised city planning.² Crime accompanies urbanisation, and recently has shadowed urban planning. The paper concludes with a consideration of the manner in which urban planning in Australia can impact on crime trends and patterns, beyond crime prevention through urban design. The globalisation theme is reintroduced when suggesting a more integrated crime prevention and control strategy within which urban planning has a role to reduce social exclusion and hence the crimes of the marginalised.

Globalisation

Globalisation presents as simple and complex. Put simply and in its contemporary manifestations, it is the collapsing of time and space: the process whereby through mass communication, multi-national commerce, internationalised politics, and trans-national regulation we seem to be moving inexorably towards a common materialist culture. The more complex interpretation of globalisation is as paradox — wherein there are as many pressures driving in the direction of the common culture as those preventing its attainment.

The contemporary phase of globalisation means modernisation and the marketing of predominant consumerist values. The influence of modernisation over developing cultures in transition is initially destabilising of custom and tradition. The same could be said of cultures and communities fragmented and stressed through the discriminatory pressures of urbanisation. Crime is now both crucial within this process of destabilisation, and local efforts to negotiate order.

Crime control is expected to restore order and endorse state dominance, while crime often provides the motivation behind informal market economies beyond the reach of state control. In the reordering of city life in deprived and marginalised urban communities in

1 The concept of globalisation adopted in this paper is a development on that argued for in *The Globalisation of Crime*. In light of the recent responses to global terror, modern representations of globalisation tend to conceal its political imperatives and its 'western-centric' focus (Findlay 2004). Its manifestations in contexts of modernisation may have little resonance for the underdeveloped world. The ideas of internationalisation (in the analysis of crime control) and the cosmopolitan (analysing crime, control and culture) may broaden out a consideration of globalisation as modernisation (Findlay & Henham 2005). The thoughts for this paper were further refined through participation in the recent Institute of Criminology Seminar 'The Changing Face of Sydney Crime: Mean streets or lost suburbs', 2005.

2 See Lee and Herborn 2003.

transition, crime will arise in response to constrained opportunities and in attempts to free up the restrictive offering of legitimate social choice.³ Globalisation, modernisation, development, crime and its control are now interrelated in a constant and consistent fashion so as to significantly influence the emergent global culture. Crime as a feature of marginalised suburbs commonly characterises the disorderly dimensions of the megalopolis.

In modernised societies such as Australia the urban location of cultural transition generates predictable and consistent strains towards crime. Urbanisation and migration fuel modern Australian social structure, and its place within globalisation.

Australia as a globalised society is highly urbanised and multicultural. An adverse consequence of the synthesis between migration and urbanisation in Australia has been the destruction of traditional community cohesion in an environment where young people are marginalised from their traditions, as well as from the aspirations offered in the host culture, particularly as materialism. Migration to the cities has created ethnic ghettos. Crime is attendant on such developments, more as a consequence of selective urbanisation. However, this in turn has generated a popular wisdom concerning crime and ethnicity which has skewed law enforcement policy in particular, marginalising whole communities and alienating their youth from authority structures both internal and external.⁴

Whether it be in the treatment of urban unrest in the suburbs of major cities, or in its representation, state instrumentalities have shown little interest in wider social explanations involving the crime, urbanisation, exclusion nexus. Allied with this is the official propensity to lay blame on the individuals and marginalised communities rather than to locate some responsibility in the processes of city building and regulation.⁵

As demonstrated in the policing of ethnic urban communities in Australia's large cities, an appreciation of crime within globalisation is only partial unless control is considered. Control is more than a response to crime. The globalised strategies of crime control tend also to reveal the impetus for globalisation. For instance, *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design* (CPTED) has become integrated into the design project for modern globalised cities:⁶ cities which are quartered into the social and economic interests which fuel and fall out from globalisation. Crime and its control, as global political concerns, currently are essential features of global culture.

