Münster Welcomes the ESC
Frieder Dünkel on Changes in Prison Population in Europe
Working Group Reports
Candidate Profiles
Prison population rates often are interpreted as an indicator of a more or less punitive crime policy. Although it is clear that assessing punitiveness is more complicated than just comparing prison population rates and possibly considering the flow of entries and length of stay in prisons, Europe in the early 2000s was rather clearly divided on this basis. On the one hand we had the ‘good’ Scandinavian countries, with very low prison population rates, and on the other hand Eastern European countries of the old Soviet empire, in particular Russia, the Ukraine and the Baltic states. These Eastern ‘bad guys’ were competing with the US, the nation boasting the highest incarceration rates in the world, with more than 700 prisoners per 100,000 of the population.

Until the early 2000s, an increase in prison population rates in many countries could be observed, which was understood as a proof for the punitive turn. England and Wales were seen as the prototype of the ‘neo-correctional model’ (Cavadino/Dignan 2006). Indeed, the 1990s brought criminal law reforms which increased minimum sentences for violent and sex offenders almost everywhere, the consequence being that these groups of offenders now represent a larger part of the prison population and contributed to the increase of prison populations and overcrowding in many European countries (see Dünkel et al. 2010; 2016). But this general trend was not uniform. Schnaken and Dumortier (2012) gave explanations for why several European countries, in particular continental countries with a strong human rights-oriented approach to sentencing and prison policies, were able to ‘resist punitiveness’. Lappi-Seppälä (2007; 2010; 2011) also argue that a different political culture can explain the moderate way of the ‘Scandinavian exceptionalism’.

Recently the picture has become increasingly blurred. Not only are the successor states of the former Yugoslavia exceptions to the trends found among former communist states—the prison rates have traditionally been relatively low, and this tradition is preserved, for example, in Slovenia and Croatia (see Figure 1 on page 4), but some of the ‘bad guys’ have also developed more moderate sentencing practices (accompanied by a reduction of registered serious and violent crimes). Russia shows an almost 40%-reduction of its prison population, from 730 per 100,000 in 1999 to 445 in 2016, the Ukraine a similar development (from 412 to 173 in 2016). The same trend can be observed in the Baltic states which tried to reduce their traditionally high prison population.
of up to 400 prisoners per 100,000 down to 268 (Lithuania), 239 (Latvia) and 215 (Estonia) (see Figure 1). The total prison population rates are still about double the size than in most Western European countries, but far away from those under the former Soviet style of incarceration policies. While the Baltic states have tried to implement and expand alternative sanctions, such as probation (including electronic monitoring) or early release schemes (including house arrest), the explanation for the Russian and Ukrainian development is more difficult. It is unlikely that under the leadership of Putin, a more lenient sentencing policy has been introduced. But on the other hand, the role of the European Court of Human Rights’ jurisprudence might have had an impact, as the ECtHR convicted Russia in hundreds of cases for violating its own standard legislation to provide each prisoner at least 4 square meters of living space in his prison room or dormitory. It was a purposeful prison policy decision to change the ancient camp-style prison system into a Western-style cell prison system in the early 2000s, and this was to begin with youth prisons. There the number of inmates declined from more than 18,000 in 2001 to roughly 2,300 in 2012 (see Dünkel 2015).

For most Eastern European countries, we have difficulties in explaining the recent developments. There are certainly a lot of elements that could be accounted for by Garland’s concept of the ‘culture of control’ (2001), but do not fit to the reductionist facts. Maybe it is more the Italian style of a chaotic and not really well functioning criminal justice system (see Nelken 2010) which is in place. The political science indicators described by Lappi-Seppälä (2007; 2010; 2011) for the Scandinavian countries and by Dünkel (2013) for Slovenia (see also Flander/Meško 2016) would not work well with the authoritarian democracies in some Eastern European countries. All in all, looking at the developments in Eastern Europe, there are more questions than answers to identify to what extent factors such as declining crime rates; the introduction of community sanctions (i.e. probation service); changing sentencing policies (e.g. lower minimum sentences for recidivists, using pre-trial detention only as a last resort, shortening prison sentences); and using early release schemes more extensively play a role.

Data for some Western European countries also indicate astonishing changes in prison population rates. The Netherlands, with traditionally low levels in the 1980s experienced a quadrupling prison population by 2006, and then a decrease in the following 10 years by 46% (from 128 to 69). Again, we have some ideas that might explain certain trends in the period described as the ‘end of tolerance’, in particular for persistent offenders, resulting in an increase of both short-term and long-term sentences, and ‘non-native’ offenders in prisons (Tak 2008: 122, 140), but these cannot account for the dramatic decrease in recent years. A 2006 reform law expanding the scope of suspended sentences is one possible, but certainly not the only, explanation, as is the recent expansion of electronic monitoring. The Netherlands (69 prisoners per 100,000 inhabitants) and Germany (76 prisoners per 100,000 inhabitants, down by 22% since 2003) now belong to the group of countries which are characterised as being ‘exceptionalist’. Both countries have also experienced a major drop in registered (violent) crimes and focus strongly on crime prevention programmes. While their impact on crime rates is to some extent evident, or at least plausible, the impact on the size of the prison population remains unclear.

1 The role of community sanctions from an European perspective is explained, for example, in Aebi/Delgrande/Marguet 2015.
2 As indicated in the SPACE-statistics of the Council of Europe (see e.g. Aebi/Tiago/Burkhardt 2015), prison population rates are the product of entries into prisons and the length of stay. The low rates in Scandinavian countries are the result of very short term sentences, while the relatively high rates in Eastern European countries (e.g. Romania, Czech Republic, Estonia) are based on a larger proportion of long-term imprisonment (see Dünkel/Geng/Harrendorf 2016). In Sweden and Denmark, for example, many more offenders enter prison than in Germany, but the length of stay in prison is only about one-third of that in Germany.
3 For a comprehensive explanation of the increase concerning the US prison population see Travis/Western/Redburn 2015.
4 One has to consider, however, that the 2016 figure does not include the population of Crimea, Sebastopol and the Donetsk/Luhansk-region, which are not under the control of the Ukrainian government. Nevertheless, a major part of the reduction is estimated to be due to changes in sentencing (fewer pre-trial detainees, less usage of increased sentences for recidivist offenders, etc.).
5 In Lithuania, the Criminal Law reform of 2003 was quite successful in introducing alternative sanctions and reducing the prison population. This was subsequently undone by a populist government strategy supporting more severe punishment and increased prison population rates during the period 2008–2013. The recent new decline could be interpreted as a return to the attempts of the early 2000s (see also Sakalauskas 2015).
6 It is always difficult to judge if the introduction or expansion of alternative sanctions has really had an impact on prison population rates or whether it has, instead, contributed to a net-widening by enlarging the scope of offenders under judicial control, as was the case in many European countries (see the differentiated statistical analyses of Aebi/Delgrande/Marguet 2015).
7 Possible explanations are given by van Swaaningen 2013.
Belgium 105
England & Wales 147
Finland 57
Germany 76
Netherlands 69
Spain 133
Sweden 55

Figure 2. Prison population rates in Eastern Europe 1990–2015/16

Reference: World prison brief: http://www.prisonstudies.org/info/worldbrief/ (last query: 06.05.2016)

Estonia 215
Latvia 239
Croatia 81
Lithuania 268
Russian Fed. 445
Slovenia 73
Ukraine 171* without Crimea, Sebastopol and Donetsk/Lubans region, which are not under Ukrainian state control.

