

Corporate Crime: an environmental view

This essay is concerned with the topic of corporate crime and the environment. Bhopal is used initially as a case study. Bhopal is also used to illustrate a number of points throughout. Consideration is then given to what a green or eco-criminology might comprise. The work of Pearce and Tombs and Hawkins on corporate crime is examined from a green point of view and what might be done about corporate environmental crime.

BHOPAL: A NUMBER OF PERSPECTIVES

On the night of 2/3 December 1984 at Bhopal a substantial gas leak at the Union Carbide India Limited plant killed between 2500 and 10000 people (Jones). The numbers killed or otherwise affected, the amount and precise chemical content of the leak are disputed. Writing in *The Guardian* and *World Magazine* Nick Catliff says 2600 died immediately and a further 1200 have died, but that 300,000 will suffer long term damage to their health. MIC has now entered the blood stream of residents of Bhopal which may have genetic consequences.

The Chair of Union Carbide admitted moral responsibility and on arrival in India was arrested. However, pressure from the US Embassy secured his release. Union Carbide then inspired in quick succession a number of theories about general Indian incompetence, sabotage and criminal damage by a disgruntled employee (Jones). They also launched a public relations offensive which continues under the title of 'Towards Environmental Excellence'.

Six years on Union Carbide paid \$470 million to the Indian Government in an out of court settlement. This represented only six months profits to the company. Its share price jumped \$2 after the announcement, revaluing the company by \$280 million. The award translates as a handout of £6 a month to effected residents. A thriving activity now in Bhopal are photocopy shops used by claimants to pursue their claims (Catliff).

Bhopal and incidents like it, Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, Seveso and Flixborough, can be looked at from a number of perspectives. Many have concentrated on the health and safety issues or development economics. Most often it has lead to radical or head-shaking campaigning journalism or rhetoric based on the sort of figures quoted above. These and some green questions will all be touched on.

health and safety

Bhopal can be seen as a Health and Safety issue for Trade Unionists, workers, local residents, their environment and the global environment. Pearce engages in a Foucauldian excavation of chemical engineering as a discursive formation before concluding that political struggle can precipitate capital into disciplining its members. Not only is this very limited in its conception of what workers might want from capital but also short-sighted. Workers need to go beyond their corporate economistic interests.

Campaigning for better pay and conditions for chemical workers ignores questions about the uses made of the products of their labour. Those products sustain agribusiness and war: two substantial threats to the planet. Just as defence industries and workers need to find new peaceful processes so other industries need to look to alternative products and processes.

development economics and politics

Is the profit motive in capitalism responsible for both the exploitation of the worker and the planet? Long before Chernobyl, and more clearly now the Berlin Wall has fallen, it was possible to see that degradation of workers and environment existed side by side in Eastern Europe as well as under capitalism.

The need to see a return on investment, private or state, does place pressure on industrial enterprises. The idea that the Earth's resources are infinite legitimates the thief's refrain 'She'll not miss them'.

It is not just nimbyism that causes the most dangerous chemical or nuclear plants to be increasingly sited in Third World countries. Expanding markets, cheap disciplined labour, welcoming governments all compete to offer safe havens for capital in the new world economic order. Raw materials bought in Third World countries need not now be brought to the economic heartlands.

The export of capital and risk can be seen as a tactic of industrialised capital to maintain profits, discipline domestic workers and keep processes now recognised to be dangerous at arms length. However, this is only of short-term assistance. The effects of major disasters are increasingly global even in immediate impact let alone long term consequences.

Sumner marries a marxist developmental economics and criminology to illustrate how the land

is wrested from the peasants by local state and multinationals. For him the land is only what the class struggle is about. However, he does quote Mandel who recognises that monoculture does, amongst other things, "...cause serious disturbance of the country's ecology through soil erosion; over-exploitation of the soil, causing its exhaustion; undernourishment..".

any safer in the first world ?

