Presidential address, by Klaus Boers
Conference report, by Csaba Györy
ESC European Criminology Award: Laudatio by Letizia Paoli and Acceptance Speech, by Mike Levi
Young Criminologist Award: Introducing my research on prisoner deaths, by Philippa Tomczak
In Memoriam: Cristina Rechea Alberola, 1944-2022, by Rosemary Barberet, Raquel Bartolomé & Esther Fernández-Molina
Open Call for Associate Editors for the European Journal of Criminology, by Kyle Treiber & Beth Hardie
EUROCRIM2023: The Renaissance of European Criminology, By Barbara Gualco
Working group reports:
• European Working Group on Organized Crime and Criminal Networks
• ESC Rural Criminology Working Group
• ESC Working Group on Crime, Criminal Justice and COVID-19 pandemic
• ESC Working Group on Restorative Justice and Best Academic Article on Restorative Justice Prize
Dossier: Researching Green criminology in Europe, by Lieselot Bisschop, René van Swaanningen & Karin van Wingerde
Farewell, by Csaba Györy, former Editor-in-Chief of Criminology in Europe
Editorial notes, by Rita Faria, Editor-in-Chief of Criminology in Europe
President KLAUS BOERS
President-Elect JOSEP M. TAMARIT-SUMALLA
Past President CATRIEN BIJLEVELD
Executive Secretary MARCELO AEBI
Journal Editor KYLE TREIBE
Newsletter Editor RITA FARIA
Member FERNANDO MIRÓ-LLINARES
Member BARBORA HOLA
Member INEKE HAEN-MARSHALL
Member JOSE BECERRA
(organiser of the 2022 annual meeting)
Member BARBARA GUALCO
(organiser of the 2023 annual meeting)

Communications should be addressed as follows

To the president:
Institut fuer Kriminalwissenschaften – Kriminologie
Universitaet Muenster – Rechtswissenschaftliche Fakultaet
Bispinghof 24-25   D-48143 Muenster, Germany
Email: boers@uni-muenster.de

To the business office:
University of Lausanne
ESC-ICDP-Sorge-BCH
CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
Phone: 41 21 629 4638
Email: secretariat@esc-eurocrim.org

ISSN 1729-8164

Criminology in Europe is published by the European Society of Criminology.

Web www.escnewsletter.org

Editor RITA FARIA

Editorial office:
School of Criminology
Faculty of Law – University of Porto
Rua dos Bragas, 223
4050-123 Porto, Portugal
Email: editor@newsletter.org

The European Society of Criminology is a scientific institution founded under the Literary and Scientific Institutions Act 1854, a statute of the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

For advertising and marketing queries, including advertising on the Newsletter website, please contact the editor.
Dear colleagues:

For our 2022 annual conference in Malaga – the first ESC conference held in person after the pandemic lockdowns – we can congratulate and thank us all. More than 1,850 participants came to Malaga from Europe and from all over the world. And the conference was a great success, for several reasons:

1. It was very well organized by the local organizers headed by Anabel Cerezo and José Becerra, as well as by an ESC team composed of Csaba Györy and Dorel Herinean who, with the help of the chairs of our working groups, took care of the scientific programme and the conference app.

2. The plenary talks under the general conference headline Challenges and Opportunities in a Virtually and Physically Connected Europe: The Need for Criminology were inspiring. Those on crime and crime control through digitalization and machine learning— together with the panel sessions on these topics— were particularly up to date.

3. The programme represented the whole theoretical and empirical spectrum of criminological research with 1,541 sophisticated presentations— many of them by young scholars— distributed in 436 panel sessions. It proved, again, that our 34 Working Groups are the backbone of our society’s scientific discourse.

4. We are still enjoying an amazing attendance motivation. As Michael Tonry pointed out in his address for the Distinguished Services to the ESC Award: During session time, the halls and coffee and cake spots are abandoned, while the seminar rooms are well attended.

