Amsterdam: Red Light for Criminologists
By Sara Harrop

Amsterdam is famous for many things: van Gogh, Anne Frank, diamonds, and liberal attitudes to sex and soft drugs. However, as this year’s European Society of Criminology conference began, the overriding impression was of rain. In his pessimistic novel La Chute, Albert Camus likened Amsterdam’s rings of canals to Dante’s seven spheres of hell. Struggling with luggage on crowded trams and peering through steamed-up windows to try and decipher street names, one could almost begin to see why.

Jumping on a tram of dubious destination, I jabbed my strippenkaart ineffectually into the inoperative yellow ticket punch (never a good idea to get slung off a tram for fare dodging en route to a criminology conference) and spun round to collide with a familiar bearded figure. Gorazd Mêsko, of the University of Maribor, Ljubljana, looked as relieved to see me as I was to see him. The great thing about conference going is that no matter how lost and alone you may feel you are, you are bound to meet someone you know sooner or later.

The rain teemed down and maps had turned to mulch by the time we sloshed up the steps of the imposing grey hulk of the Vrije Universiteit to join the queues at the registration desk. Once there, your worries are over. Familiar faces are everywhere and smiling student helpers hand you your conference survival kit, a badge, a programme, a city guide, and, as a particularly nice touch in Amsterdam, a three-day public transport pass.

Conference organisers always give participants logo-splashed cloth bags, Continued on page 8

Council of Europe: New Delinquency Standards
By John Graham and Peter H. van der Laan

On 24 September 2003, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe adopted a new recommendation on dealing with juvenile delinquency (Recommendation Rec(2003)20). We served as scientific experts to the committee that drafted the recommendation and here summarise its main provisions.

The Council of Europe grew rapidly during the nineties. In 2004 there are 45 member states. The new members all come from Central and Eastern Europe. They are confronted by delinquency problems similar to those facing Western European countries, but also by specific problems related to their distinctive domestic situations. An earlier recommendation (No. R [87] 20) on juvenile justice was out of date, and in any case appeared not sufficiently to cover the needs and problems of new member states.

Formal context
The committee which drafted the new recommendation consisted of delegates from 22 member states and three Continued on page 11

Cambridge Institute of Criminology
By Michael Tonry

In September, after being in ‘temporary’ accommodation since 1959, when the Institute was founded by Sir Leon Radzinowicz, with support from the English Home Office and the Wolfson Trust, the Institute of Criminology moved into its new quarters. It was about time.

Anyone who has visited the Institute in recent years will remember its previous home at 7 West Road, in an old and dilapidated Victorian building, with a rambling, one-storey prefabricated extension, housing a warren of small offices, on one side, and an ugly red brick box, also one storey, Continued on page 20
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**Message from the President**

**From Amsterdam to Krakow**

As far as I can make out from my own attendance and rumours in the lobby during coffee-breaks, Amsterdam’s ESC Conference was a great success. With each annual conference, the ESC hopes increasingly to fulfil its function of providing a platform for scientific networks and exchanges. Not only formally, through the established ESC working groups and the organisation of peer-reviewed panel sessions, but also informally, the ESC should provide sufficient opportunities for discussion and enhancing personal contacts among all participants. The ESC should be a platform for encounters between East and West, North and South, Europe and other continents, established scholars and young researchers, theoretical and empirical researchers, and practitioners and policymakers.

With 529 participants from 36 countries, the Amsterdam conference certainly manifested geographical diversity. The location of the annual conference, of course, also, influences attendance, with a higher participation from that particular region. That was also the case in Toledo and Helsinki, where we had the opportunity to meet more southern and Scandinavian criminologists.

The ESC policy to ensure that conferences take place in all regions of Europe is a good way to get to know “European” criminology, and criminologists much better. 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.

So I am particularly glad that the next annual conference will take place in Krakow, and I hope that we will enjoy a high participation of criminologists from Central and Eastern Europe and that this will be reflected in the programme.

The new structure of the ESC, with the President-elect and two additional Board members nominated and elected each year by ESC members, is another way to better represent the diversity of criminology and of Europe. At the General Assembly in Amsterdam, Hans-Jürgen Kerner (University of Tübingen) was elected President for 2005-2006, and Pierre Tournier (University of Paris I, Sorbonne) and Per-Olof Wikström (University of Cambridge) were elected members of the ESC board for 2004-2005. More permanent support of the ESC will be undertaken by our first executive secretary, Marcelo Aebi (University of Seville), who will ensure continuity and may enable us to take up new initiatives. Some suggestions for new initiatives have already been made by members in Amsterdam, such as considering the desirability of seeking NGO-status with the UN or developing standards for independent policy-oriented research in criminology. These suggestions will be debated by the board. Other suggestions can be sent to me (ssnacken@vub.ac.be) or to Marcelo Aebi (aebi@us.es) for further consideration.

I look forward to working with the new board and hope to see all of you in Krakow.
The second International Self-Report Delinquency Study (ISRD) was launched at the ESC Helsinki meeting. The long-term objective is to develop periodic and systematic comparative surveys on delinquent behaviour in Europe and elsewhere.

These surveys will serve two important purposes. First, cross-cultural comparisons will teach us much more about stable correlates of juvenile crime and enable us to test explanations of crime. Second, policy makers will receive information about trends in juvenile delinquency, in their own country and compared to other states. This will help policy makers maintain and improve national youth policies.

A small steering committee has worked to coordinate the project, develop its methodology, select a sampling method, and design the questionnaire, all with regular feedback to and from participants. The steering committee consists of Ineke Haen Marshall (Nebraska), Martin Killias (Lausanne), Dennis Ribeaud (Zurich), Sonia Lucia (Lausanne), and myself.

There is considerable interest among ESC members in participating in the project. Researchers from 25 countries, many in Western and Eastern Europe, plus the US and Canada, wish to be involved.

International research collaboration, despite internet and

25 Countries Participating in Second ISRD Survey

By Josine Junger-Tas

The second International Self-Report Delinquency Study (ISRD) was launched at the ESC Helsinki meeting. The long-term objective is to develop periodic and systematic comparative surveys on delinquent behaviour in Europe and elsewhere.

These surveys will serve two important purposes. First, cross-cultural comparisons will teach us much more about stable correlates of juvenile crime and enable us to test explanations of crime. Second, policy makers will receive information about trends in juvenile delinquency, in their own country and compared to other states. This will help policy makers maintain and improve national youth policies.

A small steering committee has worked to coordinate the project, develop its methodology, select a sampling method, and design the questionnaire, all with regular feedback to and from participants. The steering committee consists of Ineke Haen Marshall (Nebraska), Martin Killias (Lausanne), Dennis Ribeaud (Zurich), Sonia Lucia (Lausanne), and myself.

There is considerable interest among ESC members in participating in the project. Researchers from 25 countries, many in Western and Eastern Europe, plus the US and Canada, wish to be involved.

International research collaboration, despite internet and

Methodology

To collect the necessary information, the sourcebook group developed a questionnaire and sent it to its network

25 Countries Participating in Second ISRD Survey

By Josine Junger-Tas

The second International Self-Report Delinquency Study (ISRD) was launched at the ESC Helsinki meeting. The long-term objective is to develop periodic and systematic comparative surveys on delinquent behaviour in Europe and elsewhere.

These surveys will serve two important purposes. First, cross-cultural comparisons will teach us much more about stable correlates of juvenile crime and enable us to test explanations of crime. Second, policy makers will receive information about trends in juvenile delinquency, in their own country and compared to other states. This will help policy makers maintain and improve national youth policies.

A small steering committee has worked to coordinate the project, develop its methodology, select a sampling method, and design the questionnaire, all with regular feedback to and from participants. The steering committee consists of Ineke Haen Marshall (Nebraska), Martin Killias (Lausanne), Dennis Ribeaud (Zurich), Sonia Lucia (Lausanne), and myself.

There is considerable interest among ESC members in participating in the project. Researchers from 25 countries, many in Western and Eastern Europe, plus the US and Canada, wish to be involved.

International research collaboration, despite internet and

Methodology

To collect the necessary information, the sourcebook group developed a questionnaire and sent it to its network

The ESC was founded in March 2000 during a two-day meeting in the Netherlands. Hosted by the WODC, the research arm of the Dutch Ministry of Justice, participants hoped the ESC would become a forum for debate and dialogue among European criminologists. Following successful previous conferences in Lausanne, Toledo, and Helsinki, the Amsterdam conference again demonstrated that the ESC is fulfilling its aim.

