

Chapter Three: Criminology and War: Can Violent Veterans See Blurred Lines Clearly?

Emma Murrayⁱ

Introduction

Criminology and International Relations (IR) contribute to connected concerns and concepts - both disciplines have shared in an analysis of political violence, security, crime, risk and human rights (Aradau and van Munster, 2009) which are each engulfed in a shared analysis of the so called 'war on terror'. In light of this shared focus and despite fewer lines being drawn between war and crime both disciplines go on as markedly distinct fields – pre-occupied with their 'own' dilemmas (Loader and Percy, 2012). The commonality of such dilemmas allows both disciplines to straddle across security studies as they concentrate their efforts on what can crudely be considered as threats to security with an inside and outside dimension. This allows for a dialogue of security scholarship that is fashioned around dichotomies of inside/outside, domestic/international or quite simple here/over there. If we continue to assume for a few moments that these divides make sense in terms of how far academic disciplines can stretch their nets of understanding, then this is illustrated by a criminology that speaks of the 'inside' (the managing of a domestic criminal threat) and an IR that concentrates for the purposes of this chapter on the 'outside' (the managing of the international threat of war).

Discussions of crime and war are structured and discussed around and across limits or borders, both in terms of the meaning ascribed to physical state borders but also to the epistemological construction on the inside and the outside. Walker (1993), an IR scholar, first suggested this in an exploration of his discipline that considered the 'limits' of international relations. Criminology has also faced scrutiny for some time about the limited tools it draws upon in order to understand a narrow view of the subject of crime. Standing accused of being both 'self-referential' and 'self-perpetuating' and lacking 'the ability to look outside itself' (Barton, et al, 2007, cited in Barton, et al, 2007: 2). Such criticisms are not only directed at mainstream criminology but critical strands of the discipline have also faced reproach with suggestions that its 'heyday' is over. Van Swaaningen (1997: 7) makes this claim based upon what he perceives to be a shift 'from epistemological and socio-political questions' back to what could be described as an 'applied science...fuelled by the political agendas of the day, and geared by the agenda of its financiers'. Whilst criminology has responded in collection such as this one, and more broadly through analyses of harm that can be seen for example in Hillyard, et al (2004) these claims are worth revisiting in this discussion as a means of assessing the academic response to the 'war on terror' not least because of the timing of this discussion.

As NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) coalition forces prepare to leave Afghanistan by the end of 2014 the coalition host countries have become unsurprisingly interested in the resettlement of veterans post war which will no doubt only intensify. It is now recognised that for some that resettlement period which is also discussed as reintegration poses challenges for some that lead to criminality. September 2013 marked five years since NAPO (National Association of Probation Officers) claimed that a significant 20,000 ex-armed forces

personnel were currently embroiled in the criminal justice system in England and Wales (NAPO, 2008). Although these figures have been contested – a debate I have had elsewhere (Murray, 2014) the criminality of veterans post war (and often service) has since captured our imagination. The returned British veteran that commits a criminal offence in the domestic sphere is certainly a striking political agenda of the day - especially as research has proven that most frequently those criminal offences are violent in nature (Howard League, 2010; McManus, et al, 2013).

That agenda has encouraged a wealth of new understandings about this *new* ‘troubled’ identity, which are to date largely quantitative that offer statistical probabilities of behaviour and experience (Dandeker, et al, 2003; Greenberg, et al, 2011; Iversen, et al, 2005; McManus, et al, 2013; van Staden, et al, 2007). They are positivistic in nature discussing the challenges faced by veterans from this perspective. Such is the research produced by the psychiatry department of Kings College London, which adopts a rational-actor analytic (Iversen, 2005; van Staden, 2007). The little qualitative work that has been conducted discusses the criminal veteran as a new problem to be highlighted and understood as a criminological or criminal justice issue and a subject to be analysed. In this vein veterans who commit crime can be perceived and researched as either criminal or vulnerable or both in a way that when reading between the lines points to their position being a product of their experience of war before turning its gaze back upon the individual in search for answers about why they have become criminal or vulnerable as a result. It is how they have experienced war and not the war itself that comes into question. This approach fails not only to question the state’s role in creating the violent veteran identity but also their role in constructing their criminality and in consequence how they then manage it.

In previous work I have begun to unpick this issue however in doing so I too have presented the criminal (now understood largely as violent) veteran as a problem for criminal justice practice (Murray, 2013; 2014). Through ‘veteranality’ this thesis conceptualises the criminal veteran as a crisis of identity before questioning how that identity overwhelms normative criminal justice processes. Its first concern is value of the ‘veteran’ identity post criminalisation. As the veteran is identified as criminal they assume an identity of tension between the good and the bad – that tension divorces the criminal veteran of the political agency of both as they can now never truly be either.

Secondly veteranality allows a glimpse at how the state’s criminal justice apparatus then manages or (mis)manages that complex identity. As a conceptual starting point it is hoped that veteranality will be viewed as an invitation to engage in a more critical conversation about how representations of war (which are perceived as occurring in the international sphere) manifest themselves in domestic security issues. It is however still wedded to the criminal law and fails to challenge the relationship between the social construction of crime and legal parameters. As a consequence it is a concept which speaks to the socio-political whilst remaining within the neat confines of criminological discourse upon which to make its claims.

