Magritte, Simenon, Beer, and Chocolate: ESC, The Belgian Way
By Judith Duchêne

The 10th edition of the annual meeting of the European Society of Criminology had to be festive, and to honor the work of the ESC’s founding members, presidents, board members and secretariat who have managed, for 10 years, to gather criminologists and other representatives of the social sciences together, opening the scope for searching new perspectives.

The organizing committee for the Liege meeting tried to take up the challenge, privileging the sense of hospitality, well-known as a Belgian particularity. Part of our strategy to create a festive atmosphere was to put each conference day under the banner of a theme representing distinctive aspects of Belgian culture, including Belgian gastronomy and surrealism.

The meeting opened on Wednesday, 8 September with the Welcome Reception and a presentation by Georges Kellens on “Preventing Human Rights Violations in Correctional Centres.” This concern, fundamental to all democracies, was not only discussed by Kellens but was also the subject of a photographic exhibition. Featuring the work of five professional artists, the exhibition, called “L’Enfer-me-ment,” was organized by the School of Criminology of the University of Liege and the “Autrement” NPO.

The exhibition extended the effects of the ESC congress; it lasted until the end of November. The aim was to attract school visits, in order to raise awareness among students about conditions of detention in Belgian prisons. The exhibition included in addition to
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2010 General Assembly: New Board Members

Three new members of the ESC board were elected at the 2010 Annual Meeting in Belgium. Henrik Tham, University of Stockholm, was elected to a three-year term as ESC president. Ana Cerezo, University of Malaga, and Rossella Selmini, Regional Government of Emilia-Romagna and University of Modena, were elected to two-year terms as at-large board members.

Henrik Tham
The April 2010 issue of this newsletter described Professor Tham’s background and many accomplishments.

Continued on page 11

Nominations: ESC President
Nominations and applications are sought for the ESC presidency. They must be received by May 1, 2011. Presidents serve three-year terms, the first as president-elect, second as president, third as past-president. Applications should be sent to Marcelo Aebi, Executive Secretary, ESC (see p. 2 for address).

Nominations: Scholarship Awards
Nominations for the 2011 ESC European Criminology and Young Criminologist Awards are due by 31 January. European Criminology Awards recognise the lifetime contributions of European criminologists. Young Criminologist Awards recognise outstanding articles by younger European criminologists.

Applications: EJC Editor
Applications due January 31 2011. For more information, see p. 10.
Message from the President
A Pan-European ESC

By Miklós Lévay

After the successful 2010 Annual Meeting of the European Society of Criminology in Liege, I can only begin my message by expressing my appreciation to the organisers. On behalf of the Executive Board, and may I say all participants, I would like to thank Michaël Dantinne and his team for their wonderful work. They organised a conference that was beneficial professionally, and also entertaining. Social events, the gala dinner, and sometimes even the food paid homage to the great Belgian surrealist René Magritte.

I would also like to thank the departing members of the Executive Board—Past President Elena Larrauri, Tapio Lappi-Seppälä, and Alenka Selih—for the hard and valuable work they have done. I welcome our new members, President Elect Henrik Tham, and at-large board members Ana Cerezo and Rossella Selmini. In 2010-2011, Sophie Body-Gendrot will act as Past President. Aleksandras Dobryninas is responsible for the organisation of our 2011 conference in Vilnius, Lithuania.

As a Hungarian, I must acknowledge with a bit of sadness that, compared with previous meetings, the representation of participants from Eastern and Central Europe has not increased. The Book of Abstracts from Liege shows that fewer than 10 percent of the 600 participants came from Central and Eastern Europe. Of these, 70 percent came from five countries: Poland, The Czech Republic, Slovenia, Hungary, and Serbia.

Naturally, this is not a responsibility of the organisers. The composition of participants is basically a representation of the distribution of member states in the ESC. In 2009, the Society had 831 members from 49 countries, 101 (12 percent) of whom were from these countries. The ratio is favourably distorted by the fact that 45 of these 101 members come from Slovenia.

The following data from 2009 are especially thought-provoking: the ESC had 4 members from the Ukraine, 2 from Romania, only one from Russia (combined with 4 in 2007), and none at all from Bulgaria and Slovakia.

