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Introduction

The study of organised crime has emerged as a field of research in its own right over the past 30 to 40 years. While American scholars dominated the scene from the 1960s through to the 1980s, Europe can make a claim to have recently become the centre of organised crime research. Based on a systematic though certainly not exhaustive review of the academic literature, an attempt is made to identify some key trends regarding the institutionalisation and funding of organised crime research as well as regarding research topics and methodology. Critical challenges for future research will also be addressed. The basic argument is that while the richness of empirical studies distinguishes the European research arena, conceptually and theoretically few substantial advances have been made. In the future efforts need to be undertaken to ensure the continuity and political independence of organised crime research. This will require, inter alia, a reform of the funding schemes of the European Union.

The study of organised crime as an academic discipline

An academic discipline constitutes itself through a self-referential system comprising such elements as specialised journals, professional associations, university courses, and textbooks. By this measure the study of organised crime has evolved at least into a separate sub-discipline within the broad field of criminology and the social sciences. There are three journals with an exclusive or major focus on organised crime: Trends in Organised Crime, the journal which is affiliated with the International Association for the Study of Organised Crime (IASOC), Crime, Law and Social Change with the longest tradition and the highest prestige among the three journals, and Global Crime which was previously published under the name “Transnational Organised Crime”. It is interesting
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to note that at the time of writing two out of the three journals have editors based in Europe. A shift of weight from the U.S. to Europe is also discernible with regard to the professional associations in the field. IASOC, traditionally dominated by American scholars, has a growing European membership and for the first time in its history it is headed by a European president, Dina Siegel from the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. The other major association of organised crime researchers is a genuinely European creation although its membership has expanded to other parts of the world: the Standing Group Organised Crime of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR). The e-Newsletter Organised Crime issued by the Standing Group is also an important publication platform apart from the three journals. Finally, in all modesty, the Cross-border Crime Colloquium group and the series of books produced by this group, including the present volume, cannot be left unmentioned in this context.

Courses on organised crime have regularly been taught in criminology and criminal justice programme in the United States for decades, with European universities now following suit. A number of textbooks are available of which the ones by Howard Abadinsky (2007) and by Jay Albanese (2007) have the longest tradition, with the first editions dating back to the 1980s, although the first organised crime texts appeared as early as the mid 1970s, most notably Frederic Homer’s underrated “Guns and Garlic” (Homer, 1974; see also Pace and Style, 1975). An indicator of the increased importance of organised crime as a subject in European criminology curricula is the recent publication of European textbooks, or textbook-like introductory volumes on organised crime (Ignjatovic, 1998; Johansen, 1996; Wright, 2006).

While scholars interested in organised crime are scattered all across the continent, certain centres of research activity have emerged in Europe since the 1990s. Some of these research centres are institutionally independent, like the Centre for the Study of Democracy (CSD) in Sofia, Bulgaria. Some are integrated into governmental structures, such as WODC in the Netherlands and the Council for Crime Prevention (Brå) in Sweden; some are affiliated with universities, such as CIROC in the Netherlands, Transcrime in Italy, Ghent University’s Institute for International Research on Criminal Policy (IRCP), and the office of TraCCC in Tbilisi, Georgia, a research institute with headquarters at George-Mason-University in Virginia. Some universities have become centres of organised crime research not by virtue of formal structures but because of continuous research by scholars, including PhD students, with a specialisation in organised crime studies, namely Cardiff University in Wales, Tilburg University in the Netherlands, and the University of Leuven in Belgium. Several supranational research and documentation centres, finally, like the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) in Lisbon, the United Nations Office on
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Drugs and Crime in Vienna, or the Geneva based International Organisation for Migration (IOM) have made significant contributions to the study of organised crime in specific areas, such as drug trafficking, human trafficking and human smuggling.

