

Wildlife trade in the context of criminology¹

By Dr Edyta Drzazga²

Abstract

Traditional criminology rejects the idea that the environment has any autotelic value and only researches if it is directly or indirectly beneficial to humans. As a result, the extent of criminologists' involvement in reducing the suffering of non-human species has often been questioned. However, due to the increasing environmental degradation, which began to rise to the rank of the most pressing problems of the modern world, there was a partial change in researchers' approach. Its expression was the emergence of green criminology, which took environmental problems as its particular focus. Hence, the choice of research topics highlights the contrasting approaches of the traditional and green perspectives towards wildlife trade. The aim is to examine whether there are any possibilities in including both approaches in order to make the control of wildlife trade more efficient.

1. Introduction

At first glance, criminology provides an excellent platform for debating environmental harm, including wildlife trade. However, the question of the usefulness of criminology turns out to be more intricate when taking into account the epistemological and methodological rigors imposed by this discipline in its traditional form. Environmental topics have often been overlooked in traditional crime studies, with green criminology being a relatively recent development. When these topics were addressed, they were usually justified by linking them to more "attractive" and "serious" types of crimes, such as domestic violence, serial killings, and organized crime. The focus was generally on the usefulness of the environment and its components to human interests, rather than their intrinsic value. Traditional criminology tends to reject the idea that the environment has any autotelic value and only conducts research if it is directly or indirectly beneficial to humans. As a result, the extent of criminologists' involvement in reducing the suffering of non-human beings has often been questioned. However, due to the increasing degradation of the environment, which began to rise to the rank of the most pressing problems of the modern world, there was a partial change in the approach of researchers. Its expression

¹ The project was created as a result of the research project No. UMO-2015/19/D/HS5/00105 financed by the funds of the National Science Centre (NCN).

² Correspondence details: Dr Edyta Drzazga, Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland, email: edyta.drzazga@uj.edu.pl

was the emergence of green criminology, which took environmental problems as its particular focus. The originator of the term "green criminology" is considered to be M.J. Lynch, who introduced it in the 1990s to describe the study of environmental crimes embedded in the critical stream of criminology (Lynch 1990: 1-4).

The different approaches of the two perspectives - traditional and green - to the problem of wildlife trade are evident in the very choice of research topics.

2. Traditional criminology and environmental harm

Mainstream criminologists have conducted research on issues at the intersection of harm to animals and violence against humans. Ascione (et al. 2007: 355) pointed out, among other things, that 1. women tend to postpone the decision to seek help at a shelter for victims of domestic violence or to forgo such protection because of concern about an animal left with a violent partner (Qulinsk 1999). 2. animal abuse can be a severe form of psychological violence to which children are exposed (Baldry 2003). 3. perpetrators of animal abuse are more likely to face jail sentences for violent, property, and drug offenses. In addition, such individuals are more likely to admit to deviant behaviour in self-report surveys (Arluke et al. 1990). Another line of research in traditional criminology has attempted to analyze crime against animals as part of a continuum of criminal behaviour or as a possible indicator of future criminal propensity.

Based on the above concise overview of the most important studies, it can be concluded that both their scope and the very choice of topics related to animals was - and is - strictly dictated by the possible connections of the phenomenon under study with traditional types of crime that primarily affect humans. This is because it was and is typical for mainstream criminology to adopt an anthropocentric perspective in its approach to the idea of justice, around which the research was organized. Underlying this perspective is the belief in the biological, mental, and moral superiority of humans over animals. It is human interests that are placed at the centre of considerations, while the value of the environment is entirely dependent on its variable assumed value at any given time. Therefore, all legal regulations are directed not so much at removing the real sources of crime, which lie deep in the social structure of crime against the environment, as at stopping selected i.e. criminalized acts committed to the detriment of the environment. This is because the majority of such acts or omissions remain outside any sphere of legal and criminal regulation. This is because the overriding goal is profit maximization, and the means to this end is seen as sustaining the processes of production and consumption, even if they generate global catastrophic consequences for nature, including great animal suffering (White 2018: 345; White and Heckenberg 2014:66).