The city has been recognised as a vibrant experimental context for crime and control. The environmental determinists and those who see crime as a product of social disorganisation identify the city as a focus for crime and its transition. Crime is mapped across the life of a city and as such can surrender to the sciences of control.⁷ Also as a crucial context for the modern representation of globalisation, the city provides a site for the study of relationships between crime, globalisation and control.

3 See Findlay 1999, chap 6.

4 With specific reference to middle eastern communities, and the fear of terrorism see Poynting (et al.) 2004; chaps 1 & 3 in particular.

5 See the press reporting and government reaction to the urban unrest in the outer Sydney suburb of Macquarie Fields. NB *Stateline NSW*, 4/3/2005, ABC TV, ABC Online.

6 This can range from a consideration of crime prevention in all urban development projects right through to crime prevention motivations for development policy. For instance, section 3, clause 10 (a) of the Waverley (NSW) Local Environment Plan speaks of ensuring community crime prevention when relevant development proposals are assessed.

7 See Evans (et al.) (1992).

A contemporary exploration of crime and its control cannot avoid confronting the connections between crime and globalisation.⁸ This requires a consideration of the way crime promotes globalisation, the way in which crime is a characteristic of globalisation, and how globalisation has tended to influence crime and control. Urban planning is a theatre in which these connections find form. Marginalisation as a social bi-product of the globalised Australian city not only characterises urban exclusion, but ghettoised crime and street disorder.

The Crime/Globalisation Nexus

In its harmonious state, globalisation tends to universalise crime problems and generalise control responses. The unity of globalisation is as yet more convincing at a symbolic level. Crime represents unequivocal symbols around which global ethics are confirmed. Crime control claims an irrefutable mandate for global order and a symbolic terrain across which order rules. In this regard Newman describes, for instance, CPTED as:

A means for restructuring the residential environments of our cities so they can again become liveable and controlled, controlled not by police but by a community of people sharing a common terrain (1972:2)

Order through designing crime out of the global city.⁹

The commodification of the globe, and the pre-eminence of the marketplace has made profit the global ethic. Modern cities have become the power-houses of this ethic, and are recognisably constructed around profit and commodity imperatives. Crime as choices and relationships for profit, naturally evolves along with selective urbanisation where profit opportunities through employment and commerce are particularly constrained. These choices and relationships cross over the boundaries criminalisation pretends to maintain.

Globalisation creates new and favourable contexts for crime. This is the consequence of what Harvey refers to as the 'compression of time and the annihilation of space' (1989:293-5). Commercial crime relationships in particular, are set free to benefit from opportunities not dissimilar to those enjoyed by multinational enterprise beyond the jurisdiction of the individual state, and the limitations of single markets. The flip side of this is crime as a result of social inequality exacerbated by selective urbanisation, and forced into sharp relief in cities where rich and poor suburbs are in spatial transition.

The process of time-space compression which is globalisation has enhanced material crime relationships to an extent where they require analysis in a similar fashion to that of any other crucial market force. The claim of globalisation is that:

Spatial barriers have collapsed so that the world is now a single field within which capitalism can operate, and capital flows become more and more sensitive to the relative advantages of particular spatial locations (Waters 1995:57-58).

⁸ See Findlay (1999).

⁹ I mean here cities which have recently developed or transformed in response to globalised market conditions. Influences such as electronic information exchange and communication have stimulated urban development where the materialist dimensions of the globalised economy predominate in the physical, spatial and social environment of contemporary cities. The commonality of these dimensions enables generalisation on the relationship between globalisation and city design.

The context of crime is such a location. The modern city is such a context¹⁰ both in a spatial and an organisational sense. With Australia being one of the most urbanised nations on earth this correlation has particular resonance both for crime prevention and urban planning policy. The design of space and its boundaries are now crucial to the differentiation of crime and its control within the global city.

The globalisation of capital from money to the electronic transfer of credit, of transactions of wealth from the exchange of property to info-technology and the seemingly limitless expanse of immediate and instantaneous global markets have enabled the transformation of crime beyond people, places, and even identifiable victims. These influences have also transformed the spatial dimensions and intentions of cities wherein resides the globalised market.