**Funding of organised crime research at national level**

A variety of funding schemes have shaped the study of organised crime in Europe. Government funds have played an important part, not only with regard to the research done by governmental bodies such as WODC and Brå, but also through the commissioning of research projects. Relevant studies which fall in this category include projects funded by the Home Office, such as Pearson and Hobbs’ (2001) and the Matrix Knowledge Group’s (2007) investigations of drug traffickers in the UK, and the literature review on drug trafficking produced by Nicholas Dorn, Michael Levi, Leslie King and others (2005). The German police agency Bundeskriminalamt (BKA) has likewise funded significant research, including an exploratory study of police perceptions of organised crime (Rebscher and Vahlenkamp, 1988) and a study on the logistics of organised crime (Sieber and Bögel, 1993). The famous Van Traa Commission of the Dutch national parliament and the resulting report on organised crime in the Netherlands, drafted by four scholars (Fijnaut, Bovenkerk, Bruinsma and van de Bunt, 1998), should also be mentioned in this context.

National research foundations and councils have likewise been a source for funding organised crime research in Europe (see for example Pütter, 1998), although one might wonder how many research proposals have been rejected because of the lack of expertise of reviewers, just as in any other area of research with a strong interdisciplinary and policy orientation. Doctoral grants form a third important funding scheme on the national level. In fact, it seems that most of the empirical research in the area of organised crime is currently being undertaken by PhD students. Indeed, some of the most remarkable studies of recent years have been PhD projects, namely the interview-based studies of Colombian cocaine traffickers by Damian Zaitch (2002) and of Finnish professional criminals by Mika Junninen (2006), and Letizia Paoli’s (2003b) work on Cosa Nostra and ‘Ndrangheta. It could be argued that this tells as much about the quality of doctoral students as it tells about the deficits of established research institutions.
Research funding at European level

On the supra-national level the Council of Europe deserves credit for financing the first study on organised crime in Europe (Mack and Kerner, 1975; see also Kerner 1973). Overall, however, the European Union, through various programmes, can claim to have provided by far the most funds. Smaller funding programmes such as Falcone (see for example van de Bunt and van der Schoot, 2003) and AGIS (see for example Savona, Lewis and Vettori, 2005) made several, mainly policy oriented research projects possible. The same is true for the 6th Framework Programme. Under the 6th Framework Programme, two major projects in particular were financed with amounts of close to 500,000 Euros each, which might make them the two most expensive EU-funded research projects on organised crime to date: “Improving Knowledge on Organised Crime to develop a common European approach” (IKOC), coordinated by Ernesto Savona at the Transcrime Institute, and “Assessing Organised Crime” (AOC), coordinated by Petrus C. van Duyne at Tilburg University. It remains to be seen to what extent the 7th Framework Programme, launched in 2007, will support research on organised crime, but there is grounds for profound pessimism. Ignoring critique voiced in the drafting process, the 7th Framework Programme does not address the issue of crime in any systematic and coherent way. Instead, crime related topics are spread across several themes, primarily Theme 8 “Socio-Economic Sciences and the Humanities” and Theme 10 “Security”. It does not appear that the authors of the Programme were really concerned with improving security through an improved knowledge base of (organised) crime. In the last instance it seems that the emphasis is on subsidising large corporations in the declared interest of “strengthening the scientific and technological bases of Community industry”.\footnote{Decision No 1982/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006, OJ L 412/1.} This becomes evident in the fact that the security theme does not fall in the domain of the Directorate-General for Research, but in that of the Enterprise and Industry Directorate-General. EU-Commissioner Günter Verheugen, in an interview, justified this decision with a statement effectively negating the need for fundamental criminological research and knowledge-based criminal policy-making on the European level: “Research should not be an end in itself. (. . .) The topic of security research (. . .) supports the implementation of European security policy and also has a significant influence on the competitiveness of the relevant industry and on the overall competitiveness of Europe”.\footnote{Austria Innovative Special, Security Research, Federal Ministry of Transport, Innovation and Technology, Austria, online at: http://www.austriainnovativ.at/downloads/AI_02a07_e.pdf (last viewed: 04.12.2007).} Accordingly, in the first round of calls, proposals did not attain the necessary scores \textit{inter alia} because the referees felt industry interests were not sufficiently promoted. In one case the evaluation noted that “(t)he
claimed reinforcement of the competitiveness of European industry is not sufficiently
demonstrated”. The evaluation of another project on the improvement of strategic
crime analysis through better use of existing law enforcement databases criticised that,
although “potential exists both for new knowledge and technology development”, “no
reinforcement of the EU industry as a whole is expected”. While the lack of transpar-
ency makes it difficult to discern which direction the implementation of the 7th
Framework Programme is taking, as of now it seems that significant modifications are
necessary to insure a continuity of research on organised crime on the European level.

