Lieven Pauwels and Antoinette Verhage on Criminology in Belgium

Candidate Profiles
In my previous presidential messages, I have argued for an open and interdisciplinary criminology and for a Society that promotes such an interpretation of criminology. First of all, this was about how I myself view criminology and what I have tried to carry out and apply as president this year. At the moment, for my address at our conference in Ghent, I am preparing a more empirical analysis, in which I want to outline what we in Europe do as criminologists and what we mean by criminology.

In September, I hope to be able to present to you the results of a topic analysis of all abstracts from all of our conferences. In this message today, I focus on what the future could bring for our Society and criminology.

I will not sketch out what I think the future of criminology could be. I’m an advocate of the use of scenario techniques, in which multiple images of futures can operate at the same time. Scenarios are not predictions but tools for thinking about alternative visions of the future and stimulating anticipatory action. Via scenario exercises, we take a first step towards discovering driving forces that are relevant to the subject of the scenario, but it is uncertain in which direction they will develop. In the next phase, the extreme poles of each uncertainty are outlined and combined in scenarios.

Although it’s impossible to offer a full-fledged scenario study within the context of this message, I will provide an initial impetus, via scenarios, for what European criminology could look like within 20 years. I have constructed my scenario exercise around interdisciplinary uncertainties and the public role of criminology.

The first uncertainty has to do with the development of disciplines within scientific research. On the one hand, an evolution is conceivable in which disciplines continue to develop further although independently of each other. In such an evolution, criminology could well become one of the most successful disciplines of the 21st century. This would mean that criminology, along with other scientific disciplines, would increase in size and in scientific strength. Scientists from other fields of research could be guests in criminology but would not be regarded as full-fledged criminologists. The consequence of this is that there would be very limited interaction with what is happening in other disciplines undergoing similar self-directed evolutions. Researchers from various disciplines would pass each other like ships in the night. So, the relationship with other disciplines would not be the first and foremost concern of crimi-
nology—it would be much more important to preserve cohesion and maintain an overview within criminology itself. After all, under this scenario, the further professionalisation and specialisation of criminology leads internally to the emergence of various sub-disciplines and schools that sometimes contend with, rather than comprehend, each other.

On the other hand, it is possible that scientific disciplines become much less important and that scientific research becomes clustered around questions and themes. With such a development, criminology has much less command over its own domain, and criminologists become kings without a country. Questions related to criminology or insecurity are not exclusive to criminologists. In the organisation of research, this leads to a deterioration of the boundaries between research domains, with a lot of attention being paid to interdisciplinarity. This can lead to criminology losing importance as a separate scientific discipline and shrinking or even disappearing.

A second uncertainty concerns the relation of criminological research to the world outside of science. How will criminology relate to policy? What societal impact will criminology have in 20 years’ time?

Criminology has already been described as ‘a successful failure’ to reflect a part of the uncertainty and ambiguity around developments in the discipline. On the one hand, we see that criminology is flourishing. There are more and more criminologists who increasingly practice their profession with more skill and expertise. On the other hand, this development does not seem to be followed at all by a growing visibility and social impact. Although there are certainly differences between regions and countries in that regard, the public role that criminology receives or assumes remains a major uncertain factor, both poles of which deserve exploration. At one extreme, criminology retreats into its own discourse and communicates little about what is happening within the walls of its an/the ivory tower. In many cases, this criminology is quite critical with regard to policy and social developments without, however, being concerned about translating this criticism into dialogue or action in the public forum. At the other extreme, we see a criminology that chooses to espouse the questions that matter socially and politically at a given moment. So, criminology primarily provides knowledge and techniques from its discipline, but is completely absorbed in a social role.

We all know the types of criminological engagement that Loader & Sparks have conceived between those two extremes. Will it be the scientific expert or the lonely prophet?

The two uncertainties, and their respective poles, form the framework for four future scenarios for 2040. I have given each of the scenarios a name that a professor in such a development would be able to support:

- **Crime Science** describes the situation in which a large interdisciplinarity is linked to a pronounced public role.
- **Penal Policy** sketches a world with a low degree of interdisciplinarity and a strongly assumed public role.
- **Da Vinci** presents a future with a high degree of interdisciplinarity and a limited public role.
- **Theoretical Criminology** provides a scenario in which a limited interdisciplinarity is linked to a limited assumed public role.

In her opening oration, the new Crime Science professor explains what she wants to research in the coming years. She is a bio-engineer by training, and for her dissertation she developed a new application for the police department’s DNA database. She indicates that the insights and methods of the natural sciences will guide her in her research into security and society, and she explains that she hopes this will enable her to achieve further breakthroughs in crime prevention. She knows very well that she differs from her predecessors because she has no education in the social sciences and, to date, has never published in a journal that explicitly deals with criminology. She maintains that this can also be the very strength of her research programme because, without having to consider all kinds of complex mechanisms about people and systems, she can look for what works with highly reliable instruments and methods.

The appointment of the Penal Policy professor hits the front page of the quality newspapers. Barely a day after she submitted her resignation as prime minister, she announces her transfer to the university. In an extensive interview in the newspaper, the prime minister explains her career switch. Although she was already politically active as a student, she stayed on at the university for a number of years after her master’s in criminology and security policy. During that period, she completed her dissertation on the use of dietary supplements in prisons. After that, she worked as a prison director for a few years and led the ‘brain and policy’ research unit at the ministry. She then became politically active full-time and shot up like a rocket in the political landscape. She says that it is now time to return to the university. She is convinced that she now has more knowledge than anyone else of...
what criminology and security are all about. As professor of penal policy, she plans to valorise her political experience and knowledge in constant dialogue with those responsible for policy. Her research programme is centred on research into interventions aimed at the behavioural modification of prisoners.

The Da Vinci chair goes to a professor from the United States. The University is very proud that it has been able to snag the leader of the Human Science research lab for this position. The professor’s family situation has definitely helped her decide to return to Europe. The professor holds multiple doctorates in philosophy, mathematics and crime science. Recently, it has also become known that she is the author of a children’s book—published under a pseudonym—that received a literary prize last year. In her inaugural lecture, the new professor explains how she wants to further develop human science. She puts great effort into her research line concerning energy, in which she gives a lot of attention to data and theories with regard to norms and the exceeding of norms. In her lab, physicists, chemists, biologists, sociologists, philosophers and lawyers work alongside, and with, each other. At the reception after her speech, when she is congratulated by the Minister of Society, she has no idea who she is shaking hands with.

The professor of Theoretical Criminology is in on the decision to reduce his department’s research funds—a manoeuvre meant to cripple the critical investigation of his group. He states that his research group is among the world leaders in the discipline. He has just published in the journal with the highest impact factor in criminology. His research group is too small to carry out his ambitious research programme. This is all the more the case now that the Minister of Security only finances his own research projects. The professor refers to the words of praise that the peer review evaluation recently had for his scientific research. He says that he has taken their recommendation to heart that he could further valorise, and communicate, his extraordinary research results. His first newsletter will appear next month.

Of course, I could not really develop these scenarios for criminology in 20 years in this short message. But hopefully they provide a stimulus to think about where we want to go—and not go—with our discipline. In any case, European criminology can go in many directions. And our Society has a front row seat for following these developments and helping shape them. See you in Ghent!

Tom Vander Beken is President of the ESC, Full Professor at the Department of Criminology, Criminal Law and Social Law and director of the Institute for International Research on Criminal Policy (IRCP), both at Ghent University.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

Marcelo F. Aebi and Grace Kronicz
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IN BRIEF
In 2018, the European Society of Criminology (ESC) had 1,198 members, of which 22% were students. The 18th Annual Meeting of the Society took place in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, from 29 August to 1 September 2018 and attracted 1,203 participants, of which 74% were ESC members. During the conference, Susanne Karstedt received the 2018 European Criminology Award and Anastasia Chamberlen the 2018 ESC Young Criminologist Award. Three fellowships to attend the conference were awarded to young criminologists from Eastern Europe. The General Assembly elected Lesley McAra as President-Elect, Effi Lambropoulou as At-Large Board member, and Daniel Fink as Auditor. The General Assembly introduced a modification to Section 7 of the Constitution, which deals with the budget and financial obligations of the Society and adopted four new ESC awards that will be introduced in the upcoming years. The day following the General Assembly, Tom Vander Beken took office as President of the ESC, replacing Gorazd Meško. Tom will remain President until the end of the next conference, which will take place in Ghent, Belgium from 18 to 21 September 2019.
CONFERENCE PARTICIPATION AND ESC MEMBERSHIP
The 18th Annual Meeting of the ESC took place in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina from 29 August to 1 September 2018. Figure 1 shows the evolution of the number of participants at ESC conferences from 2004 to 2018, as well as the number of ESC members during the same period. If we concentrate on the first indicator, it can be seen that Sarajevo, with 1,203 registered participants, was the second most successful conference of the ESC, after Porto in 2015. Among the participants in Sarajevo, there were 294 students (24% of the total) as well as 307 participants that were not members of the ESC (26% of the total). These two percentages overlap because, among the non-members, 87 were students.

Figure 1 also shows that the number of participants in Sarajevo remained over 1,000, as has been the case at the latest six conferences of the ESC, since Budapest 2013. These figures must be taken into consideration when submitting applications to host future ESC conferences. The cities that will host the next few conferences were decided last year—Bucharest (Romania) in 2020, Florence (Italy) in 2021, and Malaga (Spain) in 2022. The ESC Board will soon start encouraging new applications for 2023 onwards.

In terms of affiliation, in 2018 the ESC had 1,198 members. Since 2013, the trends in the membership of the ESC and in the participation in the conferences are quite similar. In addition, the fact that roughly one-fourth (26%) of the participants at the 2018 Sarajevo conference were not members of the ESC means that, in 2018, there were 1,505 criminologists linked to the ESC in one way or another (1,198 members plus the 307 non-members that attended the conference).

Among the 2018 ESC members, there were 258 students, which represent 22% of the total. Figure 2 presents the evolution of that percentage from 2014 to 2018. It can be seen that every year between one-fifth and one-fourth of the ESC members are students. As we have pointed out in previous Annual Reports, this trend suggests that it is plausible to hypothesise that a part of the growth of the membership of the ESC since its creation is explained by the transformation of former member students in full members. At the same time, the stability of the percentage of students is a powerful indicator of the constant renewal of European criminology.