So what made this year’s meeting such a roaring academic success? The conference, hosted by the criminology departments of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and Erasmus University Rotterdam, was inaugurated by the mayor of Amsterdam, Mr. Job Cohen. It attracted 529 registered participants. Four plenary sessions on the enlargement of the EU, genocide and crimes against humanity, migration and urban problems, and the impact of global events on crime control were complemented by author-meets-critics sessions, peer-reviewed sessions, regular panel sessions, and poster presentations. There were sizeable book exhibits, criminological excursions organised by the City of Amsterdam, and a hugely enjoyable dance party, “Crime Passion,” organised by criminology students on the Friday night.

Participants came from 38 countries, including many European countries, the United States (39), Canada (11), Australia (6), Israel (4), and Turkey (3). Mexico, Japan, Egypt, Iran were each represented by one participant. Most represented were the UK (127) and the Netherlands (107). For the rest it was remarkable how well participants were spread about Europe; Northern Europe (35), Southern Europe (38), Central and Eastern Europe (39), and the neighbouring countries Belgium (35) and Germany (36). Eleven participants from France attended, a record for ESC conferences to date. 489 people, not necessarily registered participants, were actively involved in the conference as panellists, co-authors, chairs, or plenary speakers. 403 papers were presented in 119 panel sessions.
Amsterdam Conference

The broad range of the criminological domain was covered. ‘What works’ and juvenile crime were the most popular themes. Popular themes of American Society of Criminology meetings such as domestic violence, drugs, and terrorism were scarcely represented.

Despite the theme “Global Similarities, Local Differences,” only a few presentations dealt with these issues. Genocide and crimes against humanity were absent from the panel sessions. In this respect the conference reflected well the current state of affairs in criminology.

A great sign of our subject’s vitality was that the meeting was well attended by younger participants. The enthusiastic support of 16 criminology students in organising and conducting the conference was heart-warming and shows the attractiveness criminology has in this era for young people.

Next year we turn to Central Europe. Lausanne, Toledo, Helsinki, Amsterdam, Krakow. The widely varying locations of these cities show the ESC’s success in bridging distances between criminologists from northern and southern Europe, and from Eastern and Western Europe.
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ostensibly to keep all these goodies together, but in reality to aid mutual recognition. This proved particularly useful when trying to locate City Hall, kindly provided by the City of Amsterdam as a venue for the ‘welcome’ reception. It was so much simpler with a helpful trail of blue bags to follow.

Participants could now relax over a glass of wine and catch up with colleagues until silence was called and Job Cohen, mayor of Amsterdam, declared the conference officially open.

‘Global similarities, local differences’, the theme of this year’s meeting, originally the brainchild of Erasmus University’s René van Swaanningen, is an apt image for the widely varying states of criminal justice in Europe. E.U. enlargement and its implications for crime and crime control were recurring themes throughout, and it was with this topic that the conference opened with a plenary chaired by Ernesto Savona.

Practice makes perfect, and, at this fourth annual conference of the ESC, it was evident that the society has learnt from experience and matured. The advantage of Amsterdam as a venue is its accessibility, to say nothing of its swinging reputation, and almost 600 participants flocked in from all over the world.

Conference chair Professor Henk van de Bunt and his large and lively team from the Vrije Universiteit (V.U.) and Erasmus University, Rotterdam, are most grateful for the advice of Kauko Aromaa and colleagues in Helsinki, as well as the impressive list of financial sponsors who helped make the conference possible.

Trials and Triumphs

Ensuring that a diverse and demanding barrage of academics is in the right place at the right time with the appropriate equipment is never easy, yet Henk and co. managed it with seamless aplomb. Following Kauko’s advice, preparations started earlier than ever before. Professional, multi-lingual conference manager Nicolette van Erven was drafted in to help with practicalities, ably assisted by student Mirthe den Hartog. Live-wire Laura Rastovac, a student at Erasmus University, horrified that a professional website-builder proposed to charge 5,000 for his services, put her considerable energies into constructing the conference website for free.

Both the V.U. and Erasmus criminology departments are blessed with active students’ associations whose members are well-versed in the skills of lecture, seminar, and party organisation. Many were delighted to offer their enthusiastic support in exchange for conference participation and the chance to meet so many eminent elders.

During preparations, Hans Nelen gradually assumed the role of liaison officer between contextual and logistical aspects of the conference and spokesperson to the city of Amsterdam. Dina Siegel worked hard on brochures and publicity, Catrien Bijleveld took charge of the finances, the whole team held numerous brainstorming sessions on topics for keynote addresses and plenaries that would cover elements of the general conference theme, and Henk van de Bunt, in Dina’s words, ‘acted as our leader and inspiration.’

‘Making the giant step from “ideas” to actually getting things done’ was the most difficult aspect of organisation,’ says René van Swaanningen.

All Work and a Little Play

Since participants at the Amsterdam conference were lodged in hotel rooms right across the city, the social programme played an important role in assisting the exchange of ideas in more informal settings. Erasmus University hosted a reception at the V.U. following Thursday’s sessions. Wine flowed freely, mopped up with plenty of Dutch cheese. As usual, a great side-benefit was the opportunity to catch up with far-flung colleagues.

A favourite conference pastime is surreptitiously peering at names on lapel badges. It is surprising how many faces you can match to email messages, books, and journal articles. Younger participants declare that this is a real benefit.

‘It’s amazing how people you always imagined were wizened, grey-haired professors turn out to be young and hip,’ someone told me, ‘and it’s so flattering when they speak to you as an equal. It’s a bit like meeting a film star who turns out to be just a regular guy.’

Eating and drinking are always popular activities, especially when combined with a scenic tour of Amsterdam’s waterways. A Thursday night dinner cruise was popular with participants.

Perhaps it was the weather, perhaps the Dutch protestant work ethic, but conference participants seemed more industrious than in previous years. Perhaps some people managed to slip away in the evenings to ogle through windows in the Red Light District in the name of research, to sample one of Amsterdam’s many “coffee” shops (research again!), to browse through the antique markets, or simply to wander round the Jordaan, soaking up the atmosphere (and the rain!).

However, it appeared that many attendees spent their evenings in meetings – board meetings, working group meetings, panel preparation meetings. People snatched at a rare opportunity to get busy, international colleagues together in the same place. While all this is very worthy, it was remarked on that the more relaxed atmosphere of bumping into old friends while bar hopping in, say, Toleda was missed.

With so many conscientious criminologists in attendance it is no surprise that excursions of a criminological nature were a great success. After a short introduction at the university, people were taken to the Red Light District and the port of Amsterdam. Most popular of all was a visit to the Judicial Custody Programme for criminal hard drug users.

‘It was fascinating to be able to meet and talk with the inmates,’ one satisfied participant gushed. ‘We were able to learn more from an hour’s hands-on experience than in weeks of
theoretical study.’

Board Changes

A major milestone in the development of the ESC has been the launch this January of its journal, The European Journal of Criminology. Members have enjoyed three issues so far, and, to celebrate, its publishers, Sage, hosted a wine reception.

Journal apart, it has been a year of change and consolidation for the ESC. At the general assembly retiring president Ernesto Savona reiterated the society’s developments since the Helsinki meeting. Most important of these is that we now have an executive secretary to manage the day-to-day business of the society. Dr Marcelo Aebi was welcomed onto the podium by a round of applause. His international background, five languages, and commitment to European criminology make him an ideal appointee.

Another major change Ernesto announced is that a permanent constitution has been approved and taken effect. Its major innovations include appointment of an executive secretary (Aebi), changes in the board’s composition, in particular immediate past presidents will no longer continue on the board for a year and the former treasurer’s post has been eliminated. These changes freed up space for two more elected general members.

The composition of the ESC board has thus undergone its most radical changes since the society began. Four members completed their terms, two new ones were elected, and Krzysztof Krajewski, the organiser of the 2005 Krakow conference joined. Ernesto Savona, secure in the knowledge that he had done all he could to steer the ship forward during his presidential year, was able to hand over a flourishing society to his successor, Sonja Smacken, of the Free University, Brussels. Since, under the revised constitution, the ex-president will no longer sit on the ESC board, Ernesto is now freed from the burden of weekend trips to Brussels to attend lengthy meetings, as is Anna Alvazzi del Frate, who has served admirably as secretary for the past year. Per-Olof Wikström (Cambridge) and Pierre Tournier (Paris) were elected to serve as board members in the society’s first contested elections.

