Edinburgh 2008: Another Scottish Victory

By Sara Harrop and Peju Solarin

The Edinburgh conference was certainly unique for being held in a Rugby Club! In eight years of ESC conferences we have negotiated building sites, cobbled alleys, columned courtyards, and marbled lobbies in our quest for the often elusive registration desk, but this is the first time we have had to ask directions at a ticket office and squeeze past stand 2 into the Thistle Suite.

People are usually prepared to board a plane to the sunny south but are more reluctant to head to the chilly north. Scotland in general, and perhaps its well-set cosmopolitan capital in particular, have always exuded a certain mystique and exoticism.

However, Murrayfield Stadium, scene of many a victory by the Scots over other European nations, including often, Scottish speakers, chortled, the English, stole the show in early September in a different kind of Scottish one-upmanship.

There is no doubt that this eighth conference of the European Society of Criminology was a roaring success. The stadium proved more adaptable than most listed university buildings. The army of staff had the knack of disappearing into the background only to rematerialise when needed to transform the network of rooms in two blinks of an eye from lecture theatre to break-out room to dining hall to dance floor.

With over 700 participants, this was, along with Bologna in 2007, among the ESC’s largest gatherings. Among the famous Scots were Jurgen Stroebek.

The talking and the dancing (and the drinking and the eating) had to stop. The screens went blank. The flights were called. The criminologists of Europe, like the rugby veterans and theatre-goers of the world, went home and Edinburgh returned to its quieter, autumnal self. ESC 2008 is over and we have been asked to offer our reflections.

Following the 2007 ESC conference in Bologna, Rossella Selmini and Gian Guido Nobili asked whether the large numbers who attended there had been an exception or the signal of a developing trend. The experience of the Edinburgh conference suggests that the latter explanation is plausible. There were 745 registrations—slightly fewer than in Bologna but significantly larger than in earlier conferences. For much of the conference we ran fifteen parallel sessions, and these took place across ten timetabled slots, some 142 sessions in all.

Our reflection on this experience is that ESC represents a maturing conversation. It is one that involves an increasing
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ESC Edinburgh: the Organisers’ Report

By Richard Sparks and Alistair Henry
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ESC in Ljubljana in 2009

By Alenka Šelih

In September 2009 Ljubljana will host the 9th ESC conference. The Slovene Academy of Sciences and Arts, the most prestigious Slovene scientific institution, has decided to support the conference. The other institutions involved are those in which criminology has been developed as a teaching and research discipline: The Faculty of Law, University of Ljubljana, where criminology has been taught since 1930s; the Institute of Criminology at this faculty which has been a research center since the 1950s; and the new Faculty of Security and Criminal Justice
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It is quite common to hear criminologists engaged in discussions about penology, punitiveness, and increased control. I think this is testimony to the sensibility of criminologists who, witnessing an enormous increase in incarceration rates, have devoted energy to trying to explain not only crime but also the increase in punishment.

One of the first counter thoughts to this image of increased punishment everywhere is that it is not a universal phenomenon. This line of reasoning pointed to many countries in Europe, labelled ‘Western Europe’, and Scandinavian countries that did not follow this trend. So the stage was set for discussion of reasons for this relative European penal mildness. This insight has produced many analyses. Those linking punishment systems with political economy (Cavadino-Dignan 2006; Lacey 2008) are among the most influential. The bottom line read something like this: Europe, with its welfare states, is able to restrain the increase in penality happening in neoliberal Anglo-Saxon economies since the 1980s.

Other factors also were emphasized, including for example the influence of the European Court of Human Rights (Snacken 2006), and the role of experts and professionals in guiding penal policy (Tonry 2007). And we have been reminded of the importance of taking account of differences in political cultures (Green 2007) and the role legitimacy might play in mediating punitive attitudes (Lappi-Seppälä 2008).

I am convinced that all these analyses are correct, and I share them. But being an academic I can’t help but pose some questions from the South. The high rates of incarceration in Spain may come as a surprise to people who do not actively seek out comparative statistics on imprisonment rates. Spain now has 157 prisoners per 100,000 population. This is the highest rate in Western Europe. Portugal (103 per 100,000) and Greece (99 per 100,000) also have high rates compared with the rest of Western Europe. Italy (83 per 100,000) fares only a little bit better, but that’s mostly because of a 2006 amnesty that reduced the imprisonment rate by a third.

At least in Spain, the country I know best, one might think the traditionally weak welfare state is responsible for high levels of imprisonment. Esping-Andersen (1990) developed a typology of welfare states that distinguished ‘three worlds of welfare capitalism’ that characterized different European countries. He later refined this typology to include a Southern European group with lower levels of state welfare provision and higher family ties.

Esping-Andersen’s work can be used to analyse the characteristics of southern European welfare regimes and their effects on penalty (mainly on imprisonment rates). Lappi-Seppälä’s (2008) recent analysis comparing imprisonment with welfare expenditures and with income inequality produced a typology of six European regions, one composed of the Mediterranean countries. This is itself a helpful refinement.
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Criminology, as I see it ideally
By Lode Walgrave

These remarks were made by Lode Walgrave on the occasion of his receipt of the 2008 European Criminology Award of the European Society of Criminology.

I am flattered to receive this award, especially because the recognition comes from colleagues, the gourmets of criminology. It really means a lot to me. I do, however, also understand this award to be an expression by the community of European criminologists of appreciation for a certain kind of criminology.

Good criminology, as I see it, has to respond to three criteria: quality, autonomy, and responsibility.

The Intrinsic Quality of the Scientific Approach

We all know the ingredients of the recipe that makes good science: intelligent reasoning, good theorizing, adequate methodology, all based on thorough knowledge of the relevant theoretical models and empirical data. But truly good science is also imbued by wisdom.