The three grand themes of the study of OC

There are three grand themes addressed in the European academic literature under the
broad heading of ‘organised crime’: the meta level of the discourse on organised crime,
the level of empirical manifestations of organised crime, and the level of counter meas-
ures.

Meta level: the construction of ‘OC’ as a social problem

Quite a lot has been written in Europe about the construction of ‘organised crime’ as a
social problem.

The concept of ‘organised crime’, that much seems clear, is an American invention
which has been transferred to a heterogeneous crime landscape and which has gone
through modifications and reinterpretations across time and space (von Lampe, 2005a).
A number of European authors have examined how the concepts of ‘organised crime’
and ‘transnational organised crime’ gained prominence in Europe and elsewhere (see
for example Edwards and Gill, 2002; von Lampe, 1999; 2001; Luczak, 2004; Massari,
2003; Woodiwiss, 1990; 2003). Two recurring themes can be found in this literature.
There is, on the one hand, the issue of myth and reality and the apparent discrepancy
between the certainty with which the concept is used in public discourse and the weak
underlying knowledge base. On the other hand, there is the political dimension, the
instrumentalisation of the threat image of ‘organised crime’ for legitimising new law
enforcement measures and the associated infringement of civil liberties. It has been
argued that the concept of ‘organised crime’ was uncritically adopted by the Europeans,
that it serves political and institutional interests and reproduces historical threat imagery
rather than contributing to a better understanding of the social reality of crime
(Albrecht, 2002; Van Duyne, 2004; Hobbs, 2004; Kuschej and Pilgram, 1997). While
this argumentation has some merits, it cannot be ignored that research in this area is
fragmented and that, with very few exceptions, there have been no methodologically
rigid studies on the process of constructing ‘organised crime’ as a social problem, comparable, for example, to Savelsberg and Brühl’s (1994) study on the economic-crime debate in Germany. Most of the literature is essayistic and eclectic, and there is a tendency towards hedging conspiracy theories when it comes to explaining the political career of the concept of ‘organised crime’. It seems safe to say, therefore, that future researchers will find sufficient opportunities to significantly broaden, deepen, and revise current wisdom.

**Empirical manifestations of ‘organised crime’**

There is a slow but steadily growing body of empirical literature on organised crime worldwide. Yet, it seems that most of the recent work in the field has originated in Europe, with the Netherlands being the most productive country. In order to obtain a better understanding of the course the study of organised crime is taking, it is helpful to sort the literature by central research topics or basic dimensions. In fact, when describing the object of the study of organised crime, one should speak about a number of different empirical phenomena which are examined in a rather loose conceptual context which is provided by the umbrella term ‘organised crime’. These phenomena include ‘organised criminals’ as an implicitly distinct category of offenders, the activities these individuals are involved in, the associational patterns through which they are connected, the power structures that subordinate these individuals and collectives to common or particular interests, and the relations between these individuals, structures and activities on the one hand, and the legal spheres of society on the other. These main facets of the fuzzy overall picture are not equally addressed by European researchers (see von Lampe, 2006b; von Lampe et al., 2006).

**Individual Offenders**

Individual ‘organised’ offenders, for one, are hardly ever in the focus of attention. This is in stark contrast with other fields of criminology, and with the gangster and mafioso stereotypes dominating public imagery of ‘organised crime’. Frank Bovenkerk’s examination of the personality of mafia bosses, drawing on gangster biographies, remains the only work specifically dealing with this issue to date (Bovenkerk, 2000). A biographical approach is also taken by Claudio Besozzi in his more general analysis of illicit entrepreneurs (Besozzi, 2001). Others have addressed psychological aspects in broader discussions of illegal markets and criminal collectives (Canter and Alison, 2000; Van Duyne, 2000).

