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The World Health Organization defines violence as ‘the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation’ (WHO 2002:4). Pioneering peace studies analyst Johan Galtung argues that violence should be understood ‘as avoidable insults to basic human needs, and more generally to life, lowering the real level of needs satisfaction below what is potentially possible’ (Galtung 1996:197).

It is in understanding the structural roots of violence that political economic analysis is essential. Burton defines structural violence as ‘damaging deprivations caused by the nature of social institutions and policies ... and avoidable, perhaps a deliberate, violence against the person or community’ (Burton 1997:32). Violence is structured in the economic, cultural and political systems of the nation-state and the world order. At the core of any major structure is power. Power is about control, domination, and exploitation, and is constructed as relations of force because power involves coercion and repression (Heilbroner 1986; Foucault 2004). Unequal access ‘to resources, to political power, to education, to health care, or to legal standing are forms of structural violence’ (Winter & Leighton 2001).

Therein lies the link between violence and capitalism, to the extent that the structure and culture of capitalism creates inequality, poverty, unemployment, and alienation. As Miliband argues, capitalism ‘is inherently and inescapably a system of domination and exploitation; and
… is unable to make rational and humane use of the immense productive resources it has itself brought into being’ (Miliband 1991:209).

The power of the state is fundamental to capitalism and the embedding of society in market relations. Foucault’s analysis of the construction of the modern European nation-state points to the imposition of a ‘tight grid of disciplinary coercions that actually guarantees the cohesion of the social body’ (Foucault 2004:37). Power, Foucault reminds us, ‘is essentially that which represses’, and political power ‘is perpetually to use a sort of silent war to reinscribe that relationship of force’ (ibid: 16). However, where there is power, and therefore repression, there is always resistance. Relations of force cause suffering, and where there is suffering there is disobedience and the desire and demand for change. Power and resistance confront each other everywhere, and the struggle is everywhere.

Violence is also built in the structure of the world system. The global order is a system of unequal economic and political power relations dominated by powerful and rich countries. As Wallerstein (2003, 2004) argues, the capitalist world economy is dominated by a triad of the US, the EU, and Japan. The global order is also a system of unequal power relations dominated by the US military (Chomsky 2003, 2008). However, the US quest for hegemony and the dominating role of the triad are being challenged by forces in Asia and elsewhere, and the sustainability of system is doubt as it is threatening the survival of the human species and the planet’s ecosystem (Lovelock 2006).

At the core of the world-system is nationalism. Nationalism is not only a power relationship to maintain social cohesion, but also an instrument of aggression - within the nation-state as well as externally against other people. As Chomsky writes, ‘the way that power is concentrated inside the particular societies; that’s the source of extreme violence in the world’ (Mitchell & Schoeffel 2002:315).

This article is an analysis of the political economy of violence, focusing particularly on Australia. It links violence with power relations and the organization of society. It also seeks to show how violence is constructed in various forms of disobedience and resistance to power. Comparison with countries in Northern Europe suggests the positive role of a more
egalitarian society to social wellbeing. Some notes on the political economy of peace conclude the analysis.

Construction of Vulnerability and Victimization

Human relations are integral to structures of power relations of force and the construction of victims and victimizers. One example is child abuse, which may entail physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional/psychological abuse and neglect. In the period of 2006-07, there were ‘309,517 reports of suspected cases of child abuse and neglect made to state authorities’ (AIFS 2008). Sexual abuse of Aboriginal children in particular has been exposed in a number of recent reports (Ella-Duncan 2006; Memmott 2001; NTG 2007). Langton writes about the lateral violence within Aboriginal communities expressing ‘anomie and rage against those who are also victims of vertical violence and entrenched and unequal power relations’, noting that this form of violence ‘occurs when, out of anger and frustration, an oppressed group turns on itself and begins to violate each other’ (Langton 2009:15).

Socio-economic inequality is also correlated with chronic illness and associated risk factors. The country’s poorest ‘are up to more than twice as likely to die from disease, accidents, poisonings and violence’ (Kerin 2000). Glover’s research found that common risk factors such as ‘stress, violence and traumatic experience; educational disadvantage; inadequate living environments that fail to promote healthy lifestyles; poor diet and lack of exercise; alcohol misuse and tobacco smoking’ are closely linked with socio-economic status (Glover 2007:2). The geography of disadvantage and social exclusion shows that risk factors are ‘increasingly more prevalent in areas of low socioeconomic status in communities characterised by low levels of educational attainment; high levels of unemployment; substantial levels of discrimination, interpersonal violence, and exclusion; and poverty’ (Glover 2007:2).

Vinson’s study on social disadvantage maps the concentration of severe social disadvantage in Australia and identifies communities ‘caught in a spiral of low school attainment high unemployment, poor health, high imprisonment rates and child abuse’ (Vinson 2007). Poverty, deprivation
and social exclusion adversely affect the health and life chances of Aborigines, and in 2002, 36 percent of Indigenous people aged 15 years or over had a disability or long-term health condition ... [and Indigenous people were] at least twice as likely to have a profound or severe core activity limitation as non-Indigenous people’ (ABS 2005a: xxii). Moreover, there was a difference of approximately 17 years in the life expectancy of both males and females between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians.