Safety at plants in the 'developed' world is also poor. Between 1980 and 1984 the US Environmental Protection Agency was informed of 28 leaks of methyl isocyanate (MIC) from Union Carbide's plant in Institute, West Virginia. MIC was held to blame for much of the problems after Bhopal. Union Carbide admitted to a further 33 smaller additional smaller leaks. Leaks of other gasses were also reported. Institute is based in a poor mainly black neighbourhood.

some initial green questions

A product or a policy cannot be judged to be green or environmentally friendly on its own. For example Bhopal produced MIC as a precursor to a pesticide called Temik. In July 1985 one third of the California water melon crop (ten million water melons) had to be destroyed because it was contaminated with Temik. Union Carbide blamed the farmers for misapplying the chemical to water melons, the farmers claimed they had used it four years previously on a cotton crop for which it should have been safe.

Product safety violations or consumer fraud may therefore have been committed, both of interest to corporate criminologists. The green question is: how necessary is it to use these chemicals at all?

To this question might be added others like what were the knock on, or down wind, effects of Bhopal? Green questions need to be added to the health and safety, politico-economic and developmental questions that criminologists might ask of corporations in considering corporate crimes. All of these might combine in an eco-criminology.

===

CRIME AND ENVIRONMENT

A Dictionary of Green Ideas moves from Credit Unions to Crisis without stopping to define or deconstruct 'crime'. Rape, prostitution, violence all have entries deeply influenced by feminist

values but not necessarily related to the environment.

It is insufficient to append mention of women to traditional criminology to deal with its deficiencies. It is equally inappropriate simply to append feminism to green thinking to produce a green criminology or crime policy. The numbers of women in the green movement and the personal inclination of many of its members does make feminism an attractive way of looking at social problems and policy making beyond the environment.

Holistic speaking there is nothing beyond the environment. However, critics of green thinking and ideals, many green activists and traditional criminologists might agree that crime, fear of crime and criminology are outside, or marginal to, environmental discourse. An imagined green utopia may have no crime but that is a long way off. Realism demands that greens examine crime and deviance.

How might the political and academic fields of criminology and ecology mesh and produce new insights/policies for both? The result might be called eco-criminology.

ECO-CRIMINOLOGY: ethics, religion, politics, economics, feminism and theory

What would eco-criminology look like? Should the environmental aspects of corporate crime and, by extension, the intermeshed eco-criminological discourse be seen as an adjunct to traditional criminology? On the other hand the environment is for some 'the issue' and the crimes of allowing one's dog to foul the pavement might be subsumed with Bhopal into the long list of assaults on the planet.

Ideas about the earth are socially constructed. To speak of the environment as a victim can include the human and other animals that populate it. The endlessly bountiful or endlessly put upon Mother Earth are two extremes of a socially constructed essentialism. The former assumes that the earth's resources are infinite or that 'man's' necessity will 'mother' the invention. This is the dominant ideology.

Also socially constructed but less damaging to the planet is the view of feminist deep ecologists of Earth as a goddess. Eco-criminology might better be rooted in the materiality of the earth. What is clear is that it will touch on ethics, religion, politics, economics and feminism. It will need also to generate theory and comment on policy. These issues will be raised again in the conclusion.

ethics

It is necessary to consider the ethical or moral basis for any sanctions that a green social policy might mete out. *A Dictionary of Green Ideas* records both deep ecologists and their opponents, like Murray Bookchin, convinced that nature has its own philosophy and offers a guide to action.

Gorz is clearer that the politics of nature cannot be derived from ecology. *Ethics for Environmentalists* places ethics between morality and law as the norms that might be enshrined in the codes of behaviour that govern both companies and citizens. This leads to a Kantian respect for the Earth which is to be subject to human 'stewardship'.

All such discussions do eventually founder on political or religious differences.

religion and politics

To talk of the environment as the victim of corporate crime is not necessarily to accept the idea of Gaia, an Earth Mother raped by greedy men. Greens accept the inter-connectedness of all parts of the Universe. This means that the Earth and all it comprises has iterative effects each part on others and the whole. This might be seen as a cybernetic system or organism. Some people might then find it useful to personify the planet as Gaia and to revere it accordingly. Most Greens have difficulty with the biblical grant of man's (!) dominion over the earth.