In the future it can be expected that the emphasis on associational structures will become less prominent and that the study of organised crime will move closer to mainstream criminology by incorporating the human factor in the analysis of criminal struc-
This assumption is based on the notion that approaches aiming at explaining ‘organised crime’ by the structure of criminal organisations, be it networks or organisations in the narrow sense of the word, tend to underestimate the importance of individual skills and characteristics for the creation and shaping of associational structures, and collective activities for that matter. To paraphrase a popular motto (see Coles, 2001), it may not be who you are but who you know that counts in ‘organised crime’, however, who you know may depend to a considerable degree on who you are and what social skills you have for getting to know the people you need to know to be a successful, networked criminal.

*Criminal Activities*

‘Organised crime’ is associated with a wide range of criminal activities. Especially where ‘traditional organised crime’ is not an issue, as is the case in most European countries, specific types of crime or illegal markets frequently provide the frame of reference for scientific exploration, in contrast to studies focussing on ‘criminal groups’ or geographical areas.

Drug trafficking has traditionally received the most attention (see for example van de Bunt, Kunst and Siegel, 2002; Dorn, Otte and White, 1999; Gruppo Abele, 2003; Gruter and van de Mheen, 2005; Pearson and Hobbs, 2001; Zaitch, 2002). Recently, however, the cigarette black market has emerged as a favourite object of study (Antonopoulos, 2006; 2007; Van Dijck, 2007; Van Duyne, 2003b; Hornsby and Hobbs, 2007; Janssens et al., 2008; von Lampe, 2003b; 2005b; 2006a; 2007; Markina, 2007). Other areas of crime explored by empirical research in Europe include, for example, human trafficking (Antonopoulos and Winterdyk, 2005; Obradovic, 2004; Spencer et al., 2006), trafficking in stolen motor vehicles (Gerber and Killias, 2003; Sieber and Bögel, 1993), alcohol smuggling (Johansen, 2005), illegal waste disposal (Gruppo Abele et al., 2003; Massari and Monzini, 2004), credit card fraud (Levi, 2003), fencing (Sund et al., 2006; Weschke and Heine-Heiß, 1990), black labour (Van Duyne and Houtzager, 2005; Carlström and Hedström, 2007), and money laundering (Van Duyne, 2003a, 2007; Suendorf, 2001).

*Patterns of Criminal Association*

It appears that the question ‘How organised is organised crime?’ explicitly or implicitly guides most researchers in the field. The dispute over Donald Cressey’s (1969) interpretation of the American Mafia as being synonymous with organised crime and similar in structure to a government and a large corporation (see for example Albini, 1971; Smith, 1975; Anderson, 1979; Reuter, 1983; Potter, 1994), has not been confined to the re-
search community in the United States. The distancing from Cressey’s ‘bureaucratic model’ is a central component in the overall line of reasoning of quite a number of European authors as well. Indeed, there is something of a consensus that the predominant structural pattern of criminal cooperation in Europe is characterised by webs of personal relations which are flexibly used by offenders for the commission of crimes. Cooperation, according to the existing empirical studies, typically occurs either on a contractual basis, i.e. in the form of supplier-consumer or ephemeral employer-employee relations, or on a partnership basis in pairs or small groups with little overall horizontal or vertical integration (Bruinsma and Bernasco, 2004; Van Duyne, 2003b; Johansen, 2005; Jünningen, 2006; Gruppo Abele, 2003; Kleemans and Van de Bunt, 1999; von Lampe, 2003b; Paoli, 2003a; Pearson and Hobbs, 2001; Ruggiero and Khan, 2007; Zaitch, 2002).