The environment of global culture is urban. Urbanisation, particularly in its transitional forms, provides a volatile context within which the association between crime and space is clear and challenging:

Over the millennia, the way humans have arranged their living space has had a strong influence on social, on political, and economic life. It has also had an influence on crime (Graycar 1999).

The City as Metaphor¹¹

Cohen charts the manner in which the city developed as a metaphor or model for society itself. He suggests that the city 'stands for something' from the perspective of a variety of disciplines (urban sociology, urban planning and urban geography). More than this, the city as a paradigm of disorder, chaos and breakdown is a home for crime. The struggle to re-establish the order and discipline of the city is as much a contest for crime control as it is a challenge to urban planning.

The iconography of violence, crime, insecurity, pollution, traffic congestion, overcrowding is the society of the future. On the city streets lie the sharpest mirrors of dystopian imagery.¹²

'Planning out' these problems of the city is now a common language in urban planning and crime prevention/control.¹³ Minimised in this control talk is not just that the city is criminogenic but that so too may be strategies for planning and control.

In recognising that cities 'stand for something' Cohen invites us to look beyond the structures and commercial/class imperatives of the city. The metaphor of the city as order and democracy can be juxtaposed against the city as pictures and maps of hell. It was the metaphorical transition evidenced in the work of the early social statisticians, from the city utopia of order and reason to the measurement of the unruly city and its wicked and dangerous populations, which sat well with the emergence through industrialisation of control paradigms (civil policing being the primary form). The shift in paradigm argued for a revision of social control. The new city community was not only disorganised and dangerous but class came hard up against class. Divisions needed to be policed and private property parameters protected. The city as a place of isolation, stratification, fixation and dysfunction required standardisation, regimentation and militarisation.

10 It is useful to recall that not all forms of cities (or cities within a city) promote crime to the same degree. As Martin observes of Marcuse's analysis of the 'quartered' residential city, 'at least under conditions of market triumphalism, 'walls do not play equal roles for all quarters' (Marcuse 1995:244).

11 Taken from Cohen 1985, p 205.

12 Ibid.

13 For two recent examples in large Sydney municipalities see Lee & Herborn 2003, p 2-32.

The city as metaphor is growing complex. Market models for the city (as opposed to the labour force ordering of early industrial towns, the organic order of rural communities, and the concentric regeneration of the Chicago school) fail to move convincingly from image to reality. Simmel's vision of a special kind of freedom resulting from individualisation through city conditions, while anticipating the crucial anonymity of the new metropolis, seems anti-urban to some extent in its under-emphasis of the city as a theatre of controls.

Crime control perpetuates a more simplified metaphor for the city and the relationship between crime and urbanisation.¹⁴ Whether it be a confidence in planning, regulation and classification as cures for chaos, or a belief in the re-emergence of idealised communities even within the city, the metaphor became more like a paradise lost.

The city is argued for as a site for larger visions of social control through structures of discipline and the maintenance of difference.¹⁵ The visible and invisible *control machines* are a part of the city and planning for cities. The interesting corollary is how crime becomes a byproduct of its control within the city context, where control is about marginalisation and differentiation. From this it is important to ask, with urbanisation being a crucial characteristic of the modern phase of globalisation, how is crime control in the city (particularly through urban planning) producing conditions for crime?

Crime and Urbanisation

Local and comparative victimisation surveys have for years revealed significant correlations between urbanisation and crime in Australia and world-wide.¹⁶ It is more likely that one will become a victim of crime in cities than in rural settlements. The rate of reported crime also tends to rise along with increases in rates of urbanisation.