As one of the main objectives of the ESC is to be a pan-European organisation for our discipline, providing and ensuring a forum for criminologists from all regions of the continent, this leaves a feeling of discontent. Of the 45 independent European states, 20 are former members of the socialist block. Of these, only 14 had members in the ESC in 2009. (Only six countries—Slovenia, Poland, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Serbia—had five or more.) The situation is all the more alarming if one looks at the list of contributors to the European Journal of Criminology. The EJC, established in 2004, has published 31 issues so far. Not counting country reports, there are hardly any articles by Eastern and central European writers.

I do not here explore the reasons behind the phenomenon, about which we have read several times in the presidential messages of Josine Junger-Tas in the November 2002 issue of Criminology in Europe, of Ernesto Savona in October 2003, and especially of Krzysztof Krajewski in May 2008. My aim is to draw attention to the fact once again and to declare that one main goal of my presidency will be to contribute to the accelerated participation of Eastern and central European writers. Of these, only 14 had members in the ESC in 2009. (Only six countries—Slovenia, Poland, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Serbia—had five or more.) The situation is all the more alarming if one looks at the list of contributors to the European Journal of Criminology. The EJC, established in 2004, has published 31 issues so far. Not counting country reports, there are hardly any articles by Eastern and central European writers.

I do not here explore the reasons behind the phenomenon, about which we have read several times in the presidential messages of Josine Junger-Tas in the November 2002 issue of Criminology in Europe, of Ernesto Savona in October 2003, and especially of Krzysztof Krajewski in May 2008. My aim is to draw attention to the fact once again and to declare that one main goal of my presidency will be to contribute to the accelerated participation of Eastern and central European writers.

Continued on page 10
Most international crime measures refer mainly to adult criminal behaviour, suggesting that juvenile criminal acts are not of particular interest. This is surprising since youth crime is considered in many countries to be a major problem. Comparative knowledge about juvenile anti-social behaviour and juvenile crime warrant a high place on the agenda. This is why a group of interested researchers in the 1990s started a series of international and comparative surveys on juvenile delinquency. The first International Self-Report Delinquency Study, ISRD-1, was carried out in 1994. The data for ISRD-2 were collected in 2006-07.

Dissemination of the main findings from ISRD-2 will soon be completed. A first volume, *Juvenile Delinquency in Europe and Beyond: Results of the Second International Self-Report Delinquency Study*, reporting on the results of the 30 participating countries, was published in 2010 by Springer. The final manuscript for a second volume, *The Many Faces of Youth Crime*, will be submitted to Springer this fall or winter.

The second book analyzes the comparative findings from thirty countries and includes an extensive chapter on the methodology used. This should be of great interest to comparative researchers. This is followed by a descriptive section on the main findings on delinquency, victimization, substance use, and social responses to delinquent behavior.

The third section explores competing explanations of delinquency in the family, in the school, and in relation to young people’s life-styles, in relation to neighborhood characteristics. A separate chapter deals with such concepts as self-control and attitudes.

Central and Eastern European countries under communist rule had extraordinarily high imprisonment rates. During the 1970s their rates were well above those for any western country, including even the United States. In the 1980s, as figure 1 shows, they greatly exceeded rates elsewhere in Europe. Since then rates have fallen in most of these countries and include growth in imprisonment rates in many western countries, imprisonment rate rankings in Europe remain much the same in 2008 as 30 years ago (see figure 2 on p. 7) Europe remains visibly split into two different ‘penal climates.’

There are, however, significant differences among
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Nils Christie was awarded the European Criminology Prize of the European Society of Criminology for 2010.

The award committee was composed of former ESC presidents Kauko Aromaa (HEUNI, chair), Krzysztof Krajewski (Jagiellonian University, Cracow), and Hans-Jürgen Kerner (University of Tuebingen). The committee explained its decision thusly:

Nils Christie’s career and accomplishments satisfy all the elements set out in the ESC Award regulations relevant to the European criminology prize. The award recognises the lifetime contribution of a European criminologist, and is aimed at persons engaged in research, teaching, or practice.

Nils Christie has made an extensive lifetime contribution to Norwegian, Scandinavian, and international criminology. He has for many decades focused his energies on scholarly exchange, policy initiatives, and bilateral, multilateral, and transnational research initiatives.

Nils Christie is an eminent scholar. In the field of criminological theory at large and on particular issues, his commitment and brilliance are stunning. He has engaged in empirical and innovative research which influenced the development of the field substantially, including on self-reports, delinquent careers, and victim issues.