In this recipe, adequate methodology is the essential ingredient. It is the key characteristic of all intellectual activity that claims the status of being scientific. But what is adequate methodology? There is a tendency in criminology to reduce scientific methodology to the positivist approach, being quantitative as much as possible. In its extreme form, it comes close to a kind of positivist methodological imperialism.

It is a mistake. No doubt, the very sophisticated quantitative analyses presented nowadays are admirable and deserve great respect. But they have not the monopoly of being scientific and of producing scientific knowledge. Positivist methodology is not objective, as is sometimes claimed; moreover, it excludes fields of research that are crucial for criminological understanding.

Like other social sciences, criminology operates in the real world with a plethora of variations in situations, individual life courses, personalities, experiences, influences, motivations, and prospects, influenced by material, social, economic, and cultural factors and
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European Criminology Award 2008

Professor Lode Walgrave received the 2008 European Criminology Award of the European Society of Criminology in recognition of his lifetime contribution to European criminology. The award committee – composed of former ESC presidents Sonja Snacken (Free University Brussels), Hans-Jürgen Kerner (University of Tübingen), and Kauko Aromaa (HEUNI) – was impressed by the excellent scientific record of Professor Walgrave, his international and European standing as an expert on the topics of juvenile justice and delinquency and on restorative justice, his innovative ideas challenging basic assumptions in mainstream approaches to crime and punishment, his truly European approach and efforts at rallying European scholars into active networks exchanging theoretical and empirical research results, and his influence on criminal justice systems and practices.

Young Criminologist Award 2008

Dr Joris van Wijk received the ESC Young Criminologist award for 2008 for his winning article in International Migration on Angolan asylum-seekers’ migration to the Netherlands.

The award committee consisted of Professor Michael Levi (Cardiff), Professor Elena Larrauri (Pompeu Fabra), and Dr Benjamin Goold (Oxford). The committee was impressed at how van Wijk creatively wove information from five different sources: literature, court files on human smuggling cases, a representative sample of files from the Netherlands Immigration Services, interviews with key informants (such as Angola-specialists, social workers, diplomats and immigration officers), and interviews with Angolan migrants, returnees, their friends, and family members in the Netherlands, Portugal, and Angola.
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Edinburgh is a vibrant and exciting European capital.

The University of Edinburgh regularly features in the top 30 universities in the world in recent rankings.

A lengthy and distinguished history in teaching and research in Criminology and Criminal Justice.

Key areas of interest and expertise include: ‘punishment and society’, youth justice, crime and the media, policing and community safety, surveillance, quantitative criminology and comparative criminal justice.

Committed and highly qualified staff

MSc in Criminology & Criminal Justice (one year full-time/two years part-time)

The programme offers students a strong foundation in criminology and criminal justice in the first semester before moving on to more specialist options in the second. It also provides recognised qualitative and quantitative research training that equips students for further academic research (including our doctoral programme) as well as transferable skills of value in a range of employment contexts.

It is expected that the following courses will run in 2009-2010:

- Theoretical Criminology*
- Criminal Justice and Penal Process*
- Research Skills in the Social Sciences OR
  - Core Quantitative Data Analysis for Social Scientists*
- Criminological Research Methods*
- Intermediate Inferential Statistics
- Media and Crime
- Police and Policing
- Youth Crime and Justice
- Mental Health and Crime
- Gender, Crime and Criminal Justice
- Crime, Justice and Public Policy

Courses marked with an * are core courses taken by all students

For additional information on the MSc, admissions, and scholarships please view our website:
http://www.law.ed.ac.uk/pg/taught/criminology.aspx

PhD in Criminology

Criminology staff welcome PhD proposals in their areas of expertise. Please look at our web pages and contact the member of staff whose interests most closely match your own. For eligible students the MSc/PhD programmes are recognised by the ESRC.

See: http://www.law.ed.ac.uk/pg/research/phdprogramme.aspx

LLM programmes

The School of Law also offers a range of taught LLM programmes in the following areas: Law, Innovation, Technology and the Law, International Law, European Law and Commercial Law.

For further information please visit our website:
http://www.law.ed.ac.uk/pg/taught/

Email: law.pg@ed.ac.uk Telephone: +44 (0)131 650 2010
Criminological Courses at Cambridge

- MPhil in Criminology (9 months)
- MPhil in Criminological Research (1 year)
- MSt in Applied Criminology and Police Management (part-time)
- MSt in Applied Criminology, Penology and Management (part-time)
- PhD in Criminology (full-time and part-time)

The University

The beauty and history of the city of Cambridge make it a great place to study and live. With a worldwide reputation for excellence, the University offers a broad range of disciplines giving students an unrivalled opportunity for interaction and exchange.

The Institute of Criminology

The oldest of its kind in Europe, the Institute has a multi-disciplinary staff and international student body. With its modern premises, the Institute offers students state-of-the-art facilities including access to one of the best criminology libraries in the world.

Main Research Topics

Developmental Criminology; Prisons and Probation; Social Contexts of Crime; Crime Prevention; Experimental Criminology; Offender Treatment; Women and Criminal Justice; Penal Ethics and Penal Theory; Policing; Restorative Justice; Criminological Theory; Sentencing and its Outcomes; Situational Prevention; Mental Health and Crime, and Forensic Psychology.

Academic Staff

Professor Sir Anthony Bottoms; Dr Timothy Coupe; Dr Ben Crewe; Dr Mandeep Dhami; Dr Manuel Eisner; Professor David Farrington; Dr Loraine Gelsthorpe; Dr Adrian Grounds; Prof Andrew von Hirsch; Dr Paula Kautt; Prof Roy King; Prof Alison Liebling; Professor Friedrich Lösel (Director); Dr Katrin Müller-Johnson; Dr Joe Murray; Dr Kate Painter; Professor Lawrence Sherman, Dr Sarah Tait, Dr Justice Tankebe, Dr Sarah van Mastrigt, Dr Heather Strang, and Professor Per-Olof Wikström.