Walker examined the opportunities for crime which are offered in an urbanised environment. Many such opportunities are particularly attractive to groups in society which might be over-represented in crime populations or criminogenic profiles:

- a switch from public to independent modes of transport, with the private motor vehicle becoming the connection to employment, and a requirement for freedom and mobility from suburban isolation. Both the cost of cars, and the fact that they are often times left in public places for predictable periods of time, creates an opportunity for car theft or vandalism, an opportunity availed by young unemployed males who look to the car as a symbol of status and freedom.
- the development of two income households increases private material wealth. Further, it provides the location for a large amount of that wealth which is left unattended for routine periods of time. In addition children of the household may be left unattended throughout periods of the day, wherein minor property crimes and street offences are likely.
- the breakdown of the extended family (as the city becomes the focus for those who are employed), means that many traditional networks of socialisation are broken down.
- the physical separation between locations of residence, employment, and recreation mean that large parts of the city are left vacant and unattended during routine periods of the day or night. This provides further opportunities for theft and vandalism, as well as locations for violence, as people move from one location to the other.

14 As Cohen notes (1985 207), 'social control thinking is never particularly sensitive to ambivalence'.

15 See Gordon 1980, pp 63–77 — 'Questions of Geography'.

16 The early knowledge on this is discussed in Walker 1993

- a system of uniform and guaranteed salary scales renders it more difficult for young people to acquire gainful employment, and thereby the assumption of adult responsibilities such as home-ownership, family creation and material security, is delayed. Young people may turn to drug abuse, theft or violence in order to give vent to the frustration which they face.
- the increased use of 'self-serve' retailing provides obvious temptations to theft.
- the reduced staffing of services and utilities, particularly at night, makes them more vulnerable locations for crime.
- the increased availability of alcohol at all hours, and varied locations.
- the development of 'user-pays' public facilities alienates a greater number of young people from what were previously considered universal opportunities for education and recreation.
- The reduced tendency of individuals to become responsible for, and involved in, a range of crime prevention activities where the property is otherwise 'protected'. The promotion of insurance facilities to restore property and make good losses occasioned through crime.

It is argued that crime is linked to patterns of social disjuncture such as unemployment, family breakdown and drug abuse. The suggested direct and simple correlation between crime and urbanisation conceals evidence for the argument that it is not so much urbanisation which causes crime. Rather, the social disorganisation and dislocation generated by particular situations of urbanisation is a social context which is criminogenic.

Structural (social) and individual (personal) imperatives generate the context (social and individual) for deviance. Heterogeneity, selection, differentiation, mobility, integration, and alienation are phases of urban development (within the wider context of social development) correlating with essential issues for crime choice, and the constraints on economic opportunity which promote such choice.

It is not simply urbanisation, but the nature and rapidity of social change which influence criminality. In Australian society the pace of change is exacerbated by its cultural diversity. Crime is related to the complexity of developments associated with the international process of modernisation, and consequent urbanisation. The artificial division of labour supporting the modern industrialised and commodified city is a strong agent for marginalising those without wage labour or wealth. As is the case in Australian cities this is compounded by the manner in which social exclusion (and consequent crime) is disproportionately focused on Indigenous cultures, and cultures of recreational drug use, particularly in urban environments.

Significant population growth and the many powerful social pressures arising out of modernisation, lead to the oscillating nature of rural to urban migration. Developing countries, for instance, are much more likely to experience rapid and un-managed urbanisation and its attendant social disorganisation. Developed societies in turn face the criminogenic environments of cities in decay and the unravelling of urbanisation. Either way, the urbanisation/crime link is apparent, and as such the deleterious consequences of urbanisation should be matters for crime control as well as broad social policy.

The differences between urbanisation in developed and developing countries are not just those of rates of change. Associated economic growth patterns, infrastructure development, 'over-urbanisation', over-centralisation, and adjacent locations of wealth and poverty each tend to exaggerate the criminogenic context of urbanisation in developing countries.¹⁷

The over-concentration of crime and victimization in urban areas (and in pockets within these areas) is also dependent on the nature of migration feeding the growth of cities. If urban drift consists mainly of young, single males, coming into city life, featuring high unemployment and limited differential material opportunity, then the criminogenic context is not just any city. Criminal choices and relationships flourish in urban development, fostering specific criminogenic social connections (such as youth gangs and secret societies) which in turn may facilitate crime choice.¹⁸ In this respect, the recent debate about crime and ethnicity in Australia might be more usefully recast as a consideration of youth marginalisation, urban degeneration, unemployment and cultural conflict.