Figure 1. Prison population rates in Western Europe 1984–2015/16

Reference: World prison brief: http://www.prisonstudies.org/info/worldbrief/ (last query: 06.05.2016)
One of the few European countries with a still-expanding prison population is Belgium, where a levelling of the prison population rate can be observed (see Figure 2) only very recently. The country is facing some ‘homemade’ problems with criminal law reforms that did not work for reducing the prison population (e.g., the introduction and expanding of electronic monitoring), but here, as in general, further research is needed to understand who the motor is for sentencing developments and prison sentence execution policies.

While in some countries remand detention figures are particularly high, their development do not always mirror the overall prison population trends (Morgenstern 2013). This fact also contributes to the very complex picture.

And there is a great deal of uncertainty about future developments: The refugee problem could lead to a new wave of incarceration and the moderate crime policy development in some countries, such as Germany, could be reversed by terrorist acts and influence the penal climate. We saw something similar happen during the 1970s, when the Red Army Faction was on the German policy agenda. New right wing populist parties, although not yet part of the government, demanded tough crime policies, not only for extraditing foreigners and migrants more easily, but also for sentencing ‘ordinary’ offenders.

These and other questions will be discussed in the presidential address during the opening session of the ESC-conference in Münster, and I would be happy if we could find answers for these prison population issues, rather create new questions.

Frieder Dünkel is Professor of Criminology and Criminal Law at the University of Greifswald, and the President of the ESC.

Prisons, policing, life-course criminology, economic crime and state crime are major issues at the macro-, meso- and micro-levels of criminological research. They are also of significant interest for practitioners and in criminal policy. Under the umbrella of ‘Crime and Crime Control’, a link that is at the core of modern criminological research, these topics form the plenary programme of the upcoming conference in Münster. ESC conferences continue to draw many European criminologists, as well as criminologists from all over the world. For the Münster meeting we received 930 abstracts and expect more than 1,000 participants (www.eurocrim2016.com).

The hosting Criminology Department at Münster University is, as is usual in Germany, part of the Institute of Penal Sciences within the law faculty. Comprised of one full professor, three post-doc and three doctoral scholars (criminologists, lawyers and social scientists), the department mainly teaches law students in criminology, and also in juvenile justice, corrections and criminal procedural law. The law faculty, with over 5,000 students—one of the largest in Germany—is greatly acknowledged among scholars and practitioners and very attractive for students.

The department’s research focus is on life-course criminology. Since 2002, we have conducted an ongoing panel study (Crime in modern Cities, CrimoC) together with the Department of Quantitative Methods in Social Research at the University of Bielefeld (www.crimoc.org). Besides developmental and methodological analyses, this longitudinal study allows investigations into particular criminological and policy interests, e.g. normative orientations, peer association, parental education, consumption of violent media, migration, lifestyles, school climate, impact of formal control interventions or—in cooperation with the Cambridge Institute of Criminology—a comparison between the English and German juvenile justice systems.

A second research focus is on corporate crime. A larger qualitative case study has been carried out on the privatisation of former state owned enterprises in East Germany (Boers et al. 2015). Currently, we are investigating the impact of penal control on corporate compliance.

The criminology department at Münster University was founded in 1971 when Hans Joachim Schneider, a lawyer and psychologist, was appointed professor of criminology. At that time, and unfortunately until today, professorships for the sole study of criminology were quite rare in Germany, as criminology was mostly seen as an ‘auxiliary discipline’ of criminal law. Thus, most criminology professors were teaching at law faculties and were required to be also criminal law experts. Hans Joachim Schneider wrote criminology textbooks and edited several handbooks. His research focused on media crime reporting and in particular on victimological issues. In 1979, the department hosted the Second International Symposium on Victimology, during which the World Society of Victimology was founded and Hans-Joachim Schneider was elected its first president (the 16th ESC conference will be the second international criminology conference taking place in Münster). In 1998, Klaus Boers became the department’s professor of criminology. The department’s scholars have been active members of the ESC working groups on development and life-course criminology, organisational crime, quantitative methods, juvenile justice and immigration. In September 2017, we will also be hosting the conference of the Society of German, Austrian and Swiss Criminologists, with a plenary focus on migration and refugees, Islamic and right-wing radicalisation, and economic crime as well as environmental crime.

Klaus Boers is Professor of Criminology. Kristina-Maria Kanz, Christian Walburg and Christina Bentrup are Senior Researchers at the Faculty of Law, Münster University, Germany. They are all members of the organising team of the 2016 Annual Meeting.
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IN BRIEF
2015 was the year of all the records for the European Society of Criminology (ESC). The number of members reached 1308, and 1369 criminologists attended the 15th Annual Meeting of the ESC, which took place in Porto, Portugal, from 2 to 5 September 2015. During the conference, Sonja Snacken received the 2015 European Criminology Award and Daniel Seddig the 2015 ESC Young Criminologist Award. The ESC awarded three fellowships to attend the conference. The General Assembly of the ESC elected Rossella Selmini as President-Elect and Letizia Paoli as at-large Board member. The day following the General Assembly, Frieder Dünkel took office as President of the ESC, replacing Gerben Bruinsma until the end of the next conference, which will take place in Münster, Germany, from 21 to 24 September 2016.

THE 15th ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ESC (PORTO, PORTUGAL, 2–5 SEPTEMBER 2015)
Figure 1 shows the evolution of the participation in ESC conferences from 2004 to 2015. The growth in conference participation during the latest three years is particularly impressive. Porto set a new record with 1369 participants. This represents a 19% increase from the previous record, set one year before in Prague 2014. Furthermore, the number of participants in Porto 2015 was almost three times higher than the number of participants in Krakow 2005 and Tübingen 2006.

Among the participants in Porto there were 421 students (31% of the total) as well as 360 participants (26% of the total) that were not members of the ESC. These two percentages overlap because, among the non-members, 143 were students. The percentage of students is the highest registered until now. This can be explained by the wonderful job done by the local organisers of the Porto conference, who found accommodation for students at a really affordable price.

Foreseeing the number of participants in the ESC Annual Meetings has become a very complicated task. One could think that, once the period for abstracts submission is open, the progress in the reception of abstracts can be used as a predictor of the final number of participants. The next section tests that hypothesis.

WHEN DO PARTICIPANTS SUBMIT ABSTRACTS FOR ESC CONFERENCES?
In 2013, the 13th Annual Meeting of the ESC took place in Budapest, Hungary, from 4 to 7 September. The original deadline for abstract submission was set for the 1st of June 2013. The deadline was later extended until the 15th of June. Eva Inzelt (ELTE Faculty of Law, Budapest, Hungary), who was part of the organising committee of the conference, registered carefully the flow of submissions. Based on her data, we have produced figure 2, which shows the increase in the total number of abstracts during the 20 days that went from 27 May to 15 June 2013.

It can be seen in figure 2 that, 5 days before the first deadline, only 211 abstracts had been received. That was less than 23% of the final number of abstracts. Now put yourself for a moment in the skin of the local organisers who have assured to their university that the conference was going to be a success and have engaged in expenses and made reservations for at least 800 participants. Every year, one of the tasks of the executive Secretariat during these days is to reassure them that everything will turn out right, although we cannot be fully sure about the final outcome. Then, in the next two days, 29 and 30 May, the number of abstracts almost doubled. But the real peak came during the 31st May and the 1st of June. Roughly 40% of the abstracts arrived during those 48 hours. Finally, during the extension of the deadline, 156 abstracts, representing 17% of the deadline, were submitted. Thus, all in all, three quarters of the abstracts were received in only 20 days, and just around the two deadlines. There is no linear progression in the reception of the abstracts, and therefore one cannot use their number to forecast the number of participants in the conference … unless you wait until the deadline comes along.