For further information, please visit our website at: www.crim.cam.ac.uk/courses

Tel. +44 (0)1223 335363; Email: graduate.administrator@cam.ac.uk
The initial meeting took place in Tubingen in 2006. The European Society of Criminology, the Centre for Criminological Research, University of Sheffield, and the Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research, University of Glasgow support the working group. The group is primarily aimed at doctoral and post-doctoral researchers in the early stages of their career (up to seven years research experience). The group provides the opportunity for members to present their research, and provides information on publishing work, pursuing academic/research careers, applying for research funding, and working collaboratively. It is interdisciplinary, with members from various departments from across Europe who are involved in criminological research including, for example, law and sociological studies.

The second meeting of the group took place in Bologna and the third in Edinburgh. At the meeting, the co-ordinating committee for the group was finalised. The team agreed to take a number of matters forward to the rest of the group for the upcoming year.

**Aim**

The aim of is to provide a forum to discuss, develop, and collaborate on new and innovative criminal justice research on a European level with other early stage researchers and lead/senior academics.

**Objectives**

- Promote dissemination of information on the research projects undertaken and the methodologies employed by doctoral and post-doctoral researchers in early stages of their careers.
- Establish a communication network among members (e-mail distribution list, dedicated webpage, a regular newsletter).
- Organize sessions at the annual European Society of Criminology meetings which provide opportunities for early stage and postgraduate researchers to present their work and benefit from the experience of senior academics through such sessions as ‘Getting Published’ or ‘Putting Together Research Proposals’.
- To consider further methods of providing tips, advice, support, and dissemination of current projects.
- Gathering support and promoting pan-European collaborations.

**The Website**

The website is currently being updated although you can still access some details at http://www.sccjr.ac.uk/project.php?id=8.

**EPER Online Criminal Justice Database**

The committee were keen to initiate a project that would be of use to members. The group decided to establish an online database of information about the criminal justice systems of each country represented in the working group. Members will provide a brief overview and critique of their own jurisdictions’ criminal justice procedures, including any current issues. It is hoped that this will eventually build into a significant online source of information.

**4th Annual Meeting**

The fourth meeting will take place at the 2009 European Society of Criminology conference in Slovenia. The group plans to invite three members based in Eastern European jurisdictions to present papers. There will also be a presentation from a senior academic.

**The Organising Committee**

- Jenny Johnstone Chair (j.k.johnstone@ncl.ac.uk),
- Jamie Waters Vice-Chair (j.waters@sheffield.ac.uk),
- Matthew Hall Communications/Newsletter (m.p.hall@sheffield.ac.uk),
- Ryan Davenport Network Officer (r.davenport@sheffield.ac.uk),
- Micheal Vishnevsky Recruitment (East Europe) (vishmish1@gmail.com),
- Aiden Sidbottom Peer Review/Contacting Editors (uctqasi@ucl.ac.uk),
- Tanja Link Peer Review/Contacting Editors (link2@email.ukj.edu),
- Matthew Bacon PhD Liaison (lwp07mb@email.sheffield.ac.uk),
- Joanna Shapland Senior Academic Rep (Associate Member) (j.m.shapland@sheffield.ac.uk), and
- Michele Burman Senior Academic Rep (Associate Member) (m.burman@lbss.gla.ac.uk).

**Membership**

Members are doctoral and post-doctoral researchers in the early stages of their career (up to seven years research experience). Associate members are senior academics with experience of leading research projects who want to support the group. Professor Joanna Shapland and Professor Michele Burman are currently associate members of the group.

**Joining the group**

All early-stage European Society of Criminology members are invited to join. Please contact either Lisa Burns at the Centre for Criminological Research, University of Sheffield. E-mail: l.k.burns@sheffield.ac.uk (Phone: +44 (0)114 222 6859) or Jenny Johnstone at j.k.johnstone@ncl.ac.uk with questions or ideas for taking the group forward.
Developmental And Life-Course Criminology
By Arjan Blokland And Paul Nieuwbeerta

The working group organized thematic sessions on developmental and life course topics during the ESC’s annual meeting. There were three sessions of four papers each. Unfortunately, these sessions were not recognizable as such in the general program—which we hope they will be next time—but dates, times, and locations were briefed to working group members prior to the conference.

The field of developmental and life course criminology being broad, sessions included papers dealing with a range of topics (e.g. criminal trajectories in organized crime, risk factors of delinquency in adolescence and assortative mating) and papers on both substantive and methodological questions. One tangible outcome of the working group’s efforts was a collaborative Dutch-Norwegian paper comparing data on offending diversity in sex offenders’ criminal careers.

The working group did not plan an informal business meeting in Edinburgh as it had in Bologna. Several working group members suggested doing so next year in Ljubljana. The working group’s activities will be advertised in The Criminologist, the newsletter of the American Society of Criminology, which we hope will extend the group’s reach beyond Europe.

Plans are being made to organize a symposium or workshop that might be of interest to other EDLC-members. The group now has members from 15 European jurisdictions stretching from Ireland to Armenia and from Norway to Italy. We have also forged links with the Conference Permanente Européenne de La Probation.