When the Board members met online in late February and March to write down the Society’s Declaration condemning the Russian war of aggression against the people of Ukraine (http://www.esc-eurocrim.org/index.php/activities/news), we hoped that Russian leaders would not succeed, and that the suffering for civilians and soldiers would not last long. The first hope became true up to now through the unbelievable courageous resistance of the Ukrainian people and the international support. Regarding our second hope, we have come to realise that the war and atrocity crimes will continue further on, at least quite far into 2023. In the meantime, the ESC will continue providing fellowships for Ukrainian criminologists to attend our conference.

For our science, these developments— that are not limited to Eastern Europe— are a call to put more emphasis on macro-criminological research, particularly on war, atrocity crimes, and state crimes. In that perspective, ESC members are already getting together, particularly through the ESC Working Groups on Atrocity Crimes and Transitional Justice (see Hóla et al., 2022) and on Organizational Crime (see Van Erp, 2015). In addition, the creation of a thirty-fifth working group has just been approved by the Board on a traditional macro-topic that somehow was still missing: the European Working Group on Organized Crime and Criminal Networks.

Our Society is growing fast. The conference in Malaga was the most attended ever. In 2019, just before the pandemic, we had 1,436 participants in Ghent; ten years
ago, in Bilbao 2012 we had 792 and, in 2004, we were 509 in Amsterdam (see the graphs in the Annual Reports of the ESC Executive Secretariat published annually in this Newsletter). The number of ESC members grew parallelly, and in October 2022, we were more than 1,700. This growth is fantastic and proves how wise it was to constitute the ESC in 2000 to “bring together, in one multi-disciplinary society and on a European level, persons actively engaged in research, teaching and/or practice in the field of criminology” (ESC Constitution, Section 1 a)

Such growth, however, also means an increasing challenge for the local conference organisers. It is not as easy as it was before to find sufficient halls and rooms at walking distance on a non-expensive university campus, and to set up a programme with over 1,500 presentations in more than 400 panel sessions. Consequently, the ESC will support the local organisers through a conference coordinator and a conference implementer that will deal with the assembling of the scientific programme and the conference app. These positions will be filled, respectively, by Csaba Györy and Dorel Herinean, who, with the support of the Executive Secretariat, already took care of the programmes of the 2021 virtual meeting and the Malaga conference. We are happy that they will continue to bring their competence and experience to this core piece of a successful scientific conference.

The organisers of the upcoming conference in Florence (6–9 September 2023), headed by Barbara Gualco, are already doing a great job. The plenary programme is set up under the general topic The Renaissance of European Criminology, and all available venues in a fantastic urban and historical environment are reserved and were visited by the ESC Board during its October meeting. It is no secret that for the Florence conference, one can expect a similar number of participants as in Malaga. This also means that in the panel sessions, we will regularly have four presentations, and in some of them, we might even have five.

Finally, we would like to thank our colleagues Alek-sandras Dobryninas (past president), Olga Petintseva (elected Board member) and Lieven Pauwels (organiser of the conference in Ghent), whose mandate on the Bard ended in September. And we welcome our new Board members Josep M. Tamarit (president-elect), Ineke Haen–Marshall (elected Board member), Andra–Roxana Trandafir (organiser of the 2024 Bucharest conference), and Rita Faria (new editor of the Newsletter). Many thanks go to Csaba Györy, who edited the Newsletter so carefully since 2011, and who will continue to serve the society as its conference coordinator.

The Board wishes you all the best and hopes to meet you again in September in Florence.

Yours, Klaus Boers


I have always been wondering why the ASC never does a conference in Miami Beach. Certainly not for the lack of accommodation. I think now I have the answer. Waking up to the sound of the waves of the Mediterranean and the smell of the salty sea breeze mixed with the smoke of wood-fired ovens in neighbourhood restaurants, it took some self-encouragement to don a jacket and a conference badge as opposed to shorts and take the long bus ride out to the university building instead of the short walk to the beach. But soon I realised the sea and the conference is not either-or. One never leaves the sea in Málaga: it is in the air everywhere, and it can come unexpectedly come into view at any turn; it was there for a morning run before the conference and was there in the middle of the night when I returned.