Women continue to be victims of sexual assault and mental cruelty. A 2003 report states that ‘tens of thousands of lone mothers on welfare benefits have experienced rape, physical assault, torture and mental health disorders at some time during their life’ (Horin 2003; Butterworth 2003). Other statistics on the prevalence of partner violence show that in 2005, ‘around one in six adult women have experienced actual or threatened physical or sexual violence perpetuated by a partner since the age of 15’, and that 443,000 women experienced violence in 2005. This same 2005 survey points out that some 956,600 women had been sexually abused before the age of 15 (ABS 2005b; Flinders 2008). In the state of Victoria, ‘intimate partner violence is responsible for more ill-health and premature death of women under the age of 45 than any other of the well-known risk factors, including high blood pressure, obesity and smoking’ (VicHealth 2004). In New South Wales ‘police figures show Aboriginal women are nearly three times as likely to be victims of sexual assault as the general female population and nearly as six times as likely to be victims of domestic violence’ (Skelton 2008).

Violence against women has complex origins. Along with the construction of inequality in the distribution of income and employment, there are other issues regarding gender relations and the construction of masculinity in Australia – shaped by violent sports and players, and by the abuse of alcohol. However, the exploitative social structure of society underpins the abuse of children and women. As Fromm concluded, this form of cruelty will be minimized ‘only when exploitative control of any class, sex, or minority group has been done away with’ (Fromm 1974:197).
Violence in Production and Consumption

Production and consumption – the central features of the economic system – directly cause violence and human suffering. Workplaces can be physically dangerous. Five hundred young workers were killed in the 10 years preceding 2006, and 310,000 Australians aged under 25 ‘suffered work-related injuries or diseases’ (Jopson 2006). In NSW ‘there were 39,995 injuries, [of which] 25.8 percent were reported as permanent disability cases’ in 2001 (LRC 2003). The workplace is also mentally dangerous: bullying, sadism, and cruelty are forms of violence meant to humiliate and shame people. Mental cruelty affects most people at some stage of life. The culture of bullying starts at school and is often tolerated, if not encouraged, as part of the training and conditioning of young boys and girls (Slee 2003). In the electronic age, mental cruelty at schools has taken new form such as cyber-bashing and internet gossip.

The Australian Confederation of Trade Unions (ACTU) says that bullying at work ‘is a huge problem’ and involves ‘repeated, unreasonable behaviour directed toward an employee, or group of employees, that creates a risk to health and safety’ (Marles 2003). A NSW inquiry highlighted the ‘culture of fear and intimidation embedded throughout the public health sector’ (Wallace 2008). Bullying is a major problem in the private sector where many workplaces have a culture of ‘fear of reprisal or payback’ (Had 2008). Psychopaths occupy positions of power in industry and government, thriving in a corporate environment where they can destroy people who work around them. Many corporations evidently see them as good executives because ‘they are prepared to do whatever it takes, no matter of the cost’ (ABC 2008).

A culture of destructive behaviour in relation to the environment is also built into capitalist process of accumulation. Economic growth and unsustainable consumption continue to damage the continent’s major eco-systems. Australia’s impact on climate change is considerable: Australians have the highest emissions per person of all industrial countries. ‘At 27.2 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per person, emissions by Australians are 27 percent higher than those of US citizens and more than double the average for industrialized countries’ (Turton 2004; vii). ‘Excessive resource development, uncontrolled urban and
industrial discharges and agricultural intensification’ are causing ‘reduction of groundwater flow to sustain wetlands, springs and rivers, irrevocably salinised or polluted groundwater and land subsidence’ (Frew 2007).

Meanwhile, land degradation results from ‘clearance of native vegetation, overgrazing by sheep and rabbits, soil nutrients exhaustion, soil erosion, man-made droughts, weeds, misguided government policies, and salinization’ (Diamond 2005:398). Dry-land salinity is a major problem which now adversely affects some 3 million hectares, and a ‘further 5.7 million hectares is judged to be at immediate risk’ (Lowe 2005:48). Australians are among the biggest per capita waste producers in the world, creating ‘around 1.1 tonnes of solid waste per person annually’ (Hamilton 2002:17). Human alteration of the environment affects health and mental wellbeing. The introduction of countless chemicals in the atmosphere, water system, and food chain correlates with western-types allergic hyper-activities, diabetes, cancers, cardio-vascular and cerebro-vascular diseases. Australian scientist Ian Lowe suggests that these forms of damage to the ecosystem are immoral because the population is consuming and wasting resources needed to sustain future generations; while Tim Flannery argues that Australians are ‘future eaters’ (Flannery 1999).

