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Fear and crime. Developmental impressions from England & Wales and Germany

Fear of crime has been a central issue in criminal policy, police strategy, and criminological research since the 1960s in the United States and since the 1980s in Europe. This development has been accompanied by rising crime rates and, usually, by an increased law-and-order discourse (cf. Ferrall et al., 2009). Meanwhile, one can observe not only a remarkable crime drop but a decrease in fear of crime rates as well.

After discussing the understanding of fear of crime and mentioning the central explanatory concepts, the decrease of crime and fear of crime in two major European countries with available time series data will be discussed; for Germany, in comparison with social and economic anxieties.

Definition

Fear of crime can be understood as the affective component of personal crime attitudes. The latter also includes personal risk assessment (the cognitive component) and behavioural responses to avoid or protect against criminal victimisation (the conative component). Fear is triggered by threats to physical, sexual, or psychological integrity.

Fear of crime, therefore, refers to violent or sexual offences as well as burglary, while property offences will be associated with anger and economic offences with annoyance (Boers, 2003; Gerber et al., 2010).

The operationalisation of fear of crime is still in question. From its inception to the present, fear of crime has been surveyed with a one-item question used in regular population surveys: How safe do you feel or would you feel being out alone in your neighbourhood after dark (the so-called standard item). This question does, however, not meet the criteria of internal measurement validity. Criminal offences are not explicitly mentioned. Thus, in addition to crime-related dangers, an unspecified sense of threat may be addressed, which may also be accompanied by diffuse fears of “darkness” or “being alone”.

Therefore, one should ask for specific offences that can trigger a fear reaction; furthermore, reference should be made to the residential area since all respondents can only judge this area from their own perception (specific fear of crime). The redesigned question is: To what extent does it worry you to be beaten up, robbed, killed, sexually harassed, sexually assaulted, or raped in your neighbourhood, or to have your home broken into? (not at all, somewhat, quite, or very worried). This specific query has become common since the 1980s, especially in criminological studies and large-scale crime surveys (e.g., Maxfield, 1984; Ferraro, 1995: 34-37; Crime Survey for England and Wales2). By taking into account the frequency and impact of fearful experiences, the measurement of fear of crime has been noticeably improved in recent years (Farrall et al., 2009; Jackson & Kuha, 2016).

Explanatory perspectives

Three main approaches have emerged to explain fear of crime: at the individual level, the victimisation perspective; at the social meso level of the neighbourhood, the
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social control perspective; and at the social macro level, the social problem perspective. Empirical investigations of these single perspectives yielded mixed evidence while perceived signs of social disorganisation in the neighbourhood appeared to be most influential; see Boers, 2003; Farrall et al., 2009). Against this background, integrative explanatory models have been developed that focus on mediating and moderating relationships between the micro, meso and macro level (Ferraro, 1995; Boers, 2003; Farrall et al., 2009). In this short contribution, one aspect of the social-problem perspective is of particular interest: insecurities about social, economic or political problems are transferred to crime and lead, in turn, to fear of crime (cf. Hummelsheim et al. 2011).

Developments of Crime and Fear of Crime

According to the representative Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW), from the end of the 1990s until 2020, both the prevalence rate of violent victimisation and the rate of fear of crime have continuously decreased by about two-thirds (fear: from 25 to 8 per cent “highly worried”; victims of violence from 4.4 to 1.6 per cent). Fear of crime was surveyed with the specific question related to four violent offences: mugging, rape, physical attack by a stranger and racially-motivated assault (Figure 1, with data details)(3).

Figure 1: Developments of fear* and victimisation** of violent offences in England and Wales, 1997-2020. Per cent of highest level of ‘worry’ (n = 8,569–46,888). Per cent of adult victims, once or more times (n = 14,937–33,734).

* Includes worry about mugging, rape, physical attack by a stranger and racially-motivated assault; the single response items were very, fairly, not very, not at all worried
** Annual data collection since 2002, before irregularly
Source: Office for National Statistics 2022. Crime in England and Wales. Appendix tables, Table A3; Annual supplementary tables, Table S31.
At the beginning of the 2000s, such a parallel downward trend in violent crime and fear of crime was still considered improbable, considering the known trend in data at the time. Given the internationally noticeable crime drop from the 1990s onwards (see Tonry, 2014), it seemed “that rates of ‘fear’ of crime may climb when the crime rate climbs, but fail to fall when the crime rate falls” (Ditton et al., 2000: 144; see also Innes & Fielding, 2002; Hope, 2003). In studies published since 2010, however, a decline in fear of crime and other attitudes to crime has been reported from the 2000s onwards for Northern and Western Europe, Australia, New Zealand, and (already since the mid-1990s) North America, but hardly for South America (Eysink Smeets & Foekens, 2018; for Chicago, also since the mid-1990s, Skogan, 2011). For Germany, there is an ongoing time series on fear of mugging and fear of burglary that started in 1992. On behalf of an insurance company, nationally representative surveys have been conducted annually (R+V Versicherung, 2022; Boers et al., 2017). After the German reunification in 1990, fear of crime reached a very high level of up to 28 percent of very anxious respondents, which was mainly due to the high fear scores in East Germany. Between 1997 and 2022, however, fear of crime fell by a good two-thirds to below ten per cent (Figure 2, with data details; East and West German rates are not displayed separately). The increase between 2013 and 2016 was accompanied by an increase in burglary.

Figure 2: Anxiety about mugging and burglary. Germany 1992-2022. Per cent very anxious* (n = 2,400 in 2022, age 14 and over).

* Value 6 and 7 on a scale ranging from not at all anxious (1) to very anxious (7).
Source: R+V Versicherung, 2022; time series constructed by the author.
For Germany, neither national nor longer time series of self-reported delinquency or self-reported victimisation do exist. However, the available official and self-reported crime data also indicate a considerable decline in violent crime, especially among adolescents, beginning in the 2000s (Baier, 2020; Federal Ministry of the Interior & Federal Ministry of Justice, 2023). Overall, there seems to have been a parallel drop in fear of crime and violent crime in Germany as well, starting in the 2000s at the latest.

Concluding remarks

Even though the course of the time series is only compared descriptively here, i.e., without further correlative analyses, the parallel decline in fear of crime and violent crime may raise some questions regarding the social-problem perspective. In view of this, can we assume that the fear of crime is based quite essentially on a transfer from other social, political, or economic fears – irrespective of knowledge of the actual prevalence of crime? Furthermore, the following should be considered as well: in the German surveys, the same respondents were also asked about 21 social, political and economic problems. Over the years, the greatest anxieties have been expressed about the European debt crisis, the cost of living, terrorism, autocratic governments, migration, and climate change; in 2022, the threat of war was added. Even though most of these fears also decreased between 2016 and 2019, they have – unlike the fear of crime – increased significantly again since then (an exception is the fear of “own unemployment”, which has steadily decreased, presumably in view of a quite stable labour market). Most importantly, the levels observed for these social anxieties have regularly been one to two times higher than for fear of crime, and the latter often ranked lowest of all the problems surveyed (R+V Versicherung, 2022; not shown in a chart).

Based on a correlative analysis, it may be that there is an association between fear of crime and other social anxieties in specific subgroups, for example, among respondents who perceive strong social disorganisation in their neighbourhood (Boers, 2003). One could also assume that in times of low fear of crime, the proportion of generally anxious personalities may be significantly elevated among the remaining few who fall into the very anxious category. Besides crime, they might perceive other problems as frightening too. However, this would have to be investigated more closely in the future.
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(3) Due to the COVID pandemic the CSEW could not collect data on fear of crime for 2021 and 2022, results for 2023 are not yet available.

(4) The author thanks R+V Versicherung for providing the annual frequencies. The time series were constructed by the author. Their interpretation is the sole view of the author.
In brief

The 22nd Annual European Society of Criminology (ESC) meeting was convened in Malaga, Spain, in September 2022, with an unprecedented 1875 attendees. This figure represents the most significant participation ever recorded at a Eurocrim conference and was coupled with a record number of 1717 ESC members. The ESC offered five fellowships to emerging criminologists from Albania, North Macedonia, Serbia, and Turkey. Additionally, two special fellowships were awarded to colleagues from Ukraine.

In terms of accolades, the 2022 European Criminology Award was bestowed upon Michael Levi, while Philippa Tomczak was honoured with the 2022 ESC Young Criminologist Award. The European Journal of Criminology Best Article of the Year 2021 Award was conferred on Aleš Završnik. Meanwhile, Seán Columb received the 2022 Book Award, and Michael Tonry was awarded the 2022 Distinguished Services to the ESC Award.

To address a significant backlog, the European Journal of Criminology published several issues comprising a higher number of articles than usual. The ESC Executive Board appointed Rita Faria as the incoming Editor of the ESC Newsletter, Csaba Györy as Conference Coordinator, and Dorel Herinean as Conference Implementer.

On April 21, 2022, the Board publicly expressed deep concern about Russia’s aggression towards Ukraine through a Declaration —“Declaration of the Executive Board of the European Society of Criminology concerning the war in Ukraine”— published on the ESC website and included in this newsletter. The declaration was aptly titled.

The ESC membership elected Josep M. Tamarit-Sumalla as President-Elect, Ineke Haen-Marshall as an At-large Board member, and Daniel Fink as Auditor. On September 24, 2022, Klaus Boers assumed the role of President of the ESC, and Catrien Bijleveld transitioned to Past-President.
Trend in ESC membership from 2001 to 2022

After two years of strain and lifestyle changes due to the control measures imposed to reduce the spread of COVID-19, 2022 marked the return to a relatively routine activity for criminologists and they, quite rationally, choose massively to get together with their peers in “Malaga la bella”, as a poet labelled the city that hosted the 2022 Eurocrim conference. Such a gathering had a direct effect on the number of members of the ESC, as can be seen in Figure 1.

The Figure shows the trend in ESC membership from 2001 to 2022, except for the years 2002 and 2003, for which data are not available in the archives of the society. Clearly, the overall trend from 2001 is one of growth. Starting with 351 members in 2001, the membership increased substantially to 1,717 members by 2022, more than a four-fold increase.