In 2018, ESC members came from 52 countries (55, if figures for the United Kingdom are broken down by nations), covering five continents. The United Kingdom remained the most well-represented country with 243
members, followed by Germany (119 members), the Netherlands (96), the United States of America (81), Belgium (78), Italy (63), Spain and Switzerland (both with 54), Sweden (37), Poland (31), Australia and Norway (27), Canada and Ireland (22), Bosnia and Herzegovina (19), Hungary, Israel and Japan (18), Croatia, Portugal and Slovenia (16), Austria (14), Finland and Greece (12), the Czech Republic and Denmark (9), France (8), Lithuania and Romania (6), Korea, Serbia and Turkey (4), China, Iceland and Slovakia (3), Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Luxembourg, Malta, North Macedonia, Peru and Taiwan (2), and Colombia, Estonia, Georgia, Iran, Kenya, Russia, Ukraine and Uruguay with one member each.

Figure 3 presents the average annual number of ESC members by country from 2013 (i.e. the year in which the ESC started having more than 1,000 members per year) to 2018. The Figure includes only the 26 countries that had an average annual number of at least 10 members. It can be seen that the United Kingdom provided the largest number of members (roughly 250 per year), followed by Germany (roughly 110). Then, several groups can be identified: one with three countries that provided roughly 80 members per year and country (the United States of America, the Netherlands and Belgium); another one with three countries that provided roughly 55 members per year (Switzerland, Spain and Italy); a third one with six countries that provided roughly 25 members per year (Sweden, Norway, Portugal, Australia, Poland and Hungary); a fourth one with six countries that provided roughly 15 members per year (Ireland, Canada, Austria, Greece, Israel and Finland) and the last one with six countries that provided roughly 11 members per year (Slovenia, France, Japan, Denmark, Croatia and the Czech Republic. The aim of Figure 3 is not to establish direct comparisons between countries, because that would require weighting the number of members by the population of the country or by a relevant indicator of the development of criminology in the country, such as the number of programs in criminology or the number of publications in criminology journals.

AWARDS AND FELLOWSHIPS GRANTED BY THE ESC IN 2018

2018 European Criminology Award

Susanne Karstedt, former professor at the universities of Keele and Leeds in the United Kingdom, and currently professor at Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia,
received the 2018 ESC European Criminology Award in recognition of her lifetime contribution to criminology. The award committee—composed of former ESC presidents Frieder Dünkel (Chair, University of Greifswald, Germany), Vesna Nikolić-Ristanović (University of Belgrade, Serbia), and Rossella Selmini (University of Minnesota, United States of America)—considered that: Professor Karstedt is a recognized leader and innovator in three substantially different emerging fields: quantitative cross-national studies of crime and criminal justice system operations; the roles of emotion in criminal justice; and problems of crime, including atrocities, in transitional societies. She has contributed seminal works and lectured widely on each. Her research and overall work related to state crime and transitional justice is of special importance. Professor Karstedt has explored the unique European experience of state crime across the past century, and the leading role of Europe in addressing and preventing atrocity crimes. Her work has relevance for different parts of Europe, including newly-established post-communist and post-conflict countries, but it also has wider international/global relevance and impact. She was a co-founder and presently is one of the chairs of the European Criminology Group on Atrocity Crimes and Transitional Justice of the ESC.

The Awards Ceremony took place during the ESC conference in Sarajevo, and the laudatio of the awardee was delivered by Michael Levi (University of Cardiff, Wales). The acceptance speech by Susanne Karstedt, entitled “Is ‘big picture criminology’ policy relevant”, was published in issue 2018/3 of the Newsletter of the ESC, Criminology in Europe, together with the laudatio by Michael Levi.

2018 ESC Young Criminologist Award
Anastasia Chamberlen (University of Warwick, United Kingdom) received the 2018 ESC Young Criminologist Award in recognition of her article ‘Embodying Prison Pain: Women’s experiences of self-injury in prison and the emotions of punishment’, published in 2016 in Theoretical Criminology (Vol. 20, Issue 2).

The award committee—composed of Janne Kivivuori (Chair, University of Helsinki, Finland), Dario Melossi (University of Bologna, Italy), and Anna-Maria Getoš Kalac (University of Zagreb, Croatia)—considered that in her article:

Anastasia Chamberlen explores the meanings and motivations of self-injury practices as disclosed in interviews with a small group of female former prisoners in England. In considering their testimonies through a feminist perspective, she illuminates aspects of their experiences of imprisonment that go beyond the ‘pains of imprisonment’ literature. Specifically, she examines their accounts of self-injury with a focus
The embodied aspects of their experiences. In so doing, she highlights the materiality of the emotional harms of their prison experiences and suggests that the pains of imprisonment are still very much inscribed on and expressed through the prisoner's body. This paper advances a more theoretically situated, interdisciplinary critique of punishment drawn from medical sociological, phenomenological and feminist scholarship. The committee particularly emphasizes the comparative strengths of the paper regarding originality of its research question, interdisciplinary approach, methodology (qualitative) and clarity of thought through excellent expression.

The Awards Ceremony took place during the ESC conference in Sarajevo, and the laudatio of the awardee was delivered by Henrique Carvalho (University of Warwick, United Kingdom).

**Fellowships to attend the 18th Annual Meeting of the ESC**

In 2018, the ESC granted three fellowships to attend the ESC conference in Sarajevo. The fellowships were granted to Temur Gugushvili (Georgia), Julija Jurtoska (North Macedonia) and Angelina Stanojoska (North Macedonia). Adanela Musaraj (Albania) had also been granted a fellowship, but could not attend the conference for personal reasons.

The panel that awarded the fellowships was composed of composed by Helmut Kury (Chair, Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law, Freiburg, Germany, chair), Eva Inzelt (ELTE Faculty of Law, Budapest, Hungary), and José Angel Brandariz (University of A Coruna, Spain).

**European Criminology Oral History Project (ECOH)**

The third wave of interviews for the European Criminology Oral History Project (ECOH) took place during the ESC conference in Sarajevo. The following sixteen interviews, which were conducted in Muenster (2016) and Cardiff (2017), are already available on the YouTube channel of the European Society of Criminology:

- Christopher Birkbeck, interviewed by Gary LaFree;
- GerbenBruinsma, interviewed by Lieven Pauwels;
- José Luis Díez-Ripollés, interviewed by Anabel Cerezo-Domínguez;
- Frieder Dünkel, interviewed by Ineke Pruin;
- Ineke Haen-Marshall, interviewed by Dirk Enzmann;
- Tim Hope, interviewed by Adam Edwards;
- Susanne Karstedt, interviewed by Alison Liebling;
- Martin Kilias, interviewed by Marcelo F. Aebi;
- Krzysztof Krajewski, interviewed by Irena Rzeplinska;
- Friedrich Lösel, interviewed by Caroline Lansky;
- Dario Melossi, interviewed by Máximo Sozzo;
- David Nelken, interviewed by Stewart Field;
- Paul Ponsaers, interviewed by Antoinette Verhage;
- Sebastián Roché, interviewed by Jenny Fleming;
- Joanna Shapland, interviewed by Matthew Hall;
- Michael Tonry, interviewed by Manuel Eisner.

You can also reach that channel through the ESC Website: http://esc-eurocrim.org/index.php/activities/echo. The ECOH project is placed under the responsibility of Rossella Selmini, former president of the ESC.

**NEW AWARDS**

During the General Assembly that took place in Cardiff on 15 September 2017, it was agreed that the ESC Executive Board would consult the members of the Society about a series of new ESC awards. Consequently, during the summer of 2018, each ESC member received an email with a personal link to an online questionnaire with restricted access. One hundred and fifty-eight (158) members participated in the survey and they overwhelmingly accepted the awards and their rules. Consequently, during the General Assembly of the ESC that took place in Sarajevo on 31 August 2018, the members of the Society decided to introduce the following new awards:

- European Journal of Criminology Best Article of the Year Award
- ESC Early Career Award
- Distinguished Services to the ESC Award
- ESC Book Award

The annual European Journal of Criminology Best Article Award recognises the author(s) of the most outstanding article published in the European Journal of Criminology during each calendar year and will be awarded for the first time in 2019.

The ESC Early Career Award recognises the outstanding scientific achievement of an early career European criminologist. The Distinguished Services to the ESC Award recognises outstanding service contributions to the effective functioning of the European Society of Criminology. The ESC Book Award recognises the author(s) of a book that represents an outstanding contribution to the further development of European criminology. These three awards will be introduced from 2020 onwards.

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
INTRODUCTION

It has become a tradition that conference organisers are asked to briefly summarise the state of the art of criminology in their country. Although Belgium is a rather small and relatively young nation, it has a long and rich historical tradition of criminological research. In fact, research topics which today would fall under the wide umbrella of criminological research were imported from Belgium’s neighbouring countries as soon as the Belgian nation-state emerged. As it is not the first time that Belgium is the stage for the ESC conference, we have the advantage that we do not need to start from scratch. A fine introduction to Belgian criminology has already been published in this newsletter. Dantinne and Duchêne (2010) wrote an excellent introduction prior to the 2010 ESC conference in Liège. At the time of the Liège conference, we would not have believed that nine years later, our research group would be responsible for preparing the 19th conference of the ESC. When we realised we were supposed to write an article on criminology in Belgium, the first reaction—when informally talking to colleagues—was: hasn’t everybody read something on the historical developments of the schools of criminology in Belgium? Excellent articles and book chapters document Belgian criminological research in different domains (e.g. Bruinsma and Walgrave, 2009; Snacken, 2007; Daems, Maes and Robert, 2013; Daems and Parmentier, 2017; see also the capita selected at the end of this article).