Many greens certainly think of ecological thought as a new way of thinking 'neither left nor right but in front' which seeks to dislodge old style (ie left/right) thinking. Spretnak sees green thinking as post-modern but rational though holding to spiritual green values herself. Perhaps it is a fear of fascist connotations that prevents some from embracing land and air as political themes. Spretnak and Capra certainly found that German Greens were wary of emphasising the spiritual aspects of their beliefs because of the Nazi use of earth imagery.

Large landowners have taken up the ethic of 'stewardship' to deny access to land. This reinforces the point made about ethics that politics cannot be derived from nature or ecology. The National Front and all the mainstream parties have environmental policies. An anarchist perspective is more than tenable.

economics

In a market economy economic solutions are proffered. 'Make the polluter pay' or, as the latest US oil pollution legislation in the wake of the Amoco Cadiz is dubbed, 'You spill. We bill'. Suggestions of a carbon tax to reduce the greenhouse effect are based on this premise. A tax on pollution is like a license to pollute.

Some have called this green economics. An alternative green economics does not to employ market forces or State planning but starts from a different point. Such a green economics challenges notions of growth. What constitutes relative deprivation would need to be reconsidered.

feminism

In trying to elucidate what eco-criminology might be it is instructive to follow the debates within feminism and criminology about the possibilities of feminist criminology or methods (Gelsthorpe). Those influences must lead to questions about whether the discourse of eco-criminology is properly gender neutral or whether women might be made invisible within it.

The rape analogy of some greens is demeaning to women. Though the constant legitimate assaults on the planet and therefore on its populace do bring to mind the once hidden facts of domestic violence against women. Just as women have had to put male violence on the agenda so human violence against the planet must be faced.

It is wrong to equate women and nature, but it is clear that many women are involved in environmental/ecological struggles. Did Bhopal effect women more? There may be possible sexual differences in the take up and susceptibility to toxic gas emissions but if women were less well nourished and more overworked this might affect recovery.

The effects of corporate eco-crime on black people, often aboriginal people, and workers must be considered. Political sympathy for women or aboriginal people cannot, however, stand in the way of considering the ecological effects. It is easy to fall into a sentimental belief that all native peoples live in harmony with nature. It may not be so.

theory and policies

Should an environmental awareness underpin the work of the eco-criminologist or been seen as an over-arching meta-narrative. Is eco-criminology a theory or a perspective? Is eco-criminology, or eco-sociology for that matter, to be seen as one of the previously silenced voices

of modernism. If post-modern would it undermine or prop up 'late capitalism' (Jameson), be subversive or subservient?

Holistic and more qualitative but also drawing from the science of ecology eco-criminology would, like feminist criminology, aim to be 'good research' (Gelsthorpe). Similarly it should be more than just criminology by greens or for greens.

Before examining what an eco-criminology might say about corporate crime it might first be appropriate to look at more conventional treatments of Corporate Crime.



CORPORATE CRIME

In *Power, Crime, and Mystification* Box is mostly concerned to put corporations in the dock on behalf of the industrial working class. He points out that workers, shareholders, government and society may all suffer at the hands of corporate crime. You could just add 'and the environment' to this list. It is possible to go wider than that. The environment is wider than that.

The environment and the environmental demands of consumers poses problems for companies which may be met by illegal or environmentally damaging means.

Whilst Box might be seen as the left side of conventional writing on corporate crime Vaughan, Braithwaite, and Clinard represent a liberal or social democratic strand. A *laissez faire* strand would accept no restraint on companies and therefore no criminal sanctions nor the possibility of corporate criminology.

Vaughan and Clinard concern themselves with organisational matters, Vaughan with the agencies that police corporate crime and Clinard with the ethical tone of a company that comes down from the chief executive. Braithwaite in the face of the complexities of policing large high tech companies favours seeking to coopt them into setting and then policing their own regulations.