However, this trend is not consistently linear and has been affected by two main factors. First, a significant dip is seen in the years 2020 and 2021 during the COVID-19 pandemic. Membership fell from 1386 in 2019 to 1036 in 2020, a decrease of about 25%, before rising slightly to 1099 in 2021. This is likely due to the shift from in-person to e-conferences, which led to a decrease in interest or availability to participate, probably due to the lack of personal interaction and networking opportunities typically found at in-person conferences. Second, as we have pointed out in several of our previous annual reports, the place where the annual conference takes place has a strong influence on the number of participants to it, which in turn translates into an increase in the number of ESC members who benefit from a reduced registration fee. As seen in Figure 3 (below), the conferences organised in Spain, Italy, Portugal and Belgium registered peaks in the number of participants, which also coincide with peaks in membership. In that context, the magnitude of the drop in membership from 2019 — when the conference took place in Ghent— to 2020-21 must be relativised. Keeping more than 1000 members — a number similar to those of 2013, 2014 and 2016 — during the COVID-19 pandemic highlights the resilience of the ESC during those challenging times.

The data for 2022 shows a sharp rebound, with the highest number of members ever recorded, at 1717. This could be a result of the pent-up demand for interaction and networking among criminology professionals following the pandemic years combined with the charms of Andalusia.

In sum, the ESC has seen an overall increase in its membership from 2001 to 2022, with some significant year-to-year fluctuations, particularly during the pandemic years. These variations highlight the impact of external factors such as global events, conference location, and conference formats on the society’s membership.
Geographical distribution of ESC members in 2022

Figure 2 illustrates the geographical distribution of the 1717 members of the ESC in 2022, presenting a compelling picture of the society’s global reach. This distribution is surely influenced by factors such as linguistic and cultural proximity and the political, economic, and academic environment in each country. English-speaking countries or those with strong ties to English-speaking cultures may contribute with more members due to fewer language barriers. Besides, countries with a solid tradition of academic freedom and strong financial support for research might be expected to have higher participation than those with less favourable conditions.

In the interim, we must base our discussion on the absolute figures shown in Figure 2. It is noteworthy that representation is drawn from the five inhabited continents represented by the Olympic rings: Africa, America, Asia, Europe, and Oceania. As is typical, the United Kingdom leads with the highest number of ESC members (371 or 22% of the total), followed by The Netherlands (166 members, 10% of the total) and the United States of America (140 members, 8.2% of total). The strong representation from the US as well as from other non-European countries—Canada (32 members), Israel (28), Australia (24), Japan (12), South Korea (10), Chile (6), Mexico (4), Argentina (2), India (2), New Zealand (2), Taiwan (2), Uruguay (2), Brazil (1), Iran (1), South Africa (1), United Arab Emirates (1)—highlights the ESC’s global appeal. All in all, 14% of the ESC members (248 individuals) come from non-European countries.

Belgium, Spain, and Germany also have substantial representation, each contributing with over 100 members.
(7.9%, 7.5%, and 7.1% of total membership, respectively). Indeed, it is worth considering the already mentioned impact of the location of the conference on the ESC members. The number of members from the host country or neighbouring countries, such as Portugal (47 members), is usually boosted. Together with Portugal, other countries with a significant number of members — between 2% and 3% in round numbers — are Italy, Switzerland, Poland, Canada, Norway, and Sweden. Finally, there are a few countries with one or two participants — such as Brazil, Iran, Slovakia, South Africa, Thailand, and the United Arab Emirates — who probably have a specific interest in European criminology or who have significant collaborations with European colleagues. In sum, the current geographical distribution of the ESC membership shows that it has become a truly international society.

Eurocrim 2022 in Malaga: The 22nd Annual Meeting of the ESC

Figure 3 shows the participation trend in ESC conferences from 2001 to 2022. We previously addressed how this trend correlates with membership growth, as depicted in Figure 1, hence we will not delve into that discussion again. A general growth trajectory is apparent, influenced by the varied conference locations, with a marked surge from 2021 (e-conference) to 2022. This spike aligns with the 22nd Annual ESC Meeting (Eurocrim 2022), held in Malaga from September 21-24 2022, which attracted an unparalleled 1875 attendees.

Among those present were five young criminologists from Albania, North Macedonia, Serbia, and Turkey who were granted the customary ESC fellowships to attend the Society’s Annual Conference. Considering the extraordinary circumstances precipitated by the conflict in Ukraine, the ESC Executive Board resolved to extend additional fellowships to colleagues from the affected region. Two Ukrainian criminologists applied and were granted these fellowships, albeit only one ultimately managed to attend the event. The Board announced these fellowships on April 22, 2022, along with a declaration expressing profound concern regarding Russia’s aggression against Ukraine. The full declaration can be accessed in this Newsletter and on the ESC website.

Seventy-two per cent of attendees were ESC members, with the remaining 28% non-members. Intriguingly, a
similar breakdown appeared when comparing educational status—non-students, or more accurately “former students,” versus students—which also presented a 72-28 per cent distribution. This was the highest student turnout ever recorded, considering that students comprised 22-25% of participants in past conferences. Similarly to the geographic distribution of ESC members shown in Figure 2, all five inhabited continents were represented at Eurocrim 2022.

Given that 28% of conference attendees were non-ESC members, we can conclude that in 2022, the ESC community expanded to encompass 2243 criminologists (1717 members and 526 non-members who attended the conference).

The 2022 Eurocrim conference further consolidated the organisational structure implemented during the 2020 and 2021 e-conferences. In light of this, Csaba Györy (from Eotvos Loránd University, ELTE, and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary) and Dorel Herinean (from the University of Bucharest, Romania) were appointed respectively as Conference Coordinator and Conference Implementer by the ESC Executive Board. Also, new professional software was introduced for abstract submission and a separate one for the conference app. The local organisers handled the conference’s scientific program during the first twenty ESC conferences—from abstract submission to panel assembly, encompassing abstract peer review. However, as participant numbers steadily increased (see Figure 3), this system showed limitations. In that context, our deepest gratitude is extended to the chairs of the over thirty ESC Working Groups who served as abstract peer-reviewers and assembled the sessions for their thematic areas. Without their invaluable contribution, organising the 2022 e-conference would have been impossible. More details about these organisational shifts can be found below, in an article by Csaba Györy and Marcelo Aebi.

ESC Awards

In 2022, the ESC delivered five awards: The ESC European Criminology Award, the ESC Young Criminologist Award, the European Journal of Criminology (EJC) Best Article of the Year Award, the ESC Book Award, and the Distinguished Services to the ESC Award. The awardees received their plaques and diplomas in two ceremonies that took place during the 2022 Eurocrim conference.

2022 European Criminology Award

Michael Levi, Professor of Criminology at the University of Cardiff, Wales, United Kingdom, received the 2022 ESC European Criminology Award in recognition of his lifetime contribution to criminology. The award committee was composed of former ESC presidents Tom Vander Beken (Chair, Ghent University), Lesley McAra (University of Edinburgh) and Aleksandras Dobryninas (Vilnius University). An impressive laudatio of Michel Levi was pronounced by Letizia Paoli in Malaga and has been published in the previous issue of this Newsletter (2023/1: pp 8–11). In the same issue, readers will find the acceptance speech of Michael Levi, entitled “Criminology is a never-ending story” (pp. 12–15). It is undoubtedly a piece to remember, written — and pronounced in Malaga — with Michael’s inimitable style that combines science, humour, wisdom, humanism, savant references, and irony.

2022 ESC Young Criminologist Award

Philippa Tomczak from the School of Sociology and Social Policy at the University of Nottingham, England, United Kingdom, received the 2022 ESC Young Criminologist Award in recognition of her article “Reconceptualizing multisectoral prison regulation: Voluntary organizations and bereaved families as regulators” published in 2021 as Online First, in Theoretical Criminology. The award committee — composed by Lesley McAra (Chair, University of Edinburgh), Fernando Miró (Miguel Hernández University of Elche, Spain) and Olga Petintseva (Ghent University, Belgium) — considered that “Tomczak’s article takes as its empirical focus the theme of prison suicide and explores the ways in which voluntary organisations and bereaved families can act as ‘regulators’, driving change in prison regulation and culture, even although such groups are often silenced within, absent from, official narratives. The theoretical contribution stems from the application of processual social ontology, predicated on the possibility of transformation in social phenomena. The article deploys empirical evidence from a qualitative research project, with documentary analysis, interviews with multisectorial stakeholders and analysis of over 100 fatal inquiry investigations. The article concludes with the positive assertion regarding the possibility of penal change. [...]. The Jury also agreed that Tomczak’s work had important practical implications demonstrating the significance and rigour of her empirical work.” Philippa Tomczak presented her research on prisoner deaths in the previous issue of this Newsletter (2023/1: pp 16–17).
EJC Best Article of the Year 2021 Award

Aleš Završnik, from the Institute of Criminology at the Faculty of Law of the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, received the ESC European Journal of Criminology Best 2021 Article award in recognition of his article “Algorithmic justice: Algorithms and big data in criminal justice settings”, published in issue 18/5 (pp 623–642) of the EJC. The award committee — composed by Catrien Bijleveld (Chair, NSCR and ESC President at the time), Janna Verbruggen (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and winner of the Award in 2021) and Kyle Treiber (University of Cambridge and EJC Editor-in-Chief) — consider that the article “draws scholarly attention to a contemporary topic which is largely overlooked but critically important to emerging criminal justice practices. The paper is broad to the point of multidisciplinarity in scope, presenting an inventory of possible ways algorithms and big data could be and are being used across diverse areas of criminal justice and law, with the potential to influence, and in some instances already actively influencing, the identification, adjudication, management, and treatment of offenders. In doing so Završnik’s paper raises many critical points regarding the efficacy, reliability, and ethics of these approaches, identifying and detailing an array of important issues which will no doubt inspire and underpin future empirical research. Overall, the jury felt Završnik’s paper best exemplifies the aims of the European Journal of Criminology, and the European Society of Criminology which it represents, to foster scholarly debate about topics and practices in European criminology and criminal justice, especially those which may be both fundamental and radical in shaping our perspectives on criminal justice and how we address the problem of crime.”