Thus, for the most part, mainstream criminology has not been and is not interested in real social change in terms of reducing the harm or suffering inflicted on fauna and flora. This is for a variety of reasons. First of all, it would require researchers to criminalize acts that have not (yet) been criminalized. According to most of them, this contradicts the commonly accepted definition of a crime being an unlawful, punishable, criminal, and culpable act. However, tracing the history of criminological thought, one can see that such concepts have already taken place. One of the most famous representatives of positivist criminology consistently, although without the favour of the scientific community, dealt with acts that, according to him, were very harmful to society, although not covered by criminalization. We are talking about Edwin Sutherland and his research devoted to so-called white-collar crime (Sutherland 1945: 132-139). Today no one questions his achievements or the methods he used, thanks to which the scale, scope, and social cost of the phenomenon were brought to light for the first time, and the phenomenon itself was finally criminalized.

So, can the argument regarding the absence of a crime for harming animals legally be considered sufficient? Is it not reasonable to assume that systematic research in this area will provide convincing evidence of the need to criminalize some part of this deviant phenomenon in the future? Unfortunately, there are many indications that this line of defence is not enough for everyone. This, in turn, raises questions about the real, perhaps deeply entrenched reasons for the reluctance of traditional criminologists to take up topics related to the phenomena of harming animals, as long as they do not constitute crimes or are not at least indirectly related to other types of crime involving human victims.

It is nothing new in criminology to analyze behaviour that, although not a crime, is a deviation, i.e. a departure from some socially accepted norm. Is it not possible, then, to treat the infliction of suffering on nonhuman beings precisely as a deviation, a kind of aberration undesirable in a civilization that likes to boast of having achieved a high level of understanding of the ethical, moral, social, and psychological consequences of using violence against the weaker, marginalized, defenceless? Or is it precisely that animals are still being taken out of the bracket of beings deserving such protection? And this is the moment to lean into the fundamental issue, i.e. who, to whom, and for what reasons has the power to confer the attribute of being the perpetrator and the victim? Such questions, more or less since the 1960s, also began to be asked by criminologists coming from the critical current. And it was within this current that green criminology, which was keenly interested in answering the above questions, found a place for itself.

3. Green criminology and environmental harm

Green criminologists, in response to the questions raised above, recognized that definitions of environmental crimes are not fixed once and for all, nor are they uniform. On the contrary, they are subject to change over time and are constructed by two groups of social actors: corporations and environmental social movements (Lynch and Stretesky 2003: 222). However, these groups do not start

from equal positions and have different social resources at their disposal. While corporations have a powerful real influence on public perceptions of the meaning of environmental crimes anchored in legal definitions and demand the status quo in this regard, the influence of pro-environmental organizations seeking to change the unfavourable status quo is grassroots and diffuse in scope (Drzazga, 2018: 246). Environmental movements construct the definition of an environmental crime based on the idea of environmental justice. This means that the condition of violating existing legal regulations does not have to be met for a crime to occur. In this case, we are dealing with a so-called green crime, which may or may not be a criminalized act. (Lynch and Stretesky 2003: 227).

And it is the way environmental crime is defined that significantly distinguishes green criminology from traditional criminology. The majority of green criminologists include precisely "green crimes" as the object of their research, which include acts that are not criminalized and that cause harm to the environment (South, Brisman, and Bierne 2013: 27-30). Thus, the subjects of their research include animal harm encompassing both cruelty typical of the livestock industry and individual cases of domestic animal abuse (Agnew 1998; Beirne 1997, 1999, 2007, 2009); and wildlife trafficking of endangered species (Wyatt 2012, 2013; Nurse 2015; Sollund 2013). Despite the scale of the above phenomena and the harm they generate, most of them are not even criminalized. While mainstream criminologists believe that these activities - and especially the non-criminalized part of them - remain outside the spectrum of interest in crime studies, green criminologists focus on studying them. This is because they believe that the environment has an autotelic value, that is, it does not require the fulfilment of external evaluation criteria in order to justify its protection. This is especially so if it is assumed that the researcher is an integral part of the observed and studied reality, in which both humans and animals and other components of the environment are interconnected systems of vessels. From such a point of view, there is no room for the realization of an exclusively anthropocentric idea of justice.