Capitalism embeds society into market relations and imprints a culture, creating patterns of consumption and lifestyle that are harmful to body and mind. This is manifested in rising rates of obesity, respiratory disease and diabetes, and other problems among children. 1 in 4 young Australian are said to be overweight or obese (ABC 2008a), while the rising number of obese children is linked to increasing rates of type 2 diabetes among young people (Benson 2008; Watts 2008). Many health specialists have blamed the media for targeting children: ‘it has been estimated the average Australian child watches 96 food ads a week—63 of which are for high fat or high sugar foods’ (Ludlow & Showbridge 2008). The increasing sexualisation of children in the Australian media is also putting children at risk. It has been coined ‘corporate paedophilia’ because it harms children in a variety of ways, including causing severe eating disorders (Rush & La Nauze 2006a, 2006b). Children are also exposed to an increasingly toxic environment which affects their health
and life chances, as exemplified in Queensland’s Mt Isa where elevated blood lead levels among children is correlated with deficits in IQ, learning, memory and behavioural problems. Little heed is being paid nationally to studies which show that children ‘who use mobile phones are five times more likely to develop brain tumours’ (News Focus 2008).

Lifestyle in Australia is increasingly dangerous. Sheehan makes the point that ‘during the past 50 years, more than 134,000 died on Australian roads, tens of thousands were maimed or crippled, and hundreds of thousands were seriously injured—all absorbed and normalised as the cost of the primacy of the motor vehicle in our culture’ (Sheehan 2005). In 2003 alone, 1,620 people were killed in road traffic accidents and 93,681 people were injured – at an estimated cost of approximately A$17billion (Connelly & Supangan 2006). Not included were the 300 or so ‘pedestrians and cyclists killed in vehicle related accidents on Australian roads each year, and another 3,000 [who] sustain serious injuries’ (Bibby 2008). More indirectly, traffic pollution kills many people every year: Kearney links emissions from diesel to asthma attacks, cardiovascular and respiratory disease and cancer and says that ‘one in five lung cancer deaths can be attributed to fine particles from burning fossil fuels’ (Dowling & Blackburn 2007). Other estimates suggest that pollution from cars ‘may be prematurely killing as many as 2,000 Australians each year and causing another 2,000 asthma attacks’ (Smith & Robotham 2005).

Other health problems result directly from consumption patterns. Obesity is linked to diabetes, heart attacks and osteoarthritis and certain cancers (Metherell 2008). Diabetes affect some 1.4 million Australians, mostly caused by diet and lifestyle factors ... with more than 80 percent diagnosed with type2 diabetes [which] leads to long term serious complications such as blindness, the need for amputation, kidney failure and other serious problems’ (Pollard 2006). One in five Australians is said to have cardiovascular disease (Beaumont 2003). Diseases linked to lifestyle tend to be more prevalent among lower socio-economic groups, and with the worst incidence of heart disease being among Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders (Beaumont 2003).

Critics of consumerism have coined the term ‘affluenza’ to describe the sense of emptiness and meaninglessness (Hamilton and Denniss 2005).
Others argue that consumerism ‘reflects social neuroses and insecurities fanned by inequality and increased competition for status’ (Wilkinson 2009:4). One manifestation is an increased dependency on drugs. Alcohol is the most prevalent drug in Australia and, in 2004-5, ‘13 percent of all adults or approximately 2.0 million persons drank at risky/high risk level’ (ABS 2006b). The alcohol-treatment group Arbias suggests that some 2 million adults are at risk of permanent brain damage, while ‘more than 200,000 Australians are living with undiagnosed permanent brain damage caused by drinking alcohol’ (Lunn 2007). After tobacco, alcohol is ‘the second largest cause of drug-related deaths and hospitalisation, and is the main cause of death on Australian roads’ (ABS 2006a:10). Alcohol consumption increases the risk of women developing all types of cancer (BBC 2009). Alcohol puts at risk many young people between 1993 and 2002, some 2,643 young Australians between the ages of 15 and 24 years died from alcohol related injury and disease, and over 100,000 young people were hospitalized for alcohol related injury or disease’ (NDRI 2004). Tobacco smoking is the largest single preventable cause of death and disease in Australia (ABS 2006a).

The extent to which these health problems are causally attributable to capitalism remains contentious, of course. But, to the extent that they are manifestations of the modern consumerist form of capitalism, they illustrate the structurally violent consequences that result from the system in practice.

**Violence Against the State**

Where there is power there is always resistance and disobedience, and struggle for change. The legal order is a human invention to define the nature of deviance and the means to control it. As such, crime acquires a political character that needs to be analysed in the context of relations of power. Chambliss situates criminal behaviour squarely in the culture and structure of capitalism and writes that ‘criminal behaviour is the inevitable expression of class conflict resulting from the inherent exploitative nature of economic relations’ (Chambliss 1975, in Walklate 1998:27). Thus, crime is not only the consequence of the structure of the...
state but also a form of protest, of resistance and rebellion, of revenge, against the state as the embodiment of the existing social and economic order. Quinney suggests that crime reflects the extent to which society is maladjusted to capitalism (Walklate 1998:28).