One of the perceived attractions of an urban environment is access to commercial opportunity. The trade and commerce of the city is another force for differentiation through divisions of capital and labour. The restriction of opportunity to access these can distort the material expectations of crime choices.

So, along with economic disparity and poverty, another level of social indication towards crime is urbanisation and urban drift. Where these themes intersect is more likely to be a site of crime choice. The motivation behind such choice is all too often the same as that which determines commercial decisions in a development setting, legitimate or otherwise.

The marginalisation of those who chose crime in response to the structural constraints of urbanisation, requires detailed analysis as a foundation for a crime prevention strategy integral to city planning. Consideration of what it is about cities and city design which stimulates crime, is crucial to this analysis. Not all cities are criminogenic. However, as globalisation promotes urbanisation and the growth of cities, these are city forms likely to marginalise, and produce crime environments.

Crime and Marginalisation – case-study of the urban Indigenous Australian

Marginalisation is a predictable feature and consequence of social development and urbanisation. It affects certain individuals and groups within a culture more directly and extensively than others. Susceptibility to marginalisation may be indicated by many of the factors which are also nominated as criminogenic: youth, unemployment, lack of education, poverty, homelessness etc. However marginalisation is a relative concept and depends largely on the context within which it is assessed. For example, the company fraudster might feel more marginalised from his corporate culture than would a pick-pocket from his peers.

The figures for Indigenous criminality in Australia portray a wildly disproportionate picture when compared with any other cultural component of Australian society. Break these down further and it is young urban Indigenous males and females who come into contact with criminal justice at a relatively alarming rate. These young people exhibit the characteristics of marginalised urban youth but more completely and to greater degrees than non-Indigenous youth. Unemployment, drug abuse, poor housing, and low educational attainment are more likely to combine in the lives of young urban Indigenous Australians. Add to this a criminal justice process which tends to select Indigenous suspects readily and the over-representation figures are easier to understand. These individuals have a radically restricted range of choices as a result of marginalisation. The nature of their offences is often best revealed through their location in the public space of the urban centre and on the periphery of private society.

17 See Braithwaite (1979); Box (1987).

18 See Clinard & Abbott (1973).

By discussing crime in terms of responses and reactions to social environments, in particular to city environments which marginalise, we are considering crime as choices designed to confront or compensate for the forces of marginalisation. Therefore, in planning for crime prevention, the sites and scenarios of the city which marginalise need to be addressed along with their crime consequences. Even the nature of the crime which planners target for prevention, and the territories of the cities selected as crime zones will declare difference between public and private, rich and poor, the protected and the exposed.

Urban Indigenous Australians are constrained to the overuse of public space. The nature of their occupancy, often focused around recreational drug and alcohol use, brings them into regular contest with the police, the other significant colonisers of public space. If urban planning minimises or contains and excludes public space, the marginalisation of its occupants will be exacerbated. If private space is designed and designated to resist and exclude those dispossessed from public space then crime becomes a consequence of the maintenance of the public/private divide in the city.

Urban Indigenous Australians as a consequence of planning policy and police practice are having their occupancy of city space criminalised. In their case, considerations of crime are more often confined to a context of official and institutional reactions, in a labelling sense from within state agencies.

Police are significant for the labelling process. Offences in public places and crimes committed by the socially dispossessed are a large concern for police, and are commonly represented by the media as crime endangering community peace and the safety of private property. This imagery is not lost on those responsible for urban design. It tends to prioritise the planner's crime prevention agenda. It is translated into a further marginalisation of the socially disadvantaged and the city space where they are confined.

From an urban planning dimension, crime prevention has been conceived as quarantine, physical security, visibility, and the private/public divide, particularly in predominantly Indigenous urban enclaves. Such strategies are designed to segregate society, and may further marginalise those 'communities' who have made crime choices, in terms of the limited range of crimes available.