However, there is always room for an additional point of view, reflecting our own perceptions of the development of criminology in Belgium. Besides that, nine years have passed since the ESC took place in Belgium for the first time. This implies that a new generation of young and promising scholars who will attend the conference probably does not know the history of criminology in the hosting country. We try to identify past and contemporary currents and shed a light on both the emergence and development of criminological research traditions, on the one hand, and criminology as an educational programme on the other. As we describe Belgian criminology in a nutshell, we are forced to take some shortcuts. We have decided to divide the emergence and development of Belgian criminology into distinguishable time intervals (early positivism, 1945–1960s, 1980s–2000, and recent developments). We also touch upon research funding and contemporary challenges. As the overall theme of the conference is ‘Convergent roads, bridges and new pathways in criminology’, we inevitably must ask the question to what extent criminology converges or diverges in Belgium. Asking the question is much easier than answering it, but traveling through the many ‘archives’ of Belgian criminology has been a pleasant (and unfinished) journey for us.

THE EARLY DAYS OF POSITIVISM AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF DIFFERENT SCHOOLS OF CRIMINOLOGY

On Adolphe Quételet, area characteristics and propensities

Textbooks typically give an outline of the history of criminology by extensively discussing the Classical School of thought, highlighting the works of Beccaria and Bentham and the utilitarian tradition, followed by the first wave of ‘Positivism’ (e.g. Spierenburg, 2016). The emergence of criminology in Belgium begins with the formation of the Belgian monarchy in 1830. At that time, criminology did not exist as an institutionalised discipline. Before 1830, Belgium did not exist as a country and was part of the Netherlands from 1814–1830 (together called ‘the Low Lands’), and before that, Belgium was part of France (under the reign of Napoléon Bonaparte, who temporarily reigned over a large part of the European continent before being defeated in the battle of Waterloo).3

Crime, crime causation, prevention, rehabilitation, law-making, and institutional embeddedness, were topics that drew the attention of academics and policymakers at the dawn of the Belgian state. The Belgian Penal Code is a perfect example of a code which was directly affected by the ‘rationality’ principles and the utilitarian principles of Cesare Beccaria, Jeremy Bentham, and John Stuart Mill, on the one hand, and early biological, psychological and sociological positivist schools on the other hand. From the second half of the 19th century,
continental Europe came strongly under the influence of biological, psychological and sociological positivism. Many scholars identify Cesare Lombroso as the father of positivism, but it has to be underscored that the Belgian scholar Adolphe Quételet (born in Ghent on February 22, 1796 and died in Brussels on February 17, 1874) had already conducted criminologically relevant research when Lombroso was still a toddler (Bruinsma 2010). One may wonder why we emphasise a ‘moral statistician’ like Quételet in an article on (historical) developments in Belgian criminology. While textbooks mention Quételet as a (moralising) positivist, this caricature is simply wrong. Nineteenth-century European scholars like Quételet contributed much more to early criminological theorising than one would expect, most notably to the Chicago School. The ideas of early European scholars like Quételet were well known among the established scholars of the early Chicago School, but these ideas were remarkably less cited (Weisburd, 2017).

Quételet was more than an astronomer. He also was the first professor of mathematics at Ghent University. When applying probability theory to social data, he discovered many ‘regularities’ which puzzled criminologists ‘avant la lettre’ back then and still puzzled criminologists at the beginning of the 21st century. The discovery of ‘social laws’ inevitably led to flawed deterministic interpretations of the relationship between area characteristics and criminal statistics. Such was the zeitgeist. On the one hand, positivism liberated science from religion and provided natural explanations for natural phenomena, instead of invoking god(s) or demons. On the other hand, immature sciences and naïve ideas about the necessity of blindly copying methods developed in the natural sciences were the precursors to its ultimate downfall in the 20th century. However, Quételet wrote a lot more on crime. In his book A treatise on man and the development of his faculties, he wrote about criminal propensities (‘les propensions et les facultés de l’homme’) and displayed an age-crime curve based on Belgian criminal records, long before contemporary (developmental) psychology/criminology discussed these topics. Quételet was remarkably prudent in his writings and stressed that his findings should not be interpreted with the fatalism which is generally ascribed to early positivism. Being an expert on probability theory must have been a good enough antidote to fatalistic interpretations. Quételet also invited the readers of his work to reflect on social crime prevention and rehabilitation.

Socially-engaged scholarship has been part of Belgian criminology since its early days. While Belgium was an emerging nation, its policymakers of that time did not need to perform a complex search for a good statistician to fit the job to build the first (criminal) statistics. As is often the case in the development of traditions, expertise is not enough; some luck helps as well. Quételet was the ‘right person at the right time’. He was already an established scholar of his time due to his previous geographical inquiries on France (Bruinsma 2010).

The Belgian Anthropological Tradition: a cocktail of Italian and French schools of thought

In the second half of the 19th century, biological positivism gained momentum with Lombroso’s now defunct theory of atavism, a complete misunderstanding of Darwin’s theory of evolution. The Italian anthropological school (e.g. Cesare Lombroso [1835–1909] and Enrico Ferri [1856–1929]) and the French environmental anthropological school of thought (Alexandre Lacassagne [1843–1924 and Gabriel Tarde [1843–1904]) had a profound influence on early Belgian criminal anthropology, of which Louis Vervaeck (1872–1943) was a famous example (De Bont, 2001). Louis Vervaeck was a prison director and founder of the penitentiary anthropological services. He obtained his degree of medicine at the Université Libre de Bruxelles. He was nicknamed the ‘Belgian Lombroso’, although his ideas strongly diverged from Lombroso in some ways, especially regarding the role of social (environmental and ecological) influences on criminality, criminal behavior, and recidivism. Louis Vervaeck was not an academic but an engaged social reformer (in its 19th-century meaning). From its beginning, early Belgian criminal anthropology was already a mixture of schools of thought and thus an example of early ‘integrative risk factor thinking’ avant-la-lettre. Indeed, the unique geographical position of Belgium can be related to its combined influence of Anglo-Saxon/German and French research traditions.2 The early Positivist schools left their mark on criminal policy and the Penal Code, which was transformed by disciples of the Early Social Defence Movement. (Professor Adolphe Prins ad-

---

1 The former Dutch king Willem Van Oranje Nassau made the establishment of Ghent University, the institution hosting the 2019 ESC Conference, possible. Indirectly, he thus contributed to the geographical dispersion of criminological institutes in Belgium.

2 This is still the case today if one takes a look at the variety of schools of thought which are present in contemporary Belgian criminological schools. For those who read Dutch, a more detailed description of early positivism can be found in De Bont (2001).
vised both the Catholic Minister Justice Jules Lejeune (1828–1911) and the influential Emile Vandervelde (1866–1938, Minister of Justice between 1918–1921) (see Cartuyvels, Champetiers and Wyvekens, 2010)). In this historical timeframe a series of rudimentary insights emerged on the differential treatment of minors who committed an ‘offence’. Over the following decades, a number of initiatives were undertaken in Belgium’s criminal justice system, aiming to put Social Defence ideas into practice. Criminology in those days was very closely tied to criminal justice policy and was nothing but an auxiliary science to criminal law. Criminal policy was almost exclusively made by Ministers who were either professors of law themselves or practicing lawyers advised by law professors. The law on the conditional release of prisoners (also known as the ‘Lejeune’ Law of 1888, as it was introduced by the former Minister of Justice Lejeune) was one of the most famous products of this movement. Other examples are the emergence of a separate youth protection legal system in 1912 (Put and Walgrave, 2006; Christiaens and Nuytens, 2009) and the separate ‘treatment’ of mentally ill offenders. (even the much contested law of 1930 was designed to protect society against abnormal and habitual offenders. See e.g., Cosyns and Goethals, 2013 and Vandevende et al, 2011).

Dantinne and Duchêne (2010) describe how in 1890, Adolphe Prins (Professor of Natural Law, 1845–1919) and Fernand Héger-Gilbert (Professor of Medicine, 1849–1925) established a university group for criminology studies at the Université Libre de Bruxelles. The strong interests of legal scholars in transforming the law to better fit human nature than a ‘narrow rationalist’ dogma partly explains why Belgian criminology was primarily located in law schools. The same development could be observed in Germany (Landecker, 1941) and the Netherlands (Tonry and Bijleveld, 2007). Back then, criminology was of importance to lawyers and psychiatrists (see also Bruinsma and Walgrave, 2009), Legal scholars and judges had to apply the Penal Code and ‘understand the etiology of those who broke the law’, while psychiatrists were supposed to ‘treat’ those who broke the law and answer the difficult question of legal responsibility at the time they committed crime they were convicted for. This explains why the first criminology students were either lawyers or psychiatrists, taking an additional course in ‘criminal science’ (or ‘sciences criminelles’, a generic term). The German professor of criminal law Franz von Liszt (1851–1919) founded the International Criminalistic Association in 1889, together with the Belgian Adolphe Prins and the Dutch Gerhard van Hamel. This association was devoted to the study of crime as a social phenomenon and to the promotion of a theory of punishment as a means of preventing crime (Landecker, 1944).

In 1937, the International Society of Criminology was founded, and its first conference took place in 1938 in Paris. At that time, polarised discussions took place between the different anthropological schools. Daems, Maes and Robert (2013) describe how these early evolutions gave rise to the establishment of schools of criminology in the first decades after World War I. Within the faculties of Law, schools of criminology were established in Leuven (1929), Brussels (1935), Ghent (1938), and Liege (1938).

The school of criminology at Ghent University was established by former Dean of the Faculty of Law Nico Gunzburg (Cools et al., 2013). Professor Etienne De Greeff (1898–1961, Leuven University) was the leading Belgian academic of the anthropological tradition in Belgium. Under his supervision, several doctoral dissertations were written (Casselman, 2011). Among his famous students were Jean Pinatel (1915–1999) and Christian Debuyst (1925–1990, Université Catholique de Louvain), who introduced a clinical and phenomenological tradition in Belgium.