A note for professors: Not only students deliver their written assignments just in time … Deadlines, deadlines. You cannot leave with them, but you cannot leave without them.

ESC MEMBERSHIP IN 2015
Figure 3 shows the evolution of the ESC membership from 2004 to 2015. In this case, with the exceptions of 2010 and 2011, the progression has been linear. Nev-
ertheless, the jump from 2014 to 2015, when the number of members reached 1308, is particularly impressive. It represents a rise of 19%, which is the same percentage observed in the increase of the number of participants to the conference. It can also be noted that 2015 was one of the only three years—the other ones were 2004 and 2007—in which the number of participants to the conference was slightly higher than the number of members. This configuration always reflects the arrival of an important number of persons that participate for the first time in an ESC conference. Usually they familiarise quite soon with the society and realise that they can have all the benefits of the membership for the same amount they paid for registering as non-members. In that context, we have mentioned that, in Porto, 26% of the participants were not members of the ESC. If we add these 360 persons to the total number of ESC members, we can conclude that, in 2015, there were 1688 criminologists linked to the ESC. This is again an absolute record and a sign of the strength of criminology in Europe.

The future seems also bright because in 2015 there were 320 students among the 1308 ESC members. Hence, students represented 24% of them. Since 2008, the percentage of students had oscillated between 21 and 22% of the ESC members. Only in 2007 that percentage was higher (27%). In 2015, ESC Members came from 57 countries (60 if figures for the United Kingdom are breakdown by nations), covering the five continents. The United Kingdom remained the most well represented country with 301 members, followed by Germany (105 members), the United States of America (101),
the Netherlands (88), Belgium (86), Switzerland (75), Spain (67), Italy (57), Portugal (52), Norway (29), Sweden (28), Australia (24), Poland (23), Israel (20), Greece (19), Canada (18), Denmark (15), Finland and France (both with 14 members), Austria and Hungary (13), Brazil, the Czech Republic and Japan (12), Slovenia (11), Croatia (10), Ireland (9), Turkey (7), Serbia (6), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Romania and Russia (5), Cyprus, Lithuania and Peru (4), Albania, FYRO Macedonia, Iceland, Latvia, Malta and South Africa (3), Argentina, Chile, China, Estonia, Georgia and Luxemburg (2), and Bulgaria, Colombia, Korea, Kosovo (UNR), Lebanon, Malaysia, Mexico, the Philippines, Slovakia and Ukraine (1).

Figure 4 presents the countries with at least 10 ESC members in 2005. It can be seen that a third...
American country, Brazil, has joined this group. This can be explained by the strong ties between Brazil and Portugal, but is also a sign of the growth of criminology in Portuguese speaking countries. This growth is reflected in the recent creation of an International Association of Portuguese Speaking Criminologists.

In order to appreciate the evolution of the membership, Figure 4 can be complemented with Table 1, which presents the 27 countries that, in one year of another between 2004 and 2015 had at least 10 ESC members. There are 8 countries that always reached that number, and 3 of them—the United Kingdom, Germany and the United States of America—always had the highest number of members. Belgium and the Netherlands traditionally occupied the fourth and fifth place, sometimes with more members from one country and sometimes with more members of the other. Then come Switzerland, Spain and Italy. For the other 19 countries, the increase in the number of participants has been relatively constant. As we have mentioned in previous annual reports, the fact of organising an ESC conference always leads to a peak in the number of participants from that country, but the good news is that, after the conference, the number of members from that country traditionally remains higher than before.

Members from countries of the Balkan region are also on the rise. This trend seems related to the organisation of the 2009 ESC conference in Ljubljana as well as to the work of the Balkan Criminology ESC working group, which is very active in the region. The future organisation of the 2018 ESC conference in Sarajevo will surely contribute to that positive trend.

Table 1. Members of the ESC by countries with at least 10 members in one year, 2004–2015*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Countries are sorted according to the number of members in 2015.
AWARDS AND FELLOWSHIPS GRANTED BY THE ESC IN 2015

European Criminology Award

Sonja Snacken, Professor at the Faculty of Law and Criminology of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium, received the 2015 ESC European Criminology Award in recognition of her lifetime contribution to criminology. The award committee—composed by former ESC presidents Henrik Tham (chair, University of Stockholm, Sweden), Vesna Nikolic-Ristanovic (University of Belgrade, Serbia), and Michael Tonry (University of Minnesota, United States of America)—considered that:

‘Sonja Snacken combines in her writings the role of the sharp and empirically oriented researcher with that of the engaged citizen who believes in humane values and who is willing to fight for them. In comparing penal systems and prison regimes in Europe she tries—together with other European criminologists—to explain variations historically and between nations. The differences in punitivity are shown to mainly be a function of differences in welfare and social equality, in human rights and in democracy. Having established these criminological facts she points to the main cause of these differences—political decision-making. And in her official capacity in organizations, committees and councils she confronts the politicians. The winner of the European Society of Criminology Award 2015, Sonja Snacken, is a European criminologist in the best sense of the word.’

The Awards Ceremony took place during the ESC conference in Porto, and the laudatio of the awardee was delivered by Elena Larrauri (Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona, Spain).

Young Criminologist Award

Daniel Seddig (University of Zurich, Switzerland) received the 2015 ESC Young Criminologist Award in recognition of his article ‘Peer Group Association, the Acceptance of Norms and Violent Behaviour: A Longitudinal Analysis of Reciprocal Effects’ published in 2014 in the European Journal of Criminology.

The award committee was composed by Paul Knepper (chair, University of Sheffield, England, United Kingdom), Klaus Boers (University of Muenster, Germany) and May-Len Skilbrei (University of Oslo, Norway). The committee considered that:

‘The article deals with a question at the centre of criminology: the question of peer group association. The article brings a rich theoretical framework to a robust empirical analysis (specifically, a structural equation model) with panel data. We believe that Dr Daniel Seddig is a worthy recipient of the ESC Young Scholar Award.’

The Awards Ceremony also took place during the ESC conference in Porto, where Daniel Seddig had a talk with Paul Knepper, which is available as a podcast on the website of the European Journal of Criminology (http://euc.sagepub.com/site/Podcast/podcast_dir.xhtml). Several other podcasts, reflecting interviews with some of the authors that participated in a special double issue on comparative criminology of the journal (issues 4 and 5 of 2015), are also available at the same Internet address.

Fellowships to attend the 15th Annual Meeting of the ESC

In 2015, the ESC granted three fellowships to attend the ESC conference in Porto. The fellowships were granted to Angelina Stanojska (University of Bitola, FYRO Macedonia), Ivona Shushak (University of Bitola, FYRO Macedonia) and Srdan Vujović (University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina). The panel that awarded the fellowships was composed by Krzysztof Krajewski (chair, Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland), Aleksandras Dobryninas (University of Vilnius, Lithuania), and Jaime Waters (Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, United Kingdom).

After several years chairing the panel of the ESC fellowships, Krzysztof Krajewski decided to retire from that position. The members of the ESC thanked him with a long applause during the General Assembly that took place in Porto.

And that is all for the 2015 Annual Report from the Executive Secretariat. We are looking forward to see you in Münster!