While mainstream criminology is dominated by an anthropocentric perspective, green criminology can be distinguished by the primacy of two concepts of justice in particular: biocentric and ecocentric (Halsey, White 1998: 345-371; White 2018: 342-362). According to the former, human beings are given the same value as other beings. The second, on the other hand, presupposes the necessity of directing - necessary, according to its proponents - production processes in such a way that they do not exceed acceptable limits of harm to the environment. It is therefore an intermediate solution between biocentric and anthropocentric justice. Opting for either of these concepts entails not inconsiderable consequences for criminal policy. This will be explained in more detail using the example of the illegal wildlife trade in Poland. Before that, however, it is worth introducing yet another concept that has recently influenced the development of green criminology. Its source is the so-called deep ecology.

For the green criminologist, the above set of assumptions that abandon the anthropocentric frame of reference in favour of taking into account the autotelic value of other species of living beings enables a

more critical analysis of environmental harm. Moreover, in such an expanded perspective of green criminology, it is necessary to include harm (when someone or something has been physically or psychologically damaged or injured) as a sufficient justification for undertaking research in the field (Wyatt 2012: 54-58).

According to the new in-depth perspective, not only are animals an intrinsic value and thus deserving of protection, but other species and ecosystems viewed as a whole also deserve it. The current dominant narrative of green criminology lacks such an expanded view of harm. Therefore, voices are calling not only for a reduction in the harm and suffering caused by individual cases of animal abuse but also for a bold challenge to the pervasive, socially acceptable abuses of the natural environment that are driven by overconsumption and commodification processes.

5. Criminology and illegal wildlife trade

The above, at times critical, overview of the attitude of criminologists to environmental problems opens a discussion of the real or practical contribution of criminology to the processes of learning about and reducing environmental crime or environmental harm. From here, doubts may arise as to whether criminology, especially its mainstream, can prove useful in the context of the title defence of the defenceless. Questions may also arise as to whether and how the adoption of selected assumptions of traditional and green criminology in its older or emerging form may affect specific problems.

Illegal wildlife trade is an excellent example illustrating the above relationships. Both a criminologist coming from the traditional trend and a representative of green criminology can find convincing arguments for covering this phenomenon. The world of mainstream criminology, which is dominated by an anthropocentric vision of justice, is usually interested in the fact that wildlife trade in its illegal form presents a direct or indirect threat to the interests of humanity. This phenomenon is combined with the introduction of invasive species that can displace native ones and transmit various diseases to them. This, in turn, negatively affects production and commercial processes. It is pointed out that it can deplete the natural resources on which the economies of various societies rely due to the deprivation of tax revenues that could affect them in the case of legal trade. Yet another argument in favour of taking an interest in a phenomenon derived from the anthropological concept of justice is that of generating an increasingly acute problem of so-called "ecological migration. This is because the turnover of wildlife of species threatened with extinction leads to a reduction in biodiversity and, consequently, to the loss or significant reduction of opportunities to obtain profit or food from an area, which forces the people living there to leave (Wyatt 2013: 44-46). And finally, this phenomenon threatens human health and life as a result of the spread of zoonotic diseases.