In addition, Indigenous urban communities have in recent years suffered physical and service degradation, alongside the systematic repositioning of local control over housing issues. Aboriginal housing collectives, a feature of the Whitlam government in the 1970s have been gradually dismantled to where now Indigenous residents may have little beyond the power of protest to resist unwanted urban development.

As a consequence of recent urban conflict involving Indigenous people in Sydney's inner city suburb of Redfern, political debate has centred around urban redevelopment as a crucial crime control imperative. In this, Indigenous interests have been seen by local Indigenous residents as largely marginalised or ignored.¹⁹ Conservative politicians have even suggested the solution of a wholesale bull-dozing of Aboriginal housing in the area.

19 The Aboriginal Housing Company have refused to participate in a joint taskforce with the Redfern Waterloo Authority and the NSW State Government, disputing the extent to which any redevelopment would constrain residential occupancy. In the name of 'occupational diversity' the local authority and government want to replace the residential area primarily with 'enterprise and cultural' space.

Crime Choice and Urban Design

Obviously the intervention of criminal justice agencies into crime situations marginalises criminal behaviour and actors. However, the choices made by individuals utilising crime to enhance opportunity even through collective urban unrest and the violent reclaiming of public space, may themselves develop from contexts of marginalisation, and may in turn develop or diminish such contexts. Alterations to the physical and social environments of crime choice should be designed as much against marginalisation as they are against the proliferation and manifestation of the crimes of the marginalised.²⁰

When speaking of 'choice' in the context of marginalisation it is necessary to appreciate the forces at work to either promote or constrain certain ranges of choice. This is opportunity. Urban violence may be the attempt to create opportunity or the result of its frustration.

Important influences over opportunity are strategies of crime control. Urban planning is now accepted as a credible component of control. Responses to crime such as control strategies obviously qualify choice and influence the context within which choices are made, criminal or otherwise. However, it is now also understood that crime control can result in new contexts and opportunities for crime. In the case of urban planning for crime prevention, the criminogenic consequences of urban design should be as legitimate a concern for designers as planning against crime.

Not only is marginalisation, as a stimulant for crime, contextually relative, but it takes form through the reactions of others. Police intervention into urban conflict is an example of how violence will escalate through the control enterprise. Any transformation of the physical and social environment from which they are triggered will influence such reactions. In this respect the choices which are structured within marginalised relationships (and environments of marginalisation) are governed by the consequence of any transformation in urban living space, further marginalising those who exist in crime relationships. For example, if a woman is victimised through domestic violence she may find that her choices to relieve such violence focus on violence. Further, her ability to avoid a violent environment may be essentially constrained by the physical and social environment in which she exists, and which is ignored or exacerbated by urban planning.

Many of the structures of choice for crime will be so designed as to counteract the consequences of further marginalisation, at least from within a group or sub-culture. Therefore while a choice of crime may have marginalising consequences in wider society, it may also tend to galvanise a sub-culture. This is in evidence when the anti-police consensus of urban Indigenous people boils over into individual resistance and collective dissent. It is this dual direction of social marginalisation and sub-cultural integration which needs to be addressed if control strategies are to prove effective. The manner in which different classes within the city 'construct their sense of territory and community in radically different ways' (Harvey 1994:370) will explain both the construction of priorities for safety and security, and the behaviours and incursions which may threaten these.²¹

20 Spatial aspects of inequality in city life 'along the crucial fault lines of income, employment, ethnicity and age' test the reality of 'community crime prevention amongst the tumult' (Martin 1999).

21 'Harvey (1994:371) suggests, for low income populations, "usually lacking the means to overcome and hence command space, to find themselves for the most part trapped in space". More particularly, for those whose access to housing and transport is insecure, the main way to dominate space is through "continuous appropriation" ... the most extreme and stark instance of this is the experience of homeless people, simultaneously trapped in space and struggling to make some shelter of it' (Martin 1999).

in society is centred (and across all classes) remains largely untouched, while public space, the domain of the young, the unemployed and the homeless receives disproportionate attention.