2022 ESC Book Award

Seán Columb, from the School of Law and Social Justice at the University of Liverpool, England, United Kingdom, received the 2022 ESC Book Award in recognition of his book Trading Life: Organ Trafficking, Illicit Networks, and Exploitation, published in 2021 by Stanford University Press. The award committee—composed of Andrea-Roxana Trandafir (Chair, University of Bucharest, Romania), Ronald van Steden (Vrije Universiteit and NSCR, Netherlands), and José Becerra-Muñoz (University of Malaga, Spain) — considered that the book “provides an in-depth analysis of organ trafficking and the connections of the existing black market with health and criminal policies. The author’s study is informed by over 60 interviews, out of which thirty-one of them to organ sellers, seven to organ brokers, nine to organ recipients, seven to medical professionals, two to international law enforcement officials and seven to NGOs staff members, which gives a unique insight of their situations. The author pays much attention to the victims of organ trade. His normative point is that the murky business of selling and buying organs stems from a combination of harsh state policies and the vulnerable situation of illegal migrants, who are recruited to sell their kidneys. Although the book is mainly based on fieldwork in Egypt (the author travelled there from 2014 to 2020), it speaks to an international criminal audience and beyond. Organ trafficking, as a form of organized crime, is a global problem and very much appeals to people’s imagination. The book confronts the deep, root causes of the problem, mainly connected to poverty. It connects health, migration and criminal policy to uncover a strategy that focuses on criminalization to avoid discussions about the failure of the system in many aspects. The author gives detailed and vivid empirical descriptions of how organ trade networks operate. Theoretically, the study contributes to debates about organized crime and illicit networks that intersect with legal (medical) institutions. The methods used are, therefore, relevant, appropriate and allow the author to describe and discuss the topic from different perspectives. The work is successful in widening the traditional focus on the problem, going beyond data and figures of organ smuggling to learn about a complex system in which incentives and trade-offs are studied from a holistic point of view. In the final chapter, the author discusses policy implications arising from his work. He, for example, proposes an alternative, de-criminalizing regulatory policy response to organ trade. The author’s viewpoint is controversial, yet refreshing and relates to his position that the precarious context of illegal migrants plays a large role in understanding why illegal organ transplant and trade are currently taking place. The author has an accessible writing style, being a mixture of journalistic observations (the book contains — sometimes disturbing — photographs) and concise academic research. Briefly, the book is a very ambitious and quite unique piece of research that deals with a global problem. The author manages to avoid simple North-South, rich-poor arguments, which, despite being crucial, are taken even further to expose how different policies on different topics and countries shape a complex network of incentives resulting on a cruel black market.”
2022 Distinguished Services to the ESC award

Michael Tonry, one of the founders of the ESC, former President, and Editor of the ESC Newsletter during the first ten years of the society, received the 2022 Distinguished Services to the ESC Award in recognition of his outstanding service contributions to the effective functioning of the European Society of Criminology. The award committee was composed by Aleksandras Dobryninas (Chair, Vilnius University), Klaus Boers (University of Münster) and Csaba Györy (Eötvös Loránd University, ELTE). Csaba Györy pronounced the laudation — which can be found below — during the Awards ceremony in Malaga, which was followed by a moving and bright acceptance speech from Michael Tonry.

Briefs

Elections: In 2022, for the third year running, ESC members utilised an electronic voting system facilitated by the University of Lausanne. The outcome of the vote saw Josep M. Tamarit-Sumalla appointed as President-Elect, Ineke Haen-Marshall as an At-large Board member, and Daniel Fink as Auditor.

European Journal of Criminology: Regular readers of the European Journal of Criminology and ESC members may have noticed the recent issues of the journal carrying a larger-than-normal quantity of content. This arises from concerted efforts to shrink the journal’s backlog, leading to an increased number of articles in each issue. This temporary measure is expected to continue until approximately mid-2023.

ESC Newsletter: At the 2022 Eurocrim conference, the ESC Board evaluated candidates who responded to the call for the ESC Newsletter Editor position and selected Rita Faria (University of Porto, Portugal) for the role. Rita commenced her tenure at the year’s end, succeeding Csaba Györy, who had been in the role since 2011.

ESC Working Groups: The number of ESC working groups continues to grow, with the current tally exceeding thirty. This expansion has led the ESC Board to implement two key guidelines when evaluating proposals for new working groups:

1. They must not overlap with existing groups, and
2. They must garner support from at least ten ESC members, creating a sizeable network.

It’s also worth reiterating, as stipulated in the ESC Constitution, that all Working Group members must be current ESC members. Furthermore, Chairs of these groups are asked to assist in organising ESC conferences by peer-reviewing abstracts and assembling the respective panels.

ESC Summer School: The General Assembly endorsed the establishment of an ESC Summer School, a project subsequently stalled due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The project has been revitalised, and the Board plans to present a detailed proposal at the 2023 General Assembly, aiming to launch the inaugural summer school in 2024.

European Criminology Oral History Project (ECOH): The return to in-person conferences enabled José Angel Brandariz (University of A Coruña, Spain), who heads the ECOH project, to organize five new interviews for the project. In Malaga, a series of interviews took place: Catrien Bijleveld was interviewed by Elanie Rodermond, Miklós Lévay by Éva Inzelt, Gorazd Mesko by Rok Hacin, Rossella Selmini by Alessandro Corda, and Tom Vander Beken by Jelle Janssens. These interviews are now available on the ESC’s YouTube channel.

Future Conferences: The 23rd ESC Annual Meeting is scheduled for September 6–9, 2023, in Florence, Italy. The 24th Conference will be held in Bucharest, Romania, from September 11–14, 2024. The 25th Conference is set for Athens, Greece, from September 3–6, 2025.

Keeping in touch: If you want to stay up to date with the latest ESC news, please visit the ESC website http://esc-eurocrim.org/, the ESC Newsletter website https://escnewsletter.org/, follow us on Facebook (https://www.facebook.com/groups/110696536816) and Twitter @esc_eurocrim (https://twitter.com/esc_eurocrim), and watch the YouTube channel of the ESC (https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCommPTU1z27MXC9rFkCz6w).

(5) The data included in this report were collected by Gra ciela Kronicz; the text was written by Marcelo Aebi.

(6) https://www.esc-eurocrim.org/index.php/activities/ links#Societies

(7) https://asc41.org/resources/associations/

Prof. Michael Tonry is one of the founders of the European Society of Criminology (ESC) and participated in the kick-off meeting to launch the ESC in The Hague (the Netherlands) on 7–8 April 2000. He also held the position of ESC Newsletter editor between 2000 and 2010. Michael Tonry was elected the 14th President by the ESC General Assembly of 2012. Altogether, Michael Tonry served on the Board for 13 years, ten years as a Newsletter Editor, and three years as president-elect, president and past president of ESC.

Michael Tonry has had an illustrious academic career on both sides of the Atlantic. He is internationally recognised as a significant figure in the field of the criminal policy and criminal sanction system of the United States and one of the most influential scholars in the comparative study of criminal policy and societal reactions to crime. He was one of the first who moved beyond the methodological and epistemological isolationism that besets many great national criminological traditions and encouraged criminologists to look beyond the institutional setting of their own country. He belongs to those team leaders who can identify the best researchers and put them to work together, either in an institute, as in Cambridge, or in preparing one of the timeless volumes of Crime and Justice. However, the current award is not granted only for his scholarly achievements but, first and foremost, for his services to the ESC. In the case of Michael Tonry, these two are closely connected: being one of the founding fathers of the ESC, he applied the same open and inclusive view he employs in his scholarly work to the then-young ESC. Like the other founding members, Michael understood instinctively that the ESC should not become a local copy of more established scientific organisations but one that creates its unique structure and tradition, even with the inevitable dead-ends and side steps that come with experimentation. And time has proven the founding members right: today’s ESC is a unique society with its organisational ethos and communal identity. As a former official and president of the American Society of Criminology (ASC), he also had an inside view of how more established organisations work. His peerless insights were indispensable in helping the ESC find its path.

Looking at Michael Tonry’s role in editing the ESC Newsletter, one could admit that without Michael,
Michael Tønry has had an illustrious academic career on both sides of the Atlantic. He is internationally recognised as a significant figure in the field of the criminal policy and criminal sanction system of the United States and one of the most influential scholars in the comparative study of criminal policy and societal reactions to crime.

After leaving his position as Newsletter Editor, Michael served three years on the ESC Executive Board as President-elect, President and Past-President. This period was different from the early years of the Society. It was marked by a contiguous growth in membership, larger conferences, and the rise of the European Journal of Criminology to the top tier of criminology journals. In response, the ESC had to undergo a certain level of professionalisation. Michael Tønry was instrumental in assisting the Society through this phase: he provided the Executive Secretary, the Journal editor, and the Newsletter editor with invaluable advice. He helped the ESC find a more assertive tone in renegotiating the contract with SAGE concerning the European Journal of Criminology, resulting in a new contract much more favourable to the ESC. At the same time, he also helped make sure that professionalisation does not mean a move towards profit-oriented industrial size events, professional employees, and a more corporate mindset in general, and that the ESC remains an inclusive organisation committed to using its funds for the advancement of European Criminology as a transnational and interpersonal conversation.

Due to the above-presented reasons, the Jury considers that Prof. Michael Tønry has given very distinguished services to the ESC and, therefore, fully deserves that award.

The Award Committee
May 2022
As European criminologists, we focus and report on (international) crimes and injustices: their prevalence, aetiology, prevention, consequences for victims and societies, and on responses to them. We condemn such atrocities and injustices and also those who commit them or take advantage of conflict situations to restrict fundamental human rights and freedoms. Consequently, the Executive Board of the European Society of Criminology declares its utmost concern at Russia’s aggression against Ukraine. While the war in Ukraine is not the only current conflict in the world in which civilians suffer and struggle, it touches our academic Society in two particular ways. First, we are a criminological Society and there are strong indications that atrocities — which might constitute international crimes — are being committed, leading to widespread victimisation. These include war crimes, such as killings and intentional attacks against the civilian population, and crimes against humanity, such as the forcible transfer of populations and sexual violence. The war is forcing millions of people to leave their livelihoods and all their material possessions and to become refugees. Second, Ukraine is a European country. The fact that an aggressive war is waged on European soil renders attention to such atrocities particularly pressing for us as a Society.