In addition, it is estimated that 75% of new infectious diseases are of animal origin, which are predominantly derived from wildlife. Illegal trade in such species increases the risk of global epidemics such as H5N1 avian influenza and severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS). Cf. Opinion of the

European Economic and Social Committee on the Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on an EU approach to illegal wildlife trade

All of the above types of threats generated by illegal wildlife trade from the point of view of the principals of traditional criminology constitute the most convincing set of arguments for undertaking research in this area. However, it is widely accepted that criminology is a field of science focused not only on the growth of knowledge but also on identifying appropriate, i.e. effective, adequate solutions to a given crime problem. Therefore, to what extent and based on what vision of justice recommendations will be made in the field of social control of wildlife trade, will have a feedback effect on the problem under study itself.

It is worth starting the analysis of this relationship with a brief overview of the ways of counteracting the phenomenon in question. From a legal perspective, there are at least two models - a system of criminalization and a system of regulation (Nurse 2015: 94). The first is assumed to be more in line with a biocentric or ecological stance and consists of a complete ban on the marketing of endangered animal species. The second, on the other hand, boils down to legalizing and thus sustaining to a certain extent a phenomenon that is beneficial to human interests for certain reasons. Thus, this model expresses an anthropological concept. Currently, the protection of animals and plants of endangered species is based on the regulatory model and corresponds to the anthropocentric attitude of most societies. Its foundations were laid with the entry into force in 1973 of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (also known as the Washington Convention or CITES for short).¹¹ CITES regulates the movement of live and dead specimens (and their derivative products) of plants and animals of endangered species across borders. Appendices I, II, and III of the Convention contain updated lists of species whose transportation across borders is regulated. Currently, to ensure compliance with the Convention and protect species threatened by trade, Regulation (EEC) No. 3626/8212 was issued. It introduced the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora in the Community. It was subsequently replaced by Council Regulation No. 338/97 of December 9, 1996, on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade

Again, the scope of protection for individual species is differentiated, assigning specific plant and animal species to annexes A, B, C, and D.

Council Regulation 338/97, in addition to introducing CITES regulations, also bans the commercial use within the EU of all species in Annexes A and B. These annexes include all species listed in CITES Appendices I and II, as well as several others - those protected within the Union, or those deemed dangerous to European wildlife due to their invasiveness. It should be emphasized that the ban on the commercial use of specimens of species from Annexes A and B is not absolute, as the Regulation provides for various exceptions to it and introduces conditions that allow certain specimens to be exempted from the ban.

A traditional criminologist, taking as the starting point of his considerations primarily the provision criminalizing a given act, will be primarily interested in the so-called CITES crime in the context of the above legal framework. This is because outside the sphere of his scientific study are all other acts related to the commercial use of animals threatened with extinction, simply because they are not covered by the criminal law sanction. This is the case even when these acts lead to great environmental damage and unquantifiable animal suffering. At first glance, this approach, which does not challenge the limited, and based on overexploitation of nature, only perpetuates an anthropocentric vision of justice and is ineffective in countering the phenomenon in its broad sense. However, the issue is more complex than it appears on the surface, and the vision of a definitive unambiguous assessment of the contribution of traditional criminology, even if not fully informed, seems to fade somewhat in light of some more detailed observations. What constitutes the weakness of the traditional trend in criminology, i.e. the strict focus on the protection of human interests, can at the same time become its potential strength in terms of designing effective tools for controlling the phenomenon, or at least not making it worse.