POLICING OR REGULATING CORPORATE CRIME ?

In a recent issue of the British Journal of Criminology some of these issues were touched on from left and centre. Quite crudely Pearce and Tombs can be called policers and Hawkins a

regulator. Both parties could produce evidence from their writings to refute this but it helps put starkly the lines of division. Set out below are their arguments. Interesting are their points of agreement.

Pearce and Tombs' argument is not specifically about the environment, but about health and safety. It could be applied to the environment and it is mentioned. Hawkins' expertise is on regulation and the environment and he deploys arguments from this field to comment on Pearce and Tombs on health and safety. Neither quotes approvingly or disapprovingly from the work of environmentalists or environmental campaigning groups whom have a lot to say about the policing/regulation debate.

Both sides assume the inevitability of industrial processes and only argue over the smaller matter of policing or regulation. Their differences are political. Again crudely; Hawkins favours business over state whereas Pearce and Tombs favour state over business. A green cannot give either precedence if only in the light of the disastrous record both have.

PEARCE & TOMBS

Pearce and Tombs criticise the view that the illegalities of corporations are so unique as to warrant different forms of regulation to 'traditional' crime. This difference is encapsulated in the title of Conklin's book *"Illegal but not Criminal"* (Conklin) which he took from an interview with an executive of a company that had conspired to fix prices. They argue that companies are 'amoral calculators' against whom "there is a need for the criminal law in this area to be strictly and consistently enforced", for the state to deter senior management possibly in novel ways. They believe a punitive regulatory strategy to be both feasible and desirable. They oppose what they call compliance strategies. This is largely Box's position too.

They open their arguments with a quote which suggests that the Indian State may have negligently licensed Union Carbide to operate a plant at Bhopal by relying on an inadequate staffed and inexperienced inspectorate. They make no further reference to the quote which, out of context, may be open to a number of interpretations. It might be presumed that they intend we understand that Bhopal may not have happened if the Indian State could afford to employ more and better inspectors and followed the policies they advocate.

'amoral calculators'

The first step of their argument is that companies are, in the taxonomy of Kagan and Scholz,

amoral calculators not political citizens or organisationally incompetent. They reject a 'bad apple' theory and are particularly scathing about empirical attempts to give a figure for the number of bad apples.

Corporations are seen to act with economic rationality (profit maximisation and corporate continuity) and that sometimes means that the company or its employees, in its interests, acts illegally. They are clear that this does not mean that all regulations are ignored.

Amongst the illegal acts they lay particular emphasis on are the 600 who die in Britain each year from work-related accidents and a trade union estimate of 20,000 deaths from work-related ill-health. Of course, environmental damage, legal, licensed or illegal can also form part of the calculus of profit.

criminal law

The Criminal Law is to be used, the 'cop' not the 'consultant', to avoid the cooptation of enforcement officials and because they reject the ideological distinction between enforcement strategies against corporate crime and 'traditional' crime. They specifically reject Kagan and Scholz's contention that a 'legalistic enforcement strategy can jeopardize the agency's legal mandate, funding, and its very existence'. They also reject Braithwaite's proposals for self-regulation.

novel ways

They draw an analogy between the policing of health and safety and motoring offences. They argue that the means of dealing with motor and road traffic offences would be appropriate for corporations. Moreover, the reason these are not considered practical stem from an ideological view of corporations and the power of those corporations.

They point out that motorists cannot avoid responsibility for their safety violations in the way that corporations can. Faulty brakes may be the fault of chauffeur or garage but it is the owner who is strictly liable. Applying this to Bhopal would have left Union Carbide responsible for inspection, training and security. In which instance their accusations against the Indian State, non-existent terrorist organisations or a disgruntled employee would have availed them nought.

The analogy leads them to consider ideas about careless or reckless employing. They recognise that whilst there are measures of motoring competence the capacity to identify or improve

employing standards is held back by ideologically inflected standards of practicability or other economic and political concerns such as local jobs.