Nils Christie demonstrated, in a variety of fields of work, remarkable knowledge and expertise, and has contributed importantly to the repeated redefinition of research agendas and crime policy debates, both nationally and internationally. It is his conviction that criminologists as social scientists have the duty to try to influence society by participation in the relevant debates. Consequently, he has been member of a number of Royal Commissions in Norway, but most significantly a fearless writer and speaker on controversial topics including the (over) use of prisons and other closed institutions, drugs policy, crime victim issues, and restorative justice.

Nils Christie has for decades had immense influence in Europe and in the “remainder” of the world, in terms of independent critical analyses of modern state crime control, criminal justice, and correctional systems. His arguments may not always please everybody in the field, even in academia. However, they have never been ad hominem nor been provocative solely for the sake of provocation. To the contrary: they evidence Nils Christie’s deep commitment to humanity, human rights, harm reduction, and social solidarity among mankind and its people.

...and Torbjorn Skardhamar receives 2010 Young Criminologist Award

Torbjorn Skardhamar, a researcher in the Division of Social and Demographic Research, Statistics Norway, was awarded the ESC Young Criminologist Award for 2010. The award, for an article or articles by a European criminologist aged 35 or younger, was based on articles published in the British Journal of Criminology and Criminology.

The award committee was composed of Tapio Lappi-Seppälä (National Research Institute of Legal Policy, Finland, chair), Aleksandras Dobryninas (University of Vilnius, Lithuania), and René van Swaamingen (Erasmus University, Rotterdam). The Committee explained its decision thusly:

The jury proposes that the Young Criminologist Award for 2010 be granted to Torbjorn Skardhamar. The jury reached this conclusion after looking at the two papers together. These papers touch the core argument of one of the most influential criminological theories of recent years—Terrie E. Moffitt’s typology of adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent offenders. In the British Journal of Criminology article, Torbjorn Skardhamar analyses step-by-step theoretical possibilities concerning whether the “nature” of the criteria used in Moffitt’s analyses make a taxonomic theory plausible (which he concludes they do not). In the Criminology article, using artificial data and a simulation model, he creatively and innovatively examines the methodology used in developing and supporting Moffitt’s classification and identifies major limitations.

These two works are original, innovative, and rigorous. Skardhamar treats Moffitt’s his views fairly and maturely. Despite his young age Skardhamar has nine times published articles in international peer-reviewed journals. These works testify to an active and talented young criminologist.
the photos a game, a DVD reporting people’s general opinions on detention, and a theoretical folder explaining life in prison. Students in the Master of Criminology course provided guided tours of the exhibition for school groups and other visitors.

On Thursday, 9 September, most of the 610 registered delegates took shuttles to the green conference site of the campus of Sart Tilman, University of Liege. Helped by students and organizing committee members, they made their ways to the Sutherland, Lombroso, Lausanne, Toledo, Red, Yellow, and other rooms. There was a cornucopia of riches; participants had to choose on average among 16 panel sessions going on in each time slot. With 472 abstracts to manage, organized and grouped under thematic headings, and 141 panel sessions to schedule in two and a half days, the organizing committee experienced moments of despair!

More seriously, the general theme, “Crime and Criminology: From Individuals to Organizations,” highlighted the complementarity of criminological approaches focused on organizational and individual levels through wide and diversified communications on subjects such as terrorism, juvenile delinquency, domestic violence, victimization, and sentencing.

The plenary sessions completed this scope by inviting renowned professors to discuss offending, organized crime, policy, and prevention. We want once more to thank the plenary speakers: David Farrington (Cambridge), Michel Born (Liege), Carlos Morselli (Montréal), Gary Lafree (Maryland), Britta Kyvsgaard (Danish Ministry of Justice), and Katalin Gönczöl (Eötvös University, Budapest).

Poster sessions also were a great success. Participants could admire 34 presentations on the Thursday and Friday. Posters were clear, interesting, and beautiful and aroused informal but enriching discussions.

After the hard work mobilized in each session, it was the time for the gourmet breaks, perfectly run by the catering services of the University. The lunch of the Thursday celebrated Belgian gastronomy through typical meals such as waterzooi, meat balls in a sauce made with the syrup of Liege, Belgian fries,… The most curious went back home with local products which were sold in the Europe Lecture Halls by regional producers. The last surprise planned for this day was the Belgian Beers Open Bar which met a huge success thanks to the help of the typical Belgian weather which precluded any impossible excuse!