How then can criminology begin to ask the epistemological and socio-political questions van Swaaningen (1997) spoke of with reference to the returned veteran who commits a violent crime? How can we make better sense of this identity theoretically? How can we ensure that at this pivotal point in the ‘war on terror’ veterans experiences are not only seen as a practical

criminal justice problem or a new unit of analysis in administrative criminology but as a means of advancing our understandings of the complexities connecting war and crime in a way that we have not yet begun to consider? In a modest attempt to engage the reader in these 7very issues this chapter is one of two halves. This first part of the chapter aims to map out some of the ways in which criminologists have engaged with IR in the past in an attempt to disrupt stable meanings between the inside and the outside. This is by no means exhaustive but the literatures that have been selected provide the framework on which to hang the suggestions to follow. It is intended to provide some context through a brief exploration of some key perspectives and literature that have endeavoured to see the blurring of lines between of the inside/outside dichotomy more clearly. The second part of the chapter utilizes narrative interviews with veterans currently serving a sentence in the criminal justice system of England and Wales as a muse to suggest that the veteran is a logical extension of a debate between the inside and the outside. It has emerged from a fresh look at the wealth of data collected that demonstrates the complexities of the veteran convicted of a violent offence. These narratives demonstrate that these individuals who once managed ‘criminal’ groups and the risk that they posed internationally are now managed as risky for their criminal status in the domestic sphere.

Taking Stock

The lack of engagement with war in criminological literatures is well-documented elsewhere (Jamieson, 1998; Ruggerio, 2005) and throughout this book. It is important however to just briefly map out the landscape here before looking outside of the discipline. Jamieson’s (1998) efforts are often taken as a starting point; this is not to dismiss or to treat previous less connected efforts as a tokenism (Durkheim, 1992; Hakeem, 1946; Mannheim, 1941; Sorokin,

1944) but to afford war a clear place in criminology under the banner of a ‘criminology of war’. The chapter from *The New European Criminology* was less concerned with the legitimacy or illegitimacy of war as a phenomenon but rather on how exceptionally damaging engaging in such behaviours can be both during and immediately after war periods. Upon providing an overview of explanatory representations that underpin the relationship between war and crime Jamieson (1998) calls for students of criminology to be more attentive to such complex connections. Those calls, and the calls from others, have led to a surge of interest and subsequent production of writing and research within (albeit on the fringes) of the discipline (Ruggiero, 2010).

The dominant focus has been the extent in which criminology can look beyond legalistic and narrow definitions of state crime in a way that affords war a place amongst state crime literature (Green and Ward, 2004; Jamieson and McEvoy, 2005; Kramer and Michalowski, 2005; White, 2007). This included drawing on states of exception – where the legal and illegal co-exist (Agamben, 2005), infringements of human rights legislations (Gearty, 2005), dual purpose violence (Green and Ward, 2009) and ‘legality’ arguments (Hudson, 2009). These works question the conditions upon which the parameters of crime could be extended and reworked to encompass the waging of war and go as far as to suggest that a ‘sociological-criminological analysis of war today may lead to its unconditional criminalisation’ (Ruggiero, 2005: 239). This is of course a theoretical criminalisation (Mandel 2004; Ruggiero 2005; 2007) and Degenhardt (2010) proposes these new offerings as idealistic. It is argued that these influences call for ‘exceptional practices’ to emerge to call states to account in a way that ‘dissolves the issues to a super-national institution...instead of solving the problem of illegitimate violence by liberal regimes’ (Degenhardt, 2010: 344). It is further limited she claims by imagining the state as a source of power at a time when power can no longer be

limited to an understanding of the state as a set of institutions that are accompanied by private agencies in both war and criminal justice – the monopoly of force is now a commodity.

This emergence however gives rise to a challenging of legitimacy of war and its development allows theoretical criminological analysis to demonstrate the criminogenic properties of war whilst aiming to tease out the many complexities that connect war and crime. Such developments explore both war conflicts and post-conflict conditions (Bouffard, 2005; Green and Ward, 2009; Hudson, 2009; Jeffery, 2007; McGarry, 2010; Ruggiero, 2007; Treadwell, 2010). The advances in the literature since can be described as moving in four directions: war as inherently criminal or as having criminological properties (as has been discussed); the complexities that link military operations with policing functions (Kraska, 1993; 2001; 2007; Sparks, 2006; Krasman, 2007); war as a site of victimisation (Kauzlarrich, et al, 2001; McGarry and Walklate, 2011) and lastly how post war situations frequently challenges the boundaries of war and domestic criminal justice process (Murray, 2013; 2014). This not only engages criminology in discussions of war but complements growing concerns with the international. They highlight macro-structural changes of physical state borders and our understandings of those boundaries through an analysis of the relationship between technology, governance, risk and politics – all of which not only transcend national borders but also disciplinary borders. The war on terror is a ‘global war’ and hence by its very nature exceeds conventional understandings of space (Jabri, 2006: 49).

Taking a look outside

Through a series of articles in a special issue of *Global Crime* (2012) it is argued that globalising processes render the inside and outside divide visible only in academia – impossible to draw outside of university walls (Aas, 2012; Holmqvist, 2012). Whilst this is not the space to discuss the contributions found in that issue, in turn it highlights that fostering and feeding the link between criminology and IR is both a challenging yet rewarding enterprise. As such it is important to remain mindful that although there is now a small body of work that reduces the lines drawn between both disciplines, such lines are nonetheless very real in terms of the literature and our understandings of common problems. The special issue can be and should be taken as invitation for more efforts to engage with international security problems from an interdisciplinary perspective. It calls for ‘approaches to criminology and international relations which engage thoroughly and thoughtfully with the literature of the other field’ (Loader and Percy, 2012: 218). Previously Aradau and van Munster (2009) and Degenhardt (2010) had highlighted the worth of such actions. It is anticipated that a project such as this may of course lead to what will be considered an ‘interesting but not perfect criminology’ whilst discussing an ‘important but not flawless IR’; even so the insights gleaned from an engagement such as this create new opportunities that have the capacity to overcome current ‘obstacles to understanding’ (Loader and Percy, 2012: 214).