**FROM 1945 TO THE 1960s**

After World War II, the Belgian anthropological schools lost their influence and vanished. This was mainly due to the connections between early biological positivism and social Darwinism (or better said Spencerism), nazi ideology and atrocities, and the Eugenics movement...
(which originally was embraced by politicians at both the left and the right-wing side of the spectrum). Early biological positivism was a complete failure; not only the ‘atavistic’ theory of Lombroso and others have been discarded (see Rafter, 2008) from the discussion, but the fear of scholars of being associated with regimes who totally abused Darwin’s theory of evolution kept criminologists generally way from biology. This was the case in Belgium just like in other countries in which criminology was taught. However, the decline of the anthropological school was not the end of positivism in the field of penal law and criminology. A slightly revised version of the social defence movement (“la défense sociale nouvelle” or ‘the new social defence’, a term coined by Marc Ancel, 1954) emerged. This new social defense movement was inspired by a humanistic approach, in which individual liberty was socially embedded and in which ‘social defense’ was argued to be interpreted in terms of providing services to those who were at risk of drifting into crime. This movement had worthy ideals, such as improving the legal status of detainees and rehabilitation. In practice, only minor changes were made in juvenile law. (The law of the protection of juveniles (1912) was replaced by the law of the protection of juveniles of 1965.) Criminologist Gerda De Bock (1922–2011), criminologist, lawyer, and founder of social work in Flanders, was the first female full professor at Ghent University. She taught courses on juvenile justice and played a pioneering role in introducing the welfare approach to (institutionalised) juveniles and juvenile justice. This welfare approach would become more visible in the 1960s through the installment of the social welfare educational program at Ghent University. The new social defense movement was further embraced in different Belgian schools. For example, at Ghent University, these ideals were taken up by Paul Ghysbrecht (1927–1998), professor of psychiatry and Willy Calewaert (1916–1993), professor of penal law, who combined his chair with being a lawyer and activist, and member of the resistance during World War II and of Minister of Education (1973–1974 and 1980–1981). Etienne De Greeff exemplifies the social psychological positivism at Leuven University and Christian Debuyst at the Catholic University of Louvain. (Social psychological positivism was dominant in this time frame. In Belgium, criminology was seen as an auxiliairy science of law until at least the 1960s (Daems and Parmentier, 2017). The social defense philosophy was meant as an overarching philosophy binding penlists, criminologists, lawyers, humanists, and philosophers of law.

FROM THE 1960s TO THE 1990s

IN A NUTSHELL

Several developments, such as the discovery of hidden crime and the development of a sociology of deviance and social reaction (especially labeling theories and conflict theories, but also Marxist theories) contributed to the awakening of a more ‘independent’ criminology, i.e. as a sui generis discipline that was more than ‘just an auxiliary science’ of law. Belgian professors at different institutions started to incorporate these ideas and apply them to the study of different aspects of the criminal justice system. Belgian criminology became much more diverse because of this sociological impetus. Some examples can illustrate this. The sociology of punishment and penology became strong and major research areas at the VUB (Free University Brussels) and ULB (Université Libre De Bruxelles); victimology and restorative justice became key areas of research at the University of Leuven. Also, critical criminologies found their way to several universities, e.g. at Ghent University (Nathan Weinstock and Patrick Hebberecht (1951–2015); see Decorte et al. 2016) and Leuven University (Lode Van Outrive, 1932–2009, Louvain-la-Neuve (Guy Houchon, 1932–2019 and Fabienne Brion). During this period, psychiatric-psychological approaches became less popular among academics, but they remained important among practitioners. Institutionally, the 1960s were very important to Belgian criminology. It was a period of gradual independence, as criminology became an educational programme in its own right in this decade (see later). It was no longer necessary to have obtained a degree in law before studying criminology. The establishment of criminology as a separate educational programme marked the beginning of an era in which criminological research would explode and criminology student numbers would rise, somewhat like the butterfly’s wings causing a hurricane at the other end of the world.

The 1980s were characterised by a series of events that profoundly shocked Belgium (for example the still-unsolved case of Killers of Brabant, or the terrorist activities of the CCC, a group of communist extremists targeting federal buildings in the 1980s). The crimi-
logical inquiries ordered by federal institutions at that time were mostly small scale research projects, mainly on petty crime, such as burglary, thereby partially following the situational approach which became very strong in the U.K. and U.S.

Empirical research in Belgian criminology existed throughout this time period, but it was scarce when viewed through the frame of contemporary international publication standards, which stresses output and metrics (and that is definitely not a value judgement) for several reasons. In this contribution, we can only briefly touch upon some factors we assume were relevant to understanding this phenomenon. Firstly, academia was structurally and culturally different at that time. There was no publication pressure as we experience today and stimulating Ph.D. projects was not stressed in the same way it is stressed now. Secondly, methodologically, Belgian criminology programmes were not as advanced and rich as they are today, both in terms of qualitative and quantitative research methods. There was much more emphasis on methodology in criminology programmes which were developed in faculties of social sciences. Thirdly, data

C. RON HUFF

On 31 March 2019, Ron Huff passed away—only a few years after his retirement as the Dean of the School of Social Ecology at the University of California at Irvine—defeated by pancreatic cancer that he had battled with for more than a year. Ron played a decisive role in the establishment of the European Society of Criminology during the years 1999–2001. Since that time, he attended virtually all ESC annual meetings until 2017 when he organised, as Chair and presenter, a last panel dedicated to research on wrongful convictions.

Growing up in Ohio in a working-class family, he became familiar with gang problems as a social worker before becoming a leading specialist on juvenile delinquency. Over his entire career, Ron was particularly devoted to bringing research to the attention of policymakers. This was nowhere as evident as in the field of wrongful convictions, where he was a real pioneer. Previously considered a topic of marginal academic relevance, Ron’s commitment to empirically-founded research helped promote the understanding that judicial errors have structural causes beyond personal deficiencies of actors in criminal justice. The three edited books he initiated furthered the understanding that there are important international commonalities, but also differences across systems. For example, a lack of resources and training among defence lawyers may play a more critical role under the American system than in continental Europe, where there is stronger judicial involvement in the fact finding process.

Ron was an extremely helpful, supportive and friendly person. When he learned, during his presidency of the American Society of Criminology, about plans to establish a European Society of Criminology, he spontaneously offered, along with ASC secretary Chris Eskridge, all the logistical help that was needed given the nonexistent infrastructure and organisational inexperience among the European colleagues involved in that process. For Ron, having a European Society as a partner organisation meant bringing new insights into the American context. No doubt, we have lost, here in Europe, a great friend and a voice who often ‘advocated’ European solutions on the American continent.

Martin Killias is a permanent visiting professor at the Faculty of Law, University of St. Gallen, Switzerland.
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on crime and the criminal justice system in particular (including e.g., morphology of the police forces, public prosecution, judges) were of extremely bad quality. The first attempts to systematically understand the problems with police data and create useful police statistics only go back to the 1980s, and even today the situation is suboptimal as data access and quality still pose difficult issues for researchers. Fourth, the personal preferences of scholars and their academic socialisation into different research traditions also play subtle roles in the cultural evolution of research traditions.

BELGIAN CRIMINOLOGY FROM THE 1990s INTO THE NEW MILLENNIUM

In 1991, the School for Criminology in Ghent was reintegrated in the Law Faculty. While Belgian criminologists have always been visible in international criminology (each in their own tradition through participation at the ASC and ISC), they have begun to participate in larger numbers in international projects starting in the 1990s. An early example of this is the Belgian participation in the International Self-Reported Delinquency Study from its beginning. Another phenomenon is the growth of empirical research to inform Belgian criminal policy and crime prevention strategies by local or regional authorities.

Belgium did not have a fully developed crime prevention policy in the 1980s, but this changed in the 1990s, leading to a series of new studies on petty crime, drug use, prostitution, organised crime, and the organisational structure of prevention policies and actors. Electoral successes by right-wing populist parties (especially that of the Vlaams Belang (Flemish Interest), a Flemish nationalist party (then called Vlaams Blok) in 1991) played, without doubt, a significant role in the attention paid by local and federal governments to the study of a wider array of criminal phenomena, neighbourhood problems (disorder) and public fear. Quantitative criminology developed rather late in comparison to the Anglo-Saxon tradition, and this can be understood in light of personal preferences and the historical context, but also practical reasons (i.e. the huge lack of data in Belgium). By the 1990s, it became possible to use integrated police statistics, combining police statistics from different police forces, giving a total overview, and federal, regional and local survey data in Belgium. The infamous case of paedophile and murderer Marc Dutroux led to the reorganisation of the Belgian police and the large-scale introduction of Anglosaxon policing strategies (Ponsaers and De Kimpe, 2001). A widespread fear of crime led to the emergence of a ‘fear of crime’ research tradition, especially among policymakers and later academics (Pleyser, 2009). At the dawn of the new millennium, one could also observe a small revival of etiological research. Theories which drew the attention of empirical inquiries in Belgium included the theory of societal vulnerability (developed at Leuven University by among others Jaak Van Kerckvoorde, Lode Walgrave, Nicole Vettenburg), and later (not exhaustively): Social Disorganisation Theory, Strain Theory, Situational Action Theory, and Procedural Justice Theory.

By the beginning of the 21st century, the Belgian criminological landscape (research and education) had exploded in many ways. Belgian criminal policy no longer focused on social prevention and soft situational prevention. Instead, a security-driven perspective became increasingly present in Belgium, affecting the kind of studies which were undertaken, the resources provided by governments, and thus the research programmes. While Belgian criminologists before the 1990s predominantly wrote in their native languages (Dutch and French) and had a strong Belgian focus, criminologists were now increasingly writing Ph.D.s, articles, books, book chapters and research reports in English.

8 This is not to say that quantitative research did not exist in the 1980s. Belgian criminologists at different universities also conducted quantitative empirical research in the 1980s (e.g., Paul Ponsaers, Patrick Hebberecht (1951–2015), Brice De Ruyver (1954–2017) at Ghent University, Jaak Van Kerckvoorde (1943–1994), Lode Walgrave and Johan Goethals at Leuven University, Christian Elaerts, Sonja Snackenat the Free University of Brussels, Michel Borntan Liège University). At virtually all Belgian universities, sources of biases and selectivity in the criminal justice system, were important research topics. Belgian criminology has especially paid attention to the relationship between, crime, criminalisation and socially vulnerable groups who are mainly subject of this selectivity.


10 The Federal Crime Victim Survey was an instrument that informed criminologists on the dark and grey numbers of hidden crimes. The first Belgian federal victim survey dates from 1997. By 2010, it was (temporarily) abandoned for a combination of financial and political reasons. It was revived in 2018.