Urban planners are faced with the global reality of cities which marginalise, and economies which increase the divide between the rich and the poor. These realities are criminogenic. If urban planning is to focus on and foster these divisions, and its crime prevention strategies are premised on these criminogenic consequences of globalisation, then the social outcomes of urban planning will be criminal.

When crime is analysed within a global context, the world becomes more harmonious and at the same time, more diverse. Globalisation, and its impact on crime is compared with localised frames of reference. The global city and our degenerating local urban environments are a measure of this.

Urban environments provide one of the clearest contexts within which the connections between crime and youth, crime and gender, crime and racial discrimination, and crime and economic disparity might be explored. As both crime and urbanisation are dynamic social phenomena, their relationship has been widely discussed in terms of 'drift' (Matza 1964). Fluid commitments to crime often are demonstrated in similar ways as are the choices made by young unemployed males to move to the city, or to be trapped in its contexts of frustration and blocked opportunity.

The fear of crime, now one essence of modern city life, is an important stimulus for urban design. It has altered the image of the city and its designation of space and citizens as dangerous or vulnerable. Encounter or exclusion focussed planning will concentrate the distortion of these fears so long as such strategies centre on the 'crimes' and 'crime relationships' of the young, the dispossessed, and those disenfranchised from the global economy.

Globalisation as Paradox: The Challenge for Urban Design

Paradox is an important device in the reconciliation of the intangibles that are globalisation and crime. This is especially apparent when relating crime and marginalisation. Social and economic development promotes certain interests and marginalises others. If the analysis recognises the functional potential of crime as a response to marginalisation then it becomes more than an exploration of strain, opportunity and conflict.

The concern for crime prevention through urban planning, and responses to crime in general, should not retreat from the challenges of policy that confronts marginalisation. Regarding globalised crime in particular, the potentials for (and of) an integrated crime control strategy are obvious. Urban design can be a potent contributor to any integrated strategy.

Globalisation may be harmonious and diverse; one culture and all cultures. Primarily, it is a process reliant on crucial social relationships to defeat and deny time and space. Crime is one of these relationships. It is a natural consequence of modernisation as well as sharing the consumerist and profit priorities which characterise the modern. As with modernisation, crime can marginalise and reintegrate, unify and divide.

Urban planning needs to recognise the harmonious potential of globalisation. It should appreciate a more sophisticated conception of crime relationships, crime choices and the impact of city space on these. It needs to transcend physical and symbolic techniques of sorting and turning away, in favour of strategies for reconciliation and reintegration,

particularly in the luxury of public space.²⁵ It must enhance rather than undermine the positive potential of a single and unified global culture. Not as with Sydney 'The Living City', where transport shelters no longer shelter but advertise, where public toilets are privatised, where community space is leased to commercial interests and contained, and where the homeless and urban poor are banished and denied living space in the living city.

We need cities that will be conditions of life, of full and free and unfragmented lives, not cities of discretion and domination: we need walls that welcome and shelter, not walls that obscure and oppress (Marcuse 1995:251).