While we do not know at this moment how the conflict will develop or how long it will last, the ESC Executive Board has made the following decisions:

- First, within our fellowship program to attend the annual conference of the ESC, we will give precedence to colleagues affected by the war in Ukraine. We will increase the number of these fellowships and extend the deadline for application for a fellowship for these colleagues until 1st June 2022;
- Second, we will, in close collaboration with our working group ECACTJ (European Criminology Group on Atrocity Crimes and Transitional Justice) organise a number of sessions at the ESC annual conference in Malaga (Eurocrim 2022) that will be devoted to the Ukrainian situation specifically, to the criminology of international crimes in a more generic sense, and to justice responses in general;
- Third, together with the local organisers of Eurocrim 2022, we are preparing a plenary in Malaga that will be devoted to international crimes and criminology;
- Fourth, the European Journal of Criminology, which serves as a forum for high-quality scholarship on these among many other topics the discipline addresses, is exploring, together with SAGE Publications, a number of possibilities to give scholarly attention to the conflict in Ukraine. These include the organisation of a special issue or the identification of key papers which could be offered free of charge. The Journal is considerate of any impact on the publication process for authors, reviewers, etc. affected by the war.

Finally, the Executive Board wishes to stress that the European Society of Criminology continues to welcome to its conferences and any activities all scholars, irrespective of their nationality or background, who accept the values the Society ascribes to, as laid down in the European Convention on Human Rights and other key Council of Europe Conventions and Recommendations.
Note from the Editor-in-Chief and Editorial Team for the European Journal of Criminology

The last two years have been busy for the European Journal of Criminology. Of particular note to our readers will be the ‘bumper’ issues we began producing in late 2022. With the support of SAGE publishing we have been steadily reducing our backlog of online first articles awaiting print publication, and are pleased to report that after Issue 20.4 (July 2023), which will be our last ‘bumper’ issue, the time from online first to print publication will be approximately six months. We appreciate the patience of our past authors and hope all our readers enjoy the large array of articles we have and will publish in Issues 19 (2022) and 20 (2023). We published over 80 articles in 2022, nearly twice our usual rate, and should exceed this in 2023. We will return to printing approximately eight articles per issue in the September 2023 Issue.

You can now follow the European Journal of Criminology on Twitter @EJC_Eurocrim! Please join us to keep up to date with the latest publications and journal activities.

Our Editorial Team is continuously working to streamline our peer review process. We recently launched an Open Call for Associate Editors to support an effective and efficient peer review process. We hope to attract a wide range of applicants from early career to established scholars who want to be involved in shaping European criminology. We are looking to maintain a team of around six Associate Editors with expertise covering a wide array of topics and regions of Europe. For more information please visit the journal’s website (https://journals.sagepub.com/home/euc) and follow this link: https://journals.sagepub.com/pb-assets/cmscontent/EUC/Call%20for%20editors%20PDF-1680034322.pdf

Up-to-date contact information is vital to our ability to communicate with authors and reviewers. We would be grateful if all current and future authors and reviewers could check and if necessary update their details in our ScholarOne databased, which can be accessed at https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/euc. We remain extremely grateful to everyone who contributes their scholarship, time, and expertise to the journal and its peer review process.
Candidates to the ESC board - 2023
Election of ESC President: candidate profile
Michele Burman

Whilst it came as a surprise to me, I am very pleased and honoured to be nominated for the role of ESC President. The ESC is very close to my heart. I have participated in all but one of the ESC annual conferences since the first one held in Lausanne in 2001 and, since 2010 I have co-convened, with Loraine Gelsthorpe, the ESC Working Group on Gender, Crime and Justice. Over the 22 years since I joined the ESC, I have witnessed the marked expansion and diversification of the criminological community of Europe. I have made many good friends and forged many productive research collaborations. I have had the privilege to learn about criminology and criminological research from many colleagues across Europe. Today, the ESC, through its members, embodies some of the most exciting criminological research, teaching and practice in the world and has made strong contributions to scholarly thinking and understandings of contemporary society. I am very proud to be a member of that community and would be delighted to serve and represent the ESC as President.

My own research interests are concerned with social inequalities and social justice (broadly defined). Informed by feminist theory and praxis, my work centres on gender and justice and has led to widely cited publications and has had an impact on policy, legislation and practice, e.g., informing revisions to the law of evidence in rape and the policing of crimes of violence against women and children. I use both qualitative and quantitative methods and have a strong public engagement portfolio. I am passionate about promoting criminological research for public benefit, especially in the translation of research to non-academic audiences towards goals of social justice and greater social equality.

I bring strategic leadership experience and academic credibility to the role. I am a Professor of Criminology at Glasgow University in Scotland, with a BA in Sociology and Psychology from the University of Cape Town; a BA. Hons. in Clinical Psychology from UNISA; an MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice, and; a PhD in constructions of consent, credibility and character in sexual offence trials from University of Edinburgh. I have considerable experience of academic leadership including, from 2015 to 2019, as Head of a large and complex School of Social and Political Sciences comprising over 300 staff and 5,000 students, as a former Director of Research, a Chair of the Social Sciences Ethics Committee, and a member of numerous university leadership working groups and committees. I have held several governmental advisory and consultancy roles, e.g., on policies concerning prostitution; victim’s rights, women’s imprisonment, consent (Scottish Government), youth justice (Northern Ireland), and restorative juvenile justice (European Commission) and acted as an expert for parliamentary committees of inquiry on domestic abuse, community sanctions, and sexual offences. I have extensive experience working with schools, community groups and charitable trusts, e.g., board member of the Ethnic Minority Law Centre 2008 to 2015, Scottish Women’s Rights Centre 2015–present, and chair of Women’s Support Project, 2008–present.

With Richard Sparks and Gill McIvor, I am a Founding Co-Director of the Scottish Centre for Crime and Jus-
tice Research (SCCJR), a cross-institutional research collaboration between the Universities of Glasgow, Edinburgh, Stirling, Strathclyde and Edinburgh Napier. I led SCCJR for 10 years from 2006 until 2016 as coordinator with overall responsibility for day-to-day management, co-ordination of research and KE activities, budgeting and finances and liaison with external partners. Now in its 17th year, I am immensely proud of SCCJR as it has grown to become one of the largest criminological research centres in Europe as evidenced by its large staff base, far-reaching research programme, high levels of public engagement and large and diverse doctoral student community.

I have participated as partner or coordinator in 45 research projects and successfully mentored 16 doctoral students to completion of their PhD degrees. I view criminology as an area best served by multi- and inter-disciplinary research and collaborations, and I endeavour to work in this way, most recently as a partner in the European Commission project Improving Frontline Responses to Domestic Violence (IMPRODOVA), working with law enforcement, medics, lawyers, NGOs and policymakers in eight European countries. My work is financed by national (e.g., Economic and Social Research Council; British Academy; Nuffield Foundation; Wellcome Trust, Equalities and Human Rights Commission) and international (e.g. European Commission; Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation) funders.

From 2015 to 2020, I was Co-Editor-in-Chief of Criminology and Criminal Justice (the official journal of the British Society of Criminology). I served as a criminology expert member in the UK’s Research Excellence Framework (REF) subpanel on Social Policy & Social Work in both REF 2014 and REF 2021. I was elected as Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh (FRSE) 2017 and Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences (FAcSS) 2018. In the Queen’s Birthday List 2019 I was awarded a CBE for Services to Criminology.

Key among the many things I learnt in my leadership roles are: the importance of robust structures (appropriate governance, clear objectives, designated responsibilities, strong, open mechanisms for communication); the need for altruistic leadership in prioritising collective needs, and the importance of understanding how different partners can contribute and work together to achieve common goals. My approach is collaborative, inclusive and hands-on, and aims to build trust, manage relations, and connect people to make things happen. If elected, I would relish the opportunity to support the objectives listed in the ESC’s constitution (e.g., bringing together criminologists in one multi-disciplinary society; fostering criminology, encouraging exchange and cooperation, acting as a forum for the dissemination of knowledge) to ensure the ESC remains an open and inclusive environment fostering ideas and links across borders. Recognising that our current volatile research environment particularly affects early career researchers and doctoral students, a key ambition would be to facilitate the career development of this important body of researchers. With the expansion of the ESC criminological base comes opportunities and challenges, including the risk of fragmentation. If elected, I would endeavour to amplify the conversations within criminology as a whole to nurture knowledge sharing across subdisciplinary boundaries to ensure that criminological expertise continues to support responses to the complex, dynamic and rapidly evolving societal changes we face.
I am pleased to have the opportunity to put myself forward for election as President of the ESC.

I started my studies as one of that fortunate generation of first-generation educated people paid for by UK taxpayers, studying Philosophy Politics and Economics at Oxford – which has turned out to be unexpectedly useful in the areas of criminology on which I have worked. After this, I took what was then the only UK criminology postgraduate course at Cambridge and, having become interested in the organisation of crimes and the ways that they were regulated and/or criminally prosecuted (or not) and the effectiveness of those approaches, I did my PhD at Southampton on bankruptcy fraud. When my funding finished, I was fortunate enough to get one of only two criminology lectureship posts available in the UK that year and moved to Cardiff in 1975, where I have happily remained ever since, becoming a full Professor in 1991.

My involvement in the ESC began at its initial set-up meeting and conference, and I have served on the Board 2006–2008 and 2016–2018, leading the Cardiff team in organising the 2017 ESC, so I am familiar with its duties and responsibilities as well as with the delights of its conferences. When on the Board, I served on the committee deciding the Young Criminologist Award, and I understand that the ESC needs to cater for the broad spectrum between that and my own generation for whom criminology was not the mass popular subject it is today. My hope and expectation is that during and long after the next Presidency, we can continue to flourish as the centrepiece of the broad European criminological project, facilitating the expansion of areas of conceptual and research specialism without losing the conference’s special appeal as an ‘omnium gatherum’ (Passing Latin exams was then compulsory for Oxford entrance!). I was honoured to receive the European Criminology Award in Malaga and hope to continue to contribute to the ESC, whether elected or not.

