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THE POLITICS OF REACTION

It can be an interesting exercise to contrast the divergent ways in which our politicians choose to address crime, especially the way in which they answer calls to make changes to our criminal law and processes. Often they will simply react to a “crisis”. Sometimes they will instigate a meticulous and protracted program of reform. The notion of legislatively reacting to a crisis is a curious phenomenon and warrants some exploration. Clearly the impact of the media is not insignificant. In New South Wales, we have seen many recent examples: reactions to “Lebanese” gang rapes, to the Cronulla riots, to the clamour for more (and more) police powers.

In seeking to understand the phenomenon of reaction, a glance at the work of one of the world’s leading criminological and sociological theorists should prove enlightening. David Garland, in his seminal work The Culture of Control, contrasts so-called “adaptive” and “non-adaptive” responses to crime. He notes that while state administration “has gone about its business of devising strategies, adapting to its limitations and coming to terms with its changing environment, the state’s political machine has repeatedly indulged in a form of evasion and denial which is almost hysterical”.

Although Garland’s thesis is directly aimed at historical developments in the United States and Britain, it is telling how eerily familiar some of his themes might seem to our ears, creating a peculiar resonance. And so,

[disregarding evidence that crime does not readily respond to severe sentences, or new police powers, or a greater use of imprisonment, legislatures have repeatedly adopted a punitive “law and order” stance.]

In Garland’s eyes, political expediency not infrequently dominates the motivations of the key players:

Their most pressing concern is to do something decisive, to respond with immediate effect to public outrage, to demonstrate that the state is in control and is willing to use its powers to uphold “law and order” and to protect the law-abiding public … Policymaking becomes a form of acting out that downplays the complexities and long-term character of effective crime control in favour of the immediate gratifications of a more expressive alternative. Lawmaking becomes a matter of retaliatory gestures intended to reassure a worried public.

With the sound of a worried public ringing in our ears, we can turn to the work of an earlier leading criminological and sociological theorist, Stan Cohen, to revisit his notion of “moral panic”.

---

1 I would like to thank my friend and colleague Dr Arlie Loughnan for helping to awaken my curiosity for some rudimentary ingredients in the processes of justice.
3 Garland, n 1, p 131.
5 Garland, n 1, pp 133-134 (emphasis in the original).
Cohen's thesis, nicely summarised by Poynting and Morgan, rests on seven key moments:  


Not unusually, moral panics might begin with a fear, perhaps a fear of “The Other”. Sometimes, even before the entrepreneurs and experts – the politicians and police – become involved, sections of society choose to take the law into their own hands. Such outbreaks of lawlessness might be termed pogroms, where the dominant culture attacks and subdues a minority it perceives as a threat. Certainly Australia has experienced its own pogroms over the years. Besides the acts of genocide perpetrated by white colonists against the indigenous population from initial settlement up until the 1920s, there were riots against and killings of Chinese on the gold-fields in the 1850s-1870s, murderous riots directed at Afghan cameleers in the 1890s, and race riots in Kalgoorlie in 1934 directed at southern-European immigrants. As commentators have noted, the print media of the day certainly played its part in fostering mistrust and fear as a catalyst for the actions, or in response to them, confirming Cohen’s notion of the menace being shaped for the populace by the dual ploy of hyperbole and typecasting.

Our fear of The Other continued to develop through the Menzies years (fear of Reds and the Yellow Peril) and then through the Vietnam War, the focus in that latter period initiating a fear of Boat People and then more mainstream Asian migration.

From the time of the White Australia Policy to the Vietnam War to the ignorant populism of One Nation, anti-Asian sentiment has been an unfortunate but persistent feature in sections of the Australian community.

The media focus of the period was on “Asian gangs” and the “Asian drug trade”, a focus whose objective was arguably “ethnicising criminality and criminalising ethnicity”. With the advent of the first Gulf War, the media’s critical tentacles began to shift from the “Asian Other” and started to zero in on “Lebanese gangs” towards the late 1990s, especially after a series of drive-by shootings in New South Wales. Politicians, including then-Premier Bob Carr, were quick to point the finger at The Other. In time, more politicians and commentators gleefully joined the throng.

---

9 See, eg Poynting S, “What Caused the Cronulla Riot?” (2006) 48(1) Race & Class 85 at 90. Arguably, it was the fear of the threat of the Chinese on the gold-fields and the later Pacific Islander “kanakas” on the plantations in Queensland that gave birth to the blight of the White Australia Policy.
10 See Kabir N, “The Afghan Other” in Poynting and Morgan, n 7, pp 154-156. See also Poynting, n 9 at 90.
11 See Poynting, n 9 at 90.
15 Bob Carr stated: “The people trying to destroy the Australian way of life will simply not succeed” in the Daily Telegraph (3 November 1998) p 5.