Marcelo F. Aebi is Professor of Criminology at the School of Criminal Sciences, University of Lausanne, Switzerland
Grace Kronicz is the Secretary of the General Secretariat of the European Society of Criminology
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Postgraduate Study in Criminology.

The School of Law has an international reputation and a tradition of excellence stretching back over a hundred years. We offer a teaching team of renowned academics who are dedicated to pursuing an innovative programme of criminological research and to delivering high-quality education in criminology at both masters and doctoral level.

The Centre for Criminological Research is a focal point for criminology at Sheffield and one of Europe’s leading centres in the subject area. Reaching across the university to bring together experts from a wide range of departments, it forms a unique interdisciplinary forum for research and innovation. The Centre is committed to the development of the next generation of criminologists who will make their own contribution to theory, policy and practice.

All this makes Sheffield an exciting choice for postgraduate study.

MA in International Criminology (MAIC)

This taught programme provides its graduates with a comprehensive understanding of criminology and criminal justice from international and comparative dimensions. MAIC offers three possible pathways:

- Taught pathway
- Research pathway
- Restorative justice pathway

Postgraduate Research Programmes

The School of Law has a dynamic PhD research programme and a number of studentships are made available each year. Research supervisors are known internationally for their research in many areas of criminology. Many have been involved in informing policy processes through research and advisory work for government departments, public agencies and international bodies.

Academic Staff

**Professor Stephen Farrall**
Politics and crime; desistance; fear of crime

**Professor Paul Knepper**
International crime; historical criminology; crime and social theory

**Professor Joanna Shapland**
Victimology; restorative justice; informal economy; desistance

**Dr Matthew Bacon**
Police and policing; drug control policy; informal economy

**Dr Cormac Behan**
Punishment and prison; penal history

**Dr Andrew Costello**
Socio-spatial criminology

**Dr Matthew Hall**
Victimology; procedural justice; court procedure; green criminology

**Dr Gwen Robinson**
Community sanctions; offender rehabilitation and management; restorative justice

**Dr Gilly Sharpe**
Youth crime and justice; gender; desistance

Dr Layla Skinns
Police custody process; police and policing; multi-agency criminal justice partnerships

Dr Maggie Wykes
Gender, violence and representation in law, policy and the media; internet crime

Additional distinguished academic and research staff complement and enhance the academic community:

www.shef.ac.uk/law/staff

Contact us:
Please visit our website for further details including information on how to apply

T: +44 (0)114 222 6770
E: pgradlaw@sheffield.ac.uk
W: www.shef.ac.uk/law/prospective/pgt
facebook.com/sheffieldlawschool
twitter.com/lawsheffield

SHEFFIELD UNIVERSITY
CENTRE FOR CRIMINOLOGICAL RESEARCH

The University Of Sheffield.
The course, held at the Inter University Centre since 2014, provides participants with in-depth and up-to-date knowledge about the state of crime research in the Balkans. The main focus is on criminological methodology, phenomenology, and etiology. In addition, participants can take advantage of excellent networking opportunities with colleagues from the region and beyond. They will also have the possibility to present their Ph.D./Master/Diploma thesis before internationally renowned experts.

One-Week International Intensive Course, Dubrovnik/Croatia, 10-14 October 2016

The course is organized by the

MAX PLANCK PARTNER GROUP FOR BALKAN CRIMINOLOGY

It is accredited by the Zagreb Faculty of Law and offers 4 ECTS credits, for which regular attendance and the delivery of a participant presentation in oral and written form are required. The program includes keynote lectures, student presentations, soft skills training, and extensive exchange and discussion. In addition, a Dubrovnik city tour is offered.

Special feature: the best student paper of the Course will be awarded and selected for publication in the European Journal of Criminology.

The course fee is 150 €, plus 40 € local registration fee. Participants are expected to make their own travel and accommodation arrangements; these costs are not covered. A limited number of scholarships are available for eligible participants.

For the program and further practical information please visit www.balkan-criminology.eu or contact the course manager Ms. Reana Bezić at: r.bezic@balkan-criminology.eu.
WORKING GROUP REPORTS

Nicholas Lord

EUROPEAN WORKING GROUP ON ORGANISATIONAL CRIME (EUROC)

During the European Society of Criminology Annual Conference in Porto in September 2015, Dr Nicholas Lord (Senior Lecturer in Criminology, School of Law, University of Manchester, UK) took over as Chair of the European Working Group on Organisational Crime (EUROC). Prof Judith van Erp (Utrecht University, the Netherlands) and Prof Wim Huisman (VU Amsterdam, the Netherlands) remain on the board of the Working Group and continue to play an integral role in the direction and management of the Group. The Group has over 100 members who continue to take an active interest in the Group and has succeeded in organising over 10 panel sessions at the upcoming ESC conference in Münster.

At the Porto conference, EUROC had a strong presence with several panels organised around central issues such as causality, prevalence/nature, explanations, and regulation/control of a variety of white-collar and corporate crimes. An annual meeting was also held at the Porto conference and was well attended by members. During this session, activities for the forthcoming year were outlined and discussed. This discussion included (i) the development of an EU COST funding application to further formalise the Working Group, and (ii) discussion of dissemination of the first ever Routledge Handbook of White-Collar and Corporate Crime in Europe (2015) (Edited by Judith van Erp, Wim Huisman, Gudrun Vande Walle).

EUROC was also represented at the American Society of Criminology (ASC) Annual Conference in Washington, DC, in November 2015. Wim Huisman and Nicholas Lord gave an update of the Group’s activities to the National White-Collar Crime Research Consortium. Potential for collaboration between the two groups was explored with future associations now on the agenda. Finally, three sessions under the auspices of EUROC will be held at the ECPR Regulatory Governance conference in Tilburg in July 2016. These panels are organised around the theme of ‘The Regulation of Corporate Crime’ and will explore the intersection and differences between a regulatory governance and white collar crime scholarship approach and critically discuss the values and risks of a regulatory approach to corporate crime.

Nicholas Lord is Senior Lecturer in Criminology at the University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

WORKING GROUP REPORTS

José Luis Díez-Ripollés and José Becerra

CRIMINAL LAW MAKING POLICY

WHEN LAWYERS NEED CRIMINOLOGISTS (AND VICE VERSA?)

You may think that Criminal Law Making Policy is a topic scientifically dominated by a legal approach. Well, think again.

Legal scholars’ main concerns don’t usually include events that take place before legislation is actually passed and ready to be implemented. The paradigm which has dominated the last centuries is still influenced by the ‘presumed rationality of legislation’, which means that law can and will be criticised or interpreted once it is passed, but the process by which it is made will not be questioned.

On the other hand, Criminology and other connected fields of knowledge do pay attention to legislative decision making processes, that is, policies in preparation. Studies about lobbies (mass media, experts, victims associations, etc.), for instance, are not numerous but constant topics in our ESC Conferences.

Also connected with legislative decision making is policy evaluation, another field of great interest. Once decisions have been made and policies have been implemented, evaluation studies are a great source of information for future policies, as well as a tool for public transparency and accountability. Legal approaches on this matter have almost exclusively focused their work on legal standards-based evaluation (i.e. proportionality),
leaving out of their scope other standards and methods (e.g. efficiency, process, outcome, impact).

Once again, Criminology, Sociology, Psychology and Political Science offer a wide range of concepts and tools to provide us with a deep understanding of criminal policy making.