Two challenges emerge in this situation. The first challenge is to develop a sufficiently concise terminology to adequately capture the variation and fluidity of patterns of criminal association. The paucity of concepts, which is mirrored in the frequent use of ambiguous phrases like ‘loosely structured’ or ‘network like’ translates into a lack of analytical clarity. The second challenge lies in the application of network analytical tools. What would seem an obvious choice in instances where no form of structural integration of offenders exists, to examine offender relations in terms of networks, has considerable limitations of which the problem of missing and incomplete data may be the most crucial one. Missing data influence network analysis more than traditional statistical analyses (Knoke and Kuklinski, 1982; Robins, Koskinen and Pattison, 2008), and data are particularly likely to be missing in the case of criminal networks where researchers seldom know about all relevant individuals beforehand, and even if they do, they may not be able to obtain the required information on all of them (Sparrow, 1991). Proceeding with the analysis “in terms of what is known” (McAndrew, 2000: 62) may make sense for some network analytical approaches, but not for all. Criminal network analysis is also limited by the lack of depth of the available information. Often, data do not consistently go beyond merely stating that some form of contact exists between a given pair of actors. This level of information is only sufficient for certain research questions, such as the one addressed by a Swedish study which, based on co-offending data, explored the reach of criminal contacts of a set of drug traffickers. The study revealed that the 127 individuals convicted in connection with serious drug offences in Stockholm county in 2003, had been in contact, directly or indirectly, with at least 7,000 other individuals suspected of criminal involvement, which the authors took as evidence for the existence of a widespread criminal milieu (Korsell et al., 2005). In other studies, network analysis has proven valuable for sorting through data sets involving large numbers of actors, especially in the initial phase of data analysis (see for example Giannakopoulos, 2001). Otherwise, the greatest value of the network concept
seems to be that it forces researchers to adopt a bottom-up approach in the description and analysis of offender structures independent from popular imagery and constructs (Klerks, 2003; von Lampe, 2003a). Henner Hess’ classic study of the Sicilian Mafia (Hess, 1970), in which he breaks down the world of Cosa Nostra into different types of dyadic ties, is a good example for such a down-to-earth research strategy. However, there is a certain danger of falling into the other extreme by failing to acknowledge durable, vertically and horizontally differentiated offender structures where they indeed exist. At the moment it seems that the analysis of criminal networks using the tools of network analysis is still in an infant state in Europe, and that the apparent limits of this methodology have not yet been tested in practice, despite the popularity the idea of criminal network analysis has gained in recent years (Bruinsma and Bernasco, 2004; Klerks, 2003; McAndrew, 2000).

**Overarching Power Structures**

Above the micro-level of entrepreneurial offenders and offender collectives, overarching structures can be found which claim control over a given territory, such as a town or region, or an illegal market or illegal-market level, in furtherance of particular or common interests. The American scholar Alan Block has coined the term ‘power syndicate’, as opposed to ‘enterprise syndicate’, for this kind of criminal structure (Block, 1983: 13). In Europe, phenomena falling into this category have for the most part been identified and studied in Southern Italy (Gambetta, 1993; Hess, 1970; Paoli, 2003b) and in Russia (Varese, 2001). An interesting question which has recently been raised is to what extent these territorially based groups have the capacity to migrate and to reproduce their position of power, which may extend also to the legal economy, in areas or even countries outside their traditional sphere of influence (Varese, 2004; 2006).

The fact that ‘power syndicates’ with roots in countries other than Italy and Russia have not received a similar degree of attention may be due to the fact that they simply do not exist, or have ceased to exist. But it may also be that ‘hegemonic order’ where it is confined to the underworld and does not extend into the legal spheres of society, is simply less often recognised as such by researchers (Hobbs, 2001; Hartmann and von Lampe, 2008).

**Illegal-Legal Nexus**

The individuals, structures, and activities associated with ‘organised crime’ do not exist in a social vacuum. Rather, they are tied in with their surroundings in different ways.
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One aspect is the “social embeddedness of organised crime” (Kleemans and van de Bunt, 1999) in certain social strata, milieus, or ethnic communities. Anomie theory has been one obvious choice to explain this connection with regard to migrant communities (Bovenkerk, 1998) whereas concepts and theories from social and cultural anthropology have been applied to indigenous ‘organised crime’ phenomena like the Sicilian Mafia (Cottino, 1999; Hessinger, 2002). Not all ‘organised crime’, however, is necessarily (sub-) culturally rooted. Research on cigarette smuggling and on a wide range of other areas of crime in Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium suggests that to a considerable degree offenders involved in illegal market activities do not have a wider criminal background and apparently start their criminal careers fairly late in life (Van Dijck, 2007; Van Duyne, 2003b; Janssens et al., 2008; Kleemans and van de Poot, 2008; von Lampe, 2005b).