People may steal because they ‘need’ money, or aspire to the value and lifestyle of ‘others’ but do not have the means to achieve success. The ‘losers’ suffer from relative deprivation, or status deprivation. In that sense, society constructs winners and losers. A 2005 survey estimated that 488,200 households ‘were victims of one at least one break-in to their home, garage or shed, or an attempted break-in, or had at least one motor vehicle stolen. Moreover, an estimated total of 841,500 persons had been victims of at least one robbery, assault, or sexual assault in the 12 months prior to the survey (ABS 2005b). A 2008 personal fraud survey indicated that ‘806,000 Australians aged 15 years and over were victims of at least one incident of personal fraud’, and that over ‘5.8 million Australians were exposed to a scam in the 12 months prior to the survey’ (ABS 2008b). Most offenders who end up in prison are men from socially disadvantaged strata of society. Many have been abused as children which is a source of shame and humiliation. Gilligan writes that ‘the overall social and economic structure of society—the degree to which it is or is not stratified into highly polarized upper and lower social classes and castes—is a much more powerful determinant of the level of violence’ than family structure, such as one parent family (Gilligan 2001:78). Gilligan also focuses on the role of society in the construction of masculinity and the sex-role of patriarchy ‘which is literally defined as involving the expectation, even the requirement, of violence’, and this is reflected in the prison culture of patriarchy and machismo (Gilligan 2001:56, 65).

Corporate crime is another dimension of criminality within capitalism, causing emotional and physical harm to countless people. Corporate crime involves work-related death or injury, bullying, tax fraud, selling contaminated or harmful foods, drugs or services, defrauding lenders, and polluting the environment. In recent years, a large number of Australian financial corporations have defrauded their investors in various types of pyramid schemes. Companies – such as Hastings Capital, Fincorp, Australian Capital Reserve, Bridgecorp, and the Storm
Financial Group – have sold debentures to mostly small investors and then went bankrupt, but not before making fortunes for their principals. There have also been outright scams like the failed fuel pill company Firepower, while the sale of complex financial derivative and hedge fund products has been described by billionaire Warren Buffet as ‘weapons of mass destruction’.

Corporate behaviour is directly influenced by the culture of greed promoted by the state, and by dependency of the political parties on corporate funding. In other words, the extent of business crime is a reflection of the extent of state corruption. The business sector gets its cues from the ‘get rich quick’ mentality and behaviour of the political elite (TI 2007). State corruption and growing inequality encourages the desire to cheat and legitimizes the practice of cheating. The many financial scandals of the 1980s highlighted the lack of effective regulation, the erosion of corporate morality, a culture of corruption, and the success of fraudulent getting-rich-quick enterprises. Even more grandiose financial frauds were exposed during the emergence of the global financial crisis in 2008. The state’s symbiotic relations with the corporate sector could be construed as ‘crimes against civil society’ because the legal order promotes the expansion and growth of the corporate sector, its power to dominate civil society and, in the process, to privatise the role of the state and democracy.

Another dimension is what Quinney calls ‘crimes of domination’, whereby corporations control and use the country’s resources, dictate the nature of production and consumption, and, thus, shape lifestyle and the culture of consumerism (Quinney 1980). ‘Crimes of domination’ include harmful practices – such as price-fixing, bribing and polluting – that go largely unpunished because of the courts’ reluctance to impose criminal liability on corporations (Braithwaite 1992; Buchanan 2008; Cameron 2007; Glasbeek 2003). The soft approach to white collar crime allows for forms of plunder and looting of public and private assets.

Many harmful actions by corporations are not treated as crime at all. The 2009 case of Pacific Brands is a case in point. It involved the sacking of 1,850 workers by the company while salary and bonus payments for the company’s top executives doubled between 2007 and 2008. Meanwhile, the company received some A$20 million of taxpayer money to re-skill
and retool its business. ACTU leader Sharon Burrow called the company’s action ‘a crime, a corporate crime’ (Robinson 2009). The Babcock & Brown business, which made hundreds of millions of dollars for their principals while leaving investors with worthless paper, is a further example of what a financial writer has called ‘legalised daylight robbery’ (Kohler 2008).

Corporate behaviour is also reflected in organized crime. As a growing feature of the Australian economy, this includes running the illicit drug market, share market manipulation, the take-over of legitimate business, asset-stripping, extortion and prostitution. Milroy estimates that ‘between $4 billion and $12 billion in drug money is being laundered offshore every year, which is 10 to 30 times higher than the public estimate provided by AUSTRAC, Australia’s anti money-laundering agency’ (Gilling 2008:21; Small & Gilling 2008). The extent of organized crime in Australia has been the subject of a number of commissions of inquiry and reports – such as the Costigan Commission (1980-84), the Fitzgerald Inquiry (1987) and WA Inc. (1991) – which have revealed close links between government and the expansion of organized and corporate crime.