On the Friday 10 September, delegates were welcomed in a new decoration inspired by Magritte’s surrealist world. Apples (which seemed to be delicious for many participants!), derby hats, posters of some Belgian surrealists’ masterpieces, clouds tablecloths, students disguised to remind the character of Magritte’s picture “The Son of Man” (1964): all these elements created a particular atmosphere all day long. The lunch also honoured creativity. The meal began with a soup that gave the impression to be a coffee. The chef played with the illusion of the appearances: things were not what they seemed to be. During all breaks, participants had the occasion to take a “surrealist” picture into the clouds. The results are wonderful! Don’t hesitate to watch and download the pictures on this private link: http://picasaweb.google.com/criminology2010.

After all panel sessions, everybody was invited to the Sutherland room to congratulate the two laureates of the ESC Awards: Nils Christie (University of Oslo) obtained the ESC European Criminology Award, while Torbjørn Skardhamar (Statistics Norway) obtained the ESC Young Criminologist Award. We congratulate them both for their contribution to research in criminology.

Friday was crowned by the gala dinner in the “Magic Mirrors Tent” implanted near the Court House, on the most beautiful square of Liege. The concept of the gala dinner was to celebrate the ESC’s 10th anniversary, with reminders—through lots of surprises—of each organizing country of the annual conference. Flamenco, European culinary specialties, table decorations, foreign wines, beer and chocolate cheered up the evening and concluded with a concert of the group “Missed Call” which enthused the fans of the dance floor. This night, Liege earned its nickname of the “Fiery City” thanks to all participants who helped us to make this event cordial, energetic, and unforgettable.

Saturday was the day of the brave who still had a bit of vitality to attend the last panel and plenary sessions. The programme was lighter but proposed themes that were not approached on the Thursday and the Friday such as green criminology, fear of crime, criminology and culture. Beside the intellectual aspects, the delegates were rewarded for their participation with a luxurious buffet of smoked salmon, sushis, oysters,—the last moment of conviviality before the return trip.

Organizing an annual ESC congress is a huge human and practical adventure. You have to master, at the same time, the intellectual contingencies and all details which will ensure a comfortable life for every participant during these four days. Every member of the small organizing committee involved the best of himself and learned a lot from this experience which gave the University of Liege the opportunity to increase its visibility on the criminological international scene. We hope all the participants enjoyed the conference and that they were able to make great contacts. We wish a very good luck to the organizing committee of the next congress in Vilnius. We hope the prediction made by our Organizing Committee Chair, Michaël Dantinne, in a previous newsletter has become true: “Come to Liege, You Won’t Regret it!”
the countries of the region, which may be classified roughly into four groups. The first consists of Russia (and probably Belarus)—they have notoriously high imprisonment rates. The second consists of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Ukraine, whether or not (Ukraine) in the EU. For most of the period they had imprisonment rates resembling Russia’s, although Estonia and Lithuania have made significant progress in reducing them. The third group consists of Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria; they have very large prison populations, but at rates well below the first two groups. The last “group” consists only of Slovenia, European champion of ‘penal mildness.’

As Tonry (2007) observes ‘penal policies and imprisonment patterns result from policy decisions. What we don’t know is why particular policies emerge in particular places.’ A relatively large literature attempts to explain differences in punishment patterns between various countries and regions of the industrialized west. But little attention has been paid to conditions affecting post-communist countries in transition, and their patterns of punitive penal policies. If we are to understand punishment policies and practices in Central and Eastern Europe, we must provide convincing answers to two questions. First, why do high imprisonment rates persist in the region twenty years after the fall of the Berlin wall? Second, why are there such conspicuous differences among these countries?

According to Lappi-Seppälä (2008), low imprisonment rates are strongly associated with whether a country is characterized by low levels of income inequality and high levels of welfare spending, legitimacy of the state in the eyes of citizens, and social trust. Central and Eastern European countries typically have high income inequality and comparatively low levels of welfare spending, legitimacy, and trust. This could partly explain high imprisonment rates.

Political legitimacy may be a crucial factor. Most countries in the region were for long periods dominated by foreign powers; this diminished trust towards authority of any kind. This was especially conspicuous in the case of communist authorities which lacked political legitimacy among the vast majority of the population. This was probably one reason why communist crime control policies were so punitive; they were not necessarily rational, penological tools, but socio-technical instruments.

Do current political regimes in answer these questions is well beyond the scope of this short article. However, legitimacy deficits could partly explain the persistence of punitive crime control policies into our time.