Long-term board members, Martin Killias, ending his term as treasurer, and Paul Wiles, his as past-president, also stepped down. Without Professor Killias, the ESC’s founder and moving force, the ESC would certainly not exist so it is not surprising that members were lavish in their praise for all the work he has done. His multi-lingual enthusiasm will certainly be missed.

Party Time!

On the Friday night of the conference something happened. All but an unlucky few had the stresses of delivering papers and responding to difficult questions safely behind them, the mood lightened, and the atmosphere metamorphosed to party mode.

This was all thanks to the enterprising Erasmus University and V.U. students. To imprint Amsterdam’s youthful image on the minds of jaded conference goers, they came up with the brilliant idea of organising the first ESC conference dance party.

So, on a steamy night near Central Station, those of us in our middle-youth were able to relive the heady days when we were disco deities. Student Union bar memories came flooding back, even down to the beer slops and fag ash coating the floor. As a concession to the oldies, 70s and 80s music reigned till midnight so people could practice embarrassing their children at wedding receptions to their hearts’ content.

Into the wee small hours rap and techno blared, young bodies writhed in the smoky penumbra, people screeched at each other across tables, and Catrien Bijleveld, René van Swaanningen, Hans Nelen, and I raised the average age on the dance floor by about two decades. What a wonderful way to see out a conference! Can we repeat this in Krakow next year?

Crime and Tolerance

Global similarities in crime are ever-present and, alas, a recurring theme of this year’s conference was missing laptops. Silvia Ciotti’s (Perugia) was lost by her airline. Friedrich Lösel (Nürnberg) put his down for a few seconds while buying a ticket at Central Station. That proved to be quite an expensive ticket.

I returned from the party at 2:00 a.m. to find my hotel room door in ruins and my laptop missing. After initial shocked disbelief, I could not help seeing the funny side. After all, it’s not everyone who has the learning experience of a first-hand brush with Dutch criminality and the justice system.

Down at the local police station the handsome, smiling, young officer spent a couple of hours putting the sordid details into their idiosyncratic computer system, then bade me farewell by suggesting I calm my frazzled nerves with a nice bit of weed. Now, there’s Dutch tolerance for you!
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observing parties. These were Canada, the International Association of Juvenile and Family Court Magistrates, and the Permanent European Conference on Probation and Aftercare. The committee was directed to consider:
- current trends in juvenile delinquency and juvenile justice system responses;
- the functioning of the juvenile justice system, and ways it might be made more effective;
- safeguards available to young offenders throughout proceedings;
- methods of intervention, in open and closed environments;
- functioning of existing closed institutions (prisons, custodial centres, new types of residential establishments, for instance).

Recommendation Rec(2003)20 contains a number of definitions. The term ‘juveniles’ is legal rather than developmental and refers to persons above the age of criminal responsibility and below the age of majority. The age of what constitutes a ‘juvenile’ thus can vary between states.

The recommendation, however, contemplates application of juvenile justice policies above the age of majority to encompass young adults, in recognition of the lengthening transition to adulthood. It also envisions application to those below the age of criminal responsibility as a number of countries expressed concern about responses to anti-social behaviour of children, which, were they older, would be defined as criminal and dealt with accordingly.

Social Context

Recommendation Rec(2003)20 reiterates key principles laid down in the superseded 1987 recommendation. The juvenile justice system should be seen as only part of the overall response to juvenile crime, avoid repressive approaches, and focus on education and reintegration. Juveniles should receive at least the same level of procedural safeguards as adults, and deprivation of liberty should be used only as a last resort. Interventions should, as far as possible, be carried out in the juvenile’s home environment.

A re-appraisal of responses to juvenile crime was seen as required, however, by the accession of new member states from Central and Eastern Europe, advances in scientific research, developments in juvenile justice policy and practice, and significant changes in the lives of young people.

Young People’s Changing Lives

Recommendation Rec(2003)20 documents a number of changes in the lives of young people that have increased the risk of their involvement in violent and criminal behaviour. These include increases in child poverty and income inequality, especially in Central and Eastern Europe; greater incidence of divorce and family breakdown and their effects on parenting; growth in experimentation with psychoactive substances, including alcohol, at an increasingly young age; decline of the youth labour market and increased unemployment among young adults, particularly young men and those with low skill levels; increasing concentrations of social and economic problems and related crime and violence, often in inner cities or housing estates on the peripheries of urban areas; mass migration of ethnic minorities into and within Europe; and increased risks of psycho-social disorders among young people, especially young men.

The extent and effects of these changes seem particularly to affect the rapidly changing societies of Central and Eastern Europe.

The Changing Nature of Crime and Delinquency

Although those changes are likely to have affected the scale and nature of juvenile crime, few empirical data demonstrate this. Many countries lack the infrastructure and data systems to produce reliable crime data over sufficient periods to allow for valid conclusions on trends and developments. Police statistics from some Western European countries suggest that juvenile crime is generally stable, except violent crime, which appears to be rising.

Other sources of information, however, question this view. In those few countries in which recurring victim and self-report studies are conducted, the rise in violent crime appears to be modest or even non-existent.

Based purely on anecdotal evidence, rates of juvenile crime and violence in some but not all of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe appear to be lower than in the West, but to be increasing at a greater pace.

The Need for New Responses

Regardless of what the data show, there is a widely shared perception that juvenile violence is increasing, that offenders are offending earlier, and that a small proportion commit large numbers of offences.

At the same time, research tells us more about the causes of crime and also that some interventions can work with some young offenders some of the time.

Experiments with alternative approaches, such as restorative justice and intensive, community-based support and supervision, suggest that traditional approaches could be changed in ways that would improve responses to juvenile crime and violence.

There is widespread concern that the juvenile justice system is slow, ineffective, and over-burdened. Delays are commonplace, public confidence is low, and re-offending rates are high. As traditional sources of informal social control – schools, families, the workplace – have weakened, expectations placed on the criminal justice system have increased.

In a few member states these developments have led to more repressive approaches, reflected in higher rates of custody for juveniles and a shift from a welfare (needs-led) approach to a justice (punishment or ‘just deserts’) approach. In other countries, there is not enough information to establish whether
Juvenile Delinquency
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custody rates are rising or whether published data include those on pre-trial detention or in secure residential homes.

Nevertheless, it is believed that increasing use is being made of such provisions in many countries. In Central and Eastern Europe, where resources are much more limited, some member states are struggling to implement existing international standards. For them the most pressing issues are the provision of adequate capacity and the quality of such provision.

Guiding Principles

Taking these considerations into account the committee identified the following important principles:

· responses to juvenile offending should be swift, early, and consistent;
· responsibility for offending behaviour should be widened to include a young offender’s parents;
· as far as possible and where appropriate, interventions should include reparation to victims and their communities;
· interventions should directly address offending behaviour and be informed, as far as possible, by scientific evidence on effectiveness.

European Rules for Minors

Recommendation Rec(2003)20 sets out standards for juvenile justice policies, legislation, and practices but contains no provisions on the treatment of juveniles in prison or subject to community sanctions and measures. It highlights the need to develop separate and distinctive European Rules on these subjects for juveniles.

Juveniles in custody are often highly vulnerable. Given the high prevalence and incidence of suicide, attempted suicide, bullying, self-harm, and mental health problems, the experience of custody seems very traumatic. The European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) recommends that juveniles be held in detention centres specifically designed for young persons, with regimes tailored to their needs and staffed by persons trained in dealing with them.

The Council of Europe decided in 2001 to revise the European Prison Rules. Gaps and weaknesses were identified, including inadequate provision for young offenders. The European Prison Rules, however, do not apply to juveniles. Nor do the European Rules on Community Sanctions and Measures.

Accordingly, the committee that drafted Recommendation Rec(2003)20 strongly believed that the development of European Rules for Juveniles covering both of these areas is necessary, and recommended including all forms of detention, including asylum and immigration detainees.

Strategic Approach

Recommendation Rec(2003)20 calls for a strategic approach that addresses three key goals, takes into account the importance of working together, and focuses on specific target groups and effective interventions.

Three Goals

Juvenile justice systems in Europe have no common vision or philosophy. Some countries have ‘welfare’-based models focusing on the needs of the juvenile. Others have ‘justice’ models emphasising retribution and public protection. In practice, juvenile justice systems should meet both welfare needs of juveniles and protective and retributive needs.

A common, public vision and purpose of the juvenile system should be constructed around three goals that reflect the best interests of young offenders, their victims, and the public: prevention of offending, reintegration of the offender, and reparation to compensate for wrongdoing. These reflect, in combination, the best interests of young offenders, their victims, and the public.