At the Edinburgh conference, the working group convened a series of themed seminars. The first explored the histories of community sanctions in Belgium, England, Scotland, and Sweden. Aline Bauwens (Free University of Brussels) explored evidence around the reconfiguration of probation in Belgium. Lol Burke and George Mair (John Moore University, Liverpool) reviewed the 100 year history of probation in England and Wales, asking what lessons can be learned from this history. Fergus McNeill (University of Glasgow) presented initial findings from an oral history of probation in the 1950s and 60s in Scotland. Kerstin Svenssson (Lund University) examined the changing nature of assessment in Swedish social work in criminal justice. The group also learned of experiences introducing the new the national probation system in France. These papers highlighted commonalities and differences in the ways community sanctions and measures have been constituted and reconstituted in different jurisdictions, opening up a range of important questions about what sense comparative penology might make of these different trajectories.

The second session focused on gender, diversity, and compliance with community sanctions, with contributions from Catalonia, Scotland, and Wales. Elena Larrauri (Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona) explored legal and practical problems with the development of educational programs for persons convicted of gender violence in Spain. Gill McIvor (University of Stirling) examined the difficulties that Scotland has faced in struggling to contain the rise in the number of women imprisoned by developing community sanctions. Gill’s focus on the barriers that women face in engaging with community sanctions was further developed by Pamela Ugwudike (Swansea University) in exploring the importance of interactional dynamics in addressing compliance with community penalties. In different ways, all three papers touched on the issues of legitimacy raised by Tom Tyler in his plenary address.

In the third session on ‘Reviving Alternatives to Custody’, José Cid (Autonoma University of Barcelona) highlighted a problem with the use of community sanctions and measures in Spain, where the retubritivist approach to sentencing produces a use of suspended sentences restricted mainly to first offenders, leaving reoffenders vulnerable to receiving custodial sentences because of a lack of rehabilitative provision in the community. George Mair (John Moores University, Liverpool) reviewed the English and Welsh experience introducing the new the...
Edinburgh 2008: Another Scottish Victory

(continued from page 1)

Organiser Richard Sparks of the University of Edinburgh’s Faculty of Law laid initial plans for the conference three years ago but preparations began in earnest in September 2007. Richard is hugely grateful to Rossella Selmini for all her help and advice following the 2007 Bologna meeting.

Arlene Sievwright of Edinburgh’s Office for Lifelong Learning was drafted in to help with the logistics. Richard is hugely grateful to her also—for enthusiasm, common sense, and most important of all, stamina. It is not easy to be courteous and charming after working a 17-hour day but Arlene managed this with flair and ease.

Richard and Arlene also noted the incredible support of key individuals from The Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research, The Scottish Institute of Policing Research, and the University of Edinburgh in the mental gymnastics of fitting the 553 abstracts into 142 panel sessions.

About 30 percent of the panels at any ESC conference arrive ready-made. The others need to be assembled painstakingly to ensure a balanced composition of presentations on similar themes. Inevitably, orphans need to be slotted into the best available space. Once the panels are assembled there follows the juggling act of arranging the timetable so that similar subjects do not run parallel. All this to save participants the misery of gnawing their teeth with indecision about whether to attend a session on juvenile justice in Germany or the deviant youth of Denmark—one can’t imagine the agony involved. Fortunately the one-site feature of Murrayfield helped alleviate a lot of this as one could glide in and out of sessions in seconds!

The panels and plenary sessions were often full to bursting point with late-comers squatting cross-legged on the floor. So the quality of the speakers and the interest of their subject matter must have been deemed high enough for people to want till the evening before slipping off for a wee dram.

We were also pleased to see a large number of high quality posters this year. Past conference organisers have often bemoaned their lack. Several of these plenaries were successfully executed. Of course there were rogue sessions that had one speaker exceeding allotted time, leaving others to exercise their auctioneering skills in the little time available. One victim did amazingly well with his little time, which even had people laughing and applauding. Oh dear, we gave away a clue!

‘I really enjoyed having all the events in one place,’ was a comment heard with gratifying frequency. ‘I’ve never been able to find so may people I was seeking out so easily.’

Richard Sparks reiterated the Murrayfield Stadium’s advantages as a venue. ‘Everything is on one site. There are hotels so close you can walk!’ And if not, there were the ever-efficient buses. ‘Edinburgh is small and easy to get around. There’s also plenty to do. That’s why we didn’t organise any criminological excursions. We thought people would prefer to spend their precious time out exploring the castle or sampling some of the local whiskies rather than visiting yet another prison or drug rehabilitation centre.’

And one would have to agree with the numerous city centre sightings of the classy ESC-blue bags.

To encourage folk to stay around, plenty of alcohol was made available without people needing to venture from Murrayfield’s haven to brave the Scottish weather. Sage Publishing organised a wine reception on the Thursday evening and Famous Grouse provided whisky cocktails on
the Friday while the stadium staff completed the transformation of the lecture room to a dining cum ballroom.

Friday evening, and the conference was drawing to a close. Most participants could relax. Their papers had been delivered. Pulses were back to normal and taut nerves were unwinding. Before a packed auditorium, former ESC president and chairman of the society’s European Criminology awards for 2008, Sonja Snacken presented this year’s awards ceremony.

Elena Larrauri, 2008-09 ESC president, was delighted to introduce Joris van Wijk of the Free University Amsterdam as winner of the Young Criminologist Award 2008. Joris had flown all the way from India to collect his award for his work on human trafficking.

Catrien Bijleveld took the podium for a moving introduction to the winner of the ESC European Criminologist Award, the Catholic University of Leuven’s very own Lode Walgrave. Huge cheers arose as Lode stepped up to make a heartfelt and thought provoking acceptance speech (reprinted elsewhere in this issue).

Friday’s ceilidh was a coup. After three days of sitting in lecture rooms and an excellent dinner of Scotch broth, chicken, vegetables and an unpronounceable dessert, what better way of enlivening body and spirit than flinging yourself with gay abandon into the Gay Gordons! Some seemed a bit overwhelmed at the thought of stripping the willow or swinging their partners.