That being said, in recent years there has been an estimable growth of scientific interest in criminal law making among legal academics. We believe the Spanish situation is a paradigmatic example of this. In our country, Criminal Law experts and Criminologists are pursuing a common interest together: to increase the rationality of decisions that result in the form of criminal legislation. The evolution is clear: the number of legal scholars becoming interested in other social sciences and looking for conceptual and methodological tools for criminal policy analysis is growing.

Such interest encouraged us to form the Criminal Law Making Policy ESC Working Group (mirrored by a Spanish Group with the same objectives) in 2013. We founded the European Working Group in Budapest (2013) and were able to organise two panel sessions in Prague (2014) with colleagues from Australia, Hungary, Colombia, Belgium, Brazil and Spain.

We believe two important things were clear then: 1) the concern over how criminal legislation is being made is deep and shared among scholars in many countries; and 2) a multidisciplinary approach is the best way to guarantee a determined impulse to this field of research and practice.

We are currently working on the publication of a book with some of the contributions presented so far and were eager to carry on with our multidisciplinary and cross-national discussions in Porto. For last year’s conference, two new panels were accepted for presentation, this time with an interesting focus on evaluation and transparency of criminal law-making processes.

Moreover, a new meeting took place about how best to continue and expand our activities. Anyone interested was, of course, invited.

You will find more information about our Group at http://www.esc-eurocrim.org/workgroups.shtml#law.

José Luis Díez-Ripollés is Professor of Criminal Law at the University of Malaga
José Becerra is Assistant Professor of Criminal law at the University of Malaga

WORKING GROUP REPORTS

Susanne Karstedt and Nandor Knust
EUROPEAN CRIMINOLOGY GROUP ON ATROCITY CRIMES AND TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE (ECACTJ)

The European Criminology Group on Atrocity Crimes and Transitional Justice (ECACTJ) provides a network for European criminologists who are engaged in research on atrocity crimes and transitional justice, whether in or on Europe, or globally. The aim of this ESC-Working Group is to enhance the contribution of criminology and criminologists in this field, to stimulate research in and on Europe and to promote exchange between European and international researchers. The group collaborates with other networks and research groups in the field. The Supranational Criminology Network is represented in the group by its founder, Professor Alette Smeulers, Tilburg University, Netherlands. With its focus on researchers in Europe, it is nonetheless global in its perspectives. The group was founded in 2013, and has thrived since then with an increasing membership. It has presently more than 30 members.

Following the success of Prague 2014 with five panels, the group presented itself with an impressive line-up of panels in Porto 2015. Themes included transnational business and atrocity crimes and human rights violations, international courts and tribunals, court procedures, and victims and perpetrators. Presenters from the Netherlands, Germany, Slovenia, Norway, Australia and the UK gave insights into their work on transitional justice and courts in Rwanda and former Yugoslavia, on historical trials like the Nuremberg Trials, or addressed global actors and their involvement in atrocity crimes.

At the 2016 European Criminology Conference in Münster the group is represented with six panels. The conference administration was extremely helpful as they allowed for an easy way for the ECACTJ chairs (Susanne Karstedt, Nandor Knust) to allocate abstract submis-
The European Society of Criminology (ESC) Working Group on Victimology was established in 2013 to facilitate contact between victimological scholars. In the past 3 years, numerous panel sessions at each ESC conference have been organised; networking and cooperation between victimological scholars have been enhanced; new research lines have been set forth and cooperation on numerous European projects have been facilitated. Currently, the group consists of nearly 70 members active in the field of victimology and the group is continuously growing.

This year in Muenster we have organised 5 sessions that are very much in line with the current victimological debate, with a total of 19 presentations given by members of our Working Group. The panel themes are: Victimology and Restorative Justice, Victimology and Gender; Policy-oriented Victimology; Narrative Victimology and Theoretical Victimology.
The Working Group is currently also in the final stages of finishing a COST Action proposal on cultural victimology. COST is a networking subsidy that provides financial means for a period of four years to stimulate cooperation and networking between partners in Europe. This COST Action intends to understand the mediating and moderating influence of cultural constructs on victimology which will help improve our understanding of the extent to which the current victimological knowledge base can be generalised from the types of victimisation and geographical locations that have been relatively extensively studied to elsewhere. A greater grasp of this complexity in return will offer greater insight into the underlying causal factors of this current research base, as well as offer new perspectives and lines of inquiry.

We welcome new members to the Working Group and invite all interested researchers to join our meeting at the start of the ESC conference (for more details see the conference programme). Members who are interested in joining our COST proposal or would like more information about the group, please contact us at a.pemberton@uvt.nl or p.g.m.vaneck@uvt.nl. You can find the Working Group also on Facebook and Twitter.

Antony Pemberton is full professor of Victimology at the International Victimology Institute Tilburg (INTERVICT), Tilburg University in Tilburg, the Netherlands and director of INTERVICT. Antony is the chair of this Working Group.

Pauline Aarten is Assistant Professor at INTERVICT, Tilburg University in Tilburg, the Netherlands and the secretary of this Working Group.

WORKING GROUP REPORTS

Filipp Vojta and Sabine Carl

ESC POSTGRADUATE AND EARLY STAGE RESEARCHERS WORKING GROUP (EPER)

WE’VE GOT YOUR BACK IN MÜNSTER TOO!

Last year’s ‘Publish or Perish’ panel at Eurocrim in Porto proved to be another success for EPER, in terms of both attendance and of offering interactive, insightful presentations which resonate with the prevalent needs of young researchers. The presenters, Prof. John Winterdyk (Mount Royal University) and Prof. Paul Knepper (The University of Sheffield) successfully tackled many challenging questions on the topic of academic publishing and shared their experience on how to overcome practical conundrums which might befall researchers in the pursuit of publishing their results. Based on the feedback, the panel particularly appealed to those who were struggling with their first academic publication.

Encouraged to further explore topics of similar relevance for young researchers, the EPER chairs, Sabine Carl and Filip Vojta, have decided to team up again with Prof. Winterdyk and Prof. Knepper as speakers and organise a pre-arranged panel on academic reviewing and writing for this year’s Eurocrim conference in Münster. One of the main incentives for the choice of the theme was the recognition that, as with most professions, the skill sets required to be successful in a discipline are not by default part of one’s training. In particular, Prof. Winterdyk has stressed that, although in academia students are required to write papers, reports, a thesis, or a dissertation, few graduate programs actually offer courses on how to write a ‘good’ academic article or how to prepare an informed book review, let alone provide a critical review of an article being considered for publication. Yet, he reasons, these skills are considered essential to the success of an academic and steps can and should be followed in order to become (more) successful.

The EPER panel “I’ve got your back, Jack!” — Reviewing and writing for academic journals’ will delineate these steps and in an interactive and practical way educate the audience on how to efficiently and—from the aspect of academic ethics—correctly provide a quality review for academic journals. By participating, the attendees will first and foremost develop the skill set necessary to offer their service as peer and/or book reviewers. In addition, through a subsequent hands-on exercise they will learn how to refine and hone their skills in order to become stronger academic writers.
The panel was arranged under the EPER umbrella for the first time in May 2016, while Prof. Winterdyk was a visiting researcher at the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law in Freiburg, Germany. It was well attended by both doctoral students and senior researchers in criminal law and criminology, whose overwhelmingly positive feedback testified to the quality of the panel as well as the relevance of the topic. The EPER chairs would therefore like to cordially invite all interested participants of the ESC Eurocrim in Münster to join the discussion and gain unique insights into secrets of the craft.