In light of this potential for a less than perfect dialogue two cautionary notes are essential before continuing to embark on this endeavour. It may of course seem ironic to map out limits in an argument based on challenging limits (both the physical and epistemological). To clarify the ‘limits’ about to be discussed concerns how far this argument can claim to engage with international relations, whereas the limits discussed beyond this point refer to the points

at which both disciplines appear to pass the problem over to the other. With respect to the former, it is the intention here to engage with international relations in the lower case. That is not to engage directly with the discipline or a thorough exploration of its understandings (both novel and contested) but rather to highlight the worth of exploring alternative discourses centred in and around common problems. As part of this exercise appreciations can surface that are at the least inclusive rather than exclusive of one another, and at the most can point to problems that almost occur between disciplines. The second point is that erosions of lines in security are much broader than the inside and outside (Loader and Percy, 2012) and efforts to disrupt understandings between the inside and outside are much broader than an unpicking of the relationship between war and crime - for example public vs. private security are omitted here but can be found elsewhere (Avant and Haulfer, 2012).

That said let us now turn to the ways in which lines between war and crime are now blurred. This blurring (and the literature that exposes it) has developed in three ways: the metaphorical; the merging of military and police policy and practice, and lastly matters of spatially. At the outset there is blurring of language through the sharing of metaphors. It is well documented that one cannot escape the war metaphor in criminological discourse (Garland, 1996; Ruggiero, 2005; Steinert, 2003 to name but a few). It is a rhetorical trope that speaks of ways in which to manage social problems, namely crime, in a way that assumes 'them' an 'enemy' status. Warfare is understood in populist politics as a 'process of civilisation' (Steinert, 2003: 265), so too is the punishment framework. As a result 'the war on drugs', 'war on trafficking' and of course the 'war on terror' allow a governing of apparent social ills in such a way that serves to reiterate sovereignty at the point of crisis (Garland 1996) in a curious way. Once the 'enemy' is identified so too is something to be

fearful of, an elusive 'other' and deviant group that must be governed and its risk managed. What is perhaps not so well documented in criminology is that warfare relies more and more frequently upon metaphors of criminal justice - waged through a language that situates and perceives insurgents not as actors of war but rather as criminals. Whilst this did not start with the 'war on terror'; earlier examples can be found in a language constructed around the need to 'punish' or react to the illegal are evident in both the first Gulf war, Kosovo (Degenhardt 2010) and in Northern Ireland. It is perhaps now increasingly obvious however through public and political rhetoric entrenched with notions to 'bring terrorists to justice' and 'eliminate the threat that they pose' (Blair, 2001). Inviting once more an elusive 'other' that must be governed and its risk managed.

Distinctions are problematised then also by a process of labelling as the 'named' terrorists perceive their acts as those of war whilst counter-terror discourses perceive them as criminal. The counter-strategies that have emerged as a result do so then with criminals in mind leading to a war that merges military provision with police provision and practices of war with law enforcement in a bid to protect the domestic through international designs (Krasman, 1993; 2001; 2007; Sparks, 2006; Krasman, 2007; Loader and Percy, 2012). This blurring has seen NATO coalition forces train Afghan Police as part of their role in occupying Afghanistan (Loader and Percy, 2012); the military employing policing tasks such as going on 'patrol' and even the military having an increasing role in securing the domestic arena, of which the Olympics in London 2012 is testament to. Such strategies are constructed around the 'inside' going 'out', a 'fascination with turning limits into links' through a methodology that operates 'to secure the expansion of global governance' from police power (Ryan 2012: 21). But, in the example of the Olympics in London 2012 the 'outside' is also brought 'in' as

the military are utilised to provide domestic security against the imagined terror threat. Ryan (2012: 3) explores the work of Benjamin Walter (2006) to claim that ‘policing displays an intrinsic will to transcend limits’ it is ‘a limit unto itself’.

Essentially then, when war and terrorism intersect action is based on the management of dangerous populations and the risk that they pose, such is the aim of the criminal justice system. This brings into question relations between ‘punishment’ and ‘defence mechanisms’ (Degenhardt, 2010: 343). This problematises discourses that perceive war and punishment systems as separate, exclusive of one another in post-modernity. As systems they are instead intertwined in a complex way that allow ‘punishment to represent violence’ (Degenhardt, 2010: 343). That violence is a response to the violence of ‘others’. War grants its combatants an authority to engage in behaviours such as murder and destruction of property in the name of ‘duty’ and ‘military necessity’ (Jamieson, 1998). Individuals are taken from predominately ordinary homes and communities and are taught to be aggressive, to hate and to kill (Hakeem, 1946). Violent behaviour, which is largely concealed in civil society ‘is provided with a public and legitimate object’ (Jamieson, 1998: 483). A new perception of brutality promotes and legitimises violence *per se* as the solution to social problems (Jamieson, 1998: 484) and allows for a destructive violence to be seen rather as ‘heroic folly’ (Durkheim, 1974). Benjamin (1928) suggests that a critical interrogation of violence must start by setting out the relationship it has to law and justice. This is because violence (in its subjective sense) is only achieved when the reason for that violence interferes with moral associations. The scope of such associations is defined by designs of law and justice. Violence is then a point upon a legal compass that measures morality through ends and means. Our response to that interaction is subjective (ranging from triumph to horror) and shaped by a range of societal

and cultural influences that outline in which circumstances we attribute culpability to individuals whose actions have caused harm (Levi and Maguire, 2002).

One final and briefer point concerning the third theme should also be made: that of spatiality and physical space. Without intending to over labour the point that understandings of war and crime are both discussed across distinctions between the inside/outside, and noting once more that this is about physical space as well as constructions of knowledge, it is important to consider the issue of spatiality as it is this moving from one place to another that will be essential in understanding the dialogue on veterans to follow. Globalising processes have eroded territory based states which has led to discrepancies between the epistemology of war which almost takes for granted that engaging in warfare is a linear motion based upon territory and how the practices of modern war disrupts those understandings through new realities of the modern state (Holmquist, 2012). Aas (2012) discusses this as a process: when international and domestic security are blurred risks no longer have a territory or point of origin.