‘Pero es muy complicado!’ protested a Spanish colleague, shying away from Sara’s proffered invitation to dance.

We wish they had realised that the whole point of Scottish dancing is not to whirl around gracefully showing off your prowess. It is to make a complete idiot of yourself clod-hopping over people’s feet, collapsing in a heap, laughing uproariously, and emerging covered in bruises. Some did it with more aplomb than others, of course. Several gentlemen dressed up for the occasion, looking most fetching in their clan kilts and sporrans.

Although he declined to imitate them, Richard Sparks showed his Scottish naturalisation by proving surprisingly light on his feet and Arlene Sievwright skipped about as only one born to it can. The sight of certain famous professors righting recalcitrant limbs and shrieking with mirth will remain etched on many a retina, further immortalised in celluloid.

The blue white and yellow flag of the ESC now resides in Slovenia. We wish Alenka Šelih and her colleagues in Ljubljana every success with the formidable task of organising the 2009 conference. One thing the Edinburgh organizers mentioned, in retrospect, was that they wished they could have taped most of the conference. Well, that’s that.

Now to Slovenia. They do have a hard act to follow.

Peju Solarin and Sara Harrop

Krzysztof Krajewski and Elena Larrauri

Sara Harrop is assistant editor of 'Criminology in Europe'. Peju Solarin will take over as assistant editor from 1 January 2009.
number of quite committed repeat participants (we have decided to avoid terms like ‘persistent’ and ‘recidivist’ here—though not without struggle!). We suspect that for a quite large number of these ESC is now a key event in the year, and one whose priority in people’s calendars has risen. These repeaters are joined by first-time ESC-conferees, a proportion of whom will return in future and by interested locals who may well not attend other conferences. Naturally the number of the latter will tend to be larger in places where there is a fairly extensive criminological community, comprising researchers, practitioners, civil servants, and so on. We believe that beyond any local contingent factors that may affect participation from year to year (and no doubt some of these did work in our favour) it is the event itself, like the society that promotes it, that has grown and developed.

From our perspective as local organizers all this was reflected in the ways people approached and used the conference—the pre-conference meetings, the working groups, the self-organized panels, and so on. The more active working groups contributed greatly to the coherence of the event, as well as making the local organizers’ lives a bit easier.

This is also registered, albeit somewhat impressionistically, in the informal feedback that we have so far received. Much of this feedback has emphasized the generally high quality of the papers and the focused nature of many of the sessions. We are not trying to claim credit for these, merely to observe that they suggest an event, and a society, that has ‘moved on’.

The Edinburgh conference featured several ‘firsts’. It was the first of these conferences to take place in the UK, not to mention the first to happen in a rugby stadium! Our view is that the venue worked pretty well, even if the initial approach was slightly disconcerting for many. Who knows, perhaps the great sports stadia of Europe are even now bracing themselves for future invasions by hordes of criminologists?

Even if this appears unlikely it does seem clear that certain levels of size and organizational capacity are going to be de rigueur for future conferences. Although the venue may have been a bit unconventional we felt that it did have certain advantages, and that amongst these was a quite strong sense of participation that may have been aided by having most people together in one place for much of the time.

There were a number of minor innovations in Edinburgh. We held four plenary sessions, each with one keynote speaker and one or more respondents. Our feeling was that these worked well, and that the format offered a high degree of focus and connection between the contributions. We were quite pleased with our experiment in extending plenary discussion through the use of a subsequent seminar by the plenary speaker and respondents.

We would like to reiterate our appreciation to all who participated in these sessions: Tom Tyler, Lesley McAra, Loic Wacquant, and Neil Walker as keynote speakers; David Smith, Sophie Body-Gendrot, Sonja Snacken, Katja Franko Aas, and René van Swaanningen as respondents; and Vivien Stern, Ian Loader, and Michele Burman as Chairs.

We are also most grateful to the two ministers in the Scottish Government—Kenny McAskill and Fergus Ewing—who addressed the conference.

Many people become involved in putting together a major event of this kind. We were fortunate in being able to draw on the human (and financial!) resources of the Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research and the Scottish Institute for Policing Research. Colleagues from across Scotland helped us enormously in collating the programme. These include our fellow-members of the local executive committee Lesley McAra and Susan McVie and an ‘extended family’ from a number of universities.

The conference benefited greatly from the energy and commitment of our red-shirted helpers, postgraduate students Ellie Bates, Monica Boyle, Jennifer Fleetwood, Ali Fraser, Stephanie Fohring, Adelle Gardiner, Fiona Jamieson, Katrina Morrison, Ioannis Papageorgiou, Assanee Sanghanate, Denise Smith, and Ashley Varghese, and of course the direction so ably provided by their ring-leader Jackie Palmer.

We were most fortunate in the professionalism of our hosts at Murrayfield, not least their plentiful and excellent catering. Those who stayed to the end were rewarded with
The full Scottish experience in the form of our spirited ceilidh (you had to be there, we decline to attempt to explain this any further) and especially the playing of our excellent band The Thunderdogs.

The University of Edinburgh has supported this event superbly. We are very grateful indeed to the Principal of the University, Professor Sir Timothy O’Shea, and the Head of the School of Law, Professor Douglas Brodie, both of whom greeted delegates at our reception in the magnificent setting of the Playfair Library.

Perhaps above all, the University’s Office of Lifelong Learning provided the two people who did more than anyone else to make the conference work. Bob Carr did terrific work in producing the programme, abstracts, room allocations, and much else. Everyone concerned will surely acknowledge Arlene Sievwright as the real master-mind and presiding spirit of the conference. Arlene’s efficiency, decisiveness, and amazing good humour are now legendary. Thanks again Arlene.