Mental disorder is a different manifestation of violence within the society, affecting victims of the system. Mental disorder, interpreted in a broad sense, is an expression of alienation, and hence, of protest and rebellion. This is implied in Hamilton’s analysis of alienation as ‘the subjugation of the human spirit in consumer culture [which] manifests itself, to an ever increasing degree, in restless dissatisfaction, chronic stress and private despair, feelings that give rise to a rash of psychological disorders – anxiety, depression, substance abuse’ (Hamilton 2006:36). Mental disorder can be construed as a form of inner rebellion and resistance. What differentiates this form of resistance is that it is not mobilized and it is unconstructed in the social realm because the individual is alienated.

A 2007 national survey shows that almost half of Australians aged 16-85 (45 percent or 7.3 million) ‘had a lifetime mental disorder, i.e. a mental disorder at some point in their life’, and that one in five, or 3.2 million, ‘had a 12 month mental disorder’ (ABS 2008c). The report suggests that ‘an estimated 23 percent of the total Australian adult population are
affected by one or more mental disorders in any given year’ (DHA 2008). Hickie claims that the situation in Australia is alarming, and writes that ‘800,000 adults plus 100,000 teenagers suffer some sort of depression every year. One in four women and one in six men have an episode of clinical depression’ (Liu 2006). Depression has been found to be toxic to the brain and may be linked to dementia which affected more than 227,000 people, mostly women, in 2008. Dementia cases are forecast to reach 500,000 cases by 2040 (Robotham 2008; AA 2008).

Again the causal links are complex, but there is potentially a significant political economic dimension. Mental disorder among young people may be linked to changes in diet and childhood stress. Canadian researchers suggest that childhood abuse or neglect increases the incidence of depression in adult life, a condition which ‘could be inherited by the next generation’ (Robotham 2009). Mental illness is also linked to increasing level of anti-social behaviour among adolescents, such as self-harm, hyperactivity and bullying. The national review on mental health care demonstrates that ‘any person seeking mental health care runs the serious risk that his or her basic needs will be ignored, trivialised or neglected’ (MHCA 2005).

State Violence

The state has an official monopoly over the means of violence. Only the state has the right to kill and inflict suffering on others in the name of the law or for some higher purpose, such as in defence of liberty and the national interest or to destroy ‘terrorism’. The state has the right to lie to people, arrest, detain, and incarcerate individuals, and to wage overt and covert war against groups and other countries. The state imposes relations of inequality and ensures the dominance of a political and economic oligarchy; and puts in place systems of repression to control behaviour and impose social cohesion.

Violence against society is narrated in national criminal courts statistics. In 2006-2007, there were 638,347 defendants who faced various courts, with more than 94 percent proven guilty. Some 82 percent were sentenced to custodial order, with custody in a correctional institution or
custody in the community, or a fully suspended sentence. In 2005-06, between 78-79,000 were imprisoned each quarter. The prison population has increased by more than 40 percent from 1994 to 2004, and totalled 27,615 persons as of 30 June 2008, excluding persons in ‘juvenile institutions, psychiatric custody and policy custody’ (ABS 2004, 2008a). In 2008, most offenders were in prison for crimes against property (44 percent), followed by illicit drug offenses (33 percent), and ‘acts intended to cause injury’, which included sexual assaults and domestic violence (ABS 2008a). The prison population excludes many young people who end up in the country’s juvenile detention centers where almost half are from non-Anglo ethnic background, and most come from economically deprived groups who live in economically depressed areas (Safe 1998). Young indigenous ‘are 23 times more likely to be in juvenile detention than non-indigenous persons’ (AIC 2006:16).

The state’s incarceration policy continues the construction of violence and disadvantage in society. Many prisoners have a history of sexual, physical or emotional abuse as children, of poor employment and education, have indigenous status and have a history of mental illness. In NSW, according to Baldry, most prisoners come from socially disadvantaged social groups, and more than ‘50 percent of prisoners have an intellectual or psychiatric disability’, and most have suffered ‘physical or sexual abuse as a child and domestic violence as adults, and 90 percent have alcohol or other drug problem’ (Baldry 2005). Incarceration punishes offenders and continues the cycle of violence. Most prisoners have access to drugs and maintain their addiction during the term of their sentence which makes it easier for the system to control them. Another form of control is to segregate prisoners along racial lines – Aborigines, Arabs, Islanders, Vietnamese, and other racial groups (Bearup 2002:23). Bashing is a common occurrence and the homicide rate is many times higher than in the general population. Heilpern suggests that 25 percent of young men in NSW jails had been raped, some on a daily basis (Heilpern 1998).

State violence against civil society has been exposed in a number of royal commissions and inquiries, including the Wood Commission (1995-97), the WA Commission on Police Corruption (2002-04), the Commission into HIH Insurance (2001-03) and the Cole Inquiry (2005).
These demonstrate the extent of state corruption, a form of aggression against civil society that has undermined public confidence and trust in the system of justice, weakened the rights and civil liberties of ordinary citizens, and restricted the capacity of federal and state parliaments, and local governments, to defend and advance the ideals of democracy.