In many ways, the geographic setup was perfect: a beautiful city right on the sea, ficus-shaded grand avenues and meandering streets, medieval fortresses, the smell of tropical flowers, and bustling restaurants and bars, combined with a venue still within easy reach, but far enough from all this temptation for the participants to hang around at the venue for most of the days. It also certainly helped that Spanish university cafeterias serve better quality food than many fancy restaurants in our respective countries, with a decent wine or beer to match. Drinking during lunchtime on a workday would be an interesting comparative anthropological study; in some countries or regions, it is shunned; in others, it is a fact of life. The fact that this habit is an obvious part of the Spanish way of life also clearly helped the conversations going on during lunch breaks.

I would not say it is due to this daytime fun, but Spain is an absolute record breaker: already 3 ESC conferences have taken place in Spain (with exactly 10 years between them): first Toledo in 2002, then Bilbao in 2012 and now Málaga in 2022. In any case, the ESC and its members clearly seem to have an emotional attachment to Spain. The conference was a record breaker (yet again): almost 2000 participants came to Málaga at the end. The combination of such an attractive city and post-covid hunger for academic conferences certainly played a role in this record: after years of holding classes via Zoom or Teams, recording Panopto lectures at home while holding screaming or bored kids at bay, who would not have wanted to reconnect with colleagues under the Mediterranean sun? However, the trend of growing participant numbers clearly is still there and might force the ESC to make some changes in a few years if it does not want to say farewell to university buildings and move the conference to some dreadful convention centre.

In Málaga, space was not a problem. Plenty of simple, functional rooms were available in the main building and the surrounding area to house everyone comfortably. It is a question of personal taste, of course, but I prefer such simple, no-nonsense functionality over opulence at a conference venue. I also especially liked the architecture, the rooms that managed to be full of light but without the direct sunlight, and the shady courtyards, places to mingle and socialise.

The opening ceremony started with a timely call for a European-wide victim survey for our outgoing president, Catrien Bijleveld. Then the mood turned more sombre as the presentation of Caroline Fournet drew attention to Russia’s aggression on Ukraine, and the war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide suspected to have been committed (or sadly, more precisely put, being committed) in the course of it. Russia’s brutal war, and its human and societal consequences, which at this time are still hard to fathom, will occupy many members of our Society for many years to come.

The evening was concluded with a wonderful reception in the magical Botanical Garden, where participants wandered on moonlit paths, reconnecting with each other after the long covid years.
The next day, the conference easily settled into its usual rhythm: people buzzing around between venues or engaged in intense discussions in the cafeteria. The size of the conference was not necessarily visible due to the clever allocation of panels and venues. The only sign that gave this occasionally away was that in some thematic areas, such as prisons or environmental criminology there were so many panels that the area ran out of panel time slots, and parallel sessions had to be held.

The primaries were also particularly interesting, taking us out of our comfort zone and facing fundamental challenges criminological thinking is facing, for example, how the virtual space is changing criminality and our perception of it (Rita Haverkamp) or how climate change is affecting many “traditional” form of criminality, such as violent crime (Ellen van Damme).

This year, the European Criminology Award was presented to Mike Levi from Cardiff. For one of the founding members of the ESC, who is also a former board member and conference organiser, on top of being one of the most globally recognised names of European criminology, the award was clearly well deserved. Mike started talking about corporate crime when it was an obscure backwater of British criminology, occasionally populated by transient Marxists who believed there was little use in studying it as it could not be addressed until we torch capitalism in its entirety. Fifty years later, it is a booming field of criminology in Europe, and Mike has a significant role in this development. Corporate crime is also booming, but our generation of criminologists is much better equipped, both theoretically and methodologically, to understand it (though our theoretical sophistication is not exactly a solace for the average citizen, who tends to pick up the bill for the harms caused). But hardly any articles will be written about it without reference to a certain “Levi, M.” Popping up in the bibliography. In his characteristically witty and self-deprecating speech, instead of congratulating himself for his own greatness, Mike offered a thoughtful reflection on how the field has changed and where the white spots remain – clearly a marching order for future generations.

The fact that we had so many participants from the Global South was another very positive development at the conference. While many of such participants were from Latin America due to various Spanish and Portuguese cooperation projects, my impression was that the door had been opened in this regard. This might also be something that the ESC should encourage, with a special fellowship program, for example, for criminologists coming from countries outside the Council of Europe.