From this point the chapter now turns to explore the ways in which the experience of the returned veteran who commits a violent crime can be used as a muse to see those blurred lines more clearly. Put simply what happens to our new understandings of the inside and outside of security when those who have been the security provider on the outside become a threat to security on the inside? The remainder of this chapter now turns to empirical data collected to highlight a new problem - a new debate about those who have been instrumental in managing the risk posed by enemy groups in 'war on terror' become a group to be managed because of the risk they pose to domestic security as a result of their crimes.

Veterans and risk – beyond what we can ‘know’

Hillyard, et al (2004: 25) contend that although Foucault is a recurrent reference in criminology, ‘the epistemological significance of much of Foucault’s work seems to have passed criminology by.’ The epistemological assumptions of the data presented here, and the socio-political analyses to follow, are based upon Foucault’s understanding of discourse. Foucault (1974) invited his books to be used a ‘tool-box’ instead of simply being read; a source that can be rummaged through and if a tool will help in an area then to use it. Foucault’s offerings on discourse can then be *used* as a tool from which the narratives generated, and the wider socio-political context in which they were constructed, be better understood.

Central to this analysis is the view that discourse and power cannot be separated, and that meaning is constantly agreed and realised within complex power relations (Kings and Horrocks, 2010). Dominant discourse become accounts of reality, for example a veteran may be the hero, the victim or the dangerous through discursive frames pre-existing long before their experience of such an identity. Thus exploring the way in which individual biographies are narrated and consequently framed tells us something about knowledge and power. To pose epistemology in this way is to accept Foucault’s description of self-constitution, that ‘a regime of truth offers the terms that make self-recognition possible’ (Butler, 2005: 22). The ‘regime of truth’ is historically specific – sustained by discursive formation and functioning to provide discourses of ‘truth’ in definite temporal spaces (Foucault, 1980). Accordingly, the veteran’s identity is shaped by a regime of truth that suggests who will be recognised as a subject and who will not. Hall (1997) advises that Foucault approached each population by

asking six questions. What follows in this section is the application of these six questions to the study of violent veterans.

The first task is to question the set of accounts/statements that provide us with knowledge about violent veterans. There is always more than one way of thinking about a subject within the *discursive formation*, providing us with ways to understand or articulate violent veterans at any particular time – this is what Foucault (1970) termed the *episteme*. The hero, the victim and the beast are all ways of understanding the veteran – they are all part of the episteme. These accounts need not be confined to a ‘top-down’ approach upheld by the state. Accounts of what it means to be a violent veteran can also take shape from the ‘bottom-up’ through resistance, conformity and acceptance (Van Dijk, 1993). Being a veteran who becomes violent and criminal is perhaps evidence of resistance - their narratives subordinate and their status untold.

The second concern is the way in which understanding is organised so as to exclude ways of thinking about the topic, governing the ‘sayable’ or ‘thinkable’ about soldiering and veterans at any given historical moment (Hall, 1997). An example of this is the urgency to attribute a veteran’s criminality to their often socially deprived background, and not to their time spent in combat. The Howard League (2011) has claimed that their time in the forces will have actually delayed their criminality and not caused it. Blaming social deprivation pre-combat for their behaviour above the combat experience in itself encourages an understanding of violent veterans as people vulnerable to committing crime as opposed to the belief that war has damaged them.

The third is to question the subject of the discourse itself – what constitutes the violent veteran. I use the term subject and not individual intentionally as it aids in our understanding that the human experience of reality is a construction. A Foucauldian subject then undergoes a self-crafting process within the context of the regime of truth that provides what a recognisable subject can be. Butler (2005: 22) points out that this,

does not mean that any given regime of truth sets an invariable framework for recognition; it means only that it is in relation to this framework that recognition takes place or the norms that govern recognition are challenged and transformed.

I will return to this shortly. What is important to understand here however is that *being* a subject is not merely the product of discourse, but discourse represents us ‘at a cost’ (Butler, 2005: 121).

The fourth problem is to ask how knowledge gains authority. What constitutes the ‘truth’ about violent veterans in a particular space and time (Hall, 1997)? Foucault considers ‘truth’ to be an historical event. Truth is then produced and not in permanent existence (waiting to be found). This production of truth is bound to associations with power, knowledge and the subject. An analysis of this kind aims to show the ‘real as polemical’ (O’Farrell, 2005).

The fifth concern is with the ways in which we deal with the ‘subjects’; the criminal justice system is charged with regulating the conduct of the violent veteran. The sixth however is more of an acknowledgement than a question, that the contingent nature of truth provides an ever-changing *episteme* of war. As Foucault (1970: 168) observes, ‘in any given culture and

at any given moment, there is always only one episteme that defines the conditions of possibility of all knowledge’.

Socio-political analysis assumes an analysis of the arrangement of discourse, power and dominance - and the place of the researcher in such social relationships (Van Dijk 1993). Meaning is produced by discourse and although subjects may and will produce texts, they are always functioning within the *regime of truth*, which governs the *discursive formation* that provides the *episteme* (Hall 2001). In consequence the data used in this chapter was part of a project that explored those six problems through the use of narrative interviewsⁱⁱ. The project was concerned with the investigation into crimes (in particular violence) committed by Iraq and Afghanistan veterans post war and service with the purpose of developing our understanding of *being* a violent veteran and their experiences of punishment in the criminal justice system in England and Walesⁱⁱⁱ.

The Western veteran: a new risk in the War on Terror?