Race crime is also closely related to the role of the state in manufacturing hatred against the ‘other’. Continued violence against and within indigenous people is closely linked to state policies in maintaining high levels of disadvantage in society. Waves of race crime against Asian people also increased substantially with the growth of the One Nation movement and the election of Pauline Hanson to parliament (Paul 1998). In more recent years, race hatred has been directed at people of ‘middle-eastern appearance’, and more generally against Muslims. Racism encourages the government to violate the rights of asylum seekers and enforce a policy of detention and deportation. Many refugees have been sent back to grave danger or death. In other instances, asylum seekers have been left to die at sea on their way to Australia; as in the case of the vessel code-named SIEV-X (suspected illegal entry vessel) by Canberra, sabotaged before leaving Indonesia and killing 353 refugees, including many women and children (Paul 2006:69).

As a ‘US sheriff’, Australia has engaged in military intervention and invasion in various parts of the world, including West Asia. Collaboration with the USA has also meant participating in the arrest or kidnapping of ‘suspects’ and their rendition to third countries to be interrogated and tortured. Australia’s military activity in the world is concomitant with a strategy to promote nationalism at home with a mixture of fear of attack, the worship of dead heroes and virtues of militarism, and the glorification of Australia’s military past. Moreover, government policy has demonized Muslims in particular, and Arab people generally, instilling fear in society about their threat to Australia’s security, welfare and identity. Chronic anxiety and fear of the ‘other’ has been widely used to gain public support for the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, where the killing of women and children by Australian soldiers is not considered a crime but collateral damage in the ‘war on terror’. As of February 2009, an estimated 1.3 million civilians had been killed as a result of the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003, and between 8,000 and
27,000 killed since the invasion of Afghanistan in 2002 (JFP 2009). Major wars, writes Fromm (1974:215), are caused ‘by instrumental aggression of the military and political elites’ and a solution required ‘a different system of production, ownership, and consumption than the present one’ (ibid: 216).

**Systemic Causal Connections**

Identifying an array of social problems that have a structurally violent dimension is one thing: demonstrating a causal connection to the structures of contemporary capitalism is another. There are a number of more-or-less direct connections though. Capitalism is a system of accumulation which extracts surplus value by turning humans and human relations into commodities and markets. Polanyi described the process as ‘running society as an adjunct to the market. Instead of economy being embedded in social relations, social relations are embedded in the economic system’ (Polanyi 1944, 2001:60). He argued that turning people and the environment into commodities assured the destruction of both.

In the more modern context of consumerism and social pathology, Hamilton and others argue that advanced capitalism makes money out of human misery and is bad for mental health (Hamilton 2003; Hamilton & Denniss 2005; James 2007). Hamilton writes that ‘the extraordinary proliferation of the diseases of affluence suggests that the psychological wellbeing of citizens of rich countries is in decline. These diseases include drug dependence, obesity, loneliness and a suite of psychological disorders ranging from depression, anxiety, compulsive behaviours and widespread but ill defined anomie. Perhaps the most telling evidence is the extraordinary prevalence of depression in rich countries’ (Hamilton 2005).

The construction of a market economy has been accompanied by a substantial change in the character of society. Fromm has written about the importance of social character in society as a response to the individual’s inherent religious needs, which he defines as ‘any group-shared system of thought and action that offers the individual a frame or
Fromm argues that modern capitalism created a marketing social character based on ‘experiencing oneself as a commodity, and one’s value not as “use value”, but as “exchange value”’ (ibid:132). In a market economy there is a need to be in demand, and to succeed requires that one experiences oneself ‘simultaneously as the seller and the commodity to be sold (ibid: 133). Fromm further argues that the marketing social character forms the basis for the ‘having’ mode of existence, based on private property and profit ‘which produces the desire—indeed the need—for power ... and in the last analysis, in one’s capacity to conquer, rob, kill (ibid: 68). By contrast, the ‘being’ mode lies in loving, sharing and giving.

Dahl maintains that ‘modern corporate capitalism tends to produce inequalities in social and economic resources so great as to bring about severe violations of political equality and hence of the democratic process’ (Dahl 1985:60). A major mechanism is the symbiotic relationship between the state and the corporate sector because the state relies on the private sector to perform the main task of accumulation. Their relations lead to a concentration of power in the hands of the few and to growing political inequality. Citizens are increasingly marginalized because the corporate sector has effectively captured state power to advance its own interests. Corporate funding of political parties is one means whereby corporations gain undue influence.

Political economic inequality is a major source of corruption because it allows for the concentration of power in the hands of the few, with little transparency and accountability. This situation leads to the enactment of legislation which favours the interests of major donors and the bribing of officials (Haller & Shore 2005). Furthermore, government can restrict access to information, repress dissent, and hide behind a veil of secrecy (Hamilton & Maddison 2007). Corruption is a major form of violence against civil society because it allows for the mismanagement and maldevelopment of the economy and society, and for the growth of organized crime.