The farewell dinner was a fitting conclusion to the conference. Each farewell dinner is a unique experience, and this one also was one clearly delivered: as the sun set over the Mediterranean, an intimidating number of tapas was served, and the wine flowed freely. Those not initiated into tapas culture might have filled up merely an hour into the dinner; those who took a more strategic approach to feast on the first six-seven dishes were rewarded with a comprehensive tableau of Andalusian specialties. As if chefs, not being able to decide which dish to cook from the Andalusia cookbook, ended up cooking all of them. It is not a surprise that after such a feast, the party went on, first at the venue, then in town.

I myself got home well after 6 am. I stood for a while at the window, glazing at the sea, turning from mute grey to deep blue as the sun rose behind. Suddenly, a group of people walked past under by window on the promenade, gesticulating wildly and excitedly talking over each other. They all still had the ESC conference badge on their neck. What can be a better testament to a great conference than that?
Letizia Paoli

Laudatio of Prof. Dr. Michael Levi for the European Criminology Award of the European Society of Criminology

There are multiple reasons to explain why Michael Levi — or Mike, as we all know him — fully deserves the European Criminology Award of ESC. Since 1980s he has been the criminologist — certainly in Europe but probably also worldwide — who has most persistently and systematically investigated fraud, corruption and money laundering. These economic crimes — and in particular fraud — have presented a significant challenge to criminal justice and regulatory systems for centuries, but the advent of mass internet banking and shopping at the start of this century made them the most common type of crime for gain. Unlike drugs and other illicit markets, they have not attracted much crime control expenditure from governments, nor have they led to a massive expansion of the prison population anywhere in the world. Yet it is now acknowledged in the media and in the policy and practitioner spheres, as well as by many criminologists that this is an important area of criminal activity, generating huge economic and social costs, and raising questions of elite social impunity and legitimacy as well as insecurities about cybercrime in many parts of the world.

Michael Levi has attempted to fill some major gaps in our knowledge and understanding of these phenomena and of the ways in which they are controlled — generating fresh data, producing innovative theorizing and rigorous empirical analyses, and offering much — needed policy guidance. His substantial oeuvre of books, articles and research studies has contributed significantly to both academic and policy development in a European and indeed global context, always focused on European evidence, but using American, Asian and Australian data for comparative insight (for a full list, see https://www.cardiff.ac.uk/people/view/38041-levi-michael).

Among the most significant theoretical contributions he has made in a range of difficult fields, perhaps the greatest was to create in his 1972-5 doctoral research ‘routine activities theory’ avant la lettre. His thesis was then shortened and published as The Phantom Capitalists: the Organisation and Control of Long-Firm Fraud (Levi, 1981). His study related patterns of bankruptcy fraud to the business cycles and to both the standard and explicitly counter-fraud efforts of business credit controllers, from the mid-19th century onwards, relying on interviews with fraudsters, police, tax investigators and liquidators, as well as credit control agencies. Mike showed the dynamics of the ‘Arms Race’ between fraudsters and target victim companies/third party credit rating agencies. In particular, he revealed how many white-collar fraudsters could evade police actions, which were — and 50 years later still are — largely focused on ‘usual suspects’, i.e., those the police view as ‘organised criminals’. The book was republished in a revised and expanded second edition in 2008, which also received much praise (Levi, 2008a).

His fifty-year long research on fraud also constitutes one of Mike’s most significant empirical contributions. In a
string of articles, books and reports, he has described and explained the organisation and control of a range of frauds (from elite kleptocrat and corporate executive embezzlement to more banal, such as credit card fraud), including how the proceeds of crimes are handled and how frauds are informally and formally managed by potential victims (business and individuals) and by the criminal justice and state regulatory systems (e.g., Levi, 1981/2008a; Levi, 1987/2013; Levi et al., 2017).