After the panel, EPER will hold a meeting in order to elect new board members. All EPER members are welcome as candidates for the positions. In addition, an informal EPER night of drinks and discussion is being planned.

In addition to the existing EPER website platform (http://www.cjp.org.uk/esc/), the current Facebook domain ‘ESC Early Stage Researchers Working Group (EPER)’ (https://www.facebook.com/groups/1613269015585954/) is the primary source of news and updates regarding the activities of the Group. New members are very welcome to join the Group and should contact the EPER chairs, Sabine Carl (sabine.carl@gmail.com) or Filip Vojta (filip.vojta@gmail.com).

Filip Vojta is a PhD candidate at the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law in Freiburg, Germany, and a research member of the Max Planck Partner Group for ‘Balkan Criminology’.

Sabine Carl is senior researcher at the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law in Freiburg, Germany.

Filip Vojta

In the past year, many of our EHRG members have also been actively involved in the COST Action on Femicide, a network action that involves 15 of the 28 EU countries. The difficulties encountered in homicide research are similarly present in femicide research, as rates cannot be adequately compared since there is too much non-comparative material. Notwithstanding, this research initiative aims to facilitate contact between scholars from different fields in order to draw attention to femicide as a visible social fact.

Further, the EHRG is organizing a panel at the upcoming European Society of Criminology annual meeting. We are glad to announce presentations by our members Janine Janssen on ‘Killing in the name of honour’, Aneta Wilkowska-Płóciennik on ‘A family origin of a killer’, Karoliina Suopnää on ‘Trajectories of crime and income before homicides and other types of violence’ and Simone Walser on ‘Homicides in Switzerland from 2005 until 2014’.

Other recent developments include the extension of the European Homicide Monitor. To examine various explanations for (cross-national) differences in homicide in Europe, several years ago three European countries (Finland, the Netherlands and Sweden) launched a joint database, the European Homicide Monitor (EHM). Now, several years down the road, other European countries are in the process of joining this initiative and collecting data according to this easy-to-use, accessible framework. These countries include Switzerland, Italy, Denmark and Estonia. The European Homicide Monitor enables

WORKING GROUP REPORTS

Marieke Liem

EUROPEAN HOMICIDE RESEARCH GROUP (EHRG)

Homicide, unlike other crimes, is characterised by a low frequency and high variability of events. In order to adequately study this phenomenon it is essential to join forces across Europe. We are therefore very excited to welcome a number of new members of the European Homicide Research Group, including Maria Lameiras Fernandez from the University of Vigo (Spain), Juan David Gómez-Quintero, Santiago Boira and Chaimé Marcuello Servós from the University of Zaragoza (Spain) and UNAM (Mexico), Birgit Haller from the Institute of Conflict Research (Austria), Sadik Toprak from Bülent Ecevit University (Turkey), Gunilla Krantz from Göteborg University (Sweden) and Aneta Wilkowska-Płóciennik from the University of Warsaw (Poland). To accommodate our expanding group, we launched a new website that provides an overview of our members and their affiliations. Please visit www.violenceresearchinitiative.org/EHRG for news and updates.

In the past year, many of our EHRG members have also been actively involved in the COST Action on Femicide, a network action that involves 15 of the 28 EU countries. The difficulties encountered in homicide research are similarly present in femicide research, as rates cannot be adequately compared since there is too much non-comparative material. Notwithstanding, this research initiative aims to facilitate contact between scholars from different fields in order to draw attention to femicide as a visible social fact.
The ESC Working Group on Community Sanctions and Measures was formed in 2007 by a small group of scholars to encourage networking, foster discussion, stimulate empirical research, enable theoretical development and encourage critical and comparative work on community sanctions and measures in European jurisdictions. The group has grown steadily since its inception, with around 80 members today. We organise a seminar every spring, to which members are invited to present their research, discuss research ideas and network.

This year the working group held its 9th annual seminar, which took place over 2 days on 26–27 May 2016. Our venue this year was Dublin, and our host was Dr. Deirdre Healy of University College Dublin. The event was attended by 27 members of the working group, who came from ten different countries. Papers at this event addressed a wide range of issues, including oral histories of probation in Ireland (Deirdre Healy & Louise Kennefick); electronic monitoring in Belgium and the Netherlands (Kristel Beyens & Miranda Boone); probation in the news (Fergus McNell & Paul McGuinness) and the sociology of rehabilitation work (Hannah Graham). The full programme for the seminar, as well as some of the presentations from this and previous seminars can be found on the webpage/blog for the Working Group: https://communitysanctionsblog.wordpress.com/

We also organise a stream of panel sessions at the annual ESC Conference. In Porto, September 2015, we organised seven panel sessions, with in total 28 presentations from a number of different jurisdictions. At this year’s conference in Münster our Working Group expects to host around four panel sessions, with papers on a variety of topics including electronic monitoring in Europe; emotional labour in probation practice; resettlement of offenders in Europe; and CSM in Portugal and Italy.

Members of the Working Group on Community Sanctions and Measures developed a successful application for a COST Action on Offender Supervision in Europe, which concluded a 4-year programme of work in March 2016 (see: www.offendersupervision.eu). Both the COST Action and the ESC Working Group have been springboards for successful collaborations and research funding applications, including the ‘Supervisible’ project which used visual methods to explore how individuals experience being subject to supervision: http://www.offendersupervision.eu/supervisible

ESC members interested in joining the CSM Working Group should contact us at: G.J.Robinson@sheffield.ac.uk or kerstin.svensson@soch.lu.se.

Gwen Robinson is Reader in Criminal Justice at the School of Law, University of Sheffield, UK.
Kerstin Svensson is Professor of Social Work at the Lund University School of Social Work, Sweden.
The Gender and Crime Working Group has been growing over time. Last year at the conference we once again engaged in an information exchange exercise, outlining key developments in each of our countries, but also highlighting concerns. We are able to repeat the success of our themed panels last year at the forthcoming conference: Girls and Young Women, and Gender, sentencing and punishment. The Working Group continues to facilitate informal exchanges across countries—and contribute to developing research potential. Next year (2017) we are planning a Spring meeting in Spain to take forward some ideas for cross-county and cross-cultural analysis. We look forward to seeing everyone at the forthcoming conference in Munster.

Loraine Gelsthorpe is Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Cambridge University, Cambridge, UK. Michele Burman is Professor of Criminology at University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK.

The joint working group of the European Society of Criminology (ESC) and the International Society for the Study of Drug Policy (ISSDP) on European drug policy has organised three events in the year 2015/16, to further its aim of enabling discussion and encouraging research on European drug policy. The first two of these events took place in Porto, around the 2015 conference of the ESC. On the day before the conference, the working group collaborated with the universities of Porto and Kent to hold a half-day symposium on Portuguese drug policy. This topic has attracted worldwide interest since Portugal embarked on a new strategy, including the decriminalisation of possession of all illicit drugs in 2001. The symposium included presentations from João Goulão, director of SICAD (which coordinates the Portuguese strategy) and from two professionals who work with ‘Committees for the Dissuasion of Addiction’; Cristina Reis and Maria dos Anjos. Criminological perspectives on the Portuguese approach were given by Caitlin Hughes (UNSW Australia), Helmut Kury (University of Freiburg), Serge Brochu (University of Montreal) and Jorge Qunitas (University of Porto).