Working together. Juvenile crime cannot be tackled by the juvenile justice system alone. Using law as the only tool for tackling crime limits society’s capacity to control and prevent criminal behaviour. Families, schools, local neighbourhoods, and peer groups are all key influences on delinquent behaviour. All are important socialising institutions.

Target groups. Several target groups are addressed. Young persistent and serious offenders are responsible for a large amount of crime and have a disproportionate impact on their families and local communities. They often have multiple needs and interconnected problems (drug misuse, truancy from school, problems at home). These need to be tackled together by a juvenile justice system that includes local agencies that can address wider contextual factors.

Drug-related offending and the increasing prevalence of drug misuse amongst children and young people raise particular concern. The recommendation supports measures developed in some countries for treating drug misuse and dealing with drug-related crime, such as diverting problem drug users from prosecution into treatment and testing.

Similar concerns exist about alcohol-related offending. In some countries increases in public order offences and violence are believed to result, at least in part, from widespread and more excessive drinking habits of young people. The recommendation endorses measures in several countries such as banning the consumption of alcohol from certain places during certain times and using licensing laws to discourage under-age drinking.

Most member states are concerned by the large and increasing numbers of young offenders from minority ethnic communities who appear before the courts. This is partly a consequence of recent trends in mass migration, but in some countries minority ethnic communities are into their second and even third generations. Other countries have historic or indigenous minorities.

Continued on page 14
1. Expanding the range of suitable alternatives to formal prosecution should continue. They must adhere to the principle of proportionality, reflect the best interests of the juvenile, and apply only in cases where responsibility is freely accepted.

2. Member states should develop a broader spectrum of new, more effective (but still proportional) community sanctions and measures to address serious, violent, and persistent juvenile offending. They should address offending behaviour and the needs of the offender. The offender’s parents or other legal guardians should be involved (unless this is considered counter-productive). Where possible and appropriate, mediation, restoration, and reparation should occur.

3. Culpability should reflect the age and maturity of the offender and be in step with the offender’s stage of development, with criminal measures being progressively applied as individual responsibility increases.

4. Parents (or legal guardians) should be encouraged to take greater responsibility for the offending behaviour of younger children. They should attend court proceedings (unless this is considered counter-productive) and, where possible, should be offered help, support, and guidance. They should be required, where appropriate, to attend counselling or parent training courses, ensure their child attends school, and assist official agencies in carrying out community sanctions and measures.

5. Reflecting the extended transition to adulthood, young adults under the age of 21 should be adjudicated and sentenced as juveniles and be subject to the same interventions, unless deemed by the court to be as mature and responsible for their actions as a fully mature adult.

6. To facilitate their entry into the labour market, young adult offenders under the age of 21 should not be required to disclose their criminal record to prospective employers, other than in exceptional circumstances.

7. Instruments for assessing the risk of future re-offending should be developed so that the nature, intensity, and duration of interventions can be closely matched to the risk of re-offending, and to the needs of the offender, always bearing in mind the principle of proportionality. Where appropriate, relevant agencies should be encouraged to share information, but always in accordance with requirements of data protection legislation.

8. Time limits should be set to reduce delays and ensure the swiftest possible response to juvenile offending. Measures to speed up justice and improve effectiveness should always be balanced with the requirements of due process.

9. Where juveniles are detained in police custody, account should be taken of their status as a minor and their age, vulnerability, and maturity. They should be promptly informed in a manner that ensures full understanding of their rights and safeguards. When questioned by the police they should, in principle, be accompanied by their parent or legal guardian. They should have a right of access to a medical doctor. They should not be detained in police custody for longer than 48 hours and for younger offenders every effort should be made to reduce this further.

10. When, as a last resort, juvenile suspects are remanded in custody, this should not be for longer than six months up to trial commencement. This period can be extended only when a judge not involved in the investigation of the case is satisfied that delays are fully justified by exceptional circumstances.

11. Where possible, alternatives to remand in custody for juvenile suspects should be used, such as placements with relatives, foster families, or in other supported accommodation. Custodial remands should never be used as a punishment, form of intimidation, or substitute for child protection or mental health measures.

12. In considering whether to prevent further offending by remanding a juvenile suspect in custody, courts should undertake a full risk assessment based on comprehensive and reliable information on the young person’s personal and social circumstances.

13. Preparation for release of juveniles should begin on the first day of confinement. A full needs/risk assessment should inform a reintegration plan, which fully prepares offenders for release by addressing in a co-ordinated manner their educational, employment, income, health, housing, supervision, family, and community-related needs.

14. A phased approach to reintegration should be adopted, using periods of leave, open institutions, early release on licence, and resettlement units. Resources should be invested in the provision of reintegration post-release that, in all cases, should be planned and carried out with the close co-operation of outside agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: Major additional recommendations for handling juvenile delinquents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Expanding the range of suitable alternatives to formal prosecution should continue. They must adhere to the principle of proportionality, reflect the best interests of the juvenile, and apply only in cases where responsibility is freely accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Member states should develop a broader spectrum of new, more effective (but still proportional) community sanctions and measures to address serious, violent, and persistent juvenile offending. They should address offending behaviour and the needs of the offender. The offender’s parents or other legal guardians should be involved (unless this is considered counter-productive). Where possible and appropriate, mediation, restoration, and reparation should occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Culpability should reflect the age and maturity of the offender and be in step with the offender’s stage of development, with criminal measures being progressively applied as individual responsibility increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parents (or legal guardians) should be encouraged to take greater responsibility for the offending behaviour of younger children. They should attend court proceedings (unless this is considered counter-productive) and, where possible, should be offered help, support, and guidance. They should be required, where appropriate, to attend counselling or parent training courses, ensure their child attends school, and assist official agencies in carrying out community sanctions and measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reflecting the extended transition to adulthood, young adults under the age of 21 should be adjudicated and sentenced as juveniles and be subject to the same interventions, unless deemed by the court to be as mature and responsible for their actions as a fully mature adult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To facilitate their entry into the labour market, young adult offenders under the age of 21 should not be required to disclose their criminal record to prospective employers, other than in exceptional circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Instruments for assessing the risk of future re-offending should be developed so that the nature, intensity, and duration of interventions can be closely matched to the risk of re-offending, and to the needs of the offender, always bearing in mind the principle of proportionality. Where appropriate, relevant agencies should be encouraged to share information, but always in accordance with requirements of data protection legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Time limits should be set to reduce delays and ensure the swiftest possible response to juvenile offending. Measures to speed up justice and improve effectiveness should always be balanced with the requirements of due process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Where juveniles are detained in police custody, account should be taken of their status as a minor and their age, vulnerability, and maturity. They should be promptly informed in a manner that ensures full understanding of their rights and safeguards. When questioned by the police they should, in principle, be accompanied by their parent or legal guardian. They should have a right of access to a medical doctor. They should not be detained in police custody for longer than 48 hours and for younger offenders every effort should be made to reduce this further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When, as a last resort, juvenile suspects are remanded in custody, this should not be for longer than six months up to trial commencement. This period can be extended only when a judge not involved in the investigation of the case is satisfied that delays are fully justified by exceptional circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Where possible, alternatives to remand in custody for juvenile suspects should be used, such as placements with relatives, foster families, or in other supported accommodation. Custodial remands should never be used as a punishment, form of intimidation, or substitute for child protection or mental health measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. In considering whether to prevent further offending by remanding a juvenile suspect in custody, courts should undertake a full risk assessment based on comprehensive and reliable information on the young person’s personal and social circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Preparation for release of juveniles should begin on the first day of confinement. A full needs/risk assessment should inform a reintegration plan, which fully prepares offenders for release by addressing in a co-ordinated manner their educational, employment, income, health, housing, supervision, family, and community-related needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A phased approach to reintegration should be adopted, using periods of leave, open institutions, early release on licence, and resettlement units. Resources should be invested in the provision of reintegration post-release that, in all cases, should be planned and carried out with the close co-operation of outside agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Offenders from minority ethnic communities are disproportionately represented at each stage of the criminal justice system, from arrest through custody. This may be partly explained by higher offending rates, which in turn may be due to higher exposure to poverty and social exclusion, but may also reflect discrimination. To reduce the risk of discrimination it may help if public authorities are required to monitor the impact of justice reforms and practices on equality. They can do this by showing how the needs of ethnic minorities have been taken into consideration and what procedures and safeguards have been put into place to ensure that the new reform does not inadvertently discriminate against them.