Though I used to write the ‘violent crimes’ chapter and continue to co-write the terrorism as well as the corporate/white-collar crime chapter of the Oxford Handbook of Criminology, my main areas of research have been on ‘economic crimes’ (from elite to ‘organised’ and blue-collar, both offline and cyber-enabled frauds; corporate crimes; and money laundering) which have presented a significant challenge to criminal justice and regulatory systems for centuries as well as during Covid-19. Though some cybercrimes and frauds are now ascending the security threat agenda in Europe and elsewhere, they have traditionally not been viewed by politicians and police leadership as being as serious as drugs and some other illicit markets. I have attempted to fill some major gaps in our knowledge and understanding, using theory, and contemporary and historical empirical analysis. In the EU & Council of Europe as well as the UK, I have advised policymakers, sometimes being listened to (and therefore defined as ‘impactful’) and sometimes ignored (so ‘impactless’, even when arguably right). I remain fascinated by the comparative shaping of crimes and their control over time and place and will study these until it is time to hang up my boots.
A European criminologist – this is how I genuinely see myself.

I was born and raised in Italy, the country where I went to school and university, but for the past 11 years I have also lived and worked in other two countries in Europe: Belgium and the UK. I graduated in Law from the University of Trento (Laurea Magistrale in Giurisprudenza) and then moved to Belgium – the beautiful Ghent – for my PhD in Criminology. After completing my PhD, I was hired at the University of Essex, UK, where I currently am Senior Lecturer in Criminology and Director of its Centre for Criminology. I have been a member of the European Society of Criminology since the start of my doctorate study in Ghent in 2012, and since then I have attended nine wonderful ESC Conferences.

My research is also very much European: it analyses the social control of incivilities (anti-social behaviour, nuisance, disorder) in European countries and cities, also in a comparative perspective. Progressively since the 1990s, many European countries and cities have adopted punitive measures against (vaguely defined) uncivil or disorderly behaviour. My research contributes comparative empirical evidence to the analysis of anti-incivility regulations in Europe, outlining the context-specific and cultural factors that shape such regulations and their enforcement; it also unveils the effects that the enforcement of anti-incivility regulations often has on already vulnerable and marginalised individuals and groups. Theoretically, my research contributes to the interdisciplinary literature on the governance of inner-city spaces, which stretches through critical and cultural criminology, socio-legal studies, human geography and urban studies. My new book with Bristol University Press (2023), Policing Environmental Protest: Power and Resistance in Pandemic Times, uses interdisciplinary insights to analyse recent policies and practices which in many European countries and beyond have limited the right to protest in inner-city spaces, while also focusing on (and giving visibility to) eco-justice activist practices of resistance.

My research on and with eco-justice movements dates back to 2017, when I started a research project addressing how silenced and criminalised eco-justice movements use social media to break the silence and expose their suffered criminalisation and harms. This project involved other colleagues, including a computational social scientist. The project and its innovative AI-assisted methodologies for data collection and analysis led to several publications, a follow-up grant, and also awarded me the ‘Outstanding Early Career Researcher Award’ for the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Essex in 2021.

During my career as an early career scholar (I am within 7 years from my PhD), I published several articles in top-notch criminology journals, two co-edited books (2 more are currently in preparation), one monograph, one co-authored bestselling criminology textbook (Criminology: A Sociological Introduction, 4th ed., Routledge), in addition to several chapters in edited books and volumes.
I gave numerous presentations and papers at conferences in Europe and beyond, and was also invited to give guest talks in many universities, including UNICAMP (Brazil), VUB and Ghent University (Belgium), the Universities of Bologna, Pisa, Trento and Sassari (Italy), BGU (Israel), the John Jay College of Criminal Justice (CUNY, US), the University of the Basque Country and the Complutense University of Madrid (Spain). As a visiting scholar, I visited the Ben-Gurion University of the Negev (2017), the Brussels Centre for Urban Studies (2019) and the Oñati International Institute for the Sociology of Law (2022). All this demonstrates the broad reach of my European and international network, which I eagerly reinforce and expand each year at the annual ESC Conferences. The ESC Conferences are, indeed, a great space for (broadly defined) criminologists to meet and share ideas – and also a wonderful opportunity to expand one’s network, start research collaborations, and catch up with colleagues and friends.

If elected as at-large Board member I promise to work hard to maintain the open, inclusive and interdisciplinary spirit of the ESC, which makes it so unique, also keeping the needs of early career criminologists at heart. As at-large Board member, I would also love to contribute to the existing ESC projects, including the Oral History Project, and promise to give new energy and impetus to the designing of new projects which the Society could promote in the future.
My journey in criminology began with personally experiencing the realities of atrocity crimes. Coming from a country on the borderlines of Europe, I witnessed firsthand the devastating consequences of these crimes. This ignited a passion within me to understand the complexities behind these issues and work towards preventing their recurrence.

My academic background includes Criminology, Criminal Law, and Security Studies degrees from the University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina. I am all for collaboration in research, and I have always engaged with fellow scholars, researchers, and practitioners to deepen our collective understanding and foster meaningful progress. My work has encompassed a wide range of experiences, including local fact-finding missions on detention facilities and camps in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as academic research on intergenerational patterns in atrocity narratives and war trauma. I have utilized both qualitative and quantitative methodologies in my research endeavours. Moreover, I am a passionate teacher, dedicated to educating a new generation of empirical scholars in Eastern Europe.

While committed to contributing broadly to the growth and development of the European Society of Criminology, I will also work to ensure that established and young scholars from the European East and South participate to their full. My aim would be an inclusive and innovative environment that facilitates the exchange of ideas and fosters groundbreaking research. Given the war that is still raging in Europe, we should all work to ensure a future where justice prevails, boundaries are shattered, and the impact of our work resonates across Europe and beyond.

I firmly believe the European Society of Criminology plays a pivotal role in advancing truly European criminology, one that connects scholars from across Europe, learning from each other and building from our core European values. As the Faculty of Criminal Justice, Criminology, and Security Studies in Sarajevo was an organizer of the European conference, I had the privilege to gain invaluable practical experience in promoting this vision.
Birth and development of Criminology

Marco Ezechia Lombroso, known as Cesare, was born in Verona in 1835 and died in Turin in 1909, the city where he founded the Museum of Criminal Anthropology. There, even today, one can admire Lombroso’s private collection consisting of 684 skulls, 27 human skeletal remains, 183 brains (not exposed to the public), 502 bodies of criminals that used to commit more or less bloody crimes, 42 restraint rods, 100 death masks, 475 drawings of “Insane”, thousands of photographs of criminals, madmen, and prostitutes, brigands’ clothes and 3 “carnivorous” plant models. Lombroso’s skeleton and face in formalin are also preserved in the museum. For many, Lombroso is the scientist considered to be the father of modern criminology; for others, he is considered “crazy” but also a “visionary” for his theory of atavism explained in the text “The delinquent man” of 1896.

Inspired by Phrenology, conceived by Franz Joseph Gall and according to which the individual psychic functions depend on specific “regions” of the brain, Lombroso measured the shape and size of numerous skulls. And from the evaluation of the morphological peculiarities, such as lines and depressions, he determined the psychic qualities of different individuals and specific criminal personalities. As Lombroso himself said: “On a grey and cold morning in December 1971, analyzing a skull, all of a sudden it appeared to me, as a large plain under an inflamed horizon, I had solved the problem of the nature of the offender, who thus had to reproduce in our times the characters of primitive men down to carnivores”. It was the skull of the brigand Vilella in which Lombroso noticed an anomalous dimple
that had contained the median lobe of the cerebellum: median occipital fossa, found only in lower, “less-developed” beings.

Fortunately, some skulls are preserved in the Pathological Anatomy Museum of the University of Florence, bearing the vivid definitions of thief, forger, and a clear testimony to Lombroso’s theory.

In particular, the cast of the skull of Lorenzo Duke of Urbino is of great interest from a historical-medical point of view, as it visibly preserves the trace of the intervention carried out by the famous Berengario da Carpi, in 1528, when Lorenzo was wounded by a shotgun bullet in the neck, during the siege of Castel Mondolfo. Berengario documented this intervention in the treatise “De fracture calve sive cranei”, dedicated precisely to Lorenzo Duke of Urbino, in which the author explains the operation techniques used, referring to this particular case and integrating, therefore, testimonies of the epistolary documentation and official reports.

Thanks to the union Lombroso forged with Enrico Ferri, an illustrious criminal lawyer, and socialist deputy, the so-called Positive School was born, proposing profound reforms in the penal and penitentiary fields. However, many Catholic scholars opposed the Lombrosian doctrine because it undermined the dogma of free will. Afterward, Criminology was criticized by fascism, an authoritarian regime opposing any idea of studying crime and rehabilitating the offender. The regime’s aversion even led, in 1936, to the cancellation of Criminal Anthropology from all the kingdom’s universities.

After the fall of the regime and the end of the unfortunate and disastrous war adventure, Criminology was reintroduced into the University system alongside forensic medicine. The resumption of the discipline was carried out at the University of Rome by Benigno di Tullio with the collaboration of Salvatore Ottolenghi, a pupil of Cesare Lombroso and a fascinating figure. Born in 1861 into a noble Jewish family from Asti, at 23 he graduated in Medicine in Turin, specializing in ophthalmology, anthropology, and psychiatry, embarking on a university career as an assistant to Cesare Lombroso. Attracted by crimes as a research topic, he became the first modern criminologist and the founder of applied scientific criminology. Lombroso and Ottolenghi represented the starting point of the Scientific Police in a century marked by growth in the industry, more awareness of social issues, and the dominance of positivism. But it was in 1895 that Ottolenghi took off, leaving Lombroso and obtaining the chair of forensic medicine in Siena, convinced that this was the only way to make the dead “speak” and tell the truth. He then organized the first course for his students of scientific police, combining science and investigation. Ottolenghi’s most relevant intuition, partly taken up by previous but not specific Lombrosian suggestions, was that of using the discoveries of medical sciences and the practical knowledge of criminal anthropology at the service of a new and modern concept of the police that would, thus, become genuinely scientific. As such, a real ‘investigative epistemology’ was born. In this sense, the spoken portrait of Ottolenghi’s site inspection was the first methodological procedure that didn’t deal exclusively with photographic relief but provided a real handbook for crime scene inspection.

Training of criminologists in Italy

Because of the Lombrosian heritage, Criminology in Italian Universities is included in the scientific-disciplinary sector MED/43 - Legal Medicine. However, there are “optional” elective courses that students can choose from at the Schools of Law and Psychology. Only a few places provide, such as the University of Turin, a specialist criminological course. In all other Universities, the study of Criminology takes place within Master courses which allows allow, from a multidisciplinary perspective, overall training and an integrated picture of criminal phenomena.