Indeed, within the framework of criminology, there is an important discussion on the processes of criminalization and penalization of various acts. In particular, they are concerned with the rational basis for criminalizing the acts in question, the principles of determining statutory and judicial punishment, and their social consequences. In the context of drug crime, for example, it is pointed out that drug prohibition aimed at discouraging people from using drugs also has the opposite effect. This occurs as a result of a mechanism dubbed by Herbert Packer as the "criminalization tax" (crime tariff) (Packer: 1964). This phenomenon boils down to the fact that criminalizing a good or service for which demand is stable and will exist in the future anyway, leads to an increase in its price well above the market price. This is because the suppliers of the good or service expose themselves to criminal liability and compensate for this risk through a high-profit margin. As a result, drug production and trafficking activities become risky activities, but economically very lucrative. Therefore, it is not surprising that organized crime groups engage in it. Similar processes can be seen in the case of wildlife trafficking, especially when such rare specimens as rhinos, elephants, or polar bears become its "object." The sheer uniqueness of the products derived from them (horns, blows, various body parts, respectively, e.g.) increases their market price, which is further conquered due to the criminalization tax imposed by poachers, traffickers, and other perpetrators involved in making a profit (Drzazga 2017: 4-5). Of course, this conundrum is not tantamount to recommending the legalization of activities that lead directly to animal harm. However, it draws attention to the complexity of the phenomenon and directs attention to reaching for its causes rather than relying solely on a legal and punitive response, which is often far from effective.

One can point to analogous situations on the ground of control of illegal wildlife trade in Poland. Transporting a small amount of CITES specimens (e.g., an ointment with the addition of a roach) without complying with certain conditions, by applicable laws, is a crime that carries the same statutory penalty

as smuggling in bulk. As a result, Customs officials often "turn a blind eye" to petty smuggling - often carried out inadvertently due to ignorance - wanting to avoid initiating procedures they believe are inadequate about the seriousness of the act. Thus, from the bottom up, they correct, as it were, to a flawed criminal policy in terms of the legally regulated degree of repression undifferentiated about different categories of acts and perpetrators. Failure to respond to such phenomena, in turn, backfires both on the entire control system, making it leaky, and on determined perpetrators inclined to take advantage of such loopholes. As a result, it is difficult to effectively counter the phenomenon. The need to change this legal provision is pointed out by experts (Drzazga 2019).

Thus, an instructive lesson provided by the achievements of traditional criminology concerns the unintended negative effects of inadequate criminalization and excessive punitiveness. It turns out that they are not always a sufficient, adequate, and appropriate response in every case of illegal wildlife trade. This is because often solutions that initiate deeper social changes turn out to be more effective or equally effective and without undesirable secondary effects; in the above case, at the level of making people aware of the consequences of uncontrolled exploitation of the natural world, especially the part of it that is threatened with extinction. This fact often escapes representatives of circles concerned with the protection of non-human beings.

Another lesson relates to the aforementioned necessity to analyze a given phenomenon in depth and design countermeasures in such a way that they are tailored to its various manifestations. In a word, it is about the well-known principle in criminology "one size does not fill all" (White and D. Heckenberg 2014:292). This rule is perfectly applicable to social control of illegal wildlife trade. This is because it turns out to be an extremely diverse phenomenon, both in terms of quality and quantity. In doing so, certain geographic patterns can be picked up in terms of differences in demand, supply, the degree of market organization, the number of profits that can be made, and the combination of rare and widespread species. The subject of demand can be four categories. These are: (1) processed articles from animals; (2) collector or connoisseur items; (3) animal products used in traditional Asian medicine; (4) food. Each of these categories has certain characteristic features that must be taken into account when making proposals to counter the phenomenon (Wyatt 2013: 23).

Similarly, it is impossible to point to some general characteristics of the perpetrators and their motivations. The literature distinguishes at least a few, including. (1) individuals whose involvement in illegal wildlife trade stems from desperation or poverty; (2) those doing other work in parallel that allows them to exploit the environment with little risk of their illegal activities being exposed - examples include trappers who engage in skin harvesting; (3) people specifically hired for this purpose, as in the case of helicopter-armed bands hunting rhinos in Africa or ornithologists who harvest eggs and young birds in Russia and Central Asia to sell, often to order²⁸; (4) organized crime groups (Wyatt 2013: 36-37).