That then is just about the end. We were pleased to welcome so many people to Edinburgh. We hope everyone enjoyed its historic and contemporary attractions. We were glad of the opportunity of telling more people something about the outward-looking, civic criminology that we are trying to develop in Scotland. And we wish our colleagues in Ljubljana every success in 2009.

New Titles in Criminology

Bioviolence
Barry Kellman
The threats and consequences of bioviolence and strategies to help prevent it.
£40.00 | HB | 9780521883325
£14.99 | PB | 9780521709699

Civilizing Security
Ian Loader and Neil Walker
Two leading scholars in the field assess the role of the state in civilizing security.
£45.00 | HB | 9780521871204
£15.99 | PB | 9780521691598

Crime Prevention
Principles, Perspectives and Practices
Adam Sutton, Adrian Cherney and Rob White
This book argues that governments can and should embrace crime prevention as a policy alternative to “law and order”.
£24.99 | PB | 9780521684555

Cambridge University Press is pleased to offer members of the European Society of Criminology a 20% discount on a selection of new and recent titles.
To see a full list of titles available please go to www.cambridge.org/esc
Studies of the University of Maribor which has become known for its ambition and energy.

The conference themes concern the need to reconcile concerns for effectiveness and protection of human rights in relation to crime policy and criminology. These problems seem of general interest to all researchers in the field. They are of special interest in those countries which have recently entered into the group of democratic nations since human rights issues were a driving and mobilizing force for democratic changes in these countries.

The conference will take place in the premises of the Faculty of Law and the Faculty for Security and Criminal Justice Studies in the center of the city.

Ljubljana is a wonderful venue for a scholarly conference. Slovenia emerged as an independent nation after the collapse of former Yugoslavia and has been a parliamentary democracy since 1991. It is a well-developed and stable country with relatively good economic markers: in 2007, its GDP per capita was SUS 28,000 and its unemployment rate was 7.7 percent; 36 percent of the employed worked in industry and 61.5 percent in services. It has a well-educated labor force. A large proportion of its high school graduates continue into higher education.

Slovenia’s geographical position and historical development have made it a crossroads from West to East and from North to South. Having been for centuries a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Slovenia has witnessed enlargement of contacts between its west side, close to Italy, with its east side, close to Austria. The decades when Slovenia was part of the former Yugoslavia (1918–1991) multiplied its ties with the south, especially with Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Serbia.

As a member of the EU since 2004, Slovenia has established productive relations with other member states and participates actively in the community and with its member states.

Slovenia enjoys a privileged place because of the diversity of its regions, countryside, and cities: on its small territory (20,000 square kilometers) one can travel in a short time from the Alps to the Adriatic passing by the region of Carst or from the Panonian plains to the Alps — enjoying at all times varying and beautiful views.

Higher education and research are a top priority of the Slovenian population—unfortunately this is not adequately reflected in government support which has been less than one would wish. There are four universities (and a fifth private one is coming) and a great number of two- or three-year higher education institutions. Research is carried on within the universities—all declare themselves research universities—and in a range of independent public research institutions financed by public funds through an independent agency: The Agency for Research and Development.

The University of Ljubljana traces its origins to the end of the seventeenth century. It was organized as a full university in 1919, and is the oldest institution of higher education. Within the last two years, it was placed among the top five hundred universities in the world on the Hong Kong list; with approximately 60,000 students, it is a huge and lively institution.

Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia with 300,000 inhabitants, is situated in the middle of the country, at the so-called “Ljubljana door”—a narrow low pass from the West to the East of the country. Its origins date to Roman times, when Roman soldiers built here a castrum—a military stronghold on their way from Rome to Vindobona (Vienna).

Because of its geographical position Ljubljana (and Slovenia) have witnessed all the peaceful or violent movements of peoples and armies in this part of Europe. The city is dominated by a medieval castle first used for military purposes and later as a prison; it became finally a tourist attraction with many cultural and other programs.

The old town has retained the baroque architecture which makes it pleasant and enjoyable. At the end of the nineteenth century, its town and the surroundings were devastated by an earthquake – which had as one of the consequences a lot of new art nouveau buildings. One has to emphasize the importance of the contribution of Jože Plenik, the leading Slovene architect of the first half of the twentieth century, who has left a strong impact on the city architecture and atmosphere. Besides being the administrative center of the country, Ljubljana has always been a vivid cultural one: theatre and opera have traditions more than a hundred years long; literature has enjoyed a very special status. Not having a state of their own, Slovenes have always strongly identified themselves with their culture: their language, Slovenian, can be traced in written form to the tenth century. It is a special achievement for a small nation to publish a large number of works of fiction and poetry each year and to translate numerous works of foreign literature. As for the musical tradition, the Slovenian Philharmonic Orchestra boasts a three hundred year-long tradition.

Alenka Šelih will be organising the 2009 conference in Ljubljana.
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by-step account of all moves in the process of constructing data and drawing conclusions. Results and views based on good scientific research are systematically investigated, contextualized, and controllable. They yield data and views that transcend the more limited, short-term-oriented, and biased views that prevail among the uninformed public, electorally vulnerable politicians, and interest-guided practitioners.

But they are not objective. At their best, they may serve for a time as commonly accepted platforms of provisional knowledge for further common reflection, research, and action.

Another problem with positivist methodological imperialism is that it keeps a very important dimension in the crime and insecurity field out of the criminological sight. Abundant good literature documents well that the current feelings of insecurity and the call for harsher punitiveness rest upon deep social, economic, and cultural developments, of which capitalist globalisation forms the basso continuo.

While these grounds of the crime and punishment perception are essential to be investigated by criminological research, it is almost impossible to do this through traditional positivist methodology. That is not a reason for not investigating it. Indeed, limiting the field of research for the sake of one single methodology would be behaving like a person who lost his watch in the dark, but kept searching under the streetlamp because of the brighter visibility there.