For this reason, the problem of training criminologists has always been an important and debated topic of modern criminological science, which sought to consolidate acquired positions and carve out new operational spaces in non-traditional fields. The various studies and research perspectives have also been explored to help better understand the contribution that criminologists can provide to professional activities dealing with crime prevention, social reaction, offender treatment, protection, and support for victims.

It, therefore, follows that criminological training “is not based on given certainties and on constant references over time in a reassuring transmission of knowledge. The only serious way to protect the value of tradition is to criticize its value, with the constructive purpose of throwing away what has lost meaning and preserving what must be kept as a heritage resistant to time and transformation” (Portigliatti, 1995).
Prevention and safety

Since the mid-1990s, the Italian reality of local authorities (regions, provinces, and municipalities) has seen a continuous increase in the request for safety interventions due to growing concerns in public opinion related to social insecurity.

There is objective safety, understood as the statistical risk of being a victim of criminal behaviour, and subjective security, i.e., the one perceived by the community, determined and influenced by multiple social, psychological, and territorial variables. Certainly, for those who are used to living in a large and turbulent city, the request for security will arise from facts that are objectively different and probably more serious than for those who live in a small and quiet town.

The pragmatic verification of the effects of the various safety programs implemented, identifying their limitations, perspectives, and operational capabilities, constitutes a peculiar scientific task of criminology that goes beyond formulating criminal policy (Bandini et al., 2003).

Prison

Crime prevention represents one of the main functions attributed to the entire penal system in its various bodies and apparatuses. Historically, the use of penal sanctions has been justified not only with a series of considerations of a “retributive” type but also with a series of arguments of a “preventive” type, which date back to the utilitarian philosophies developed in the eighteenth century.

This means that Beccaria’s doctrine contributed significantly to founding the theory of deterrence, which soon became one of the cornerstones of the Classical School of Criminal Law, inspired by the Milanese school. However, the justification of the penal law through its general preventive function has undergone mixed success. After being in vogue with the Classic School of Criminal Law at the end of the nineteenth century, it was partly supplanted by new approaches derived from the Positive School and oriented toward specific prevention. According to these, the penalty must adapt to the needs of each individual and be directed to the re-education and social reintegration of offenders by transforming their personality in such a way as to make them law-abiding citizens. The new trends of the twentieth century centered on the rehabilitative function of the sentence, making extensive use of tools from the psychological and social sciences, which were gradually emerging and developing.

Indeed, the history of prison sentences demonstrates that the prison environment tends to be negatively structured, becoming a source of corruption and a crimogenic factor. In Italy, the criticism of the correctional-type approach has had wide prominence and led to an orientation that increasingly tends to separate the educational aspect from the punitive one, even in the juvenile field. In Italy, the guidelines used for juvenile justice and social services are still subjected to extensive debate and contrasting positions that go beyond the traditional re-educational approach.

In this regard, Law 663/86 (the so-called Gozzini Law) introduced innovations of particular interest, such as alternative measures to the holding and the remission of a debt.

Rather heterogeneous institutes (probation, partial release, licenses, early release) suggest to convicts that adopting certain behaviours in prisons facilitates compliance with the treatment program envisaged for them.

Recent Italian history

The O.P.G. (Judicial Psychiatric Hospital) was a detention facility that, following the prison reform of 1975, replaced the criminal asylums. Offenders suffering from psychiatric conditions such as psychoticism or schizophrenia were sent to these structures when considered incapable of understanding their actions at the time of the crime. Based on the double-track principle inserted in the Rocco Penal Code (1939), if a person is considered mentally ill and, thus, not charged, but is still deemed socially dangerous, then prison detention is not foreseen. Instead, a security measure is applied.

The O.P.G., therefore, had a dual function: for custody and social defence; or care and treatment, for the reintegration of the individual into society. The first step towards a change was the transfer of penitentiary medicine competencies from the Ministry of Justice to that of Health. The second piece was represented by the introduction of R.E.M.S. (Residences for the Execution of Security Measures). The R.E.M.S., introduced with the Law of 17 February 2012, n. 9, constituted the answer to the above requirements. The logic behind these new structures is rehabilitation; the staff comprises health professionals. Moreover, the so-called “white life sen-
“sentence” was eliminated by the same law, establishing that, unlike before, the duration of a security measure cannot exceed the maximum statutory penalty for the crime.

Clinical Criminology

Clinical criminology (i.e., applying scientific criminology to criminal practice) aims to formulate an opinion on the offender. This opinion involves a diagnosis of dangerousness, a social prognosis, and possibly a treatment intended to prepare for social reintegration. Its aim is, therefore, the recovery of the offender. Still, to achieve this aim within the framework of the penal system, the latter needed to be reformed both in its general guidelines and in its procedural mechanisms. Therefore, Clinical Criminology has presented itself as a committed and reformist discipline. After the Second World War, it was mainly supported by jurists close to the doctrines of “social defence”, such as Filippo Gramatica or Marc Ancel.

Clinical Criminology has been subjected to several criticisms by Radical Criminology. According to the latter, a conservative point of view would dominate Clinical Criminology, and its proposed reforms would only lead to strengthening the current status quo of society without changing the existing order. But since the alleged conservatism of Clinical Criminology could not be sustained in the face of its aims, radical criminologists have directed their criticisms toward other fields. They wanted to believe that Clinical Criminology argued for the assimilation of the mentally ill and delinquents: which is entirely false. Clinical Criminology is not medicine but is methodologically organized like medicine. Finally, radical criminologists have insisted that taking the offenders’ social reintegration as an objective is impossible since this would lead them to accept the established order based on social injustice. However, this criticism has no foundation because social reintegration in Clinical Criminology simply refers to the fact that it is convenient to make offenders aware of the causes of their conduct so that they can overcome them.

Privileged research fields

I had the pleasure and honor of being included by Prof. Uberto Gatti in the second edition of the International Self Report Delinquency Study, 2006. Due to the scientific importance of the project and thanks to Ineke Marshall, who inherited the sceptre from Josine Junger-Tas, the international project had a third edition (years 2012-2019) and a very recent fourth edition. The International Self-Report Delinquency Study (ISRD) is a large, international, collaborative study of victimization and delinquency among adolescents in grades 7, 8, and 9. Pioneered by Dutch criminologist Josine Junger-Tas, the project is built over two strengths. First, it uses the self-report survey method, which has long been considered a more valid and reliable measure of offending and victimization than official data. It also enables the exploration of theoretically relevant variables. Second, it uses a standardized survey instrument and sampling frame in a multinational data collection exercise that allows the study of similarities and differences between countries and tests of theories in varied social, economic, political, and cultural settings. This standardized school-based survey is underway for the fourth time (ISRD4), with over 50 countries participating. The first edition, which was pioneering, took place in 1992. Italy participated with 3 cities – Brescia, Firenze, and Messina – under the direction of Prof. Uberto Gatti. In 2005, the second ISRD commenced. The ISRD-2 design was a significant improvement over ISRD-1, in particular by focusing on the importance of developing and applying a research protocol to be followed by all participants. The ISRD-2 was conducted in 25 European and 6 American countries. Italy participated with 15 cities – Bergamo, Brescia, Brindisi, Cormano, Florence, Genoa, Lecce, Messina, Milan, Naples, Padua, Perugia, Sassari, Siena, Ventimiglia – for a sample of over 7000 students. The ISRD-3 started in 2012, and 24 national teams conducted it between 2012 and 2019. Italy participated with the cities of Brescia, Florence, Genoa, Lecce, Messina, Milano, Napoli, and Siena for a sample of 3508 students.

Conclusions

Italy, the birthplace of criminology, still contributes strongly to the development of this science. There have been numerous Italian Authors who have outlined the fields of criminological scientific knowledge over the years. Particular attention was paid to the penitentiary phenomenon and, specifically, to the individualized treatment of the offender, a prerequisite for his re-education and reintegration into society.
New patterns in crime are rising. Let’s think about the risks associated with the social media jungle populated by different types of new predators (cyberbullying, revenge porn, sextortion, soliciting minors online, etc.). What can be considered Deviance and Crime in an era of fast social changes? What can scientists do to understand more deeply the current reality? Much still needs to be done in Italy to break down gender-based stereotypes and violence. The contrast cannot be only judicial through the introduction of new types of crime (law 69/2019 named Red Code Law) and the tightening of penalties because the problem has solid socio-cultural foundations. What about the role of criminologists as “teachers”? Criminologists must use a multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approach in which scientists can join to share the outputs of their particular points of view.

So many questions to answer but there will be time to discuss them during the 23rd Conference of the European Society of Criminology in Florence, which I am extremely proud (and afraid!!!) to organize. Therefore, we’ll meet in two months...Florence is ready to welcome you!
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The upcoming 23rd annual meeting of the ESC in Florence will introduce several developments and innovations. These include:
(i) starting the conference on Wednesday afternoon with two slots of panels—respectively at 4PM and 5.30PM—before the opening ceremony;
(ii) panels with 5 individual papers; and
(iii) enforcement of the "only one presentation as first author” rule.
This kind of improvement is inevitable as, over the years, conference planning has grown from a relatively complex task to a massive endeavour, owing to an increase in the number of participants and the evolving nature of our presentations. This short article aims to explain the rationale behind these changes, shed light on the challenges and dilemmas the ESC confronts, and, most importantly, it seeks your valuable feedback and comments.

A Shift in Dynamics: The ESC and the Local Organizers

One of the significant changes made recently concerns the dynamic between the ESC and local organizers. Traditionally, the ESC, through its executive secretariat, (a) was in charge of conference registration and (b) maintained a supervisory role regarding the scientific programme or the conference, leaving the abstract submission, panel assembly, and scheduling to the local organizers. The latter are university professors with a varying number of members in their research and administrative teams whose usual tasks are usually far away from organising conferences; they are sometimes supported by companies specialised in that task, but whose efficiency varies. Certainly, each annual meeting taught us a lot about conference organisation but, immediately after each meeting, the local organisers experienced team were replaced by a new one, which would be in charge of the upcoming conference. This organisation also had an impact on the software used for abstract submission, panel assembly and programme building, which also renewed every year with varying quality and functionality results. During the first twelve ESC conferences—from 2001 to 2012—the maximum number of participants was around 800 (see the Annual Report of the Executive Secretariat, in this issue) and this system worked relatively fine. After that—and except for the two e-conferences during the COVID-19 pandemic—the minimum number was always over 1,000 and this organisational structure showed its limitations.