Recognising the limits of an exclusive focus on the criminal law they argue for a range of measures including prevention. From motoring law they suggest as penalties, fines, penalty points, endorsement, disqualification and imprisonment rather than the Factory Inspector's choice between a notice and prosecution.

The idea being that on the spot fines or points be levied and a certain number of points would lead to disqualification. Just as motorist needs a licence and an MOT so industry should too. They point out that the nuclear industry has to be licensed and that the chemical industry is more dangerous yet is not. In the wake of Bhopal the US chemical industry was made subject to new regulations. They argue that the cost of meeting these should be counted as part of the costs of production and not as externalities.

theories and politics

They conclude with a call for a clearly socialist perspective on corporate crime, for the state to devise novel means of deterring corporations and their top management with punitive legal sanctions.

Before moving on to allow Hawkins' reply a small diversion is called for to examine some actual uses of the criminal law against polluters through the courts.

THE COURTS

Bentwil argues he that 'The criminal law has an important role to play in the fight against various forms of industrial pollution'. He actually shows in discussion of a number of cases that the laws first concern is with its own integrity and procedures. Interpretation is all; prevention, cure and restitution come a long way down the list.

The facts of Attorney-General's Reference (No 2 of 1988) were that a company was granted a waste disposal licence in July 1977 subject to 14 conditions ..'thereafter substantial nuisance was caused, from time to time, to local inhabitants..!.

In 1987 the 'competent' waste disposal authority took action to indict the company. The company were found not guilty but on reference to the Court of Appeal that decision was not

approved. Bentwil is confident that future convictions can be secured.

The two year delay in bringing South West Water to court over Camelford and the fine of £10,000 gives no confidence that even successful cases have deterred. The civil cases of individuals will take even longer than the State's. The damage to health and environment may outlast the judicial process.

HAWKINS

Hawkins agrees the need to 'enhance regulatory control over business', seeks to distinguish his work and that of colleagues from that of Kagan and Scholz whilst defending both. He also makes the point that the policy recommendations derived from both penal and compliance strategies are very similar. Licensing is very much favoured by both.

In defending himself from the charge that he endorses compliance strategy Hawkins points out that in his sociological study of Regional Water Authorities (RWAs) he did not evaluate the balance of advantage in compliance strategies. His defence and critique of Pearce and Tombs does though suggest that he does favour compliance over policing.

He properly corrects them on the range of penalties available to the courts under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and that it is not just high status offenders or corporations that come before the courts. This does not seem conclusively to assist his argument because he recognises that some RWAs were, at the time of his research, unaware of the extent of their powers. Moreover, he goes on to point out that it is more often the 'cowboys' who come before the courts than the corporations which have legal and technological means of avoiding such embarrassments.

He feels that Pearce and Tombs give insufficient weight to cooperation by corporations, that is there are some 'good apples' and goes on to warn of the consequences of a backlash by these 'good apples' if a penal strategy is followed. He points to the situation in the US where President Reagan regarded the attempted penal/regulatory activities of some agencies as anti-business. They had their budgets cut. He claims that Pearce and Tombs have no strategy for preventing this. They may have no explicit strategy for this but implicit is the need for a socialist transformation (perhaps of quite mild kind?) to accompany a more penal policy towards business.

He concludes that the number, variety and moral status of these offences is such that a flexible

and discriminating policy is required in which penal sanctions have their place.

GREEN COMMENTARY ON PEARCE & TOMBS AND HAWKINS

From a green point of view the choice by Pearce and Tombs of the car and its regulation as analogy is dubious. Cars quite legally cause a significant proportion of pollution. Hawkins thinks it only 'ironic' that the consents issued by RWAs are licenses to pollute.

Hawkins is too timid in fearing a backlash by business. The need to challenge the balance of power between capital, labour and environment must be incorporated but Pearce and Tombs are perhaps too hopeful of the restraints that 'workforces, local communities and consumers' might impose on capitalist relations. Both Communist Parties in India were wedded to expanding the industrial proletariat so were ill-equipped to represent the needs of non-worker gas victims at Bhopal or to consider conversion to less damaging products. The extent to which capital might seek to avoid a penal or a compliance strategy by relocation abroad is not considered.