Therefore, criminology has to deploy a large scope of research methods, including broad social analyses, historical studies, qualitative empirical approaches, and others. It is necessary to come to a more thorough understanding of the criminological field, and to contextualize, to orient, and to deepen what can be achieved through positivist empirical work.

Autonomy

We are currently living in an era dominated by the obsession with risk, uncertainty, unsafety, and anxiety, which is often projected on fear for crime. Governments are powerless in governing the foundation of these obsessions, which is capitalist globalisation, and try to maintain their legitimacy by focusing on crime problems and giving in to penal populism. They often appeal to criminological expertise. It helps to suggest that governments’ policy is “evidence-based”, beyond debate, as if they cannot but decide as they do, because it is oriented by “objective knowledge.”

Criminologists must be aware that governments use criminology (and other social sciences) as a menu. They choose what best satisfies their political hunger. They select out, or manipulate through selective financing, what they can use to support political options chosen beforehand. Very often, it is not criminology that is orienting policy, but policy that is orienting and canalizing criminology.

Just as embedded war journalists report within the limits defined by the military and accept military statements as truth, “embedded criminologists” work within the limits defined by mainstream populism and accept the government-defined problems as the real ones.

There is nothing wrong with criminology focusing on issues as they are experienced by the public and addressing public authorities. Criminological matters indeed are by definition public matters. There is also nothing wrong with doing research ordered by governments or other public authorities, but minimal conditions must be respected.

First, criminology must work autonomously and base its approach on the full scope of relevant criminological achievements.

Second, governments must accept that criminologists also investigate the wider macro-social, economic, and
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...cultural grounds for the current penal populism and that criminologists also question the punitive apriorism in the response to crime.

Third, criminology must be allowed to address its results not only to governments, but also to the public, in order to feed the democratic debate on how to cope with the existential anxiety and its multi-leveled causes.

If the last condition were not fulfilled, criminology would ground a kind of technocracy. Political options are also a matter of social, ethical, and ideological visions, which must be submitted not to scientific experts, but to the public.

I am fully aware of the populist punitiveness of nowadays, but rather than accepting it as a given, criminology and other social sciences have to do something about it. An "assertive public criminology," as Elliott Currie describes it, should inform the public about strengths and weaknesses of current mainstream criminal policy, its possible consequences, risks, and uncertainties in the longer term. It should also propose the contours of possible alternatives, including their uncertainties. In doing so, criminology can feed the public debate to help overcome the short-term-oriented populist outrages and contribute to a better informed, longer-term-oriented democratic debate among responsible citizens.

In my view, a litmus test of the quality of democracies is the development of autonomous social sciences supported by public authorities, but addressing mainly the public debate.

Responsibility

Academic criminologists do not stop being members of the human community as a whole because they are members of a scientific community.

Criminology is not a laboratory science. It operates in the delicate field where people and social institutions confront each other, where people victimize other people, citizens' rights and liberties are at stake, families are torn apart, and some people are even brought to death. All this is carried out with the use of power, including the risk of abuse of power. Recent developments increasingly position democracy at odds with its own principles: in view of "preserving democratic liberties", it is said, citizens of far away countries can be bombed and home country liberties be diminished.

In such a world, dominated by a ruthless struggle for individualistic power and wealth, criminology cannot just sit aside and count the strokes. Even the option to work within the chalk marks drawn by official authorities and to "stay away from politics" is an ideological and political choice: to accept the problems as they are defined by the powerful and to contribute to the more efficient functioning of the social institutions that preserve the current hegemony.

There is nothing wrong with social and ethical reflection to orient social scientific research, but the reflection must be flanked by good and systematically constructed theorizing and critically guided by high quality empirical research. While it is important to distinguish what we find from what we suspect and hope, social scientists must suspect and hope also, and be clear about their suspicions and hopes.

Conclusion

My concept of quality in criminology includes good systematic quantitative research. But if it were only that, and claimed the monopoly of scientific truth, it would be a kind of charlatanism: it promises what it cannot deliver, while concealing its incapacity in a misty shroud of complicated magic-like processing.

My pursuit of autonomy for criminology does not reject cooperation with governments. But if the only criminology were embedded criminology, it would empty the realm of democratic debate on how to cope with fear for crime and uncertainty, and it would become a technical science of social exclusion.

My plea for a socially responsible criminology does not oppose purely scientific emphases in criminological work. But if it were only that, criminologists would behave like chickens. Chickens lay their egg without concern about how it will be used. Whether used for an omelet, or boiled hard, scrambled, or laid out to hatch, chickens do not care. Likewise, some scientists lay their "egg of knowledge" and do not care how it will be used.

To create more energy or a bomb, to improve living conditions for all or to increase individual profits for the rich, to understand better people in trouble or to provide new labels to justify their social exclusion, these scientists do not care. Their only mission is, they claim, to produce knowledge. Just as the chickens' mission is to produce eggs.

I view criminology's mission as higher than laying eggs.
Epilogue

My ideal of criminology is not the criminology I have carried out. I failed, more than I succeeded. But I tried.

Many of you know that I often refer to Sisyphus, the tragic hero in the old Greek myth. It is told that Sisyphus had the hubris (the arrogant recklessness) to defy the gods. They punished him by imposing on him an everlasting burden: to push a huge rock up a steep hill. But each time the top was almost attained, the rock rolled back, and Sisyphus had to start again, in a cycle that will last until eternity.