The discourse representing the veteran is rich and expansive stretching across oral histories (Max, 2012; Sarkar, 2012), personal accounts (Beattie, 2008; Cawthorne 2007; Rayment, 2008), psychiatric studies (Lifton, 1974; Sherman, 2010) and sociological readings (Hill, 1949; Turner and Rennell, 1995) to popular culture in what has been called ‘militainment’ (Stahl, 2010). This literature provides a source of reflection (from soul-searching accounts to sensationalist (re)interpretations) as both veterans and their authors strive to attribute meaning to the veteran’s position in society. The meaning provided is largely of pride or vulnerability both which are constructed around understandings of what is good. In a study titled *Heroic anxieties: the figure of the British soldier in contemporary print media*

Woodward, et al (2009: 5) suggest the function of the discourse in the media (at least) was to ‘smooth out the complexities of the conflicts they purport to represent...and the moral frameworks that the stories purport to engage with’. During a war, and for many years afterwards, the nation is proud; a collective approval of the power to fight and win masks the sacrifice of men (Edkins, 2003). Trauma and more specifically, ‘the memory of politics’ is constructed post war around national frames that omit individual experience (Edkins, 2003). It is also possible that individual experience can speak to conflicting national frames of risk, such as *being* a veteran and then *becoming* criminal.

When military personnel are discharged from their military service they assume this veteran status. At first, this label has modest personal meaning to the veteran; the worth of their new position is decided on by existing discourses. Throughout the reintegration process veterans can begin to attach meaning to the label (Brown, 2011). As the veteran learns to live as an individual again the collective memory lives on to mask the suffering of having been to war with a sense of pride. This individual often does not question the statecraft that created the war. Ruggiero (2006: 188) explains a collective memory as like a cancer that causes ‘damage beyond the functional threshold’. The violent veteran could be viewed as evidence of this damage. To assume this identity is to identify with the symbolic and subjective function of the armed forces, but also with the glorification of war that cements nationalism. It is a proud position that recognises the powerful yet precarious nature of life at war (Butler, 2009).

We have already seen that war and crime are now both the management of an ‘enemy’. In Foucault’s (2007) lectures *Society must be defended* it is proposed that both crime and war work through the identification of a selected group of ‘others’; whether that be a dangerous

class or group or those outside of the nation state. Based upon those stark differences social order can be organised and maintained. Degenhardt (2013: 38) explains that it is on these very constructions that ‘the continuum between war and crime rests as the facilitator of the processes of governance.’ Through discourses concerning the ‘the enemy within’ we have seen that discourses that assume a simple us/them or good/bad binary are unsettled. This unsettling is also demonstrated through the Afghan civilian that is both an identity to protect, and provide security for, whilst at the same time being an identity of threat (Loader and Percy, 2012). The discussion that the veteran may also unsettle these meanings is yet to be addressed in these terms. The narratives that they offer about their life embody both the national defender and national offender. It is to these narratives that this chapter now turns.

If risk is imagined on a continuum from high risk to those who manage it then the trajectory of a veteran’s life cut right across it. The participants’ data offer stories about times in their lives when they were ‘good’, when their key role was to manage the ‘bad’ in the world:

Some people just have to die and should die, they are bad people, not like the bad people you see in here, I mean really bad and it was my job to deal with that. That is what I was trained to do, that is exactly what I should be doing now stuck in here for some daft fight, there is a real fight to be had and now I won’t be part of it (Veteran Participant 2012).

See what these loons in here don’t understand is I am not the risk here, the risk is out there, and it is everywhere. I got into trouble I will admit that, it got messy; I will admit that, I am the most dangerous thing in the UK? (Laughter), should they be spending god knows how much money assessing my risk and

paying you no doubt to do the same? I don't think so, I tell you what I think for what it is worth – I think that you all should be paying me to get back to it, get back to protecting you all and not protecting people from me. It's frustrating! (Veteran Participant 2012).

The returned soldier provides a meaningful metaphor for the domestic effects of a war on terror that is portrayed as existing in the international sphere. This representation invalidates the distinction between the local and global, state and inter-state violence, as the returned soldier often cannot recognise the arbitrary limits of political space, carrying the themes and the morality learned at war back to the site of that war. The returned soldier then more than anything materialises the impossibility of their being a dividing line between the inside and outside.

I walk down the street and want to blow the windows out of the buildings, why is everything so normal? We are at war and I want the street to look like that, like it is never about the war here it is about learning to live in Civvy Street again (Veteran Participant 2011).

Why are they all laughing, I remember thinking that a lot when I got back, I couldn't speak to anyone about what I had been through, that was my job and I was cool not to tell anyone anything, I actually didn't want to. What really wound me up though was the lack of recognition from everyone. To them I had been to a bad place and might be a bit strange for a while, no acknowledgement whatsoever that I had been there for them and that actually their country was at war, they are at war, they are at risk (Veteran Participant 2013).

The troubled veteran then illustrates vividly the presence of the war in our apparently peaceful and prosperous world - threatening the narrative that upholds boundaries between the inside and outside, between us and them and amid peace and war. But also between positivist epistemology that maintains separate spheres on the inside and the outside:

What we are dealing with here are men who have been rewarded for violent behavior, yet punished for not turning up to work. They have lived under different rules to the rest of us, we must expect crime and when dealing with it be more understanding. I am not saying they should get away with it but I am suggesting a different justice system for ex-armed forces, similar to the system that operates in the military (Veteran Treatment Manager 2012).

These lads have been to war; fought for their country, we were proud of them then. They have been trained to kill and celebrated for extreme violence. They come from a culture that promotes 'suffering in silence' and often the first time they get the support they deserve is when they end up in the criminal justice system (Offender Manager 2013).