Cavadino and Dignan (2006) did not attempt to apply their explanatory models to the post-communist countries in transition. They argued that penal policies largely correspond to whether countries are neo-liberal, social democratic, conservative corporatist, or Asian corporatist in their systems of political economy. Does it make any sense to attempt to apply that model? Liberal or neo-liberal free market ideology certainly had significant effects on transition processes in the region. However, independently of that, the collapse of centrally planned economies, accompanied by withdrawal of the state from many areas of welfare policy, usually resulted in mass unemployment, rising poverty, and social exclusion. Transition also created huge income differences in formerly (at least theoretically) very egalitarian societies, and was accompanied by growing individualism and atomization of societies. The growing gap between winners and losers of transformation became one of...
the most important problems facing the new democracies. These effects were very similar to those attributed to radical neo-liberal policies.

But what about countries like Russia or Ukraine? If neo-liberal policies somehow explain high imprisonment rates, does that mean that Russia or Ukraine are the most neo-liberal countries in Europe? This is not necessarily the case. This may mean the need to add a fifth category, similar to neo-liberalism but including also specific features of post-communist countries under transition, to the Cavadino and Dignan typology.

Finally, it is useful to consider various factors discussed by Tonry (2007). Are rising crime rates, harsher public attitudes, cynical politicians, ethnic tensions, rapid social and economic change, postmodernist angst, and penal populism really non-factors, as they are present throughout the world, and cannot explain differences between countries in imprisonment rates? One attitudes towards crime and social problems. After 1989 the countries of the region, earlier being ‘low crime’ societies, in a short period experienced spectacular crime growth accompanied by significant changes in crime patterns. In Western Europe and the United States, similar increases occurred more gradually and over a longer period.

But all this being true, the experiences of countries in the region demonstrate that crime rate changes do not necessarily directly affect imprisonment rates. For instance, crime went up sharply in Poland after 1989, but the imprisonment rate remained lower than under communism (see figure 3).

According to Tonry, conflict political cultures are crucial risk factors making countries prone to high imprisonment rates. This seems to be confirmed by data presented by Lappi-Seppälä (2008). Countries in Central and Eastern Europe tend to not have orderly political scenes as a consequence of lacking an established system of the most important. As a result, political compromise is not necessarily common. This probably fosters a political dynamic closer to the conflict political culture model.

Criminal justice systems in all countries of the region are in principle politically independent. Public prosecutors and judges are career professionals nominated on merit grounds in special selection procedures protected from political influence. This should insulate against excesses in penal policies. But the reality in Central and Eastern Europe may be somewhat different.

Under the communist regimes, the criminal justice system was of special importance to the Communist Party. Political loyalty always constituted the criterion for professional career development. This most directly affected public prosecutors. Judges were affected to a lesser extent (even at that time were at least nominally independent).

The public prosecution system

![Figure 3: Crime rate and imprisonment rate in Poland (1956 - 2008)](image)
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President's Message

of criminologists from central and eastern Europe. This is essential if the ESC wishes to become a truly European organization.

We have to make an effort to reach and get to know criminologists from these regions, and their work. This is not only for the Society’s benefit. By paying more attention to countries that have (for us) ‘latent’ criminology and criminologists, we are able to assist the development of autonomous criminology in the region.

It is also important from a theoretical perspective to include the research findings of central and eastern European scholars in European and universal criminological thinking. Unfortunately, British and American textbooks, which have had a huge influence, contain hardly any mention of criminological theorizing in the region, save perhaps for Stephen Schafer’s study from 1969.

The research findings from the region are little known, although Sonja Snacken warns that “the topics criminology deals with are inherently transnational, but that does not mean that important lessons cannot be learned from specific characteristics, problems, focuses of criminological theory, and crime policies in different regions of Europe.”

In a 2006 editorial, David J. Smith argues that it is important for criminology as a whole to aspire to a wider recognition of research findings from different regions. This is due to a tendency to seek universals and formulate general theories. The reality is that, unlike other quantitative sciences—mathematics or physics—criminology is more subjective and dependent on specific cultural, social, and political contexts which may disallow a universal standard. Smith’s caution is that “attempts to formulate more general theories [should] grow out of an understanding of basic concepts such as ‘crime’ and ‘justice’ as they emerge from a specific cultural context” as opposed to an absolute standard.