It is intriguing that Sisyphus continues his ceaseless task. One possible explanation is that he goes on out of fear for death, which would follow if he did not. The desire for life is stronger than the aversion to meaningless effort. Another answer is however that Sisyphus keeps pushing the rock because of hope. If, deep down, he did not keep some hope that he will some day reach the top, he would accept death. It is typical that all artists represent Sisyphus while he is pushing the rock up, and not in the most frustrating phase, looking at the rock rolling down and walking back to resume once again the endless effort. The key to the myth is pushing up the hill.

Both dimensions are symbolic of the human condition. We all are driven by the intrinsic unquenchable desire to reach the ideal, while knowing that we can never reach it completely. We are condemned to keep striving towards the highest possible achievement, because if we did not, deterioration would be unavoidable. Continuously trying to do better is the only way to avoid degradation into much worse.

Scientists continue pursuing objective facts, while they cannot but discover subjectively what is ‘out there.’ Liberals argue for maximal liberties for citizens, but using these liberties unrestrained would lead to catastrophic social relations. Philosophers and jurists search for general principles of justice, knowing that justice cannot be but an imperfect human construction, provisional and one-sided. But still, if we did not continue pursuing the ideals, the opposite of the ideal would be to drown. If scientists gave up their ideal of objectivity, they would sink into impressionist results with no added value; if rights and liberties were not defended, enslavement would follow; if justice was not pursued, injustice would be the rule. Pursuing an ideal of criminology, while knowing that we will never reach it, is a Sisyphean task.

I thank the members of the committee that awarded me the European Society of Criminology’s European Criminology Award for their leniency in overlooking my many failures, when the rock was rolling down, and for focusing on my tentative efforts to push the rock up the hill of ideal criminology.

Community Sanctions Working Group
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Community Order and the Suspended Sentence Order in April 2005. Peter Raynor (Swansea University) set these new developments in the context of lessons that could and should have been learned from the various attempts to develop alternatives to custody in England and Wales in the 1980s. In different ways, these papers revealed how the broader political and legal contexts of attempts at reform of sentencing (and with it community programs) sometimes produce unintended consequences—for better and worse.

The fourth session turned to examining current developments in Europe. Kristel Beyens (Free University, Brussels) discussed the development of electronic monitoring in Belgium, highlighting the initial development of the ‘Belgian model’ characterized by a careful selection procedure, attention for social support, and close supervision (so called ‘activation penitentiary model’) but also a more recent destabilisation of electronic monitoring. Ester Blay (University of Girona) examined the law surrounding and use of community service in Spain (particularly Catalonia), noting that recent reforms intended to increase the use of community service have exacerbated existing and serious problems of implementation. Crucially, community service sentences have not substituted for prison sentences. Ioan Durnescu (University of Bucharest) presented findings from a recent 32 country survey of community sanctions and measures in Europe commissioned by the CEP (a pan-European association of probation organizations). Ioan noted that, despite the pressures for penal reconfiguration, one of the main features of community sanctions and measures in Europe still seems to be their use for social reintegration of offenders, as well as promoting public safety. Once again, the session highlighted the complexities of developing and reforming community sanctions and measures – and the complexities of interpreting these changes within and across jurisdictions.

These and other themes will be further explored at the next meeting of the working group which will be hosted by the Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research at the University of Glasgow, Scotland, on April 24th-25th, 2009. This seminar will explore theoretical and conceptual issues at the ‘macro’ level; explore comparisons between systems and practices at the micro level; and explore community sanctions in the jurisdiction hosting the each meeting – Scotland. The meeting will also provide opportunity for members to continue discussions about the development of comparative research projects of varying sorts.

Anyone wanting information about the group please contact Fergus McNeill (University of Glasgow) on +44 (0)141 330 5075 or F.McNeill@lbss.gla.ac.uk
President’s Message
Continued from page 2

However, since Lappi-Seppälä understandably does not specifically focus on the South, we lack an understanding of what causes the big differences within the Southern European group and between the group and other European regions.

Other questions also arise. Could it be, for example, that different welfare regimes have an impact on public opinion? It is quite surprising to look at the EU ICVS 2005 and see that punitive attitudes in Spain and Portugal are among lowest in Europe. This raises a challenge for explanations of increases in punishment that focus on public opinion.

The role of experts in the shaping of penal policies also may have a distinct southern flavour. Things that might be important in English speaking countries, for instance the participation of experts (especially professional judges and some form of parole boards), may not play a big role in southern countries, which already have these. However, the participation of experts independent of political parties may be crucial in societies with a recent authoritarian past.

Conversely, if attention is focused on legitimacy and its impact on incarceration, it may be that the authoritarian past and its heritage—including lack of public data and transparency, of democratic participation, and of a public service ethos—produce low levels of legitimacy, which may produce pressures to increase it through penal toughness gestures.

I often find it frustrating that data and case studies of penal policy almost never come from Southern European countries. It is frustrating not to be able to find your country when lists and typologies are done, because this seems to exclude us from all these interesting discussions.

Of course, my aim is not to blame the researchers. This situation is attributable to the lack of a criminological tradition in some of the southern countries. In any case, analyses such as these I have mentioned are useful in themselves because they point to lines of research in our societies. I hope the questions posed by the South can enrich analyses being produced elsewhere in Europe. This is among others the task of the ESC, to facilitate this sort of comparative work. Long life to ESC.
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The article tried to answer the questions why and how Angolan asylum seekers migrated to the Netherlands since the end of the nineties. It showed that they were opportunity-seeking migrants, rather than survival migrants.

Most made no use of typical human smugglers during their travel. They rather used assistance from their social network and made ad hoc use of the services of middlemen; so-called ‘esquemas’. Van Wijk argued that ‘archetypal’ large smuggling organisations in Angola have not evolved because highly informal social networks fulfil these functions for them.

Support is found that both push-pull and social network theories can contribute to explaining (irregular) (asylum) migration.

Elena Laurrauri presents Joris van Wijk with his award
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