Pearce and Tombs place some hopes on the state and therefore its courts. States, however, use the criminal law more readily on those seeking to protect the environment, like Greenham women, than on bodies corporate. It is far easier to drag women across common land and to question their sexuality than it is to call a company names. The Indian Government took up the case of the Bhopal victims but their resources were matched by Union Carbide and its own desire to encourage industrialisation made it an equivocal party to the case. As argued above the Courts are more concerned with legal niceties than control let alone prevention of environmental crime.

Prevention must be the key issue and neither tackle it other than by an assumption of the deterrent efficacy of the opposing penal and compliance strategies.

MEDIATION ?

A more green approach might be mediation. Jones mentions that after Bhopal there were attempts by Environmental Mediation International to concentrate on establishing a good compensation scheme rather than focusing on who was to blame. Given Union Carbide's enthusiasm for the proposal she is right to be sceptical about it.

There must be a place though for other ways forward given the delays and uncertainties of going to law. In Britain the Forum for Initiatives in Reparation and Mediation (FIRM) is widening its sphere of concern from victim/offender mediation into commercial, community and

environmental mediation. The introduction of environmental issues into Neighbourhood Watch, noise nuisance particularly, may lead to the need for more not less mediation if neighbours fall out (Marshall)¹.

I think Jones objection to mediation stems in part from a concern about the imbalance of power between the parties. Who is to mediate, what institutions or structures will be used? Berger in the introduction to Woodson's book on mediating structures describes the 'mediating structures' as 'the family, organised religion, voluntary associations, the neighbourhood, and ethnic or racial subcultures'. Not only do these look like Althusser's Ideological State Apparatuses they might be seen to stand in the way of, or in for, our experience of and interaction with the environment. Woodson though emphasises the strength of informal networks as mediating structures.

CONCLUSION

Greens might share some of the opinions of Pearce and Tombs out of anti-capitalist sentiment. A green commitment to decentralisation would lead them away from reliance on the state and its courts. Environmental regulators like RWAs might be seen as professional mediators and adopt an appropriate professional ethic. But again it is not just anti-technological bias that might lead many greens to be unwilling to allow control to pass even to a well intentioned elite. If the problem of power imbalances could be solved mediation would certainly be attractive to many. Official and commercial secrecy are issues too which prevent even elites acting on many environmental issues (Frankel).

It is difficult now to state what an eco-criminology might suggest to prevent or punish ecological crimes. Further clues might be found in actions practical actions taken.

Taking matters into their own hands the residents of Phuket in Thailand burned down a nearly completed chemical plant in 1986 because of fears about the chemicals it was to use and might discharge (Jones). This may be revolutionary violence like the 'monkeywrenching' of Earth First² or just parochial nimbyism, but burning anything has environmental consequences.

Greenpeace (Feb 91) have now targeted world leaders as 'climate criminals'. This and other direct actions might see them punningly renamed Greenpolice. Friends of the Earth in the same vein might encourage the view that the earth is a neighbourhood, watch it.

¹ I am grateful to Tony Marshall for introducing me to the work of FIRM

² A militant environmental group best known for spiking trees so that they cannot be safely cut down

Marx may have seen Capital as digging its own grave by immiserating the proletariat but it seems more likely that it will do so by alienating the planet. The planet after all need not become conscious of itself as a 'class'. It may not have an objective interest but it has objective effects.

Green social policy, socio-legal studies or an engaged eco-criminology cannot rely on the objective conditions of the earth and its decline to bring about the subjective knowledge that will be required if people are to attempt to reverse that decline.

One place to start would be with the moral status of pollution offences. This is not to call for a campaign to more strongly criminalise corporate deviance. For the reasons already stated criminal sanctions are not necessarily best but the disparity of treatment between corporate and traditional criminals should be questioned. A green criminology might look to increased use of mediation or more decentralised human scale interventions for all.