Categorising the actions of the returned soldier as criminal, or rehabilitating the veteran to an apparently civilian environment highlights the militarisation of society which wages a 'distant' war and the morality of there being a site where violence is just and necessary and others where violence is unjust and must be brought to justice. Accordingly, this investigation of the returned soldier permits an interrogation of the limits of violence and morality in war and peace:

I got a medal for killing people and a jail sentence for throwing a punch, because I'm dangerous (laughter) (Veteran Participant 2010).

The judge said that because I was a veteran that I would receive a custodial sentence because I was dangerous like and couldn't control my temper. I only pushed her but it was seen as a lack of control (Veteran Participant 2012).

He will stay on weekly reporting for the remainder of his sentence because of his military past he must be seen as high risk (Offender Manager 2013).

Elsewhere I have suggested that 'risk' in the context of criminal justice practice and processes should be explored further on the basis of evidence that illustrates that veterans are perceived as 'risky' by criminal justice professionals; that assessment is frequently becoming based upon their occupational status and not the more traditional approach that makes such assessments based upon offending status (Murray, 2013; 2014). Assessing the risk posed by individuals, and then managing that risk is the priority throughout the criminal justice process (Canton 2011); an assessment that is based upon individuals' predicted capability to cause serious harm – we know that veterans display that capability just from who they are. There is clear evidence however that this conversation can be extended to notions of a 'world risk society' proposed by Beck (1999). This is not to propose extending this conversation to a full exploration of the Risk Society thesis which is both supported (Giddens, 1998; Strydom, 2002), contested (Dingwall, 2000; Scott, 2000) and explored (Mythen, 2007) but to suggest that how the veteran represents both the risk and management of it is an issue worthy of much further examination. Beck (2002) himself has in the wake of what he calls a 'collapse of language' since 9/11 invited the war on terror to his Risk Society thesis. It has been demonstrated here that the veteran of the 'war on terror' invites a new dimension to studies that seek to evaluate the worth of the 'world risk society' in the future.

Can the violent veteran see blurred lines more clearly?

What then can be taken from the analysis above? Can the violent veteran indeed see blurred more clearly? This chapter has argued that the violent veteran's position can progress our understandings of the muddy waters between the inside and the outside of security scholarship through a new reading of data that invites a new conversation between criminology and IR. Research on the military and its place in society has grown considerably in academia. Since the cold war these studies have grown in impact and size in the field of military studies and military sociology. Drawing upon political science, sociology, international relations and psychology these studies have offered a progressive understanding of the military as an institution and most recently its masculine culture (Higate, 2003; Higate and Cameron, 2006). Most of these are however quantitative, with the few that are qualitative in nature rarely turning to in-depth methods (Carreras and Castro, 2012). Such has been the case in criminology. Research such as this however can not only expand the criminological imagination further, to consider what it means to *be* a violent veteran in the criminological sense but qualitative narrative methodology can be used to entrench each participants' biography in a socio-political setting.

In doing so a case can be established that the violent veteran is socially constructed and that this construction is assembled through tropes (styles of discourse). This epistemological position poses problems for previous studies that fail to question the frames that they adopt in their analysis. In doing so discursive frames can be no more than polemical. Research must consider the relationship that analytical frames have with the social reality they represent (Shapiro, 2001). To respect the agency of each participant above the intellectual abstractions

of particular psychological or political theories this chapter has made a modest attempt to offer an analysis both within and beyond such frames of understanding. The real skill of interpretive research is to sift through the data produced to identify these frames and to find where and when they correlate with what we know already, but more importantly where and when they show themselves to be in excess of 'what we know'.

This is not only to look beyond 'what we know' within the discipline of criminology but also to look beyond discursive frames of knowledge about our own subject matter. The advantages of bringing the inside and outside together in an analytical approach is, as Loader and Percy (2012: 216) suggest, a process which 'allows scholars to capture better the types of security provision that cut across traditional security divides' and as such 'grasp the intellectual and practical challenges that such boundary crossing generates'. We have seen that the inside/outside dichotomy is at best blurred if not wholly artificial as modern practices of war coupled with a new understanding of the state obscure epistemological teachings that claim clear cut differences between war and crime, between internal and external security provision, between the military and the police and between warfare and punishment. It was emphasised in the introduction that the arguments contained here will be considered an 'interesting but not perfect criminology' whilst discussing an 'important but not flawless IR'. It was also stressed that the insights gleaned from an engagement such as this create new opportunities that have the capacity to overcome current 'obstacles to understanding' (Loader and Percy, 2012: 214). In a time when risk discourses are being revisited in a 'war on terror' - with the concern that risk no longer has spatial or temporal confines - it is crucial not to understand the soldier deployed to manage risk and the veteran managed for their risk upon their return as separate concerns for separate disciplines.

References

- Aas, K.F. (2012) '(In) security-at-a-distance: rescaling justice, risk and warfare in a transnational age', *Global Crime*, 13 (4): 235-253.
- Agamben, G. (2005) *States of Exception*, translated by Attell, K. London: The University Chicago Press.
- Aradau, C. and van Munster, R. (2009) 'Exceptionalism and the 'War on Terror' Criminology meets IR', *British Journal of Criminology*, 49 (5): 686-701.
- Avant, D. and Haulfer, V. (2012) 'Transnational Organisations and Security', *Global Crime*, 13 (4): 254-275.
- Barton, A., Corteen, K., Scott, D. and Whyte, D. (ed.) (2007) *Expanding the Criminological Imagination: critical readings in criminology*, Oxon: Willan Publishing.
- Beck, U. (1999) *World Risk Society*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U. (2002) 'The Terrorist Threat: World Risk Society Revisited', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19: 39- 55.
- Benjamin, W. (1928) 'On the Critique of Violence' in Benjamin, W. (ed.) *One-Way Street and Other Writings*, London: Penguin.
- Blair, T. (2001) 'Prime Minister Statement to Parliament on the War on Terror. Available: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/3536131.stm> last accessed 02.05.14.
- Bouffard, L.A. (2005) 'The Military as a Bridging Environment in Criminal Careers: Differential Outcomes of the Military Experience', *Armed Forces and Society*, 31 (2): 273-295.
- Butler, J. (2005) *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable*. London: Verso Books.
- Canton, R. (2011) *Probation, Working with Offenders*, London: Routledge.