In response to these concerns, the ESC Executive Board decided in 2021 that the ESC should assume control of abstract management, panel assembly, and scheduling. Since then, these processes have been organised by Csaba Györy as Conference Coordinator and Dorel Herinean as Conference Implementer, under the supervision of the executive secretariat. After two conferences in which we tested and evaluated different types of software and collected feedback and comments from the participants, in 2023 we opted for the industry-leading software, Allacademic. This collaboration should provide a reliable and long-term professional solution.
Unravelling the Organizational Process

One of the most misunderstood aspects of our conferences is the extensive preparatory work involved behind the scenes before each organisational step. The real work begins after the final deadline for abstract submission, usually fixed on 15 April, although this year we were obliged to postpone it until 30 April. First, some housekeeping needs to be done: there are at least 10% erroneous or faulty submissions, which need to be corrected from the backend. For the upcoming Florence Eurocrim conference, this represented more than 200 authors that had to be contacted individually by email. This task alone consumes at least a whole week, and some cases may require more time, for example, when the authors do not systematically consult their email.

After that, by mid-May roughly, the reviewing process can really start. Originally this was done by a committee set up by the local organizers. Nevertheless, the multiplication of the areas of expertise covered during our conferences led us to move, in 2020, to a system based on the chairs of the Working Groups as reviewers of their thematic areas, supplemented by members of the Executive Board and, whenever needed, ESC members that are experts on other areas. This contribution is highly appreciated, especially as some reviewers must deal with more than one hundred papers. Once the more than 40 reviewers have finished their work, we can inform the authors of the abstracts about the decision taken and ask those whose abstract has been accepted to register.

Authors whose abstracts have been accepted must register before the early bird registration deadline, which was fixed on 15 June this year. If the paper has several authors, at least one must be registered by that deadline. This is a characteristic element of Eurocrim conferences. Nobody likes arriving at a panel and finding that half of the presenters are absent, and we have learned that the best means to guarantee that is to require registration.

After the deadline is passed, the ESC secretary in Lausanne confronts the list of registrations with the list of authors of the abstracts accepted. This is easier said than done, as registration is not always as straightforward as it may seem. A lot of involuntary mistakes are discovered at this point. For example, some participants register as ESC members or as students while they are not; some send a bank transfer for a slightly different amount than the right one; some are registered by their universities — a process that can occasionally be particularly lengthy — which sometimes originates a single payment for several persons without indicating their names; similarly, some participants use their credit card to pay the registration fee of colleague or partner without indicating their name; or sometimes, in countries that have two or more family names, the latter may not match in both lists. Apart from that, some authors of the abstracts accepted may forget to register or decide — without communicating their decision to us — not to come and, consequently, not to register. The secretary needs to contact all these people individually — that may represent roughly 15 of all authors — a process that is labour-intensive, time-consuming, and requires considerable tact and diplomatic skills from Grace Kronicz.

It is only after this process is finished — and usually with several pending cases of participants whose universities are particularly bureaucratic when it comes to financial issues — can the process of penal assembly start. This is performed by the reviewers mentioned above, usually during the first weeks of July. Following the completion of panel assembly, scheduling can commence, another time-intensive task given the number of panels. This means that the conference program will only be ready in August and implies that the traditional timeline of ESC conferences needs revisiting.

From this perspective, our experience shows that around 10% of the registered participants will cancel their registration before the conference or cannot attend due to an unexpected last-minute problem. If panels are composed of four participants or less, a cancellation means that the panel must be dissolved and the papers distributed in other panels, something that participants really dislike. This is one of the reasons why panels composed of individual papers will now have 5 papers in them — hence, if there is only one cancellation, the panel does not need to be dissolved — and pre-arranged panels must have at least four participants. Another reason for this change is that, with the current number of papers, we would be obliged to start our conferences one day earlier to keep the previous structure. These reasons also explain why we have modified and enforced the “only one paper as first author” rule — previously, it was possible to have more than one presentation as first author if the paper was placed in a pre-arranged panel — admitting only a few justified exceptions.
In sum, the current volume and complexity of work involved in ESC conferences led us to introduce several changes that, hopefully, will help improve their functioning. In addition, there is a need for a revised timeline — from abstract submission onwards — that will be introduced in 2024.

Managing Venue Size

Another growing challenge in conference organisation is the venue. The ESC began as a small familial conference held in university buildings, maintaining much of its intimacy despite considerable growth in the past decade. However, with participant numbers exceeding 2300, we now need venues with capacities that many universities do not have.

Problems arise not only from a lack of suitable rooms but also from financial constraints. Universities are becoming more commercially minded in utilising their facilities during summer months, sometimes charging us — albeit at discounted rates — for the buildings. Also, the politics within and between faculties at the same university often complicate the use of additional faculty buildings.

As mentioned above, in Florence we tried to mitigate this problem by implementing the “only one paper as first author” and increasing the number of papers per panel but, despite that, we are obliged to add two regular sessions on Wednesday afternoon, at 4PM and 5.30PM. These strategies have enabled us to fit the conference within the available space, albeit barely.

This is not a short-term predicament. We expect that future ESC conferences will typically draw more than 1500 participants. Meeting the room requirements without the changes introduced this year could potentially deter small or medium-sized universities from applying to host a Eurocrim conference. This would contradict the ESC’s mission to promote criminology all across Europe, and to support ambitious faculties by integrating them into the European criminology mainstream.

Finding a balance between these competing factors is indeed challenging. Fortunately, we anticipate ample space at our Bucharest conference, providing the Executive Board more time to explore other options and possible solutions to these dilemmas. We remain committed to working with our members to continue improving our conference organisation process, making it more efficient and less strenuous for everyone involved. Your understanding, patience, and constructive feedback are essential in this journey. Thank you for your continuous support!
Criminal Justice and the Ideal Defendant in the making of Remorse and Responsibility


Several members of the ESC’s Working Group on Sentencing & Penal Decision-Making have created a distinctive new volume. It’s about how people who are judged by criminal justice are ‘made’ to appear to approximate to certain ideals to those who judge them.

1. What is the book about?

The book is about the significance of remorse and responsibility in the operation of a variety of criminal justice systems across the world. It shows how at different stages of the justice process there is an implicit model of the ‘ideal defendant’ at work. It examines how this implicit model of the ‘ideal defendant’ works in different ways in different countries.

By ‘defendant’ we mean anyone proceeded against by state criminal justice. So the book examines not only criminal trials and sentencing in different systems but also rehabilitation, parole and restorative justice.

Those brought before the courts, are expected to display certain attitudes towards those courts, their alleged offences and their possible future offending. Specifically, they should demonstrate clear acceptance of their personal responsibility and express ‘genuine’ remorse.

Many defendants fall short of this ideal but they are encouraged by criminal justice practitioners throughout the system to align themselves as closely as possible to it. And they will be evaluated and treated by the system (more severely or more leniently) in the light of their performance of these expectations.

So in practice, remorse and acceptance of responsibility are not objective qualities ‘out there’ to be discovered in particular defendants or particular cases: they are constructed in the criminal justice process through routine interactions between defendants and practitioners. However, this ‘making’ of remorse and responsibility is fraught with cultural misinterpretations and unrealistic expectations.

Yet, it serves an important latent function for the state and for practitioners. Acceptance of remorse and responsibility by defendants signals publicly that defendants acknowledge the legitimacy of their own punishment. This reassures practitioners that the routine coercion of the system does not represent injustice. And it enables the public enactment of an apparently shared understanding between state and citizen after a moment of rupture in their relationship.
2. Why did we write it?
The book is seeking to bring together two bodies of criminal justice scholarship that have developed largely in isolation from each other.
First, there is work on the way that criminal justice practitioners use and apply certain forms of categorisation as a means of sorting and dealing with defendants. These can be social categories (such as gender, race, and social class). There may also be categorization on the basis of state managerial tools (especially risk-management assessments) or performance indicators (such as speed, cost and efficiency). But what part do defendants’ emotions or images of self play in these processes of classification and sorting? These studies largely ignore those questions.
Yet the role of emotion has become central to a vast developing international body of criminal justice scholarship. Part of this attention to emotion has been focused on remorse and its relationship with criminal responsibility. The literature has addressed many important questions: whether remorse affects the tendency to reoffend; its relationship with risk; the feelings of victims; and public attitudes to the role of remorse in sentencing. There is work on whether remorse ought to be a factor in decision-making (particularly in sentencing and parole) and how it relates to philosophical theories justifying punishment. But this body of scholarship has not considered what role emotions like remorse might play in the classification of defendants and their efficient processing by the state.
The book argues that emotions are themselves a key consideration in the categorisation of defendants and have significant consequences for the managerial efficiency of the criminal justice system. If defendants want continued recognition as an individual, as a citizen and as a member of the community, they have to conform to certain expectations about appropriate displays of emotion (specifically remorse and the acceptance of responsibility). But the result may not always be catharsis, healing or even genuine recognition of the unique individual.
So the book investigates the challenges and paradoxes that emerge when emotions such as remorse become part of a system of normalized expectations. It goes beyond the distinct bodies of research on emotion and classification to examine what happens when emotion itself becomes classified.

3. How did we go about doing this research?
The book is a classic illustration of the benefits of international collaboration. Its genesis lay in ESC conferences - specifically sessions in the stream run by the ESC’s Working Group on Sentencing & Penal Decision-Making. This then developed and after winning funding from the Cardiff Centre of Law and Society, we held a two-day International Seminar in Cardiff to workshop the ideas. There were rich discussions over two days of both individual papers and the collective project which involved both authors and a broader audience. The experience and insights feeding into that discussion were truly international with original contributors from Australia, Canada, Denmark, England, France, Slovenia, Scotland, the United States and Wales. Since then, collective discussion and editing has taken place through the modern wonders of digital communication and through the challenges of a global pandemic. Through it all we have been lucky to work with a wonderful editorial, copy-editing and marketing team at Hart/Bloomsbury.
The contents of the book range across different countries and different ways of constructing defendants: we think the book brings something new to established themes and opens new paths for international and cross-cultural research.
We would love to get comments and feedback from readers to continue the discussions and guide those new paths.