The above concise overview of the complex phenomenology of the phenomenon supports the conclusion that the response to illegal wildlife trade cannot be reduced to a narrow choice between criminalizing the trade or some form of its regulation (Drzazga 2017:16). While traditional criminology is a source of various techniques and measures to counter the phenomenon, which, going beyond the above-narrowed choice, may prove useful, most green criminologists are programmatically not satisfied with ad hoc solutions. In particular, a criminologist inspired by certain tenets of deep ecology will be inclined to ask uncomfortable questions that the modern world is unlikely to be willing to answer. This is because it would mean admitting the fiasco that our civilization has suffered as a result of the ruthless pursuit of prosperity without looking at the damage it causes.

This inevitably brings with it a questioning of the belief that current ecological and social relations are fundamentally just and sustainable. This conclusion is inextricably accompanied by the suspicion that state authorities themselves are often among the perpetrators and also beneficiaries of the greatest environmental damage. It is therefore difficult to expect political will at both the national and international levels to change the status quo in terms of the legal definition of the phenomena that make up wildlife trade, which are considered crimes. Rather, one should follow the proposal put forward by Rob White, according to whom pragmatic intervention on multiple fronts and based on a multidisciplinary strategic assessment, including economic, legal, social, and ecological analyses, is also necessary (White 1997). This is because it turns out that some regulation is better than none, and it is not possible to stop harmful practices immediately. Legal regulations sanctioning them are needed, especially when the perpetrators of so-called green crimes are corporations that are mostly beyond the reach of influence at the consciousness level. Therefore, the discussion on counteracting the phenomenon should include both an analysis of existing legislation and a proposal to amend it, as well as recommendations for more radical transformations of the social construction of the definition of "environmental harm."

6. Summary

Taking the above considerations into account and thinking seriously about eliminating (currently unrealistic) or reducing the scale of the phenomenon, it is not enough to rely solely on the existing legal framework and that part of the wildlife trade (essentially small in terms of volume) that is criminalized based on anthropocentric criteria for declaring an act a "crime." It is also not enough to focus on the broader harm caused by this phenomenon that also includes non-criminalized acts, as long as the social construction of harm itself is still based on a criterion related to human interest. As for the illegal wildlife trade, the magnitude of animal suffering may not be reduced to the calculus of pleasure and pain and therefore requires protection also from physical confinement, social isolation, boredom, anxiety, stress, etc. Finally, only measures aimed at profound social change and the accompanying broad definition of harm constructed based on the idea of ecocentric justice prove insufficient.

In other words, in the sphere of defending animals of endangered species, the field of action will find both the traditional criminologist and representatives of green criminology - those more oriented to the established, because still based on anthropocentric criteria, the notion of harm, and those inspired by deep ecology. This is perhaps a surprising conclusion. It may seem paradoxical to combine seemingly irreconcilable perspectives, i.e., anthropocentric, partly biocentric, and ecocentric, and to expect from such a "marriage" of approaches a desired result, even though the goals assumed within each are different. Such joint activities may have little to do with the classically understood concept of "cooperation." At the same time, as attempted to show, the various efforts made by criminologists coming from different schools are still very much needed. However, in this case, we can only deal with the initiative lying on the side of those green criminologists who can see the possibility of using some of the achievements of mainstream criminology and look deeper than just through the lens of criminal law at the problem of animal suffering. This coincides with the following reflection by Halsey: "No criminal, civil or administrative sanction will succeed in stemming the tide of ecological destruction if the concept of environmental damage is not further linked to the protection of the basic principles of those types of production that constantly have to chart new territories in which production processes will be carried out" (Halsey 1997: 235).

LITERATURE:

Agnew, R. (1998). The causes of animal abuse: A social-psychological analysis. *Theoretical Criminology*, 2(2), 177-209.

Arluke, J., Levin, C. Luke F., Ascione F.R. (1999). The relationship of animal abuse to violence and other forms of antisocial behaviour. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14, 963-975.