Many discussions of the links between the illegal and legal spheres of society are framed in the concept of corruption. One associated image is that of ‘organised criminals’ neutralising law enforcement through bribing and intimidating police officials, prosecutors and judges. Another image depicts ‘organised criminals’ in alliance with political and business elites. Relatively little empirical research has been done in these areas, and most of the literature refers to conditions in Southern Italy and Eastern Europe with few specifically addressing the dimension of ‘organised crime’ (see for example Center for the Study of Democracy, 2004; Galli, 1994; Maljevic et al., 2006; Newell, 2006; Paoli, 2003b; Varese, 2001).

Corresponding to the infiltration of government there is a concern about the infiltration of the legal economy by ‘organised crime’. This may take the form of legal businesses falling under the control of criminal groups, legal businesses and criminals establishing collusive links, or criminal networks forming within the legal business sector (Dorn et al., 2007; Paoli, 1995; Ruggiero, 2000). Finally, in extension of the regulation of illegal markets, criminal groups may provide quasi-governmental functions such as debt collection, conflict resolution and protection from competition, for legal businesses (Gambetta, 1993; Skoblikov, 1999; Varese, 2001; Volkov, 2000).7

**Countermeasures**

The third major thematic area defining the study of organised crime, apart from the meta-level of the construction of ‘organised crime’ and the empirical level of ‘organised crime’ phenomena, concerns the countermeasures taken against ‘organised crime’. For the most part, countermeasures have been adopted in the form of modified and newly
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introduced material and procedural criminal law (Paoli and Fijnaut, 2006), institutional changes in law enforcement and the criminal justice system (Pütter, 1998; Segell, 2007), and administrative law (Huisman and Nelen, 2007; Köbben, 2002). These measures, and especially their legal ramifications, have been described in great detail. However, relatively little research has been conducted on their implementation and the effectiveness with regard to reducing and preventing ‘organised crime’. The major weakness appears to be the lack of a clear understanding of the nature, extent, and developmental trends of ‘organised crime’ as independent variables. For the most part, the literature relies on prima facie plausibility, and on politically and media induced imagery regarding the reality of ‘organised crime’. Or it applies criteria which have nothing to do with the crime situation as such, but rather with bureaucratic effectiveness or civil rights issues (see for example Kinzig, 2004; Vettori, 2006a).

Some efforts have been made by scholars to tackle the deficiencies in the existing knowledgebase on ‘organised crime’, which are becoming apparent not only in the evaluation of countermeasures, but more generally in the areas of criminal policy and intelligence led policing. One undertaking has been to make better use of existing statistical data, especially in cross-national perspective, on particular areas of crime, namely human trafficking (Di Nicola and Cauduro, 2007), or on organised crime in general (Vettori, 2006b). This endeavour is closely linked to the Transcrime Institute in Italy and the IKOC project. Another undertaking, mainly associated with the Ghent University’s Institute for International Research on Criminal Policy (IRCP), aims at utilising a broader range of data for the purpose of proactive assessments of ‘organised crime’ in the form of risk analysis and scenario building (Black et al., 2001; Vander Beken and Defruytier, 2004; Vander Beken et al., 2004; Verfaillie and Vander Beken, forthcoming).

Without being able to go into any detail here, it seems that all of these approaches seek to activate and combine information from different sources, and to draw meaningful inferences from this information within one methodological framework. However, this is without solving the fundamental problem of the lack of a sound empirical and theoretical underpinning (von Lampe, 2004). No matter how elaborate the methodologies, in essence they merely reproduce existing assumptions and perceptions held by those involved in the respective studies, to be found in the fragmentary literature, or gleaned from group discussions of experts (in the case of scenario building).

An alternative direction has been proposed by the “Assessing Organised Crime” project. Without developing a comprehensive conceptual and theoretical framework, the project has outlined a mechanism, the New European Common Approach
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(NECA), not only for a more effective use of existing law enforcement data for strategic crime analysis, but also for the future integration of strategic crime analysis and scientific research. The idea behind NECA is that the existence of a sufficient knowledge base for valid and meaningful assessments of ‘organised crime’ cannot simply be pretended. Instead, it needs to be systematically built in the medium and long run (Assessing Organised Crime Research Consortium, 2007; Van Duyne, 2007; von Lampe 2005c).