Other priority target groups addressed are young people who offend in groups, young female offenders, and young children under the age of criminal responsibility.

Effective Intervention

Over the last decade, research has begun to show that the ‘nothing works’ doctrine is wrong. New ways of dealing effectively with young offenders are emerging and there is now scope for cautious optimism.

Effective interventions address criminogenic factors that cause or contribute to offending (e.g., antisocial attitudes, drug misuse, poor cognitive skills, educational failure, and poor parenting) and continue to place the offender at risk of re-offending in the future; ensure a close match between the risk of re-offending and the nature, intensity, and duration of the intervention; employ practitioners whose teaching approach matches the learning approach of the offender and use material tailored to the offender’s needs and abilities; are based in the community and are closely connected to the offender’s home environment rather than based in institutions; and draw on a range of methods (e.g., social skills training, anger management, problem-solving, etc.).

Much of the evidence focuses on interventions with serious and persistent offenders. The prevailing view is that petty and first-time offenders should continue to be diverted from formal prosecution. Very little is known about the effectiveness of interventions designed specifically for young women, ethnic minorities, and migrants.

New Responses

The recommendation also proposes a series of other responses that derive from the guiding principles and goals set out above. These are shown in table 1 where we list them without further comment.

Implementation, Rights and Safeguards, Monitoring, Evaluation and Dissemination

The recommendation finishes with a number of paragraphs on implementation, rights and safeguards, and monitoring, evaluation, and dissemination.

Implementation

The response to juvenile delinquency should be planned, coordinated, and delivered by local partnerships comprising the key public agencies – police, probation, youth and social welfare, judicial, education, employment, health, and housing authorities – and the voluntary and private sectors. Such partnerships should be responsible and accountable for achieving a common aim, be clearly led, provide initial and in-service training, plan, fund, and deliver services, set standards and monitor performance, share information (adhering to the legal requirements of data protection and taking into consideration the specific duties of the agencies concerned), evaluate effectiveness, and disseminate good practice.

Rights and Safeguards

New responses and procedures must be considered within the framework of the rights and safeguards set out in relevant international instruments.

Monitoring, Evaluation, and Dissemination

To increase the knowledge base on what interventions work, funds should be allocated to the independent scientific evaluation of such interventions and the dissemination of findings to practitioners. To ensure against discrimination on ethnic grounds and to identify cases where culturally specific interventions are required, information should be collected or research undertaken on the involvement and treatment of ethnic minorities at each and every stage of the juvenile justice system. Finally, to counter overly negative perceptions, inform public opinion, and increase public confidence, public information strategies on juvenile delinquency and the work and effectiveness of the juvenile justice system should be developed, using a wide range of outlets, including television and the Internet. This should be accomplished without making available personal information or other data that may lead to the identification of an individual offender or victim.

Note: Full copies of Rec(2003)20 and supporting materials may be obtained from

http://www.coe.int/T/E/Legal_Affairs/Legal_co-operation/Steering_Committees/. From this web page, chose CDPC, then documents, then resolutions and recommendations. From here there is a link to Rec(2003)20.

John Graham is associate director of the Audit Commission, London, and Peter van der Laan is a senior researcher at the Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement(NSCR, Leiden).
of “national correspondents”. The logic of the system of national correspondents requires each country to have one person responsible for the collection and initial checking of the data. The correspondents are experts in crime and criminal justice statistics and act as a help-line. They are also entrusted with checking their country’s reply to ensure good quality data and have full responsibility for the accuracy of the data provided. At the same time, each member of the sourcebook group, acting as “regional co-ordinator”, is responsible for a group of three or four national correspondents.

The national correspondents are crucial as they are entrusted to find the information required by the questionnaire that, quite often, is not in exactly the same format as published in national statistics. Indeed, to solve at least partially the problems posed by the different definitions of offences across Europe, the group produced a “standard” definition of each offence and asked the national correspondents to adapt their data to that definition and to highlight the eventual deviations from it. For example, homicide is defined as the intentional killing of a person, and the figures provided should include assault leading to death, euthanasia, and infanticide, but exclude assistance with suicide. The national correspondent is thus obliged to add categories that should be included and subtract ones that should be excluded or, if this proves impossible, to indicate precisely the categories included and excluded. All that information is presented in appendix 1 of the sourcebook.

Students and research assistants of the University of Seville entered the questionnaires received into an electronic database. A first draft of the sourcebook was then produced and data validation started. During this procedure many inconsistencies were found and in most cases the regional co-ordinators were obliged to contact the national correspondents again in order to clarify questionable items before final publication. However, despite the considerable efforts made by the group to detect errors and inconsistencies in the data, not all of these may have been identified; nor was it possible to deal with all errors and inconsistencies in a fully satisfactory way.

### Contents of the European Sourcebook

Most of the data collected cover the period 1995-2000, although some detailed information (e.g., percentages of minors) refers only to 1999. Data are usually presented as rates per 100,000 population or as percentages.

Whenever possible, comprehensive data are provided for the following offences: total number of offences (of which traffic offences), homicide (including and excluding attempts), assault, rape, robbery, theft (of which theft of a motor vehicle, burglary, and domestic burglary), and drug offences (of which drug trafficking). As can be seen, the sourcebook focuses on the so-called traditional crimes. The reasons are that for many countries only limited information is available on white-collar or organized crime, and that cross-national differences in the definitions and counting rules for such offences are even more diverse than for so-called street crimes.

The main chapters of the sourcebook cover the following areas:

**Police statistics.** This section includes data for the years 1995-2000 on offences and offenders known to the police, including percentages of female, minor, and alien offenders in 1999, and the numbers of police officers and civilians among police staff.

**Prosecution statistics.** This section provides information on the outcomes of criminal justice procedures at the prosecutorial level (prosecutors and examining judges) and on prosecutorial staff of the authorities for the years 1995-2000. Data included in the prosecution chapter could not be detailed by types of offences and cover all offences dealt with.

**Conviction statistics.** This section presents data on persons convicted from 1995 to 2000, including percentages of females, minors, and aliens convicted in 1999. It also includes information on the types of sanctions and measures (fines, non-custodial sanctions and measures, suspended custodial sanctions and measures, unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures, death penalties, and other measures) and the lengths of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 1999.

**Correctional statistics.** This section contains information on prison statistics and “supervision” statistics. Prison statistics cover the years 1995 to 2000 and provide information on the number of persons who were in prison on 1st September of each year (stock statistics) as well as on the number of persons admitted to the prisons during each year (flow statistics). In both cases, the information includes the percentages of pre-trial detainees, females, minors, and aliens. Data on convicted prison population by selected offences in 1999 are also provided.

Supervision statistics provide data on the stock and flow of persons sentenced to community service and of persons under the supervision or care of an agent of the correctional services from 1995 to 2000, including percentages of suspended sentences with supervision, probation, and parole or conditional release.

**Survey data.** This chapter includes victimisation data from the International Crime Victims Survey (ICVS). Figures presented are averages calculated on the basis of the three sweeps that took place in 1992, 1996, and 2000. They include the percentages of persons who were victims of assault, sexual assault, robbery, pick-pocketing, and personal theft, and the percentages of households that were victims of burglary, theft of a car, and theft from a car. Data are presented at national, urban, and rural levels. The section includes data on the percentage of offences reported to the police and the seriousness of crimes as perceived by
Second *European Sourcebook* Continued from previous page

**Victims.**

*Offence definitions.* The first edition of the European Sourcebook presented technical information on relevant legal and statistical definitions, counting rules, and statistical sources in a systematic way for the first time ever. That information has been updated and is presented in an annex (offence definitions) or in the relevant chapters (counting rules and statistical sources).

An attempt is made in the general comments that introduce each chapter to identify interesting trends and give guidance to the reader regarding the interpretation of the data. It is emphasised that level comparisons of countries are always problematic and should be handled with great caution and figures should never be used at face value (i.e., without reference to the commentaries and technical information relating to them).

**The Criminal Justice System in a Flow Perspective**

Figure 1 describes the general process from reporting offences to holding persons in prison from an all-European perspective. Two characteristic patterns are discernible. Firstly, there is not much variation between different years. Secondly, the figure shows the usual stages of the criminal justice process whose structure has often been compared to an iceberg or a funnel. However, one must keep in mind that the counting units are not the same at each stage. Moreover, data have been averaged for all countries that provided information, and some countries provided data only for certain years.