11 It is worth mentioning that two Belgian journals exist: La Revue de droit penal et de criminalogie (in French), established 1907, and Panopticum (in Dutch), established in 1979. Besides that, Dutch-speaking criminologists also publish in the Dutch Journal of Criminology, the Journal of Cultural Criminalogy, and other Dutch journals. French-speaking criminologists have always had a wide platform because French is more widely spoken than Dutch. Other, more recent journals which
However, many (if not all) Belgian criminologists continued to publish both in their native language and English. This situation is not exclusively related to Belgian criminology. Practitioners and policymakers are scarcely interested in reading (lengthy) academic research papers. Therefore, in countries where the language spoken is not English, researchers have to publish in their native language about the policy implications of their research in order to communicate this to decisionmakers and have an effect on policy. Without a doubt, the establishment of the ESC has been and continues to be an important facilitating factor enabling the international visibility of European (and thus also Belgian) scholars, by making Belgian studies more available to a European audience. Cooperation between scholars at different Belgian universities or of different traditions take place in many forms, sometimes very project-specific needs and expertise, sometimes joint Ph.D.s, and sometimes based on common interests and expertise. Since 2008, an increasing number of Ph.D. studies have been written in English and, at the same time, a debate has emerged on the added value of writing a Ph.D. in either the format of a book or as a series of articles. The debate continues today, with valuable arguments at both sides. In reality, although not at all Belgian universities, Ph.D. studies are often written in the article format.

Another emerging trend in (especially government-based) research is evaluation research. To some extent, this trend is a consequence of policy pressure on (local) initiatives to prevent crime and to prevent recidivism (e.g. the evaluation of good practices and local tools to monitor policy). Belgian criminologists have always been critical towards this widening trend (e.g. Pleysier, 2008). While a number of political scientists have been studying political violence for ages, the topic of political violence (under the misleading term ‘radicalisation’ that is popular amongst policymakers and politicians) has only ‘recently’ (since 2010) become visible in the history of Belgian criminological research and criminal policy. After the Paris attacks (Charlie Hebdo, 7/01/2015; Bataclan, 13/11/2015) and the attacks at Zaventem National Airport and Maelbeek subway station (Brussels, 22/03/2016), this topic has gained considerable political attention and hence research funding.

With regard to funding, the Belgian research landscape has several funding opportunities, of which the FWO (Research Foundation Flanders) and the FNRS (Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique for Wallonia-Brussels) are the best known. Apart from this type of funding, research is also funded by federal organisations and regional departments. Fundamental research is also funded by universities. Funding by the Ministries of the Interior or Justice has become more scarce compared to a decade ago, and a central institution that coordinates criminological research is lacking today.

**RESEARCH PRACTICES, RESEARCH ETHICS AND DMP**

The changes in Belgian criminology have not only been in the topics covered. Another area that has undergone considerable evolution is the area of research methods and research ethics. After all, criminology has not been spared examples of research misconduct, which, of course, raises awareness. As at the international level, ethical research practices have gained considerable attention in Belgium, which can be illustrated by the development of ethics committees at Belgian universities (to report potential breaches of academic integrity) and at the level of the individual faculties (for support and advice of researchers with regard to the ethical issues that can be part of their research). In classes, students are also increasingly made aware of the problems of unethical research. Ethical research also entails the proper use of research data, and both students and researchers need to think about how to store their data safely and with whom data can be shared. The research data management plan (DMP) is crucial in this respect and has gained a basic place in every kind of research (either by students or by researchers).

**DEVELOPMENTS IN THE EDUCATIONAL LANDSCAPE**

In this paragraph, we describe developments in the criminology programmes in Belgium. The 1960s and 1970s were an era of political unrest characterised by widespread protests (e.g. protest against the Vietnam War and the oil crisis). This era was also a time of focused on the translation of criminological research for practitioners and policy makers have unfortunately vanished due to the pressure of publishing in international journals.

12 Some Belgian scholars have made their careers outside Belgium. Some examples are Mathieu Deflem (U.S), Hilde Tubex (Australia), and Ronny Lippens (U.K.).

13 E.g. Belspo, Ministry of the Interior/Justice

14 The DSB (Service for Criminal Policy) has played this role for some years and instigated and guided criminological research (see http://www.dsb-spc.be) but has now been integrated in the FOD Justice (Ministry of Justice).
unrest among the youth across Europe and the world, characterised by student protests and the development of countercultures. For example, in France, this would culminate in student unrest in May 1968. In Belgium, political tensions related to language issues intensified and led to a total split-up of the universities of Brussels and Leuven. When Belgium emerged as a nation, French was used as the lingua franca of the upper classes, while the country was officially bilingual. This issue has historically been raised by the Flemish Movement who demanded an enhanced status for the Dutch language. These demands became increasingly vocal after 1967. Legally, the Catholic University of Leuven split into the Dutch-language Katholieke Universiteit te Leuven and the French-language Université catholique de Louvain (UCLouvain) in 1970. This critical event shook Belgian politics and led to the fall of the government of Paul Vanden Boeynants. The secession of Leuven University marked an escalation of linguistic tensions in Belgium after World War II and had lasting consequences for other bilingual educational and political institutions. In 1970, the first of several state reforms occurred, marking the advent of Belgium’s complex transition to a federal state. See e.g., Daems, Maes and Robert, 2013). The first fully independent programme of criminology was established in 1965 at Leuven University by the psychiatrist René Dellaert, with the help of Steven De Batselier (1932–2007) (laert, with the help of s teven de batselier (1932–2007) had lasting consequences for other bilingual educational and political institutions. In 1970, the first of several state reforms occurred, marking the advent of Belgium’s complex transition to a federal state. See e.g., Daems, Maes and Robert, 2013). The first fully independent programme of criminology was established in 1965 at Leuven University by the psychiatrist René Dellaert, with the help of Steven De Batselier (1932–2007) (see Daems and Parmentier, 2017). At Ghent University, a full-fledged programme (consisting of both a two-year first cycle candidate diploma and a two-year second cycle diploma, called a licenciate diploma) was realised much later, in 1984–1985. The Bologna Process (through which European countries agreed to ensure comparability in the standards and quality of higher-education qualifications, (see Keeling, 2006) led the reorganisation of the educational structure of criminology programmes into a first cycle (Bachelor level) and second cycle (Master level) in 2004.15 In Dutch-taught criminology programmes (both in the region of Flanders and in the Brussels region), academic programmes in criminology are available from the first year of the bachelor’s course (the BA programme takes three years, the MA programme takes one year). Erasmus Belgica facilitates exchange between Dutch-speaking and French-speaking students.

While criminology programmes have been interdisciplinary since their conception, it is remarkable that more attention than ever is now being placed on methodology (both qualitative and quantitative research methods). An important aspect of the criminology programmes is the internship through which students develop skills to function as a criminologist. Courses in English have entered the Bachelor and Master programmes. In French-taught criminology programmes (Brussels and Wallonia), two-year Master programmes are offered but no separate BA programmes in criminology exist. Some readers may even remember that different international Master Programmes existed (e.g. at Ghent University and Leuven University).16 There remain many challenges regarding internationalisation.

OUTFLOW: WHERE WILL OUR CRIMINOLOGISTS WORK?

Belgian criminology schools are characterised by the high number of students. In 2001, the Flemish Interuniversity Council (VLIR) wrote regarding its visitation of the Flemish criminology schools that there had been an ‘explosive growth of the number of students’ in the first years, especially in Ghent (VLIR, 2001). Flemish criminology schools represent a quantitatively important part of the European criminological educational landscape and are among the largest in Europe (Daems et al, 2013); the numbers keep rising. In 2013–2014, a total of 492 students enrolled in their first bachelor year of Criminology at Leuven, Brussels and Ghent.17 In 2017–2018, Ghent, Brussels and Leuven counted 743 newly-enrolled criminology students.19 At Ghent University, many of these students are female (about 70% on average) and of relatively homogenous ethnic (Belgian) background. Although a systematic analysis is lacking today, we sense that the attractiveness of criminology for students has been rising steadily ever since the Dutroux case in the late 90s and since the policymakers began to pay more attention to terrorism.

16 Very recently, a new initiative was launched: the International Research’s Master of Criminology at Rotterdam University, in which Ghent University participates https://www.internationalmastercriminology.eu/
17 This figure represents the ‘new’ students, who enrolled for the first time and thus excludes those who had to re-enroll. Data from KUL were found at https://www.kuleuven.be/prodstudinfo/index/50000050.html; data from Ghent University are based on internal analyses by Luc Lammens. We could not find any online information on the enrollments at the Free University Brussels.
18 KUL (Leuven University): 160; Ghent University: 264; Free University of Brussels: 68
19 KUL (Leuven University): 257; Ghent University: 384; Free University of Brussels: 102
This also implies that a lot of criminologists enter the job market. But in which segments of the job market will Belgian criminologists end up? We know that, traditionally, criminologists can work in many sectors (e.g. police, judicial sector, social sector, private sector, research, policy-related). In 2018, an internal analysis was conducted at Ghent University in which alumni from the past ten years were asked to fill out a survey. The analysis showed that many students actually do not enter the job market immediately but choose to start a second course of study to improve their chances at that job market.

After that, over half of those who completed additional study found a paid job within five months, the majority of them in a non-criminological professional field (37%), but also in the social sector (25%), the police (18%), policy (8%) and judicial sector (7%). This is, on the one hand, promising, as the outlook for criminology students is not extremely pessimistic, yet the large number of alumni that work in a non-criminological job is food for thought.