Empirical research and theory building

The study of ‘organised crime’ is fundamentally no different from any other area of social science research in that it is faced with the problems of finding good data, and has to meet manifold challenges in meaningfuly describing, systematising and explaining what social phenomena have been observed.

Collecting data on ‘organised crime’

All means of data collection common in sociological research can be and have been utilised in the study of ‘organised crime’: observations, interviews, and text analysis.

Participant observations have been rare, but one of the earliest European studies, Anton Blok’s exploration of the Mafia in a Sicilian Village (Blok, 1974), falls in this category. So does a yet unpublished PhD-project in Poland, which has become the subject of a book by the investigative journalist Jürgen Roth (2005). For the purpose of writing a doctoral thesis Aneta M. took on a job in a bar serving as a meeting place of the Polish underworld. This case illustrates the dangers attached to such an endeavour. Roth alleges that because of pressure exerted by criminal circles, Aneta M. was unable to obtain her doctoral degree from the University of Szczecin, Poland, where she had been based while conducting her research. A daring approach was also taken in a study of smuggling and corruption in Georgia, where researchers posed as smugglers for the purpose of participant observation and covert interviewing (Kukhianidze, Kupatadze and Gotsiridze, 2004).

For a long time, interview-based studies in the area of organised crime meant studies drawing primarily or exclusively on expert accounts, primarily police investigators (Kerner, 1973; Mack and Kerner, 1975; Rebscher and Vahlenkamp, 1988; Sieber and Bögel, 1993). In recent years, however, a growing number of research projects has been using offender interviews as one prominent source among others (see for example Johansen, 2004; Ruggiero and South, 1995), or as the primary data source. Some studies, especially those with the largest sample sizes, involve incarcerated offenders or indi-
viduals, namely informants, otherwise under the control of the criminal justice system (see for example Dorn, Otte and White, 1998; Kinzig, 2004; Pearson and Hobbs, 2001; Matrix Knowledge Group, 2007). Some studies have used both incarcerated and non-incarcerated offenders (see for example Junninen, 2006; Ruggiero and Khan, 2006; Zaitch, 2002), while some studies exclusively rely on non-incarcerated offenders (see for example Antonopoulos, 2006; Hobbs, 1995; 1999; 2001; Hornsby and Hobbs, 2007). These latter studies contradict the commonly held notion that ‘organised criminals’ are unapproachable for research purposes.9

Text analysis is most frequently used in the study of organised crime in connection with official and media reports (see for example von Lampe, 2006a), but also where criminal files and investigative files form the primary data base (see for example Van Duyne, 1996; 2003b; Herz, 2005; Hess, 1970; Kinzig, 2004; von Lampe, 2005b; 2007; Suendorf, 2001). With the increasing computerisation of police work, the study of organised crime can be expected to routinely involve the analysis of electronically stored data (see for example van Duyne, 2003a; Korsell et al., 2005).

Systematisation

No attempt is made here to comment in any detail on the different ways European researchers have been systematising their areas of study.10 However, it seems that the most valuable categories and classifications have been proposed and elaborated by North-American authors. This may be a reflection merely of the chronology of research efforts. Perhaps under different circumstances it would have been Europeans coming up with the very same concepts first. These classifications include the dichotomies of predatory and market based crime (Naylor, 2003), of “power syndicates” and “enterprise syndicates” (Block, 1983), and of economic and non-economic criminal structures (Haller, 1992), and the distinction between purely market-based criminal relations, criminal networks ties, and transactional links within criminal organisations (enterprises) (Smith, 1994).
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9 See also the special issue “Interviewing ‘Organized Criminals’” of the journal Trends in Organized Crime (11:1, 2008).
10 For a more in-depth analysis of some of the major European organised-crime literature, see von Lampe et al., 2006.
Explanation