Another important contribution to the literature on fraud and broader white-collar crime research has been his work on (a) jury decision-making in complex fraud cases (Honess et al., 1998, 2004) and (b) sentencing and other sanctioning in white-collar crime cases. Some paradoxes explored in his past and ongoing work in this area (starting from Regulating Fraud, Levi, 1987 — republished in 2013) include the lack of service given by the police to businesses that suffer frauds, the lack of follow up to reported suspicions of money laundering, and the difficulties experienced by citizens and victims in finding individuals and corporations to hold accountable for social harms. Michael Levi argues that this is attributable less to public perceptions of economic crime seriousness than to police and political resistance to shifting their finite resources to new areas that require different skill sets and relationships.

Michael Levi’s theoretical and empirical work has not been restricted to fraud. In areas that are often ideology and rhetoric-rich but evidence-light, he has enhanced their evidence base among others by:

1. Scoping the extent and examining the pattern of the organisation of serious crimes for gain (for example drugs, fraud and money laundering), including the contribution of ICT (cyber) and of professionals such as lawyers and accountants to this process (e.g., Levi, 2008b, 2021; Levi and Soudijn, 2020; Middleton and Levi, 2004, 2015);

2. Describing clearly and evaluating the impact of terrorist finance and money laundering controls and proceeds of crime confiscation on fraud, drugs trafficking environmental crimes and terrorism (e.g., Levi and Osofsky, 1995; Levi and Gilmore, 2002; van Duyne and Levi, 2005; Levi and Reuter, 2006; Levi, 2018a, 2018b, 2020; Levi et al., 2018);

3. Assessing the costs of cybercrime in the UK and worldwide and the costs of organised crime in the EU (Anderson et al. 2019 and Levi et al. 2013);

4. Analysing, explaining and critiquing the global trends in money laundering, its controls and the latter’s effectiveness (e.g., Halliday et al., 2014, 2020). A recent article of his on money laundering (Levi, 2020) won the best article prize from the Asian Criminology Society.

More generally, Mike’s work is extensively cited and has received significant scholarly attention and praise. In 2013 he was given the Distinguished Scholar Award by the International Association for the Study of Organized Crime; in 2014 he was awarded the Sellin–Glueck prize by the American Society of Criminology; and in 2019, he received the Outstanding Achievement Award from the British Society of Criminology; the Gilbert Geis Lifetime Achievement Award, Division of White-Collar and Corporate Crime, ASC; and the Lifetime Achievement Award in the first (and highly competitive) Tackling Economic Crime Awards, based on his contributions to policing and fraud prevention. In 2020, he was granted the Anti-Corruption Excellence Award for academic research and education.

Given his multi-faceted and unique expertise, it is no surprise that Michael Levi’s analytical skills have been sought by numerous governments and international organizations, including the UK Home Office, the Council of Europe, the European Commission & Parliament, Europol, the World Bank, World Economic Forum, and the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. His work on public-private partnerships in fraud and money laundering has helped to re-orient thinking in the UK, EU and internationally in the direction of deeper relationships between the State and the private sector, and to collaboration within the private sector, while noting the limits to information-sharing imposed by organisational rivalries and different national attitudes to data protection. He also helped shape the first Home Office Organised Crime Strategy, introducing an innovative and courageous focus on harm and, through that strategy, Europol’s initiatives on organized crime. Alas, that was before Brexit!

While these are the serious, main reasons for granting Mike the ESC’s most prestigious award, there are two other less academic ones that I would nonetheless like to mention. The first of these reasons has very much to do with the qualifying adjective of our association. We are the European Society of Criminology. Testifying to such a spirit, Mike has not only sat twice on the Board of our Society, coordinated the organization of the 2017 ESC Conference at Cardiff and participated in almost
all ESC Conferences. Over the years he has also made an impressive effort to learn a few words and make small talk in at least 10 European languages. Considering that Mike’s native language is English, the lingua franca of contemporary academia, this effort is even more remarkable — and worth a special appreciation, as it demonstrates his great humanity and kindness.

Last but not least, I’d like to mention Mike’s fantastic irony and wit. It is a pleasure to listen to him or read his texts not only for the important topics he discusses, his analytical acumen and valuable findings but also for his frequent quips and more or less explicit jokes. To give you a better idea, I would like to share my preferred quotes with you. I still remember that the first paper of Mike’s I read was entitled ‘Pecunia non olet: Cleansing the money-launderers from the Temple’ (Levi, 1991). This was one of the very first analyses on money-laundering control worldwide and its title contained not just one but two jokes!