**CODA: THE KALEIDOSCOPE OF CRIMINOLOGY IN BELGIUM**

Today, pluralism reigns in criminology in Belgium. Research is conducted on every aspect of the ESC’s definition of criminology. This does mean that the different Belgian departments of criminology and the National Institute for Criminology and Criminalistics no longer have their axes of gravity? Of course not. Criminological inquiries are mostly conducted in research groups, which are different entities within departments. These research groups have an increasing tendency to brand themselves using research lines, themes or topics of expertise or academic niches, e.g. human rights, policing, restorative and transitional justice, youth justice, juvenile delinquency, criminal policy, drug policy, penology, crime and the city, to name but a few. Some of these research lines overlap between institutions, which makes sense because topics need to be studied from different points of view. The lines incorporate advances in quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods, and they conduct research among traditional populations, as well as hard to reach and stigmatised groups. But the age of specialisation may have unintended side effects. It is becoming increasingly difficult to be a generalist; yet somehow we need to keep the overview. When criminologists continue to specialise in an international branch of criminology, we may arrive at some critical point of ‘hyper-specialisation’ and somewhere in that evolution, we may arrive at ‘speciation’ in Belgium. In such a situation, the mutual understanding of schools of thought becomes increasingly difficult. Additionally, in the globalising criminological society, criminologists may forget to translate their findings to local communities. However, ‘criminological’ inquiries are not exclusively conducted by criminologists, and criminologists do a lot more than studying crime, deviance, and the social reaction towards crime and deviance. In the age of interdisciplinarity, issues of conver-

---

20 The term criminology, as used in the ESC Constitution, refers to all scholarly, scientific and professional knowledge concerning the explanation, prevention, control and treatment of crime and delinquency, offenders and victims, including the measurement and detection of crime, legislation and the practice of criminal law, and law enforcement, judicial, and correctional systems.

21 An elaborated reproduction would go beyond the scope of this article. However, the different research groups clearly provide this information on their websites.

22 The term is derived from evolutionary biology, where it is used to refer to the emergence of new species, who can no longer interbreed. Here we use the term on a figurative way. It means that criminological schools no longer talk to each other.
gence and divergence also play in Belgian criminology. Criminological research converges to some extent within schools. While some scholars argue that criminology is in a preparadigmatic tradition (Lilly, Cullen and Ball, 2015), leading U.S. scholars have argued that this diversity should be treasured (Dooley, 2011). Therefore, we encourage Belgian criminologists not only to take part in the larger globalised criminological enterprise but to once in a while return home and (re)discover the richness and diversity in Belgium. Are we still allowed to speak of a ‘Belgian’ criminology, and is this desirable in the age of identity politics? Criminology in Belgium is not exclusive-
a ‘Belgian’ criminology, and is this desirable in the age of

REFERENCES AND CAPITA SELECTA


23 Why would one suggest ‘capita selecta’ at the end of a small article on criminology in Belgium? First of all, it was used by us to get an overview. Although far from complete, we made explicit use of existing Festschriften (Libri Amicorum) to get a first insight in topics studied by Belgian scholars who left their marks on contemporary criminology today, i.e. those without whom contemporary criminology would have looked different. There are many brilliant articles on topics and persons in such works, just like in overview works, published at the occasion of a department or school’s anniversary, which I also consulted. These works are of great value if your job is to squeeze more than a century’s work in a nutshell. A more systematic way of studying the evolution of Belgian criminology could be done in several ways, e.g. by systemising the Ph.D. studies by topic, by studying the journals in which Belgian criminologists publish their works, and last but not least by listening to the rich narratives of Belgian criminologists themselves. One such an example is the European Oral History Project: https://www.esc-eurocrim.org/index.php/activities/echoh. Several Belgian criminologists have been interviewed.


Elina van ’t Zand-Kurtovic and Alessandro Corda

NEW WORKING GROUP: COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCES OF CRIMINAL RECORDS

Recently, the new Working Group on Collateral Consequences of Criminal Records (CCCR) was established, chaired by Elina van ’t Zand-Kurtovic and Alessandro Corda. After punishment has been served in full, individuals re-entering society encounter additional legal and social barriers and disabilities that exist because of their conviction. People who have never being found guilty of a crime often face significant hurdles too, as arrest records and even acquittals can prove highly consequential. These ramifications of run-ins with the criminal justice system have come to be known as ‘collateral consequences’. Restrictions arising from having
a criminal record can apply to the whole realm of social life, including employment, housing, immigration status, professional licensing, social benefits, voting rights and everyday social interactions.

Theoretical and empirical criminological research on these exclusionary measures is still largely absent in the European context. The goal of this Working Group is to bring together researchers from different jurisdictions to promote research on, and knowledge of, the collateral consequences of criminal records within the European context and facilitate national and international collaboration among researchers in the field, including funding bids and publication projects.

Scholars interested in exploring this under-researched field are warmly invited to join the Working Group, share their expertise and help build a strong and dynamic research network in this subject area. In particular, the Working Group aims to include researchers working on issues such as juvenile justice, sentencing and corrections, community sanctions, punishment and fundamental rights, immigration, citizenship and criminal justice, employment, and welfare and crime.

The first steps of this Working Group were to recruit members and arrange three thematic panel sessions for the 2019 ESC annual conference in Ghent. Thematic sessions will focus on theoretical and empirical aspects of criminal records and collateral consequences. Furthermore, one session will mark the launch of the volume *Fundamental Rights and Legal Consequences of Criminal Conviction* edited by Sonja Meijer, Harry Annison and Ailbhe O’Loughlin (Hart Publishing, 2019). Additionally, we are going to have our first meeting during this conference, welcoming members and engaging in a productive discussion, as well as identifying mutual interests and developing collaborations with other ESC Working Groups. Researchers at all level of seniority who are interested in joining our Working Group or would like to obtain more information about it can contact us at e.g.van.t.zand@law.leidenuniv.nl or A.Corda@qub.ac.uk.

Elina van ’t Zand-Kurtovic is Assistant Professor at the Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology, University of Leiden, the Netherlands

Alessandro Corda is Lecturer in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice at Queen’s University Belfast School of Law, United Kingdom

### NEW WORKING GROUPS

Petra Šprem

**ESC WORKING GROUP ON VIOLENCE (EUROPEAN VIOLENCE MONITOR)**

The new ESC Working Group, ‘European Violence Monitor’ (EViMo), established in December 2018, will gather engaging scientists in order to discuss and study violence by using a truly innovative and comparative approach. Hence, EViMo will serve as a platform for discussion and powerful talks on violence phenomena, while at the same time avoiding a fragmentary approach by taking a comprehensive look into violence itself. Violence, as a global phenomenon, deserves a holistic and interdisciplinary approach to its phenomenology and aetiology.

This group will strive to encourage networking and stimulate empirical research on violence by looking at the criminological reality of violence. Rather than deal with its normative and therefore social conceptualisation, EViMo will foster a discussion on violence itself in order to see it as it is: a criminological reality, a social appearance, and a real-life event. This ‘appearance focused’ path in criminological discussions on violence should consequently reveal violence hidden behind the criminal law framework, abstract concepts and subjective categories. To put it simply, EViMo will discuss violence, not focusing only on homicides, minor offenders, domestic violence or other mainstream categories of violence which usually leads towards fragmentary and blurred results. Furthermore, by taking a step back from normative labels and providing different methodological and empirical aspects of criminological violence research, EViMo will undertake general ‘brainstorming’ on violence research. So far, our working group consists of...
members from different scientific fields coming from all around Europe. Even though the EViMo working group has just started, some of the group members already collaborate on a project ‘Violence Research Lab’, under the leadership of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Anna-Maria Getoš Kalac.

This group is particularly looking forward to meeting its members at the following ESC Conference in Ghent, Belgium (2019). A total of eight members of this group will give presentations on two panels: CRIMINOLOGICAL VIOLENCE RESEARCH — Session 1: Concepts & Normative Aspects and CRIMINOLOGICAL VIOLENCE RESEARCH — Session 2: Methodology & Empirical Aspects.

We encourage everyone to join our panel sessions and contribute to a critical and inclusive discussion on violence. Our activities will include the organisation of panels at the ESC Annual Conferences, subsequent annual group meetings, promotion of group members’ collaboration, encouraging of joint publications and project cooperation.

Finally, we always welcome new members. All ESC members with an interest in violence-related issues are welcome to join us. If you are interested, please contact chair of the group Assoc. Prof. Dr. Anna-Maria Getoš Kalac (anna.kalac@violence-lab.eu) or Reana Bezic (reana.bezic@violence-lab.eu).

More information on the working group and its members can be found on the working group’s website. Please visit: https://www.violence-lab.eu/evimo/.

---

1 CROATIAN VIOLENCE MONITOR — A Study of the Phenomenology, Etiology and Prosecution of Delinquent Violence with Focus on Protecting Particularly Vulnerable Groups of Victims (Violence Research Lab), UIP 2017-05-8876, supported by the Croatian Science Foundation and Faculty of Law, University in Zagreb. official webpage: https://www.violence-lab.eu/
(alongside Ghent University and Vrije Universiteit Brus-
sels) in organising the annual (third edition will take place
in July 2019) specialist training for PhD students ‘Elites
and experts as subjects of qualitative research: challenges
in design, execution and analysis’.

By means of a regular newsletter, the WG-QRME
has been exchanging information among members on
scientific events, publications, and funding opportunities
relating to qualitative methodologies and epistemolo-
gies. Simultaneously, the WG-QRME is active on social
media, namely via Facebook, with 151 followers (‘Quali-
tative Research Methodologies and Epistemologies’) and
Twitter with 102 followers (@Qrmewg).

The group intends to pursue its goals and objectives
of fostering qualitative methodological and epistemo-
logical reflections and innovations in Criminology. It also
intends to reinforce the network by continuing to recruit
new members and building more and better venues for
communication, exchange and scientific growth.