**Crime trends.** According to police statistics, violent assault, robbery, and drug offences increased between 1995 and 2000. Homicide, total theft, and theft of a motor vehicle remained stable, while burglary and domestic burglary decreased.

*However,* police recording practices may have changed in some countries during this period. When that occurred, the sourcebook provides information on such changes. The proportion of offences reported to the police by victims may also have changed. Nevertheless, comparisons with survey data when possible show that these results at police level reflect crime trends at least in Western European countries.

Figure 2 combines data from the first and the second editions to illustrate the evolution of three offences (violent assault, total theft, and drug offences) in Europe from 1990 to 2000. Data have been averaged for all countries that provided information. It can be seen that police recorded drug offences and violent assaults have increased, while theft offences have remained more or less stable.

**Police officers.** The number of police officers per 100,000 population varied greatly between countries, ranging from less than 200 in Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden) to more than 500 in countries such as Croatia, Cyprus, Georgia, Italy, Northern Ireland, and Russia.

**Persons convicted.** Figure 3 describes how the numbers of persons convicted for violent assault, total theft, and drug offences have changed in Europe since 1990. Data have been averaged for all countries that provided information. Similar to the picture in figure 2, the number of persons convicted for drug offences increased -but to a lesser extent than in police statistics- and the number of persons convicted for theft offences remained stable. While violent assault offences increased according to figure 2, the number of convicted persons for those offences shows a more stable pattern.

**Probability of conviction.** If instead of comparing the number of offences known to the police (figure 2) with the number of persons convicted for the same offences (figure 3), one compares the latter with the number of suspected offenders known to the police for the same offence, one can see that the probability of a conviction has increased over this period for most offences. The exceptions are burglaries and drug offences with rather stable rates.

*Continued on next page*
Prosecution. There is great variety in prosecution statistics throughout Europe. This is due to differences at the input level (cases brought to the prosecution level) and output structures (cases disposed of by the prosecution authorities). Nevertheless, some common trends can be found. There is a negative correlation between the workload of prosecuting authorities (disposed cases per 100,000 population) and the rate of cases brought before a court. This means that in countries where the prosecution authority had a low workload the rate of cases brought before a court would be high, while in countries where the workload was high the rate would tend to be low. This suggests that the criminal justice system tends to balance itself out with the prosecutors dealing directly with a higher volume of cases when workload rises.

Factors affecting the prison population. No relationship was found between the size of the prison population in a country and the general level of recorded crime. The main factors influencing prison population size are the lengths of sanctions and measures imposed and the number of people sent to prison for serious offences.

The Future

Following a tradition started in Lausanne in 2001, the sourcebook group held a meeting on the last day of the annual ESC conference in Amsterdam in August 2004. At that meeting it was decided to start collecting data for the third edition, which will cover the years 2000 to 2003, using a shorter questionnaire.

Notes

* Marcelo Aebi (University of Sevilla), Bruno Aubusson de Cavarlay (CESDIP), Gordon Barclay (Home Office), Beata Gruszczynska (University of Warsaw), Hanns van Hofer (University of Stockholm), Vasilika Hysi (University of Tirana), Jörg-Martin Jehle (University of Göttingen), Martin Killias, (University of Lausanne), Paul Smith (Ministry of Justice WODC), and Cynthia Tavares (Home Office.

This article is dedicated to the memory of Imre Kertész, member of the European Sourcebook group from 1993 to 1999.
email, is laborious. The number of issues to be dealt with and the number of documents produced have been numerous. Decision taking requires endless (internet) consultations and, most importantly, face-to-face meetings.

**Sampling**

School samples will be used because they allow better representation of lower-class juveniles and ethnic minorities. However, such a sample will work only if the study is restricted to young people under the age of 16, the age of compulsory schooling in most countries.

A more difficult issue, which created problems in the first ISRD, is whether to use national random samples or city samples. Above all this is a financial question. However, it is also related to the method of administration.

If enough schools have a reasonable number of computers at their disposal, the questionnaire might be administered electronically; this would make the national random sample a viable option. Data entry would be immediate and thus considerably cheaper.

Some countries, such as Switzerland and the Netherlands, may be able to use this option. For many, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe, this may not be possible.

If some use computers while others can’t, data comparability may be threatened, since there may be differences in outcomes between pencil and paper questionnaires and computer-assisted ones. This is an empirical question. A paper was presented by Martin Killias at the Amsterdam meeting on a project comparing the two methods.

Combining national random samples with city samples is another problem. The preferred option is that countries wanting a national sample should over-sample at least one large city, so that comparisons can be made with those using city samples. Specific requirements have been set concerning city size, structural, social, and economic characteristics, and urban-rural differences. With respect to data analysis, an obvious advantage of the city method is the possibility of multi-level analysis when comparing cities.

**Instrument Design**

Instrument design has proven complicated, involving extensive consultation. Since we wish to achieve comparisons between and within countries and to consider trends in delinquency over time, it is important to retain as many questions as possible from the first ISRD. Most of these are commonly used items that have proven their reliability and validity over time.

However, because the subjects in the second ISRD sample will be younger than in the first sample, the questionnaire seemed far too complex. We carefully reviewed the offences included in the first instrument, deciding to reproduce these as much as possible in the second one. However, the format and lay-out were radically changed, making it easier for kids to have an overview of the questions while completing them.

All participants wanted to include more questions concerning correlates and theoretical explanatory variables than were included in the first. We examined questionnaires used in comparable studies, such as a German questionnaire used in schools by Dirk Enzmann (in particular his violence scale), the Grasmick self-control scale, and items from P-O Wikström’s Peterborough instrument.

This resulted in the inclusion of topics such as victimisation, life-style, self-control, school context, life-events, and neighbourhood characteristics.

The ISRD-2 instrument accordingly is shorter, simpler, and places greater emphasis on theoretical explanatory variables.

**Translating the Instrument**

Translating the questionnaires consistently and reliably is an absolutely crucial step. Otherwise uncontrollable variations in responses will occur.

It is impossible to achieve identical questionnaires, but we should do whatever we can to realise this objective. This is not easy, since some concepts may not exist in some participating countries and variations in the meanings of others are frequent. In addition, policy and cultural differences between countries may shape perceptions of which youthful behaviours are cause for most concern.

In this respect some questions were considered as irrelevant in ISRD-1, such as ‘fare dodging’ in the US and alcohol use for Southern European countries of youth aged 16 and over. Some countries did not include questions in ISRD-1 about ethnicity, because this was considered too sensitive.

Finally, care should be taken to avoid non-comparable response categories, in particular in follow-up questions dealing with frequency. To optimise comparability, every participant is to take care of the translation himself or herself and then send the translation to Lausanne University, where a number of foreign students will test how close that questionnaire is to the original instrument.

**Next Steps**

Other aspects of the methodology, such as sampling, survey administration, data entry, and data analysis, also require attention. A methodology workshop next spring in Switzerland will be specially addressed to participants from countries not yet very familiar with the self-report method.

In the meantime, participants should apply for funding. We hope to start the survey in September 2005. To facilitate Eastern and Central European projects, the steering group will submit an application to the EU for funding their participation. If successful, this will seriously assist these states in conducting the survey.

Further information on plans for ISRD-2 can be obtained from me at jungertas@xs4all.nl.

Josine Junger-Tas is former president of the ESC.
ANNOUNCEMENTS

Helsinki Conference Volumes

Heuni is pleased to announce the publication of the following volumes, published with proceedings from the Helsinki conference. Both volumes are available at the Heuni website: http://www.heuni.fi


ESC Secretariat Changes Location

As announced in the previous issue, from September 1, 2004 Marcelo Aebi has been the new Executive Secretary of the ESC. Therefore, the Business Office is no longer in Lausanne, but has moved to Sevilla.

Please take note of the new contact details of the ESC secretariat:

Marcelo F. Aebi
Andalusian Institute of Criminology
University of Sevilla
E.T.S.I.I. - Avda. Reina Mercedes s/n
41012 Sevilla
Spain
Tel./Fax (+34) 954 09 41 73
E-mail: aebi@us.es

K.U.LEUVEN, BELGIUM
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINOLOGY

MASTERS IN EUROPEAN CRIMINOLOGY

STARTS 26 SEPTEMBER 2005

- 1 YEAR COURSE TAUGHT ENTIRELY IN ENGLISH
- COMBINATION OF LECTURES, SEMINARS AND PAPER.
- FOCUS ON CRIMINOLOGICAL THEORY AND RESEARCH
- INTERNATIONAL POLICY ORIENTED.

CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTED IN CO-OPERATION WITH SHEFFIELD UNIVERSITY (UK), TUEBINGEN UNIVERSITY (D), MAX-PLANCK INSTITUTE (FREIBURG, D).

Admission Requirements:
University degree (B.A.) in Criminology, Law or Social Sciences + TOEFL
Tuition Fee: 4000 Euro

For more information please contact:
Tel: 32/16/32 52 68; Fax: 32/16/32 55 35; E-mail: hilde.vanlindt@law.kuleuven.ac.be
Visit our website: http://www.law.kuleuven.ac.be/cals
Cambridge Institute of Criminology
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housing part of the Radzinowicz Library, on the other.

The West Road building, with its gables, arches, porches, and eccentrically placed stairways and bathrooms, was not without potential charm. In practice, however, it had suffered many years of too little maintenance, too little fresh paint, and too much wear and tear.

It was also much too small. In recent years, the Institute’s Prisons Research Centre, part of its Pathways Centre, and a number of its research staff, have been housed in separate quarters. For many years, the Institute has had to beg and borrow teaching space from other departments in Cambridge.

The move into the new building brings all of the Institute and its personnel, research centres, teaching programmes, and classrooms into one place. The new building has separate working areas for its research centres, for visiting fellows and scholars, and for PhD students, as well as long-term and short-term, current-use secure data archives for sensitive research data. There are plenty of meeting rooms, common rooms, and classrooms, and no-one any longer will be able to invoke our working arrangements as justification for not getting things done.

This article describes the Institute as it was when it moved into the new building. The core academic staff number about fifteen but, counting personnel in the various research centres, visiting fellows, postdoctoral fellows, visiting scholars, and others here for greater and shorter periods, we total about 55. The Institute has three active research centres, as well as two major long-term longitudinal studies, amongst the wide and diverse range of research activity undertaken by its staff. There are five different degree programmes. The Institute is the home of several of the world’s leading English-language criminology book series, and has a thriving programme of visiting fellows which at any time brings several distinguished scholars from around the world to join us for periods ranging between three and twelve months.

Personnel

The Institute’s continuing academic staff is multi-disciplinary: Professor Sir Anthony Bottoms (sociology), Professor David Farrington (psychology), Professor Roy King (sociology), Professor Michael Tonry (law and public policy), Professor Andrew von Hirsch (law and philosophy), Professor Per-Olof Wikström (sociology); Dr Manuel Eisner (history and sociology), Dr Alison Liebling (criminology); Dr Timothy Coupe (geography and operations research), Dr Loraine Gelthorpe (criminology), Dr Adrian Grounds (psychiatry), Dr Nathan Harris (psychology), Dr Shadd Maruna (psychology) Dr Amanda Matravers (criminology), and Dr Nicky Padfield (law).

The academic staff is also multinational, including people originally from Great Britain, the United States, Australia, Germany, Switzerland, and Sweden. Just during the calendar year 2004, visiting fellows have come from Germany, Quebec, the United States, Australia, and Finland. Most recent postdoctoral fellows have been from continental Europe.

Research

So large and diverse a continuing academic staff, of course, participates in a wide range of research. Five ongoing programmes, however, warrant special mention.

Penal Theory. The Centre on Penal Theory and Penal Ethics, headed by Andrew von Hirsch, carries out collaborative projects involving principally philosophers, ethicists, and criminal law theorists. The centre typically convenes two conferences per year, by invitation, to discuss papers prepared on topical theoretical issues. In recent years, these have included restorative justice, situational crime prevention, the German Rechtsgut theory, criminalisation, gross disproportionality, and anti-social behaviour. Papers originally prepared for these conferences typically are revised for further discussion at a second conference on the same subject. Most eventually appear in a book series, Studies in Penal Theory and Penal Ethics, published by Hart publishing.

Prisons Research. The Prisons Research Centre, headed by Alison Liebling, conducts empirical research on a wide range of topical subjects. Recent studies have included measuring the quality of prison life in order to identify what makes prison environments more and less decent and humane; prison suicide, the development of suicide prevention programmes, and evaluation of their effects; replication of Gresham Sykes’s classic ‘Society of Captives’ study of the 1950s to understand better the ways by which human beings adapt to and experience life inside prisons; the operation and effects of incentive programmes on inmate behaviour, and the effectiveness of prison officers.
The centre generally holds one large international conference each year on a topical subject, most recently in April 2004 on 'The Effects of Imprisonment.' Revised versions of the papers prepared for that conference will appear in the Institute’s *Cambridge Studies in Criminal Justice*, published by Willan Publishing.

**Pathways in Crime.** The Pathways Centre, more formally known as the ESRC Cambridge Network on the Social Contexts of Pathways in Crime (‘SCoPiC’), is the hub of an interrelated set of ongoing longitudinal studies on crime and delinquency now being carried out in Chicago, Pittsburgh, Montreal, Zurich, and London. It also sponsors original studies launched under its own banner.

The Peterborough Adolescent Development Study, directed by Per-Olof Wikström, is a prospective multi-level longitudinal study of the lives of 1,957 14-15 year-olds in Peterborough. It builds on a previous Home Office-funded project, the Peterborough Youth Study, completed in 2002.

The Sheffield desistance study, directed by Anthony Bottoms, follows the lives of 120 20-24 year-olds in Sheffield to learn about their offending, their victimisation, and, in particular, when and why they desist from active involvement in crime.

The Childhood Study, directed by Terrie E. Moffitt of the Institute of Psychiatry, King’s College, London, is an examination of contextual and community influences on the development of 1,100 sets of twins in an ongoing long-term study.

The *Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development*, founded by Donald West, now retired, is the longest-running longitudinal study of crime and delinquency in the world. Now and for nearly a quarter of a century directed by David Farrington, the research team most recently conducted interviews of the subjects, aged 8 at the outset, at age 48. The Cambridge Study has produced dozens of books, hundreds of articles, and many thousands of citations. And there is no end in sight.

**The Zurich Study.** Finally, the most recent of the Institute’s major long-term studies is the Zurich Intervention and Prevention Project at Schools, directed by Manuel Eisner. This is a longitudinal study of the lives of approximately 1,000 school children in Zurich which will include, nested within it, experimental intervention studies aimed at reducing the influence of risk factors on children’s short-term behaviour and long-term life chances. The study, in planning stages for several years, went into the field in September 2004.

**Academic Programmes**

The Institute offers a wide range of degree programmes.

**MPhil Programmes.** Two masters degree programmes, called the MPhil in Criminology (for people wishing a general introduction) and the MPhil in Criminological Research (for people aspiring eventually to PhDs) between them typically number 40 students per year. Of these, a third normally are from the British Isles, a third from other English-speaking countries, and a third from the rest of the world. Many come directly from outstanding performances as undergraduate university students but a significant number, and more each year, arrive with substantial experience as probation officers, prison governors, police officers, prosecutors, and criminal defence lawyers under their belts.

**PhD Programme.** The Institute each year admits six to eight new students to its full-time PhD programme. Although a significant number are graduates of the Institute’s MPhil programme, in recent years a majority have received their initial educations in other countries. Increasingly, their PhD projects relate to the work of one or more of the Institute’s centres and major research projects. The requirements for admission to the PhD programme are a stellar academic record, a fully elaborated research proposal, and the availability of a qualified member of our staff to supervise work on the proposed topic. Beginning in 2004, the Institute also offers part-time PhDs. Admission criteria, requirements, and expectations are the same as for the full-time programme but spread over a longer period.

**MSt Programmes.** The Institute offers two exciting part-time mid-career masters programmes for, respectively, senior police officers and senior corrections officials. The unfamiliar nomenclature ‘MSt,’ is a Cambridge idiosyncrasy, and signifies nothing other than the identity of the particular bureaucratic institution in Cambridge that formally awards the degree. In substance, the MSt and MPhil programmes are interchangeable and have comparable requirements: the completion of a specified number of classes and related essays and the writing of an 18,000-word thesis.

The Police MSt, directed by Amanda Matravers, has been offered in conjunction with the Strategic Command Course (SCC) offered by England and Wales’s National Police College in Bramshill. The SCC is a highly-sought-after and competitive rite of passage for police officers wishing to rise to the highest levels of British policing. In recent years the SCC has been a six-month residential course of which the Institute has regularly taught and assessed three weeks. Those three weeks also count as the first three weeks of the first year of the MSt course.