Gilligan argues that the class system itself is at the core of violence. The ruling class, he writes, ‘or those who represent their interests, write the laws that constitute those choices [how society creates and uses its wealth] which in turn is responsible for the social inequities that lead to
crime and violence … [and that] it is in the interest of the party that represent the interests of the very rich to foster as high a rate of crime as possible’ (186-187). Gilligan, who worked in the US prison system for many decades, concluded that the main cause of violence and crime in society is the result of shaming people, and that the existence of inequality, such as the class system, ‘exposes everyone to the risk of being inferior, which in turn stimulates aggressive competition to inflict the inferior status on others. In other words, inequality stimulates shame’ (Gilligan 2001:54). Wilkinson’s important research on inequality also leads him to the view that ‘people in more unequal societies trust each other less, and rates of violence are higher … violence is more common because inequality increases status competition … and people become sensitive to how they are seen’ (Wilkinson 2009: 3,4).

A system of inequality can be sustained only by a reciprocal system of repression that serves two basic functions. Firstly, to maintain political inequality and a ruling class in power, and secondly, to suppress resistance which is the inevitable outcome of a political and economic regime based on domination and hierarchies. Australia’s advanced capitalist society has a vast amount of what can be called ‘soft power’ in the form of widespread affluence and an entrenched culture of consumerism. Yet the consumer society contains the seeds of totalitarianism because repression is incorporated in an addiction based on needs and wants to consume more products and services and to accumulate more wealth.

Marcuse, in *One Dimensional Man*, argues that the market economy suffocates the needs that demand liberation and, instead, sustains the overwhelming need ‘for the production and consumption of waste; the need for stupefying work where it is no longer a real necessity; the need for modes of relaxation which soothe the prolong this stupefication; the need for maintaining such deceptive liberties as free competition, a free press which censors itself, free choices between brands and gadgets’ (Marcuse 1972:20). Social control is ‘anchored in the new needs’ which society has produced and which largely determine ‘what can be chosen, and what is chosen by the individual’ (*ibid:* 21).
Replication is built into the biopolitics of a state-corporation-crime synergy, integrating citizens in a ‘health’ system which provides a wide range of increasingly expensive services and drugs - and is a growing source of accumulation. Processes at work increase society’s dependence, first, by creating diseases caused by the market economy, as discussed earlier. Secondly, the body and the mind are increasingly subject to servicing because of new needs, such as those created by plastic surgery and new medical and technological innovations. Thirdly, because there are more diagnosed mental disorders, which are directly or indirectly linked to alienation, these become subject to therapy and to drug treatment.

Alienation becomes closely related to a market economy which atomizes society by shifting political and social conflict to the sphere of individual responsibility, and thus into the market. In other words, a neo-liberal market democracy depoliticizes the electorate by moving what are essentially political issues to the personal sphere of attitude, education, and values, and hence amenable to private therapy. The legal medicalisation of socio-economic and political conflict and its chemical solution is a central feature of an advanced capitalist society, complemented by a parallel expanding market for illicit drugs used to treat similar symptoms (Sargent 1982; Bell 2005; Zajdow 2008). As a mechanism of repression, the illicit drug market has the further advantage of fermenting social fear and expanding the power of the police and judiciary. In this manner, the ‘health’ system becomes a primary mechanism to manufacture consent, repress dissent and legitimize the power system.

Capitalism needs the nation-state to survive. Singer makes the point that ‘the very idea of stateless capitalism is a contradiction in terms. Take away the institutions for the protection of private property (the police, the prison, the judiciary), the more sophisticated instruments for the production of consent, and the myriad of financial devices propping up the system, and the capitalist social order would collapse like a sandcastle at the beach’ (Singer 1999:207). Chomsky argues that the nation-state system is not a viable system because it concentrates power in the hands of a small elite within each unit, and denies political equality to the majority. People who have power, writes Chomsky, ‘are going to try
to maximize it – and they’re going to maximize it at the expense of others, both in their own country and abroad’ (Mitchell & Schoeffel 2002:316).

**Market Democracy Versus Social Democracy**

While violence is a general characteristic of capitalism and the modern nation-state, its incidence varies significantly between nations. Northern European countries are generally less violent than Australia and other nations in the Anglo-American mould. This is indicated by the global peace index which measures the extent of peace in society and ranks 140 nations ‘by their relative states of peace’. Iceland, Denmark, and Norway were top ranking in 2008 (GPI 2008). Australia ranked 27th, below Romania and Oman. The UK and USA ranked 49th and 97th respectively. Australia’s indicators for the number of jailed population, level of violent crime, military expenditures, and infant mortality, were considerably higher than those of their Northern European counterparts. Moreover, Australia ranked considerably lower in indicators of political participation, women in parliament, and current education spending as a percentage of GDP.

Northern Europe fares markedly better than Australia on measures of child wellbeing. The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) report on child poverty shows that the percentage of children living in relative poverty, ‘defined as household with income below 50 percent of the national median’, is less than five percent in Sweden (2.6), Norway (3.9), Finland (4.3), Belgium (4.4), and Luxembourg (4.5) (UNICEF 2000). This compares with the substantially higher levels of poverty in Australia (12.6), the UK (19.8), and the USA (22.4). Northern European countries claim top rankings, and the USA and UK bottom rankings, in another UNICEF ‘comprehensive assessment of the lives and wellbeing of children and young people in 21 nations of the industrialized world’ (UNICEF 2007). Australia’s score on health and safety of children and on their material wellbeing was below the average for the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) countries.
According to the OECD, Australia’s had the highest rate of victimisation among the 21 rich nations in 2000 (OECD 2006). Some 30 percent of population said that they had been victim of a crime, compared with Japan (15), Denmark (23), (Norway 19) and Sweden (24). Australia also ranked considerably higher in road fatalities, and prison population. The number of convicted adults per 100,000 was 93.4, compared with Norway (29.8), Sweden (41.3) and Denmark (42.9), but considerably less than the USA (468.5).