In light of these considerations and concerns, I consider it especially important (1) to include central and eastern European criminologists in the working groups of the European Society of Criminology; (2) for the Working Group on Criminology Curricula, led by Gorazd Mesko, in cooperation with a similar project of the International Society for Criminology, to launch the website listing the criminology curricula of European universities; and (3) to complete and publish the European Handbook of Criminology initiated by Sophie Body-Gendrot.

Dear Colleagues, I look forward to your ideas and suggestions on how to ‘pan-Europeanize’ the ESC. I trust that the 2011 Annual Meeting in Vilnius will be a milestone in this endeavour. See you all in Vilnius!

(Endnotes)


intensity of this punitiveness was much greater than in the west. Some contemporary features of these societies may explain this. The question is whether there are other distinctive features of these societies that explain high imprisonment rates? In other words, is this a ‘new punitiveness,’ more intensive than elsewhere, or is it just ‘old punitiveness,’ communist style, in a slightly new disguise?

I believe that it is primarily an ‘old punitiveness’ that these societies have been unable to throw off. The punitive mentality and patterns developed in those societies during the communist period survive and have significant influence. This may be illustrated by differences between countries. Russia, even before the Soviet time, represented extremely punitive patterns. Countries that had the bad luck of being parts of Russia, and then the Soviet Union, continue today to have especially high imprisonment rates. Other countries that belonged to the Soviet Block, but that were not Soviet republics, have smaller prison populations. And Slovenia, earlier part of the communist-ruled Yugoslavia, always considered to be ‘different’ from the Soviet Block proper, is completely different.

The ‘penal climate’ in central and eastern Europe thus seems still, despite all the ‘European influences’ to which the region has been subject, to be shaped by its communist inheritance, explaining paradoxically – both similarities and differences between countries in the area of crime control, the influence of this communist past, which was so profound in many other areas of political, economic, and social life in the region, is especially resistant to change.

REFERENCES:
In the final section we use macro-level structural factors to explore differences between countries and discuss policy implications and proposals based on the findings.

There was a large time gap between ISRD-1 and ISRD-2. The first study had in some ways the character of a pilot study. We greatly improved the methodology and tightly controlled the research process for ISRD-2. Our inspiration is for such a survey be conducted every five years.

That is why we organized a meeting in Liege to announce and discuss the start of ISRD-3. We invited all researchers who would like to participate to attend this meeting and discussed some essential elements of the coming study, such as the sampling plan, the survey, the target group, data collection, and funding possibilities. The main innovations include the enlarged option of administering the instrument electronically, making it possible to add grades 6 and grade 10 to the basic target group of grades 7-9. The instrument used in ISRD-2 was improved both technically and theoretically. Larger funding possibilities appear to exist for ISRD-3. We plan as part of ISRD-3 to organize two workshops a year to assist participants and supervise the process.

A number of countries that did not participate in ISRD-2, including the UK, Greece, Croatia, Slovakia, Serbia, Australia, and China, have expressed interest in participating in ISRD-3. We invite every interested researcher to join us in the third ISRD study. Feel free to contact me: Jungertas@xs4all.nl.

Ana Cerezo
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Professor Cerezo received her M.S. and Ph.D. in Criminal Law and Criminology from the University of Malaga. She joined the Criminal Law Department there in 1993. She has been a Fulbright Visiting Researcher in the School of Criminal Justice, Rutgers University, and a visiting researcher in the Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge; the Faculty of Law, Queensland University of Technology; and the Institute of information Sciences and Electronics, Tsukuba University in Japan.

Rossella Selmini
Rossella Selmini is the Head of the Department of Urban Safety and Local Police of the Italian Regional Government of Emilia–Romagna. From 2004 to 2009 she taught criminology at the University of Macerata, Faculty of Political Sciences. She was the local organizer of the 2007 ESC Annual Meeting in Bologna, Italy. Professor Selmini was previously a researcher at the European University Institute in Florence and has taught at several Italian universities. Until 2007, she was, for a decade, the Head of the Research Unit on Crime and Prevention in the Regional Government of Emilia—Romagna.

Rossella Selmini has also been a consultant to local and national governments in the field of crime, crime prevention, and urban safety policies. She is the author or editor of 6 books. Her recent publications include books and articles on the local governance of crime, crime prevention, gender violence, policing, and victimsation.
Interested in studying Criminology and Criminal Justice with some of the world’s leading criminologists, in one of the world's most prestigious universities?
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Further Information
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For of application procedures, funding opportunities and links to college information, please visit: www.admin.ox.ac.uk/postgraduate/.