Julie Tieberghien is a postdoctoral research fellow
at the Department of Criminology, Criminal Law and
Social Law at the University of Ghent, Ghent, Belgium
Olga Petintseva is a postdoctoral research fellow at the
Department of Criminology, Criminal Law and Social
Law at the Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium
Rita Faria is a postdoctoral research fellow at the De-
partment of Criminology, University of Porto, Porto,
Portugal
Yarin Eski is a postdoctoral research fellow at the
Liverpool Centre for Advanced Policing Studies at the
Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, UK

CANDIDATES FOR ESC OFFICES

CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT OF THE ESC

ALEKSANDRAS DOBRYNINAS

Dr. Aleksandras Dobryninas is Professor of Sociol-
ygy and Chair of the Department of Criminology at
the Institute of Sociology and Social Work, Faculty of
Philosophy, Vilnius University. Graduating from Vilnius
University as a mathematician (1977), he holds doctoral
degrees in Philosophy (1985) and Sociology (habilita-
tion procedure, 2005). His research interests lie in the
areas of theoretical aspects of criminological knowl-
edge, corruption, violent crime, media and crime, and
confidence and trust in criminal justice institutions. He
is the author, co-author, and editor of various academic
publications on criminological, sociological and philo-
sophical issues, such as ‘Foundation of Criminology:
Logical and Philosophical Aspects’ (1990), ‘Virtual Rea-
ality of Crime’ (2001), ‘Lithuanian Map of Corruption’
(2004), ‘Criminological Theories’ (2008), ‘Confidence
and Trust in Lithuanian Criminal Justice System’ (2012),
‘Perception of Criminal Justice in Society’ (2014), and
‘Homicides in Lithuania; (2018). Together with his col-
leagues he started and implemented at Vilnius Univer-
sity the first, and still unique for the Baltic countries, master studies programme in sociology and criminology (1999), the joint programme for interdisciplinary (covering fields of criminal law, psychology, and sociology) studies in criminology (2008), and the bachelor studies programme in criminology (2017). Aleksandras Dobryninas has vast national and international experience in conducting policy research and organising public awareness and advocacy campaigns on the abolition of the death penalty (Lithuania, Albania, Armenia, FRY, China, Vietnam) and corruption (Lithuania, Tajikistan). He was the first Chairperson of the Transparency International Lithuanian Chapter (TILS), which was established in 2000. In 2010, together with his colleagues, he took part in the organisation and establishment of the Lithuanian Criminological Association—the first professional criminological organisation in Lithuania and the Baltic countries—and later of the academic criminological journal Kriminologijos Studijos/Criminological Studies. Aleksandras Dobryninas has been a member of ESC since 2002. Between 2009 and 2012 he served as an ESC board member. He also was a chair of the Organising Committee of the 11th Annual ESC conference in Vilnius (2011).

CANDIDATE FOR AT-LARGE BOARD MEMBERSHIP

TOM DAEMS

My name is Tom Daems and I am currently an associate professor (hoofddocent) at the Leuven Institute of Criminology (LINC), KU Leuven. Before taking up this position in Leuven I was an assistant professor in criminology and sociology of law at Ghent University. Over the years I have developed a particular interest in sociological, legal and normative questions related to punishment as well as in questions related to the development of criminology more broadly. At LINC I coordinate research line 8 on ‘Punishment and Control’ which aims to foster, in particular, research in the field of (comparative and European) penology and prison studies.

Europe and European criminology have defined many aspects of my education as well as my professional and personal life. During my studies in criminology, I spent three months as an Erasmus/Socrates student in Austria at the Karl-Franzens University in the beautiful city of Graz. Here I participated in a programme on European criminal policy and I wrote a comparative paper, in German, on Aussergerichtlicher Tatausgleich. After finishing my first degree I studied political science and European criminology in Leuven, and in 2002 I moved to London for one year to study at LSE’s Department of Sociology, with Stanley Cohen as my tutor.

Over the past decade I’ve spent several research visits at the Universities of Edinburgh and Nottingham as well as at the LSE and I have been involved in teaching at UPF in Barcelona. I’ve attended and participated in all ESC meetings since 2006 (Tübingen), with the exception of the Bologna annual meeting (in 2007), which was just weeks before finalising and submitting my PhD dissertation. On a personal level, I am happily married to a Spanish linguist and our three kids are being brought up in a bilingual family (Dutch—Spanish).

Much of my research and published work has a European focus. I published European Penology? (2013, Hart Publishing) with Dirk van Zyl Smit and Sonja Snacken. This was followed by several other books: Europe in Prisons (2017, Palgrave Macmillan, with Luc Robert), Europa waakt (2018, Universitaire Pers Leuven, with Stephan

In addition to my passion for (European) penology, I’ve developed a deep interest in criminology in general and the role key thinkers play (or have played) in its history, present and future in particular. In my book *Making Sense of Penal Change* (2008, Oxford University Press) I reviewed the literature on contemporary punishment and penal change, focussing on the work of four leading scholars (David Garland, John Pratt, Hans Boutellier and Loïc Wacquant). Over the past decade I’ve been involved in several book projects (as author or (co)editor) devoted to the lives and works of Zygmunt Bauman (Boom, 2007), David Garland (Boom, 2009), Stanley Cohen (Routledge, 2016) and Achiel Neys (Universitaire Pers Leuven, 2016). I am currently editing a special issue of the Dutch journal *Tijdschrift over Cultuur & Criminaliteit* with Bas van Stokkom devoted to the theme ‘Significant Others’, with papers on life and work of Pieter Spierenburg, Abram de Swaan, Chrisje Brants, Hans Boutellier and Chris Eliaerts. Since 2015 I have edited the *Routledge Key Thinkers in Criminology* book series with Tim Newburn, Shadd Maruna and Kelly Hannah-Moffat.

I am currently working on two book manuscripts, one on the sociology of victimisation (for the *Key Ideas in Criminology*-series of Routledge—I’ll say more on this at this year’s ESC meeting in Ghent at a special session devoted to the work of Jan van Dijk) and one on the functions of electronic monitoring (for Palgrave Macmillan, a small book inspired by the 1977 classic *De funkties van de vrijheidstraf* of Dutch criminologist Willem Nagel).

I am also editing a book *Criminology and Democratic Politics* (Routledge) with my colleague Stefaan Pleyser, with elaborated papers that were presented at a two-day symposium we recently organised in Leuven (24—25 April) at the occasion of the conferral of a doctorate honoris causa to Richard Sparks, in order to celebrate 90 years of criminology in Leuven.

More information on my work and current projects is available at this webpage: https://www.law.kuleuven.be/linc/english/staff/00043491 My twitter handle is @eurocriminology.

---

**BITNA KIM**

My name is Bitna Kim. It is always an honor and a privilege to serve the European Society of Criminology (ESC) in any capacity, but I am humbled to be nominated as a candidate for the At-Large Representative of the Society.

My education and professional career are split between my native South Korea and the United States. I earned my BA and MA in psychology at Chungbuk National University in South Korea and completed a Ph.D. in criminal justice at the College of Criminal Justice, Sam Houston State University in Texas, USA. Currently, I am a professor in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice and Co-Director of Center for Research in Criminology at Indiana University of Pennsylvania (USA), where I have been teaching since 2008.

My research interests and activities cover a broad
range of criminological topics, including 1) international/comparative issues in crime and criminal justice; 2) evidence-based policies/programs using a systematic review and meta-analysis approach; 3) multi-agency partnerships; and, 4) women and crime. My work has appeared in such diverse outlets as *Deviant Behavior; Crime and Delinquency; Criminal Justice and Behavior; International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology; International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice; Asian Journal of Criminology; Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management; Policing & Society; Police Quarterly; Federal Probation; Prison Journal; Journal of Applied Security Research; Security Journal; Criminal Justice Policy Review; Journal of Crime and Justice; Journal of Criminal Justice; Journal of Criminal Justice Education; Feminist Criminology; Women & Criminal Justice; Violence and Victims; and Trauma, Violence & Abuse*.

Much of my work in recent decades has involved multinational collaborations and comparative and cross-national subjects. One of my recent research streams includes an international project, ‘A systematic review and meta-analysis of income inequality and crime in European countries’, which was funded by the Korean Institute of Criminology (KIC). I have also published cross-national comparative studies, including ‘Internationality of women specialty journals: Content analysis and survey of editors’ in *Asian Journal of Criminology* (2018), ‘Comparative/International research on juvenile justice issues’ in *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* (2015), and ‘Research on women and crime: Exploring a global context between ASC and ESC annual meeting presentations’ in *Feminist Criminology* (2014). With my colleague, I also published results from one comparative international research project in the Society’s Newsletter, ‘An examination of international or comparative studies under the ages of the ESC’ (*ESC Newsletter*, 2011).

I serve as an advisor and evaluator on boards and commissions of various research funding bodies at an international level. In 2017, I was officially approved as an expert in the Crime & Justice Research Alliance (CJRA). I have presented as an expert at several international workshops and seminars across the USA, China, Thailand, Taiwan, and Korea. For example, I have given talks at the American Probation and Parole Association (2016), the Korean Association for Infant Mental Health (2015), the Korean Police Studies Association (2019), the National Crisis and Emergency Research Institute (2019), Korean Association for Crisis and Emergency Management (2018), and Thailand Institute of Justice (2018).

I have also taught internationally, including visiting posts at the Zhejiang Police College, China (2016), at Chungbuk National University, South Korea (2017), and in the Department of Police Administration at Dongguk University (2014). My graduate course International/Comparative Criminal Justice was introduced in *The Criminologist*, the official newsletter of the American Society of Criminology (ASC). In 2018, I was honoured for my work with the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS) Outstanding Mentor Award.

My recent leadership experience in an international context includes service as Trustee-at-Large for the ACJS (2015–2018), Executive Counselor for the Division of International Crime of the ASC (2017–2019), Executive Director of the Korean Society of Criminology in America (2018–2019), and Chair for the International Division of the Korean Association for Crisis and Emergency Management (2019). I have served on several journal editorial boards, such as *Criminal Justice Policy Review, International Criminology, Journal of Criminal Justice Education, Women and Criminal Justice, and Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*.

I have been an ESC member and active participant in our annual meeting since 2010.

The ESC has been an unparalleled source of collaboration, intellectual exchange, mentoring, and professional growth for me. I would be very delighted to ‘give back’ to the ESC by serving on the Executive Board. I believe a diversity of experience, backgrounds, and perspectives makes the ESC and discipline stronger, and it is critical that a global perspective be reflected in the Executive Board of the ESC. I have a demonstrated deep commitment to diversity and inclusivity. This is evident in my scholarship and my leadership activities.

If elected, I would continue the work of my predecessors in broadening participation within criminology and the ESC as an organisation, in highlighting diverse perspectives, in ensuring that we create a wide range of opportunities for engaging international scholars, graduate students and junior faculty, and in advocating for the greater inclusion of women and minorities. It is both comforting and exhilarating to know that I will do this work in collaboration with the rest of the ESC Board to continue and accelerate ESC’s upward trajectory.