For years I have been citing Mike’s presentation of organized crime as a ‘psychiatrist’s Rorschach blot’, ‘whose attraction as well as its weakness is that one can read almost anything into it’ (Levi, 2002: 887).

Most recently, my preferred quip has come from an article on the impact of fraud that Mike coauthored in 2008 with John Burrows. In such article Mike and his coauthor consider whether the costs of responses to crime should be included in the estimation of the costs of crime. They argue against it because otherwise “the less that is done about them, the lower are the “costs of crimes””. Winking, in a footnote they go on: ‘This consideration prompts new questions—such as whether victimization surveys should be defined as a cost of crime’ and then crucially (for us all!) they ask: ‘indeed, should the production of this paper and the whole of the criminological estate be thus included?’ (Levi and Burrows, 2008: 294).

Well, I hope that being labeled as a cost of crime does not weaken your enthusiasm in congratulating Mike for his outstanding work and for the important award bestowed on him!


In labelling theory reconsidered (1973), Howard Becker apologetically observed that he never meant to develop a theory: he only meant to ‘illuminate things formerly obscure’. That would be an achievement beyond many of us, let alone a reason to apologise. I would be happy if that was my achievement. I have a clear recollection of listening to Robert Mitchum’s comments after John Wayne got a lifetime Oscar – “Well John has been in the movie business for 40 years and this is the first time he has won an Oscar. I think that speaks for itself.” I have been more fortunate than John Wayne in my awards (but not in my riches), but principally I have been fortunate

1. First, in finding an area or, more accurately, a set of connected areas in which few scholars had worked before;

2. Second, in feeling free from my PhD subject onwards to pursue what interested me and might interest others (though for initial decades, few academics actually were interested); and

3. Finally, having supportive family and friends.

I feel fortunate too to still be interested by the still unresolved and perhaps unresolvable issues that stimulated me 50 years ago when I began my PhD – the ambiguities and overlap between white-collar and organised crime, both of them ‘floating signifiers’ in Levi-Strauss’ terminology; trying to understand how criminals organise themselves and develop their skills; and the evolving social, commercial and criminal justice controls that they confront, and how these impact on criminal behaviour. I feel lucky even though the complexities of keeping up with these criminal and crime control landscapes keep me chronically over-occupied.

The private & public sector components of the anti-fraud, anti-money laundering and anti-organised crime complexes, and how they vary over time and between societies are a suitable object of study in themselves. But these ‘control waves’ also are (or should be) considered to be part of the routine activities model which ‘produces’ crime, and the interaction between controls and the variable supply of ‘motivated offenders’ to different sorts of economic crime continues to preoccupy me, though RAT (or as I prefer to call it, RAM – for Routine Activities Model rather than Theory) did not exist as a term when I started out and indeed started to use this ultimately commonsense set of concepts beautifully developed by Marcus Felson.

Many have argued that criminology is a rendezvous subject, which was meant to be condescending but can be rephrased as a multidisciplinary subject, which sounds a great deal nicer but is just the same. Pre and within-covid, a range of criminologists got absorbed in trying to map the fall in crime and then the impact of covid on crimes of varying kinds. I have contributed to those questions too in relation to cyber, fraud and corruption in procurement. But it remains challenging to work out the counterfactuals if covid and our concrete reactions to covid like lockdowns had not happened. This will be a good preparation for the next pandemic, which surely will come in my lifetime unless the ‘Ndrangheta get to me first for failing to show sufficient respect.

We criminologists find ourselves increasingly specialised, but I do not accept that being interested in situational crime prevention means you cannot be interested in whether more or fewer people try to commit crimes and why, or in what ideologies and practical interests drive those shifts in control, policing and sanctioning. Everywhere, there are struggles between populist politicians and criminologists to get ‘our truth’ out there.