During the ESC conference itself, the working group held a panel on ‘drug policy analysis’. Marianne van Ooyen of the Netherlands Ministry of Justice spoke on ‘Dutch drug policy changes and their impact on drug markets’. Letizia Paoli (KU Leuven) presented research on ‘the harms of cocaine trafficking in the Netherlands and Belgium: policy implications from comparative assessment.’ Caitlin Hughes presented her evaluation of ‘Australian alternatives to arrest and imprisonment for drug and drug-related offenders’.

Presentations from the Porto symposium and panel are available on the ISSDP website at http://www.issdp.org/issdpesc-working-group-on-european-drug-policy/

During the 10th Annual Conference of the ISSDP (Sydney, May 2016), the working group hosted a panel on ‘power, inequality and drug policy’, chaired by Vibeke Asmussen Frank. John Collins (London School of Economics) showed how the common perception of the USA as the principal architect of the international drug control system is mistaken; European countries (including the UK) played a key role. Esben Houborg (Aarhus University) argued that the shifting balance of welfare and punitive approaches to drug policy in Denmark has affected the ‘social distribution of risk’. Alex Stevens (University of Kent) discussed the role of ‘policy constellations’ (i.e. loosely connected groups of privileged actors and organisations within the policy process, who share current interests, but are not centrally coordinated and do not necessarily share ‘core beliefs’) in creating continuity and change in British drug policy. Full versions
POSTGRADUATE STUDY IN THE INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Research Performance
The Institute for Criminology and Criminal Justice is located in the School of Law. The School of Law received an impressive top-ten ranking in the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise, finishing 7th in the UK. The School of Law was also ranked 8th in The Guardian University Guide 2014.

Staff Research Interests
Clare Dwyer – Penal policy; prisoners; transitional justice

Graham Ellison – Policing & police reform; community safety; sex trafficking & prostitution

Shadd Maruna – Desistance; psychosocial criminology; prisoner reintegration

Anne-Marie McAlinden – Child sexual abuse; sex offenders; restorative justice

Kieran McEvoy – Restorative justice; truth recovery; transitional justice

Marny Requa – Truth recovery; human rights; transitional justice

Phil Scraton – Deaths in controversial circumstances; criminological theory; prisons

Pete Shirlow – Segregation and violence; ethno-sectarianism; political violence

Yvette Russell – Feminist legal theory; gender & crime; sexuality

Criminology & Criminal Justice Programmes in the School of Law
LLM Criminology
LLM Criminal Justice
LLM in Human Rights & Criminal Justice

The School of Law also has a vibrant PhD research programme and a number of studentships are made available each year. Please contact Dr Graham Ellison (g.ellison@qub.ac.uk) for information relating to PhD opportunities in the School.

Further Information
Further details about full range of taught postgraduate programmes available in the School of Law are available online: www.law.qub.ac.uk
Alternatively contact the School’s Postgraduate Office at: pglawenquiries@qub.ac.uk
of these papers are available to ISSDP members: http://www.issdp.org/issdp-conference-papers/

The working group is planning to host panels on European drug policy at both the 2016 conference of the ESC, and the 2017 conference of the ISSDP (Aarhus, 17-19 May 2017). ESC members are invited to join the working group by emailing its convenor, Alex Stevens (a.w.stevens@kent.ac.uk).

**Alex Stevens** is Professor in Criminal Justice at the University of Kent, Canterbury, UK
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### CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT OF THE ESC

**Tim Hope**

The contribution I would be honoured to make to the ESC rests upon my life-course persistent engagement with Criminology, from being subjected to a self-report delinquency study in the 1960s to my recent retirement from academia, where I held Chairs in Criminology at Keele University and the University of Salford, Manchester. I remain not only a recidivist but also an active practitioner. I am Visiting Fellow of the Centre for Crime and Justice Studies (ISTD), possibly the oldest continuous criminological institute in Europe, and Senior Visiting Fellow of the Open University; both dedicated to advancing public understanding of crime, justice and social harm.

Having worked in nearly every sphere in which criminology is practised, I can bring my experience to bear in supporting the contribution of criminologists to the advancement of knowledge and social progress in Europe.

I trained in sociology, starting my research career just as the golden era of university expansion (and the new, critical criminology that it enabled) was coming to an end. At first reluctantly, I was recruited to the Home Office Research Unit. Fortunately, I was able to participate in exciting innovations that were developing, including Situational Crime Prevention (under the inspiring leadership of Ron Clarke), the British Crime Survey and the evaluation of social, community prevention initiatives. All seemed to promise the application of knowledge to the practical solution of social problems. Working for central government brought invaluable insights into the nature and constraints of policymaking, and the relationships and tensions between policy and research. Our discipline lies on the fault line between science and politics. I know all too acutely its stresses and fractures; especially in the fraught activity of programme evaluation, where in recent years I have had cause to articulate and defend the genuinely scientific credentials upon which truth claims about ‘what works’ must depend.

Since the 1980s, inspired by the social democratic values of the Bonnemaison Commission, there has been a distinctively European approach to urban safety. I have been engaged with the European Forum for Urban Safety, the International Centre for the Prevention of...
Crime, and working groups within the ESC. I have collaborated with colleagues in Emilia-Romagna and the Czech Republic and, with Dario Melossi, coordinated the Local Public Policy work package of the EU CRIMPREV Programme, directed by René Levy of CESDIP/GERN. Presently, the European ideal of urban safety is under grave threat from the forces of anxiety and xenophobia. As criminologists, we must no longer retreat into a technical scientism that merely serves to bolster inadequate and ultimately repressive state-centred institutions. As President, I will do what I can in the difficult times that lie ahead to keep the torch of tolerance and reason alive, and help us to continue to foster a genuinely civil society in Europe.

In my academic life, I have striven to pursue my interests in an international context. At the University of Missouri-St Louis, USA, I participated in the development of community-oriented problem-solving policing, a new philosophy for the police inspired by Herman Goldstein. The effort to foster this new paradigm has left me not only with a scepticism about the effectiveness of the practices of professional policing and the police worldview, but also about those researchers who seek to turn a value-base into a set of techniques to shore up what is rapidly becoming an outmoded and costly institution.

I was immensely fortunate to have the Department of Criminology at Keele University as my academic home for 16 years, founded by the superb Pat Carlen, and working alongside outstanding colleagues including Richard Sparks, Ian Loader, Tony Jefferson, Sandra Walklate, Suzanne Karstedt, Philip Stenning, Barry Godfrey, Stephen Farrall, and Ronnie Lippens. Not only seeking to develop a centre of excellence in the establishment of criminology as an academic discipline, my colleagues were united in the cause of raising the sights of criminology above the parochial, internal concerns of many of our countries’ criminal justice systems. With support from the UK Economic and Social Research Council, along with Rod Morgan, Vincenzo Ruggiero, and the late Ian Taylor, we organised the first European academic criminology conference in Manchester, with many of those present becoming active members of the ESC. With leadership from Suzanne Karstedt, we ran a European Union Marie Curie doctoral training centre, most of whose graduates have taken academic positions and membership of the Society.
At root, criminology is a scientific activity, with the generation of new knowledge and understanding at the heart of its contribution to society. I have worked extensively with crime victimisation survey data, and have carried out reviews and critiques of official crime statistics and quantitative evaluation methods, most recently for United Nations Organisation on Drugs and Crime, Mexico City. In my recent research work, I have become concerned with the nature and quality of the statistical bases upon which policy relies; that is, with the ‘politics of large numbers’ and how our critical, statistical reasoning about crime and justice can be improved. This has led me to focus on the promise (rather than solely on the threats) of ‘Big Data’, and the methods of data science that underpin this idea. But there are also important developments in qualitative and visual methods too. In general, I hope to help the Society continue to foster important methodological advances in our work, in which European criminologists are just as capable as our American colleagues.