- Cawthorne, N. (2007) *On The Frontline*, London: John Blake Publishing.
- Dandeker, C., Wessely, S., Iversen, A. and Ross, J. (2003) 'Improving the delivery of cross departmental support and services for veterans', The Institute of Psychiatry: Kings Collage London.
- Degenhardt, T. (2010) 'Representing War as Punishment in the War on Terror', *International Journal of Criminology and Sociological Theory*, 3 (1): 343-358.
- Degenhardt, T. (2007) 'The War on Terror and Punishment: Criminology Meets International Relations' *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Law and Society Association, TBA, Berlin, Germany, Jul 24.* Available: http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p177676_index.html
- Dingwall, R. (2000) 'Risk Society: The Cult of Theory and the Millennium' in Manning, N. and Shaw, I. (ed.) *New Risks, New Welfare: Signposts for Social Policy*, London: Blackwell. pp. 137-54.
- Durkheim, E. (1992) *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals*, London: Routledge.
- Edkins, J. (2003) *Trauma and the Memory of Politics Cambridge*, Cambridge University Press.
- Ferguson, H. (2004) 'The Sublime and the Subliminal: Modern Identities and the Aesthetics of Combat', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 21: 1-34.
- Foucault, M. (1974) 'Prisons et asiles dans le mécanisme du pouvoir' in *Dits et Ecrits, t.II*, Paris: Gallimard. pp. 523-524.
- Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/Knowledge*, Brighton: Harvester.
- Foucault, M. (2007) 'Society must be defended', *Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976*: St Martin's Press.

- Garland, D. (1996) 'The Limits of the Sovereign State: strategies of crime control in contemporary society', *British Journal of Criminology*, 36 (4): 445-471.
- Gearty, C. (2006) *Can Human Right Survive? The Hamlyn Lectures 2005*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1998) 'Risk Society: The Context of British Politics' in Franklin, J. (ed.) *The Politics of Risk Society*, Cambridge: Polity Press. pp. 23-35.
- Green, P and Ward, T. (2004) *State Crime, Governments, Violence and Corruption*, London: Pluto Press.
- Green, P. and Ward, T. (2009) 'The Transformation of Violence in Iraq', *British Journal of Criminology*, 49: 609- 627.
- Hakeem, M. (1946) 'Service in the Armed Forces and Criminality', *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 37 (2): 120-131.
- Hall, S. (1992) 'The West and the Rest' in Hall, S. and Gieben, B. (ed.) *Formations of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hall, A. (2001) 'Foucault: Power, Knowledge and Discourse', in Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. and Yates, S. (ed.) *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, London: Sage.
- Higate, P. and Cameron, A. (2006) 'Reflexivity and Researching the Military', *Armed Forces and Society*, 32 (2): 219-233.
- Higate, P. (2003) *Military Masculinities: Identity and the State*, Praeger.
- Hillyard, P., Pantazis, C., Gordon, D. and Tombs, S. (ed.) (2004) *Beyond Criminology: Taking Harm Seriously*, London: Pluto Press.
- Holmqvist, C. (2012) 'War/Space: Shifting Spatialities and the Absence of Politics in Contemporary Accounts of War', *Global Crime*, 13 (4): 219-234.

- Hudson, B. (2009) 'Justice in a Time of Terror', *British Journal of Criminology*, 49 (5): 701-717.
- Iversen, A., Nikolaou, V., Greenberg, N., Unwon, C., Hull, L., Hotopf, M., Danderker, C., Ross, J. and Wessley, S. (2005) 'What happens to British veterans when they leave the armed forces', *European Journal of Public Health*, 15 (2): 175-184.
- Jabri, V. (2006) 'War, Security and the Liberal State', *Security Dialogue*, 37 (1): 47-64.
- Jamieson, R. and McEvoy, K. (2005) 'State Crime by Proxy and Juridical Othering', *British Journal of Criminology*, 45 (4): 504-527.
- Jamison, R. (1998) 'Towards a Criminology of War' in Ruggiero, V., South, N. and Taylor, I. (ed.) *The New European Criminology, Crime and Social Order in Europe*, London: Routledge.
- Jeffery, A. (2007) 'The Geopolitical Framing of Localized Struggles: NGOs in Bosnia and Herzegovina', *Development and Change*, 38 (2): 251-274.
- King, N. and Horrocks, C. (2010) *Interviews in Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.
- Kramer, R.C. and Michalowski, R.J. (2005) 'War, aggression and state crime: a criminological analysis of the invasion and occupation of Iraq', *British Journal of Criminology*, 45 (4): 446-469.
- Kraska, P.B. (1993) 'Militarising the Drug War: A sign of the Times' in Kraska, P.B. (ed.) *Altered States of Mind: Critical Observations of the Drug War*, New York: Garland Publishing.
- Kraska, P.B. (2001) 'Crime Control as Warfare: Language Matters' in Kraska, P.B. (ed.) *Militarising the American Criminal Justice System: The changing Roles of The Armed Forces*, Boston: Northeastern University Press.