Ascione, F., Weber C., Thompson T., Heath J., Maruyama M., Hayashi K. (2007). Battered pets and domestic violence - Animal abuse reported by women experiencing intimate violence and nonabused women. *Violence Against Women*, 13(4), 355.

Baldry, A.C.. (2003). Animal abuse and exposure to interparental violence in Italian youth. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 258-281.

Beirne, P. (1997). Rethinking bestiality: Towards a concept of interspecies sexual assault. *Theoretical Criminology*, 1 (3), 317-340.

Beirne, P. (1999). For a nonspeciesist criminology: Animal abuse as an object of study. *Criminology*, 37 (1), 117-148.

Beirne, P., South N. (eds) (2007). *Issues in Green Criminology: Confronting Harms Against Environments, Humanity and Other Animals*. Cullompton: Routledge.

Beirne, P. (2009). *Confronting Animal Abuse: Law, Criminology, and Human-Animal Relationships*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Devall, B., Sessions G. (1994), *Deep ecology. Living in the belief that nature means something*. Warsaw: Empty Cloud Publishing.

Drzazga, E. (2017). *Illegal trade in wildlife in the light of green criminology*. In B. Błońska, W. Gogłoza, W. Klaus, D. Woźniakowska-Fajst, *Justice for animals* (. Warsaw: Institute of Legal Sciences of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Open Cages Association. pp. 90-95.

Halsey, M. (1997). *Environmental Crime: Toward an eco-human rights approach*, *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 8(3), 217-242.

Halsey, M., White, R. (1998). *Crime, Ecophilosophy, and Environmental Harm*. *Theoretical Criminology*, 2(3), 345-371.

Lynch, M.J (1990). *The Greening of Criminology: A perspective on the 1990s*. *The Critical Criminologist*, 2(3), 1-5.

Lynch, M., Stretesky, P. (2003). *The Meaning of Green: Contrasting Criminological Perspectives*. *Theoretical Criminology*, 7(2), 217-238.

McDonald, J.M. (1963). *The Threat to Kill*. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 120(2), 125-130. Naess, A., (1973). *The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement. A summary* (Summary of an Introductory Lecture at the 3rd World Future Research Conference, Bucharest, September 3-10, 1972). In *Inquiry*. 16 (1), 95-100.

Nurse, A. (2013). *Animal Harm. Perspectives on Why People Harm and Kill Animals*. London, New York: Routledge.

Nurse, A. (2015). *Policing Wildlife. Perspectives on the enforcement of wildlife legislation*.

Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on the 'Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on an EU approach to illegal wildlife trade' COM(2014) 64 final, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/PL/TXT/PDF/?uri=- CELEX:52013AE6185&from=EN>

Packer, H. (1964). *The Crime Tariff*, *The American Scholar*, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 551-557.

Qulinsk, J.A.. (1999). Animal abuse and family violence. In F. R. Ascione & P. Arkow (eds.), *Child abuse, domestic violence, and animal abuse: Linking the circles of compassion for prevention and intervention*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 168-175.

Sollund, R. (2013). Animal trafficking and trade: Abuse and species injustice. In D. S. South, N., Brisman, A. (2013). *Routledge International Handbook of Green Criminology*. London, New York: Routledge.

South, N., Brisman, A., Bierne P. (2013). A guide to green criminology. In N. South, A. Brisman (eds), *Routledge International Handbook of Green Criminology (27-42)*. London, New York: Routledge.

Sutherland, D. (1945). White Collar Crime? *American Sociological Review*. 10(2), 132-139. White, R. (ed) (2012). *Climate Change from a Criminological Perspective*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

White, R. (2018). Ecocentrism and criminal justice. *Theoretical Criminology*, 22(3), 342 -362. White, R., Heckenberg D. (2014). *Green Criminology. An introduction to the study of environmental harm*, London, New York: Routledge.

Wyatt, T. (2012). *Green Criminology and Wildlife Trafficking: the illegal fur and falcon trades in Russia Far East*. Saarbrücken Lap: Lambert Academic Publishing.