In sum, while I may have gathered one or two laurels in the course of my career, I have no intention of resting upon them. But nor do I seek personal advancement. I wish, then, to put the experience of a career in criminology at the service of the Society, especially the emerging generation of researchers and scholars. Over my career, criminology has established itself at all levels of activity, and I want to help that continue.

Many of you have known Professor Gorazd Meško as a fully devoted member of the European Society of Criminology since its foundation, as well as an active regular participant in its conferences since Lausanne, 2001. He also served ESC as a member of its Executive Board in 2005-2006 and co-organised its 2009 conference in Ljubljana, Slovenia.

Professor Meško studied at the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, where he received his Ph.D. in 1998, and became Professor of Criminology in 2009. He further developed his insight into criminology as a visiting scholar in the UK (Institute of Criminology, Cambridge, 1995, 2001, 2011–2014; Centre for Criminology, Oxford, 1996, 1999) and gained deeper knowledge participating on several international project teams working on a variety of criminological topics.

As a researcher and lecturer, he has visited universities in Central, Eastern, Southern, and Western Europe, and in the USA, as well as some Asian countries. All of these have shaped his interests in comparative criminological research, helping him expand the range of his research on contemporary criminology topics related to the development of criminology, fear of crime, policing, prisons, legitimacy of policing, and criminal justice, extending it to Eastern Europe. An active member of European and international criminological research projects, he has organised numerous regional and international conferences on a variety of related topics. Much of his recent work involves international collaborations and comparative or cross-national research, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe. Currently, he is Head of the Institute of Criminal Justice and Security in the Faculty of Criminal
Justice and Security at the University of Maribor.


Since 1992, he has taught courses on criminology, penology, victimology, crime control policy, and comparative criminology. In 2007, he became responsible for the Doctoral Programme at the Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, University of Maribor in Slovenia, serving as Dean for two consecutive terms. His contribution to the development of postgraduate programmes in criminology and related disciplines is acknowledged and appreciated throughout Southeastern Europe and beyond. Between 2006 and 2009, he co-managed the EU-Australia criminology student exchange, contributing significantly to the development of both criminological research and criminology teaching cultures. He has also headed the ESC working group on criminology curricula since 2004.

Last but not least, Gorazd Meško is someone building bridges between the North and the South, the West and the East. We believe his positive attitude, dedication, enthusiasm, management skills, and academic abilities will guarantee his success in leading the European Society of Criminology. We appreciate Professor Meško’s consent to being nominated as a candidate for Presidency of the ESC at our upcoming meeting in Muenster, and thank him for his willingness to further contribute to the development of criminology in Europe and beyond.

Collective of the ‘Balkan Criminology Network’

**ALL RELEVANT FACTS ABOUT CRIMINOLOGY, CRIME, THE JUSTICE SYSTEMS AND CRIMINAL POLICIES IN THE BALKAN REGION – A STANDARD READER**

Volume BC 1:
ISBN: 978-953-270-085-5 (Zagreb Faculty of Law),
ISBN: 978-3-86113-248-6 (Max Planck Institute Freiburg).

**NEW IN THE SERIES**
Volume BC 2:
ISBN: 978-3-86113-264-6 (Max Planck Institute Freiburg).
Available in Fall 2016.

All volumes of the BC book series are available in print and can be ordered through the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law, at the University of Zagreb’s Faculty of Law bookshop, or in any academic bookstore worldwide. Further titles in preparation.

---

then, I have been mainly dedicated to the study of penal policies, focusing especially on migration enforcement and Crimmigration and on managerial criminal justice. In recent years, I have delved into the politico-economic literature on punishment and the impact of the economic crisis on penalty. In fact, I am currently editing a book entitled The Political Economy of Punishment: Visions, Debates and Challenges, together with Dario Melossi and Máximo Sozzo. It is to be published by Routledge in 2017, and is the outcome of a set of international conferences I organised at the University of A Coruna. I have published around twenty authored and edited books and almost one hundred journal articles and book chapters, the vast majority of them in Spanish, but also in English, French, Italian and Portuguese. I have conducted or participated in some twenty research projects on criminological and penological issues, such as sentencing, gender and criminal justice, migration penalty and economy and penal policies. I have been visiting scholar at Chicago (USA), Buenos Aires and Lanus (Argentina), Freiburg (Germany), Milan (Italy), Coimbra (Portugal) and Salamanca and Barcelona (Spain). I have also been a member of the ESC since 2009, CINETS—Crimmigration Control International Net of Studies—and the International Association of Criminal Law, along with several Spanish and Latin American academic societies.

At a continental level, I have mainly developed academic ties with colleagues and research groups based in Southern Europe. Hence, I have been invited to lecture and teach in a wide range of Portuguese, Italian and Spanish universities. Since I am used to multilingual environments, I am fluent in English, Portuguese and Italian (together with my mother tongues, Spanish and Galician) and I have basic skills in German, French and Catalan.

Moreover, I have built strong academic links with Latin American research networks, having lectured and taught MS and PhD courses in Brazil, Chile, Peru, Bolivia, El Salvador and a number of Argentinian universities (among them, Santa Fe, Buenos Aires and Cordoba). Consequently, a significant part of my work has been published in Latin American journals and books.

I advocate an interdisciplinary approach to criminological knowledge. In line with the ethos of both the ESC and the American Society of Criminology I am committed to an academic field that can play host to debate among all sorts of criminologists. If elected, my work within the ESC Board will be geared towards that end. Additionally, I intend to contribute to spread the work and role of the ESC, particularly in Southern Europe, as well as in the emerging landscape of Latin American Criminology.
APPLICATIONS SOUGHT

EDITORSHIP
of the
EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF CRIMINOLOGY

The ESC invites applications for a new editor for the European Journal of Criminology to begin in January 2017, although the new editor will also need to be involved informally before then.

The duties of the editor include:

- Manage timely publication of the six issues of the journal each year using the Sagetrack (ScholarOne) platform.
- Build and maintain the journal’s reviewer base to ensure the quality and timeliness of the review process.
- Manage day-to-day issues with the publisher (Sage), such as proofreading of copy prior to publication.
- Advance the journal’s European mission and enhance the journal’s international reputation.
- Continue traditions of the journal, such as country surveys and special issues.
- Develop and maintain an editorial team, including an associate editor for country surveys.
- Develop and maintain an editorial board, which typically involves an annual meeting during the ESC conference.
- Maintain effective communication with authors, reviewers, the EJC editorial board and the ESC executive board.
- Participate in 4 Board meetings of the ESC Executive Board (the editor is a board member for the duration of his or her tenure as editor). Two meetings are held at the annual meeting of the ESC. The other two meetings are held in May and December at different locations across Europe.

Editors normally serve a term of 5 years and receive an annual stipend from Sage to pay for an editorial assistant as well as translation and editorial services.

Applications for the Editorship should be received at the ESC Secretariat by 15 September 2016. For further information about the journal or the role of the Editor, interested parties should contact the executive secretary of the ESC (marcelo.aebi@unil.ch) or the current editor (Paul Knepper; p.knepper@sheffield.ac.uk).

The current and prior editors are and were based in the United Kingdom. The Executive Board particularly encourages applications from other European countries. The editor must be based in a European University.