For more information...
The introductory chapter sets out the key themes of the book and summarises its individual chapters. It is available open access here: https://bloomsburycp3.codemantra.com/viewer/644929c5f4428a0001a70c49.
Stewart Field is Professor of Law at the School of Law and Politics at Cardiff University, Wales.
Cyrus Tata is Professor of Law and Criminal Justice at the Law School, University of Strathclyde, Scotland.

DISCOUNT CODES
To order this title go to www.bloomsbury.com. To receive your 20% discount use discount code GLR BE1UK in the UK/ROW, GLR BE1US in the US, GLR BE1CA in Canada, or GLR BE1AU in Australia and New Zealand. A note for EU customers: eBooks can still be purchased with 20% discount online.
Barry Goldson and Jenneke Christiaens
ESC Thematic Working Group on Juvenile Justice (TWGJJ)

Not unlike many other ESC Working Groups, Covid 19 served to slow - but not to stop - the activities of the TWGJJ over the period 2022-23.

For the 22nd annual ESC conference that took place in Malaga (21-24 September 2022), the TWGJJ judged and facilitated: six pre-arranged panels; 51 individual paper presentations and nine poster presentations. The TWGJJ had a strong presence at the conference.

A number of members of the TWGJJ attended a special meeting in March 2023 to share research news and prepare for the 23rd annual ESC conference scheduled to take place in Florence (6-9 September, 2023). For the Florence conference, the TWGJJ judged and facilitated: six pre-arranged panels and 30 individual paper presentations. The TWGJJ will again have a strong presence at the conference.

A special meeting of the TWGJJ has been arranged to take place at the Florence conference on Wednesday, 6 September at 10.00-11.30 hours. The TWGJJ continues to maintain an email list that allows members and others interested in juvenile justice to share news of events, new research/publications etc. Colleagues can subscribe to the list at: https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A0=ESC-TWGJJ

Daniel Seddig
European Working Group on Quantitative Methods in Criminology (EQMC)

The European Working Group on Quantitative Methods in Criminology (EQMC) aims to facilitate the exchange and cooperation between researchers focusing on the development and application of quantitative methods in criminology. In this context, the EQMC organizes and disseminates information on developments in quantitative methodology relevant to criminologists and organizes sessions and thematic workshops at the annual ESC conferences. People interested in joining the EQMC may send their name, affiliation, and research interests to heinz.leitgoeb@uni-leipzig.de and dseddig@uni-koeln.de.

Summary of Activities from 2022-2023
- Regular and special interest sessions at the ESC conference in Malaga, Spain, 2022:
  - Measurement Error in Crime Data
  - Understanding the perception-choice process of criminal action
  - Methodological developments in research on recidivism and repeat offending
  - New directions in quantitative criminological research I
  - New directions in quantitative criminological research II
  - Quantitative analyses on the situational action theory
  - Does criminogenic exposure really matter? Examining the situational model in Situational Action Theory
- Organization and CfP for a special issue on “Comparability and Measurement Invariance in Comparative Criminology” in International Criminology
Green criminology – the study of harms and crimes against the natural environment and nonhuman animals – has developed significantly in the past few decades and is now a respected field of scholarship worldwide. So, also in the Nordic countries. Here, I will sketch out some of the research carried out in Scandinavia, with a particular focus on Norway, since green criminology there so far has been given more priority than in other Nordic countries, whether in the form of teaching or research. For instance: for over a decade, a green criminology course (KRIM 2960/4960) has been offered to international students who have come to Oslo to take the course as part of their BA or MA degrees. These are students with diverse backgrounds who choose the course because of their concern for the environment and nonhuman species and to attend lectures held by various internationally recognized scholars. The first green criminology project in Scandinavia was funded by the Nordic Research Council for Criminology and brought together academics from Norway, Sweden, Finland and Greenland. It resulted in a book (Ellefsen et al., 2012), which, much in the spirit of green criminology, included contributions from various fields. The book illustrated that, in order to address the harms and crimes directed at the natural environment and nonhuman animals, a cross-disciplinary approach is required, and that criminology is not the only field in which scholars work based on an increasing concern for the current climate and nature crisis. Green criminology, like other subfields of criminology, pays particular attention to laws, regulations and conventions that aim to prevent unwanted, environmentally harmful behaviour and the effects and enforcement of...
such legislation. This, for example, has recently been the focus of legal scholar Ragnheiður Bragadóttir, who has investigated the enforcement of legislation related to the natural environment in Iceland, and who finds, similarly to the finding in many other countries, that environmental crimes are under-enforced (e.g. White, 2018). While legislation may be in place, the enforcement of such legislation generally seems to lack priority, and is enforced by means of administrative sanctions such as fines which, consequently, have no general preventative effects and remain symbolic (Bragadóttir 2023).

While international research on the harms and crimes of the food sector has progressed, particularly regarding animal husbandry (Fitzgerald, 2010), little attention has been paid to this particular harm in Scandinavia so far (but see e.g. Gålmark, 2008). This is despite the meat industry’s tremendous environmental, abusive and harmful effects, whether concerning the harm done to each animal in a factory farm or industrialised slaughterhouse or the destruction of the rainforest in Brazil. Many people engage in protest against the treatment of animals in industrial complexes, whether they are subject to exploitation for their flesh or for the pharmaceutical industry, and research has focussed on the systems of oppression of those who engage in legal and illegal means to protect animals from harms, e.g. by the research industry (Ellefsen, 2016).

Wildlife crimes and harms have received an increasing amount of attention in Scandinavia, particularly in regard to endangered large carnivores, such as the wolf, and the social conflicts arising due to their reappearance in the mid-eighties, when they became protected under national and international law such as the Bern Convention (1979) and the EU habitat directive (n.d.) (e.g. von Essen and Allan, 2017; Hagsstedt and Korsell, 2012; Sollund and Goyes, 2021). The study of social conflicts caused by how the wolf symbolically is cast as the enemy and the cause for urban-rural conflict is an urgent field of study alongside the rewilding of endangered large carnivores across Europe and the attempts to restore nature and rewild endangered species during the nature crisis (CRIMEANTHROP, 2019).

Wildlife crimes and harms also encompass the legal and illegal trade in endangered species. Norway is a major recipient of wildlife traded through the CITES (n.d.) system (Andersson et al., 2021), and illegally trafficked wildlife (and wildlife products) arrive in Norway regularly, whether as trophies from Africa, ivory figurines, medicinal products or live parrots and reptiles (Sollund, 2019). Like the legal and illegal killing of large carnivores (Lie, 2023), the legal and illegal wildlife trade contributes to species extinction, extensive animal harm and the destruction of ecosystems.

The green criminology research that has been carried out in Scandinavia is multi-disciplinary and critical. It also pictures and reflects similar problems and research in other parts of the world but which are also locally specific, suggesting that while the world as one is living in a crisis of global warming, species loss and pollution, criminologists in different parts of the world must also address the specific problems and conditions of each region.
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I recently travelled to Budapest to take part, as a trainer, in a workshop designed by CEPOL and exclusively dedicated to the fight against environmental crimes being developed in Europe. Participants were law enforcers from different countries, judges and prosecutors, representatives of EUROPOL and OLAF, and many others. The week was packed with work, but I still found the chance to reminisce on the ESC conference that I had attended in that same beautiful city, 10 years ago. I admit I had to search the program of EUROCRIM2013 for what it was that I had presented, as I kept more memories of beautiful bridges and the ever-lasting blue Danube, than of the content I delivered. Both presentations were historical analyses: one was on the birth of Criminology in Portugal, the other on Portuguese criminal policies. Back then I was highly involved – under the supervision of Cândido da Agra – in the historical and epistemological research on (mainly Portuguese) Criminology. I taught about it for years and published some papers but ended up abandoning this particular field of inquiry. However, historical and epistemological research taught me about the importance of analysing social and historical structures and processes, and about the importance of continued questioning of the scientific status of any given discipline – particularly of Criminology, with its fluid frontiers, adaptable concepts, rapidly changing topics and varied methodologies.

Garland (1997) argues that Criminology emerged from the convergence of two parallel endeavours: a scientific project driven by Lombroso and his promise of identifying the “criminal man”; and a governmental, administrative project put forward by states and law enforcement that needed scientific evidence and support for their crime control practices. As Gualco shows in this issue, Lombroso’s initiative managed to put Italy at the forefront of the production of scientific evidence about individuals deemed criminals. And criminological research being developed in Italy is keeping its vitality. Gualco’s piece and the participation of Italy-based criminologists in the annual conferences of the ESC show it very clearly. Simultaneously, Boers suggests that fear of crime may be correlated not only with crime trends but with other social anxieties as well, implying the need for broader political and administrative responses. Moreover, the 2022 secretariat report clearly demonstrates the sheer number of ESC members and participants in its annual conferences, as well as the worldwide breadth of Criminology. The plethora of ESC activities – including awards, EJC publications, working groups – indicates not only the sheer quantity but high quality as well of Criminology in Europe.

In his text, Garland also states that Criminology is contingent, that it may disappear the day the two projects (the scientific and the governmental) cease to be mutually supportive. The numbers proving the ESC vitality, and the experience I had recently at CEPOL, make me confident that there are still numerous fruitful and relevant encounters of the scientific project, promised by Criminology, with the law enforcement and policy-making project, as stated by Garland. Green Criminology and criminologists researching environmental crime, for instance, are particularly well placed to support law enforcement in diagnosing, developing tools
for crime fighting, and assessing outcomes of judicial and cooperation mechanisms, as well as estimating harms and providing support for awareness-raising campaigns. Obviously, there are no “criminal men” recognisable by their physiognomic and psychic traces. Environmental offenders, on the contrary, are frequently networks, groups, organisations and companies, communities, entire societies, or states (Faria, forthcoming). But Criminology is still required to produce evidence on harm production, crime commission and victimisation, as well as to support, improve and assess crime control practices, as Sollund clearly demonstrates in her piece on the current issue.

I am sure that EUROCRIM2023 in Florence will be the perfect venue to bring the ever-growing historical accomplishments of Criminology together with research and reflections that will pinpoint research questions for the foreseeable future of Criminology. I know we are all looking forward to meeting again in September of 2023!
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