On completion of a second three weeks on site in Cambridge, together with the required writing assignments, students receive a diploma. On completion of a second year of six weeks on site and writing of the thesis, participants receive a master’s degree. In a few years, every chief constable in Great Britain will have passed through the Cambridge MSt course. Many stop at the end of the one-year Diploma stage, but every year increasing numbers go on.

The Corrections Programme, directed by Roy King, is similar in outline. The vast majority of students are nominated and funded by the National Offender Management Service of England and Wales and typically are mid-career prison and probation officials who aspire to the highest professional levels.

Continued on next page
The Institute’s continuing staff, probably not surprisingly, is prolific in generating books, refereed articles, and essays. Table 1 shows some of their recent books. Besides books written and edited by individual members of staff, six major criminology series are based in the Institute. Two of these, Hart Publishing’s Studies in Penal Theory and Penal Ethics, and Willan’s Cambridge Criminal Justice Series, have already been mentioned. The Clarendon Studies in Criminology, of which Alison Liebling is general editor, is a successor to the Heinemann Series in Criminology initially founded by Sir Leon Radzinowicz. The Heinemann Series was for many years the leading criminology series in England but ceased publishing in the 1980s. Professor Roger Hood of Oxford revived it and moved it to Oxford University Press under its new name, with a particular mission of publishing outstanding PhD theses prepared by students at Oxford, Cambridge, and the London School of Economics. The editorship rotates among the three universities at roughly three-year intervals. Nearly 40 books have been published in the series since its revival in 1992.

The Crime and Public Policy series, which I edit, is published by Oxford University Press-US. Norval Morris and I started it in 1992 with the particular aim of publishing books which deploy empirical evidence in efforts to understand and shape public policy in relation to crime and punishment. More than 30 books have been published. One of them, Barry Feld’s Bad Kids, in 2002 won the Hindelang Award of the American Society of Criminology for the outstanding book that year in Criminology.

Cambridge University Press’s Studies in Criminology, edited by David Farrington and Alfred Blumstein, is a successor to a series founded by them and for many years edited by them for Springer-Verlag. The series was moved to Cambridge University Press in the early 1990s since when more than 40 books have appeared. The series specialises in criminological, as opposed to criminal justice, topics, and especially on longitudinal and developmental work. One recent book, edited by Terence Thornberry, and others, on gang participation, won the 2004 Hindelang Award of the American Society of Criminology.

Finally, the Institute is the home of Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, published by the University of Chicago Press. Established in 1977, the series’ principal aim is to publish commissioned, refereed, state-of-the-art review essays on topical research and policy subjects. Some of these are general volumes on a wide range of topics; others are thematic volumes consisting of a set of essays on separate facets of a common subject (e.g., drugs and crime, youth violence, prisons, ethnicity and crime).

Visiting Fellows

Patterned after a programme run by Nigel Walker during his term as director of the Institute of Criminology between 1974 and 1981, the Institute several years ago revived its Visiting Fellows’ programme. Though unsolicited applications are welcome, most Fellows are invited to apply. Typically they are established scholars working in fields related to those of members of our continuing staff.

Visiting fellows, though unpaid, receive formal appointments in the University of Cambridge and are included in all Institute activities while they are here. They are in addition given a private office, computer and IT facilities, administrative support, and other assistance.

Fellows come from outside the United Kingdom, slightly fewer than half from the United States and the rest from around the world. Recent fellows have included Candace Kruttschnitt (Minnesota), Robert Crutchfield (Washington), Hans-Jürgen Kerner (Tübingen), Jean-Paul Brodeur (Montreal), Rolf and Magda Loeber (Pittsburgh and Free University of Amsterdam), Kathy Daly (Griffith University, Australia), Tapio Lappi-Seppälä (Helsinki), Dan Nagin (Carnegie-Mellon), Roxanne Lieb (Washington), Julie Horney (SUNY), and Friedrich Lösel (Nürnberg).

Although by criminology standards, our continuing academic staff of 15 is a sizeable faculty, the presence of visiting fellows expands our intellectual and disciplinary breadth substantially and provides entree into research communities in other countries with which we might otherwise be unfamiliar.

The Institute has a heavy challenge ahead of it. With its new building, its talented staff, its infrastructure of research centres, major long-term studies, and degree programmes, few excuses can be offered if it fails to achieve great things. Whether it does, only time will tell.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: Selected Recent Books by Cambridge Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loeber, R., and D.P. Farrington, eds. 2001 <em>Child Delinquents: Development, Intervention, and Service Needs</em> (Sage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matravers, A., ed. 2003. <em>Sex Offenders in the Community</em> (Willan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Criminology Books from Willan Publishing

**Policing: Key Readings**
Edited by Tim Newburn (London School of Economics, University of London)

This book brings together the key readings which constitute the core of policing studies, setting these within the necessary theoretical, social and political context, and providing an explanatory commentary. Includes extracts from the writings of, among others, Kelling, Bayley, Ericson, O’Malley, Skolnick, Brogden, Eck, Waddington, Wilson, Bittner, Sherman, Dixon, Shearing, Chan, Heidensohn, Kleinig, Klockars, Moore, Styles, Manning, Goldstein, Reiner.

October 2004 720pp (246 x 171mm)
ISBN 1-84392-091-3 (paperback) £28.50
ISBN 1-84392-092-1 (hardback) £65.00

**Alternatives to Prison: options for an insecure society**
Edited by Anthony Bottoms (Universities of Cambridge and Sheffield), Sue Rex (University of Cambridge) and Gwen Robinson (University of Sheffield)

Alternatives to Prison, a product of the Coulsfield Commission and written by the leading authorities in the field, provides a comprehensive and wide-ranging review of the range of issues associated with using the variety of non-custodial sanctions, examining experiences in Scotland and Northern Ireland as well as England and Wales.

November 2004 272pp (234 x 156mm)
ISBN 1-84392-104-9 (paperback) £20.00

**The Effects of Imprisonment**
Edited by Alison Liebling and Shadd Maruna (Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge)

As the number of prisoners in the UK, USA and elsewhere continues to rise, so have concerns risen about the damaging social and psychological effects of imprisonment – on prisoners themselves, on their families, on prison employees, on the communities they leave behind and, indeed, on society itself. This book brings together a group of leading, international authorities in prisons research to address the complex issues of the effects of imprisonment.

November 2004 272pp (234 x 146mm)
ISBN 1-84392-093-X (hardback) £30.00

**Reclaiming the Streets: Surveillance, social control and the city**
Roy Coleman (University of Liverpool)

This book makes a key contribution to theoretical debates around social control in four respects: it places the analysis of CCTV within an understanding of the social relations in which the technology emerged; it analyses CCTV as a normative tool of social control and not merely as a piece of crime prevention technology; it considers how social scientists and criminologists think about and understand social control in the contemporary setting; and finally it seeks to draw lessons from the Liverpool case study and consider their applicability to the study of CCTV more generally.

September 2004 256pp (234 x 156mm)
ISBN 1-84392-077-8 (hardback) £30.00

**Surviving Russian Prisons: Punishment, economy and politics in transition**
Laura Piacentini (Stirling University)

In exploring the microworlds of the Russian prison this book at the same time presents new evidence and offers fresh insight into how prisons are governed in societies undergoing turbulent social and political transformation; it explores how current practices in relation to prisoners’ work comply with international regulations designed to promote humane containment and positive custody; and debates the nature of knowledge on penal discourse in transitional states.

October 2004 240pp (234 x 156mm)
ISBN 1-84392-103-0 (hardback) £35.00

**Juvenile Justice Reform and Restorative Justice: Building theory and policy from practice**
Gordon Bazemore and Mara Schiff (Florida Atlantic University)

This book, based on a large-scale research project funded by the National Institute of Justice and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, provides an overview of the restorative justice conferencing programs currently in operation in the United States, paying particular attention to the qualitative dimensions of this, based on interviews, focus groups and ethnographic observation. It provides an unrivalled view of restorative justice conferencing in practice, and what the people involved felt and thought about it.

November 2004 272pp (234 x 156mm)
ISBN 1-84392-094-8 (paperback) £25.00
ISBN 1-84392-095-6 (hardback) £45.00

For further information about these and other forthcoming books, or to place an order, please contact Willan Publishing on:
(tel) +44(0)1884 840337, (fax) +44(0)1884 840251,
E-mail: info@willanpublishing.co.uk  Website: www.willanpublishing.co.uk
or write to:
Willan Publishing, Culmcott House, Mill Street, Uffculme, Devon EX15 3AT, UK