Differences in levels of inequality correlate strongly with differences in levels of violence, particularly in regard to rates of victimization and prison population. The OECD’s study on equality of disposable income among individuals, as measured by the Gini coefficient, places Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands and Sweden among the lowest rated countries; Australia’s was considerably higher and closer to that of the UK. The OECD concludes that ‘crime, poverty, and social exclusion are often seen as linked to inequalities of income distribution’ (OECD: 218).

Much has been written on the close link between inequality and social outcomes. Wilkinson maintains that the greatest threat to health in rich countries is economic inequality, that people live longer in nations where income differences between the poorer and richer classes are lower, and that this correlation also holds true for other measures of the quality of life such as the level of direct violence (Sapolsky 1994; Wilkinson 1996, 2005, 2009; Wilkinson & Pickett 2009). The system that produces income inequality produces toxic social environments and relations, which explains why some people die younger than others, as well as a range of social problems such as high levels of violence, poorer mental health and educational performance and increased obesity.

Inequality and the system that produces it also affect mentality and behaviour in different but interrelated ways. The first pathway is through the production of stress and social anxieties about self-esteem which often creating a sense of humiliation and shame. Stress may be caused by feelings of relative deprivation engendered by class differences and perception of lower status (Runciman 1966). Another pathway links stress with the degradation of the immune system and results in heart disease and early death. Stress and anxiety are often linked to destructive
forms of consumerism, and to problems of isolation, alienation, and social estrangement.

Wilkinson’s statistical work demonstrates that Scandinavian countries come out best with lower levels of inequality and violence, with Australia in the middle, while the USA and the UK stand out at the high end of inequality, violence, social problems and poor health. The message is that in more egalitarian countries people lead healthier and happier lives.

Why are European, particularly Scandinavian, countries more egalitarian? Hutton claims that, as a result of their history and political struggles, Europeans developed a social character whereby ‘wealth and property were associated with profound reciprocal social obligations; and it was this ethical view which partly inspired socialism when it advocated common ownership of the means of production and proper respect for the rights of workers’ (Hutton 2003:54). This is reflected in the many studies which contrast ‘Anglo-American’ with ‘Rhenish’ forms of capitalism (Albert 1961; Sennett 1999). The latter model prevails in Germany and the Benelux countries and has similar characteristics to that of France and the Nordic countries. Both models share an emphasis on private property, the market and free enterprise, but the Rhenish model is more inclusive of the social in the business sector, and gives more importance to labor as a stakeholder in the operations of capitalism. Cooperation between capital and labor is accepted as necessary to lessen inequalities.

While the Rhenish model is not a worker’s paradise, it is a more humane form of capitalism than its Anglo-Saxon counterpart. People in northern Europe generally feel more valued as members of society and there is a higher level of social trust. Research on corruption shows that Denmark, Norway and Sweden have a high percentage of people – more than 65 percent – who agree ‘that most people can be trusted’. Australia ranks low with 39.9 percent, albeit above the USA (35.8) and Brazil (2.8) (You 2005). Trust in Scandinavia is closely related to higher levels of participation in the political process, and greater accountability and transparency on the part of the political regime. Social trust equates with the fairness of society, freedom from corruption and income equality.
The Political Economy of Peace

Fromm, Galtung, and Quinney differentiate negative peace from positive peace (Fromm 1982; Galtung 1996; Quinney 1985). Negative peace is based on policy to lessen violence without altering the social order, but the threat and application of force pervades as deterrence to crime and violence. Positive peace, in contrast, is based on the elimination of the structural sources of violence based on a different type of society.

To reduce the level of violence in Australia requires more equality and egalitarian policies to reduce the income and wealth gaps. More equality requires income redistribution by way of tax reforms to fund larger public expenditures on public goods, such as transport, housing, health and free education. More resources need to be invested in constructing a friendlier physical and social environment for children and women.

Equally important is to redress power relations and political inequality. The unlimited ‘freedom’ to accumulate wealth and resources by individuals and corporations needs to be constrained by a bill of rights and a new constitution. As Held (1987: 294) emphasises, ‘without a clear restriction on private ownership, a necessary condition of democracy cannot be met’ (Held 1987:294). The implication is the need for reform to establish a ‘system of cooperative forms of ownership and control in firms; that is, the extension of democratic principles to industry itself’ (Held 1987:203). The economy needs to be restructured towards sane consumption, sustainability, and the common good to promote a healthy people and a less violent society.
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