I understand the hard work and dedication that are necessary to serve as an At-Large Representative, and I am fully prepared to give my time and energy to the ESC. I would appreciate the opportunity to represent you as the At-Large Representative. I thank you in advance for your consideration and your support.
I am a postdoctoral researcher (funded by a grant from the Research Foundation—Flanders) and lecturer at Ghent University and Vrije Universiteit Brussel.

My expertise is situated at the intersection of several domains: migration and ethnicity, youth crime and youth justice, institutional discourses, the (in)sensitivity to diversity of judicial institutions, and (countering) discriminatory practices. Theoretically, my work is informed by critical and cultural (narrative) criminology and it aims to further advance insights fostered within these fields.

I am currently working on a three-year project—‘Performing culture in youth courts: An active ethnography of narrative negotiations’. This project further develops insights of narrative criminology, legal anthropology and participatory action research. It is set up as a collaboration between Ghent University, Vrije Universiteit Brussel and the Centre for Socio-Legal Studies at the University of Oxford.

My core publications include the monograph *Youth justice and migration: Discursive harms*, published by Palgrave in 2018, and several journal articles based on my PhD research (e.g. ‘Entextualisation’ across institutional contexts: The impact of discourse in school reports on the juvenile justice trajectories of Roma youth’ that appeared in 2019 in *Youth Justice: An International Journal*).

Furthermore, I have a strong interest in research methodology (e.g. discourse analysis, narrative analysis, expert and elite interviews, participatory action research, participatory video and visual methods in general, and feminist research methodologies and epistemologies). Some of my work on research methods has appeared recently: e.g. ‘Reflections after ‘Socrates Light’: Eliciting and countering narratives of youth justice officials’, published in the *Emerald Handbook of Narrative Criminology*; the monograph *Interviewing the powerful in crime and crime control* will soon be published by Palgrave.

I am also engaged in teaching and my courses (at both the BA and MA levels) mirror my scientific interests: Youth Criminology, Critical Criminology, Qualitative Research Methods in Criminology, and Visual Methods.

I have been active in the European Society of Criminology since my student days. I am the co-founder of the Working Group on Qualitative Research Methodologies and Epistemologies with colleagues from the University of Porto and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. The working group, though only two years old, has become an active and diverse network, which has already organised the conference Between Edges and Margins: Innovative Methods in the Study of Deviance. The conference resulted in a special issue of the *Journal of Extreme Anthropology* and a special issue of the Dutch-speaking journal *Tijdschrift over Cultuur en Criminaliteit*. Together with colleagues from the Working Group, we also organised a specialist training for PhD students on elite and expert interviewing.

Aside from this Working Group, I have collaborated with colleagues from the Working Group on Narrative Criminology, Thematic Working Group on Juvenile Justice, EUROC, ESC Narrative Criminology Working Group, Cultural Criminology Working Group, and I look forward to other prospective joint research endeavours.

I very much value independent and pluralistic research and interdisciplinary and international collaborations. This is demonstrated through my active engagement in networks such as the Centre for the Social Study of Migration and Refugees (which is an interdisciplinary research consortium), the Common Study Network of Critical Criminology; Extreme Anthropology Network; Narrative Criminology; Groupement Européen de Recherches sur les Normativités, Cultural Criminology, etc.

Furthermore, I invest in international mobility and cross-fertilisation, which can be seen from my inter-
My name is Peter Stiernstedt. I was born on Sri Lanka, raised in Sweden and educated in the United Kingdom. As a person I am very much the embodiment of a stereotypical Swede. I am always on time (or a few minutes early), quite meticulous and have good attention to detail. These personal traits have certainly facilitated my work as a management consultant where I have successfully managed several multinational projects. I also have previous board experience having served two years as a board member for ASIS Sweden (the second largest ASIS chapter in Europe). My educational background spans from physics to security management, and most recently criminology. I started my doctoral studies in 2015 and was awarded my PhD by the University of Portsmouth in May this year. Before and parallel to my academic journey I have also worked as a Management Consultant for little over a decade; focusing on Risk, Security and Crisis Solutions for both corporate and private clients worldwide. Both my work and education has provided me with extensive experi-
ence, knowledge and insight into areas such as Risk Management, Anti-Fraud and Corruption strategies, Business Continuity and Crisis Management. I have been responsible for budgets and to deliver, explain and justify ROI and KPI making me highly Business Oriented with a keen sense of using my skills to create an Organisational Competitive Advantage. Thus, I have a business acumen that Could be put to good use as a member of the Executive board of the ESC.

I joined the ESC in 2016 and have with great pleasure attended the yearly conferences since. I believe that partly this is because I in a sense have many of the classical traits of a scholar, an inquisitive mind coupled with a sharp intellect capable of creative and lateral thinking. My PhD research was aimed at developing an underlying theory of the perception of corruption in the Member States of the EU, titled “The SUM of ALL corruption—a Grounded Theory of corruption perceptions”. The thematic interest in corruption still remains and I am currently doing research into fraud and corruption in the Healthcare sector. Another large academic interest is that of private security and policing. Co-written with Mark Button under the auspices of the ICJS at the University of Portsmouth the two articles “Comparing private security regulation in the European Union” and “The evolution of security industry regulation in the European Union” was both published in 2016 in the top criminological journals; Policing and Society, and International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, respectively. My approach to research is highly structured (perhaps as a result of my background I physics). This has served me well in a research environment with ever-increasing complexity—to maintain focus while multitasking students, meetings and the challenges of everyday life. These organisational skills will help me contribute to the ESC Executive board, being able to properly prioritise and manage time to significantly contribute to the work of the board.

Moreover, as most academics, I also teach. The taught modules that I deliver range from introduction to criminology for undergraduates all the way to advanced criminological theory at masters level. I have also developed an optional module available to both students of criminology and law called “Understanding and Preventing Corruption”. On top of doing research and teaching I am also frequently participating in other scholarly activities, such as attending and presenting at conference. In October 2018 I was invited keynote speaker at the International Industrial Security Conference in Seoul, South Korea, and in June this year I presented at the 9th Counter Fraud and Forensic Accounting Conference. I consider networking to be a crucial part of Academia, which is one of the reasons that I want to join the board of the ESC, to contribute to this end. Also, in my experience working in the private sector, engaging with corporations, NGO’s and other organisations—networking has always been fundamental. Networking requires communication and I speak three languages (almost) fluently and enjoy collaborating with people from all over the world. As a result, I am a highly social person and love to interact with other people, colleagues, friends and family. Coming from a multicultural background and having lived in several European countries I have a profound understanding and respect for diversity and inclusivity. It is for these reasons (and probably some more) that I am convinced that the ESC Executive board would be value added with me as part of the team.

FROM THE NEXT ISSUE

› Criminology of Radicalization
I am honoured to have been nominated for the role of At-Large Board Member for the European Society of Criminology. I have been a member of the ESC from the time I was a graduate student and have found it a welcoming, innovative and inspiring community fostering unique, cutting edge criminological research. This community has facilitated the evolution of my own research, which is grounded in microlevel processes of criminal decision-making, to encompass macrolevel multinational cross-comparative research. As my work has benefited immeasurably from opportunities nurtured by the ESC, I am eager to give back to the Society through the role of At-Large Board Member.

I am currently a Lecturer in Neurocriminology at the University of Cambridge and a member of the Cambridge Centre for Analytic Criminology, where I am Deputy Director of the Peterborough Adolescent and Young Adult Development Study (PADS+). My main research interests include the interaction between neurocriminological and social environmental factors and their influence on cognition and behaviour, both at the point of action and throughout development and the life course. This extends to exploring the nature of human interactions cross-culturally, with a view to delineating universal processes that can form the foundation for effective crime prevention.

Having previously studied neuropsychology and technical writing at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, I joined PADS+ during its first participant wave. I have subsequently worked with this ongoing longitudinal study over the past 16 years, following participants from early adolescence into young adulthood. Key topics I have worked on within this framework are the conditional relevance of controls in the explanation of crime involvement, the role of social disadvantage in the development of crime propensities and exposure to criminogenic contexts, and, currently, the interaction between individual neurogenetics and developmental experiences in the acquisition and expression of key cognitive capacities relevant to criminal decision making. Along with my colleagues at the Centre for Analytic Criminology, I have been active in communicating findings from PADS+ and their implications for crime prevention with practitioners and policy makers both in the UK and elsewhere in Europe.

Beyond PADS+, I have been active in developing plans for a European Centre for Analytic Criminology which would be founded upon the strong research collaborations that have been forged between the PADS+ study and more than 20 research sites outside the UK, predominantly in Europe, which are producing related, and in many cases directly comparative, pieces of research. This is culminating in a large international project which will bring together cross-national comparative data from more than a dozen countries to explore the person-environment interaction in crime causation.

In addition to my research activities, I have also served as Director of the MPhil Programmes in Criminology at the University of Cambridge for the past three years, fostering cross-national research and capacity building at the graduate student level. During this time, I have also served as General Editor of the Oxford University Press Clarendon Series in Criminology, having previously served as an Editorial Board Member.

As an At-Large Board Member of the ESC, it would be my aim to help support the uniquely effective European criminological community in fostering continuing collaborative work, drawing on the collective strengths of European criminologists, to keep European criminology moving forwards towards better understanding the causes of crime and avenues for effective crime prevention.
Board Members and President:
Nominations and Applications Sought

Don’t forget: at-large members of the Executive Board and the President of the ESC are elected by the members of the ESC at the General Assembly, which always takes place at the Annual Conference.

Be part of the process!

Attend and vote in Ghent, and nominate others or apply yourself for the next election taking place at the 2021 Annual Conference in Bucharest!

Nominations and application shall be sent to the Executive Secretary by not later than 31st March 2020.

Dozens of Newsletters are sent back to the editor every year because the postal address is not correct. The Newsletter uses the address you enter into the ESC database. Please make sure you give us the right address when renewing your membership and do not forget to update it when you move or change jobs.

Thank you.