An ethic of green sociologists would, unlike Hawkins, include questioning the relative efficiency of formal and informal methods of preventing pollution and the moral ambivalence of regulators.

Just as *laissez faire* policies require that the buyer beware a green society will require wary buyers which again raises issues about secrecy and information. Greens cannot rely on consumerism to police the market. Consumerism is too easily recuperated. Best buys and value for money cannot cope with the idea that some/most things are not required at all. Clarke (1990) notes the success of the Campaign for lead-free air (CLEAR) but that has led to many consumers assuming that the problem has been solved by lead-free petrol and catalytic converters. It has not.

Jock Young has remarked³ that if people stopped buying stolen goods they would have less of their own goods stolen. Equally a demand for more and more things leads some people to steal things and companies to keep supplying them to be stolen. Over production and consumption are indicted. Advertising can then be seen as an incitement to green crime.

³ in lectures on the MA Criminology Middlesex Polytechnic 1990-1991

REFERENCES

- Bentwil J Kodwo 1990. *Criminal Courts and the Determination of Liability for Water Pollution and Waste Disposal* Justice of the Peace 17/11/90
- Box S. 1983. *Power, Crime, and Mystification* Tavistock
- Braithwaite J. 1984. *Corporate Crime in the Pharmaceutical Industry* Routledge Kegan Paul
- Button A. 1988. *A Dictionary of Green Ideas* Routledge
- Catliff N 1991. *Sabotage and the B-Word* The Guardian 1 March 1991 and *Bhopal Disaster: Killer in the Night* World Magazine Feb 1991 BBC Publications
- Clarke M. 1990. *Business Crime: Its Nature and Control* Polity
- Clinard M B. 1983. *Corporate Ethics and Crime: The Role of Middle Management* Sage
- Conklin J E. 1977 *"Illegal but not Criminal": Business Crime in America* Spectrum
- Frankel M. 1982. 'The Environment' in *Consuming Secrets: How Official Secrecy Affects Everyday Life in Britain* Delbridge R and Smith M (eds) Burnett Books
- Gelsthorpe L. 1990. *Feminist Perspectives in Criminology* Open University
- Gorz A. 1980. *Ecology as Politics* Black Rose Books
- Greenpeace Feb 1991 *Greenpeace Report*
- Hawkins K. Compliance Strategy, Prosecution Policy and Aunt Sally: A Comment on Pearce and Tombs in *British Journal of Criminology Vol 30 No 4*
- Jameson F. 'Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism' in *New Left Review 146* July/August 1984
- Jones T. 1988. *Corporate Killing: Bhopals Will Happen* Free Association Books.
- Kagan P and Scholz J. 1984. 'The Criminology of the Corporation and Regulatory Enforcement Strategies', in K. Hawkins and J Thomas eds *Enforcing Regulation* Kluwer-Nijhoff
- Marshall T. 1990. *Does Noise Have a Future?* in *Mediation Vol 7 No 1* Winter
- Mandel E. 1968. *Marxist Economic Theory* Merlin Press

Nature Conservancy Council 1990. *Ethics for Environmentalists* Centre for Philosophy and Public Affairs University of St Andrews

Pearce F. 1987. *Bhopal: You Bury Our Mistakes*. Middlesex Polytechnic Occasional Paper

Pearce F and Tombs S. 'Ideology, Hegemony and Empiricism: Compliance Theories of Regulation' in *British Journal of Criminology Vol 30 No 4*

Spretnak C and Capra F. 1984. *Green Politics: The Global Promise* Routledge

Sumner C. 1982. *Crime, Justice and Underdevelopment* Heinemann

Vaughan D. 1983. *Controlling Unlawful Organizational Behaviour: Social Structure and Corporate Misconduct* University of Chicago Press

Woodson R L. 1989. *A Summons to Life: Mediating Structures and the Prevention of Youth Crime* American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research