Wyatt, T. (2013). *Wildlife Trafficking. A Deconstruction of the Crime, the Victims and the Offenders*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

LEGAL ACTS

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora], Dz.U. 1991 No 27 item 112.

Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97 of 9 December 1996 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein, OJ EU L 61, 3.03.1997, pp. 1-69.

Ustawa z dnia 21 sierpnia 1997 r. o ochronie zwierząt [Act on the protection of animals], [consolidated text] Dz.U. 2020 item. 638.

Ustawa o ochronie przyrody z 16 kwietnia 2004 r. [The Nature Conservation Act], [consolidated text] Dz.U. 2020 item 55.

Open Peer Review Comments

Professor Rosaleen Duffy, University of Sheffield

Overall this is an interesting paper which tackles a very complex set of issues. This paper highlights an important omission in criminology, notably crimes against non-human nature, and specifically animals.

The first section sketches out the features of the field of criminology, in order to show why a focus on animals via analysis of IWT is necessary. The second section sets out why green criminology is necessary, especially to analyse harms as a result of activities than may or may not be criminalised. This is linked in to biocentric and ecocentric perspectives.

The paper provides a good overview of the range of threats from illegal wildlife trade, including the risk of zoonotic disease.

There is brief mention of the case of Poland, and the point about turning a blind eye to petty smuggling because of the structure of penalties is well made. This indicates the value of a criminological perspective because it shows how legal frameworks that allow for excessive punishments are counter-productive for controlling IWT. The paper could usefully have covered the case of Poland in more depth as part of its original contribution – to my knowledge there is little published empirical work on IWT in Poland. I would have liked to see more original empirical material in the paper to develop the main arguments.

The themes of how a green criminology perspective can highlight social and ecological injustices could be made more strongly. This is a really important theme in green criminology, but it is implicit rather than explicit throughout the paper.

The theme of anthropocentrism is also implicit and not fully drawn out in the paper. Green criminologists, especially Sollund, Wyatt and Nurse are very clear on the risks of human exceptionalism, and the harms produced by speciesism. The paper could delve further into the theme of speciesism (especially Sollund's work) to draw out the consequences of the omission of the non-human from mainstream criminology.

The summary brings together the main arguments and translated them in to policy relevant findings which is very valuable.

Professor Rosaleen Duffy,
University of Sheffield

The phenomenon of wildlife trade is analyzed in the article from various criminological perspectives: traditional (mainstream) criminology, as well as biocentric and ecocentric approaches within green criminology. At a first glance, each of these perspectives focuses on different aspects of wildlife trade: traditional criminology, which goes hand in hand with the anthropocentric trend in green criminology here, focuses, firstly, on the illegal trade in wildlife, and secondly, on the threats to humans posed by this activity. Meanwhile, the perspective of green criminology is broader. It encompasses not only crimes but all human actions causing harm to wildlife. It also recognizes the intrinsic value of nature, important not only in the context of human needs. The author illustrates that these approaches do not conflict but rather complement each other: she points out their common grounds and the possibilities of drawing from the achievements of each. The article clearly explains that the 'green' perspective enables traditional

criminology to revisit research paths that, although still relevant, have been neglected: investigating the social structures underlying crime and focusing on social harm rather than solely on criminal acts. At the same time, this text, through specific examples, proves that traditional criminology can provide accurate answers to problems related to the protection of wildlife: one of them is caution and restraint in the criminalization of human behaviors. The second is the necessity of differentiating penal policy depending on the type of crime committed against wildlife and the motivations of the perpetrators. I believe that this article provides an accurate and valuable analysis of the issue of wildlife trade, considering various theoretical perspectives: it proves that only the convergence of these perspectives allows for finding the most effective ways to protect wildlife.

Assistant Professor Barbara Błońska
Department of Criminology and Criminal Policy
University of Warsaw