Likewise, it seems that the most influential theoretical propositions, though fragmented they may be, originate in North America rather than in Europe. When one thinks of global approaches to explaining ‘organised crime’ one is immediately reminded of Robert K. Merton’s anomie theory which is closely linked to the American experience of immigrant criminal groups (Merton, 1957). More focussed theoretical propositions aim at explaining the emergence of illegal enterprises on the basis of transaction cost economics (Smith, 1994), and the structure of illegal organisations under conditions of illegality (Reuter, 1983; Smith, 1994; Southerland and Potter, 1993). These theoretical approaches have been reflected in the European research literature more or less extensively and some propositions, especially Peter Reuter’s, have been confirmed, though mostly on a rhetorical level rather than in the form of rigorous testing. This is particularly problematic as Reuter developed his hypotheses through investigations of crime phenomena, namely illegal gambling and loan sharking, in what seem to be manifestations that are quite specific to the situation in the United States and particularly New York City (Reuter, 1983).

There is probably only one theoretical approach originating in Europe which has gained some general significance: Diego Gambetta’s notion of mafia-like associations thriving as industries of protection in low-trust social environments (Gambetta, 1993). Just as this proposition has been tested in different social contexts (Hill, 2003; Varese, 2001), the subject of ‘organised crime’ in all its facets needs to be explored in different historical and socio-geographical settings in order to be able to develop and test hypotheses and theories through comparison. Europe seems to be an especially promising arena for comparative research given the patchwork character of its criminal landscape, when one looks, for example, at the uneven prevalence of drug markets (EMCDDA, 2006; United Nations, 2007). Unfortunately, there is hardly any funding available for basic research, including cross-national comparative studies, as a result of the ill-conceived goals of EU research policy.

Concluding remarks

In this short chapter only a rough and inevitably sketchy outline of the state of organised crime research in Europe could be given. From a global perspective it appears that a shift of weight has taken place over the past 20 years from North America to Europe in terms of the number and diversity of empirical research projects, but also in terms of the reality of organised crime. Following the fall of the Iron Curtain a myriad of new manifestations of criminal structures and illegal markets have emerged in ever-changing
patterns. They have been the object of numerous, mostly descriptive studies. However, the opportunities for comparative research and theory building presenting themselves from the patchwork character of the crime landscape in the new Europe have not yet been systematically exploited. This is to a large degree a problem of the ill-conceived goals of EU research policy which generally puts economic interests ahead of ‘enlightenment’, and in the area of ‘organised crime’ specifically favours the reproduction and reinforcement of threat imagery over empirically grounded theory building.

There are three major challenges defining the future of organised crime research in Europe. The first challenge is to ensure continuity of innovative research in order to go beyond merely reproducing and responding to the clichés appearing in the media and in political debates in irregular intervals. Continuity means, first of all, an ongoing research process which contributes to a cumulative body of knowledge. It also means that a network of researchers can grow to combine resources, to connect different countries, different areas of specialisation within the field of ‘organised crime’, and different academic disciplines. Continuity of research, in addition, means that relations of trust can develop between researchers and practitioners. This is particularly important in this security sensitive area of study and in many instances it is the precondition for data to become available for scientific analysis.

The access to data is the second major challenge in the study of organised crime. While researchers have been innovative and persistent in their efforts to obtain information from offenders and law enforcement sources, from victims and from experts, these successes cannot be taken for granted. Training of young researchers, further development of methodologies, and an increasing receptiveness to the needs of research on the part of law enforcement agencies and politics seem to be the keys to more and better organised crime research in the future.

The third major challenge, finally, is to maintain or win independence from outside influences. The most substantial influence-taking which is currently hampering the study of organised crime takes place in connection with the 7th Framework Programme, among others through the non-funding of basic research and through the strings attached to research grants. The themes, problems and research questions addressed in calls for research proposals typically reflect certain interests and ideologically shaped preconceptions which constrain the research process and partly predefine research outcomes. Under the headlines of ‘organised crime’ and ‘terrorism’ there is a continued fixation on socially marginalised and foreign based offender populations, and on technocratic solutions to prevent and curb crime. Research taking place within these confines cannot be expected to produce meaningful results. Against the background of the political dimensions of ‘organised crime’, independence of research is particularly important. The independent study of organised crime, in a sense, is a critical reflection of socio-political conditions and potentially an important facet of the control
by civil society of non-legitimised power. This may be more obvious in Southern Italy and in Eastern Europe, but in essence it is no less true for the rest of Europe.
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