- Kraska, P.B. (2007) ' Militarization and Policing – Its relevance to 21st Century Police', *Policing*, 1 (4): 501-513.
- Krasman, S. (2007) 'The Enemy Boarder', *Punishment and Sentencing*, 9: 301-318.
- Loader, I. and Percy, S. (2012) 'Bringing the 'Outside' In and the 'Inside Out: Crossing the Criminology/IR divide', *Global Crime* 13 (4): 213-218.
- MacManus, D., Dean, K., Jones, M., Rona, R.J., Greenberg, N., Hull, L., Fahy, T., Wessley, S. and Fear, N.T. (2013) 'Violent Offending by UK Military Personnel Deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan: a data linkage cohort study', *The Lancet*, 381: 907-917.
- Mandel, M. (2004) *How America gets away with murder: illegal wars, collateral damage and crimes against humanity*, London: Pluto Press.
- Mannheim, H. (1941) *War and Crime*, London: Watts & Co.
- McGarry, R. (2010) 'Accept it and Forget it: Demobilization, Reintegration and the Military Homecomer', in Ferguson, N. (ed.) *Post-Conflict Reconstruction*, Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Murray, E. (2013) 'Post-army trouble: veterans in the criminal justice system', *Criminal Justice Matters*, 94 (1): 20-21.
- Murray, E. (2014 *forthcoming*) 'Veteran Offenders in Cheshire: Making Sense of the 'Noise'', *Probation Journal*, TBC.
- Mythen, G. (2007) 'Reappraising the risk society thesis: telescopic sight or myopic vision?', *Current Sociology*, 55 (6): 793-813.
- Napo. (2008) 'Ex Armed Forces Personnel and the Criminal Justice System', Briefing Paper. Available: <http://www.napo.org.uk/templates/assetrelay.afm?frmAssetFileID=317>
- Rayment, S. (2008) *Into the Killing Zone*, London: Constable.

- Ruggiero, V. (2010) 'Armed Struggle in Italy: The Limits to criminology in the Study of Political Violence', *British Journal of Criminology*, 50: 708-24.
- Ruggerio, V. (2006) *Understanding political violence: a criminological analysis*, Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Ruggiero, V. (2005) 'Criminalizing War: Criminology as Ceasefire', *Social and Legal Studies*, 14: 239-257.
- Ryan, B. (2012) 'Reasonable Force: the emergence of global policing', *Review of International Studies*, 39 (2): 435:457.
- Sarkar, D. (2012) *Spitfire Voices*, Amberly Publishing.
- Scott, A. (2000) 'Risk Society or Angst Society? Two Views of Risk, Consciousness and Community' in Adam, B., Beck, U. and van Loon, J. (ed.) *The Risk Society and Beyond: Critical Issues for Social Theory*, London: Sage. pp. 33-46.
- Sherman, N. (2010) *The Untold War: Inside the Hearts, Minds, and Souls of Our Soldiers*, London: Norton and Co.
- Sorokin, P. (1944) *Russia and the United States*, New York. Dutton.
- Sparks, R. (2006) 'Ordinary Anxieties and States of Emergency: Statecraft and Spectatorship in the New Politics of Insecurity' in Armstrong, A. and McAra, L. (ed.) *Perspectives of Punishment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stahl, R. (2010) *Militainment Inc: War, Media and Popular Culture*, New York: Routledge.
- Steinert, H. (2003) 'The indispensable metaphor of war: on populist politics and the contradictions of the state's monopoly of force', *Theoretical Criminology Special Issue: War, Crime and Human Rights*, 7 (3): 265-291.
- Strydom, P. (2002) *Risk, Environment and Modernity*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

The Howard League. (2011) 'Report of the Inquiry into Former Armed Service Personnel in Prison', London: The Howard League for Penal Reform.

Treadwell, J. (2010) 'COUNTERBLAST: More than Casualties of War? Ex-military Personnel in the Criminal Justice System', *The Howard Journal*, 49 (1): 73–77.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1993) 'Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis', *Discourse and Society*, 4 (2): 249-283.

Van Staden, L. (2007) 'Transition back into civilian life: a study of personnel leaving the UK armed forces via 'military prison'', *Military Medicine*, 172 (9): 925-930.

Van Swaaningen, R. (1997) *Critical Criminology: Visions from Europe*, London. Sage.

Walker, R.B.J. (1993) *Inside/Outside: International Relations and Political Theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

White, R. (2008) 'Depleted Uranium, State Crime and the Politics of Knowing', *Theoretical Criminology*, 12 (1): 31-54.

Endnotes

ⁱ The author would like to acknowledge Justin Moorhead of Merseyside Probation and Wessley Doyle Foulkes of the University of Liverpool for their informal discussions about the content of this chapter.

ⁱⁱ Narrative interviews took place across four probation areas and the data used for the purposes of this chapter are drawn from nine narrative interviews with each participant being interviewed twice. The interview technique employed is based upon the Free-Association Narrative Interview method but at the point of analysis a critical discourse analysis was employed to shift the focus from the psycho-social to the socio-political in line with the interdisciplinary aims of the project. Brockmier and Carbaugh (2001) inform us that the narrative shifts our focus from that of inner mechanism of the mind to the 'discursive arena'.

ⁱⁱⁱ Participants of the study were combat veterans of either Afghanistan or Iraq (or both) and had been subsequently convicted of a violent offence post-deployment and were still serving their sentence. Men were chosen because at the time and still at the time of writing female veterans have not yet been perceived as a criminal justice 'problem'. The conflicts were selected as an acknowledgment of time which is crucial when considering the contingent nature of truth which, by its very nature, provides an ever changing episteme of war. As Foucault (1970: 168) observes, 'in any given culture and at any given moment, there is always only one episteme that defines the conditions of possibility of all knowledge'. Participants must have been charged with a violent offence to respond to the research and political narrative at the time of sampling which claimed that veterans were not more likely to commit crime per se, but were more likely to commit violent crime (Howard League, 2011); such claims have since been supported by McManus, et al (2013).