Mark Findlay

Law School, University of Sydney

References

- Bauman, Z (1998) *Globalisation: The human consequences*, Polity, Cambridge.
- Box, S (1987) *Recession, Crime and Punishment*, Macmillan, London.
- Braithwaite, J (1979) *Inequality, Crime and Public Policy*, Routledge, London.
- Clinard, M & Abbott, D (1973) *Crime in Developing Countries: A comparative perspective*, John Wiley, New York.
- Cohen, S (1985) *Visions of Social Control*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Davis, M (1992) *City of Quartz: Excavating the future in Los Angeles*, Vintage, New York.
- Evans, D & Herbert, T (eds) (1989) *The Geography of Crime*, Routledge, London.
- Evans, D, Fyfe, N & Herbert, D (eds) (1992) *Crime, Policing and Place: Essays in environmental criminology*, Routledge, London.
- Findlay, M (1999) *The Globalisation of Crime*, CUP, Cambridge.
- Findlay, M (2004) 'Globalisation of Crime: Terror in a contracting globe' in George, V & Page, R (eds) *Global Social Problems*, Polity, Cambridge, chap 5.
- Findlay, M & Henham, R (2005) *Transforming International Criminal Justice: Retributive and restorative justice in the trial process*, Willan, Cullompton.
- Gamble, A & Payne, A (eds) (1993) *Regionalism and World Order*, Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Geason, S & Wilson, P (1989) *Designing Out Crime*, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.
- George, V & Page, R (eds) (2004) *Global Social Problems*, Polity, Cambridge.
- Gibson, K & Watson, S (eds) (1994) *Metropolis Now: Planning and the urban in contemporary Australia*, Pluto Press, Leichhardt.
- Giddens, A (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity*, Polity, Cambridge.

25 The Crime Prevention Division of the NSW Attorney General's Department currently coordinates municipal authorities and local government regions in the creation of crime prevention 'compacts' which manifest a more integrated and holistic approach to crime prevention through environmental design.

- Giddens, A (1997) 'Anthony Giddens on Globalization: Excerpts from a Keynote Address at the UNRISD Conference on Globalization and Citizenship', *UNRISD News (United Nations Research Institute for Social Development Bulletin)*, no 15 (1996/1997), pp 4–5.
- Gilpin, R (1987) *The Political Economy of International Relations*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Gordon, C (ed) (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings by Michel Foucault 1972–1979*, Brighton, Harvester Press.
- Graycar, A (1999) 'Crime Prevention Through Organisational Design' in Williams, R (presenter) *Okham's Razor*, ABC Radio National 15/8/99 — <<http://www.abc.net.au/rn/science/ockam/stories/s44034.htm>>.
- Hall, P (1996) *Cities of Tomorrow: An intellectual history of urban planning and design in the twentieth century*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Harvey, D (1989) *The Conditions of Postmodernity*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Harvey, D (1992) 'Social Justice, Postmodernism and the City', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol 16, no 4, pp 588–601.
- Harvey, D (1994) 'Flexible Accumulation and Urbanisation: Reflections on postmodernism in the American city' in Amin, A (ed) *Post-Fordism: A reader*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Jeffrey, C (1977) *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design*, Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Lee, M & Herbron, P (2003) 'The Role of Place Management in Crime Prevention: Some reflections on governmentality and government strategies', *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, vol 15, no 1, pp 26–39.
- McRae, H (1994) *The World in 2020: Power, Culture and Prosperity A Vision of the Future*, Harper Collins, London.
- Mann, M (1986) *The Sources of Social Power (Vol 1)*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Marcuse, P (1995) 'Not Chaos, but Walls: Postmodernism and the partitioned city' in Watson, S & Gibson, K (eds) *Post-modern Cities and Spaces*, Blackwell, Cambridge Mass.
- Martin, C (2000) 'Crime and Control in Australian Urban Space', *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, vol 12, no 1, pp 79–92.
- Matza, D (1964) *Delinquency and Drift*, John Wiley, New York.
- Mendes, C (1995) 'Signal Driver: From bus stops to bus shelters — the new art of appropriating space', *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, vol 6, no 3, pp 362–370.
- Newman, O (1972) *Defensible Space*, Macmillan, New York.
- Poynting, S, Noble, G, Tabar, P & Collins, J (2005) *Bin Laden in the Suburbs: Criminalising the Arab other*, Institute of Criminology, Sydney.
- Robertson, R (1992) *Globalization*, Sage, London.
- Simmel, G (1964) *Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliations*, Free Press, New York.
- Walker, J (1994) 'Trends in Crime and Criminal Justice' in Chappell, D & Wilson, P (eds) *The Australian Criminal Justice System: The mid 90's*, Butterworths, Sydney.
- Waters, M (1995) *Globalization*, Routledge, London.