It should be the focus of more criminological comparisons that the EU focus on ‘proportionate, dissuasive and effective’ sanctions or penalties applies to Google (fine
reduced last week to €4.1 billion from €4.3 billion, but still a small percentage of annual profits of $76 billion in 2021, Google earned more than $61 billion in advertising revenue, mostly from online search and its video platform, while its cloud business grew to $5.5 billion in revenue) as much as it does to street and household crimes. But *administrative* Google penalties or the administrative, civil & more rarely criminal penalties of elite bankers and politicians are seldom considered by penal theorists, even though Google is a daily component of almost every household represented here at this ESC conference, and what bankers, industrialists and politicians do affects the environment and our energy prices, internal and transnational migration, etc.

Indeed, in Grande Stevens & ors v Italy 4 March 2014, the ECHR held that when deciding what is and is not a criminal penalty, sanction severity shall be considered, and serious sanctions shall be deemed to be criminal as far as procedural guarantees and ne bis in idem are concerned, whatever their formal label. (This avoids the issue of what a severe sanction is for a company or ultra-rich individual.) Though some governments mistakenly construct and persist with an image of ‘neighbourhood crime’ that excludes cyber-enabled frauds and Internet of Thing attacks, they are simply wrong in denying the bare necessities and routine activities of contemporary life.

One issue that continues to puzzle me is how we can rationally decide what constitutes proportionality (to what? Both harms and culpability?); to what extent and in what contexts there is a tension between dissuasiveness and proportionality of penalties, and the lack of specification in ‘effective’, at what? So (assuming that what they did contravened EU Competition Law), what would it take as a minimum sanction or persuasive act to stop Google exploiting its market advantage? If that involved no jail or company liquidation, or some other ‘significant’ restrictions on doing business, would it be seen as fair and legitimate by us and/or by the general public? Likewise, with fines (plus civil compensation?) on Boeing for its disastrous homicidal speed in bringing the Boeing 737 to market without proper preparation and communication of risks. But we cannot focus on *everything*: we need to look at the different species of trees as well as at the forest.

Of course, in the latter half of the 19th century, deception was nearly all offline (except via newspapers and by mail and magazine/poster advertisements). There were very few telephones, let alone VOIP or the sort of What’s App scammers who messaged me this month pretending to be my daughter who had had to change her phone number and asking me to send 3k to a West African name at an account which I worked out belonged to Barclays Bank. I even received another text scam here from someone pretending to be my child. From the same source? Who knows, and who will investigate? Who would have investigated if I had fallen for it? That’s easy: no-one, except perhaps in South Korea. There is a huge spectrum from elite businesspeople and politicians, through Farrall and Karstedt’s ‘Respectable Citizens’, Paoli’s organised crime networks, blue-collar opportunists, and ‘professional enablers’ like company formation agents, lawyers and accountants who may not commit crimes themselves but consciously or far less consciously assist others to commit fraud, launder money, etc. This is why those who would seek to control contemporary transnational organised crime soon run up against the structures that have been created to sustain contemporary global capitalism. This does not mean that there are no longer divisions between white-collar crime, organised crime, cybercrime and money laundering: but it does mean that the Venn diagrams of the denotation of those constructs need to allow for substantial overlap, and this overlap is a dynamic process over time and place. To the extent that the overlap is *not* dynamic, this is because the police (and some academics) do not develop intelligence sources much outside drugs, and they do not call specialist teams of fraudsters ‘Organised Crime Groups’. Analysing their formal and informal control should keep me busy till I retire or die, whichever is the sooner. US Senator Ben Wade was once asked his opinion on heaven and hell. Well,” said Mr. Wade, “I think, from all I can learn, that heaven has the better climate, but hell has the better company.” Appropriately, the first reference for this phrase I can find was in 1885, Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction! Given my interest in charity fraud, that seems appropriate. Perhaps an ESC in Malaga or Florence might combine both good weather and good company?

Perhaps the future requires a new lexicon, like ‘*serious crimes for gain*’, which I tried out a couple of times instead of ‘organised crime’ chapters in the Oxford handbook of criminology but has not caught on – maybe because it lacks cultural bite. We remain tribal – hence separate streams in criminology conferences like white-collar and corporate crime, organised crime,
cybercrime, human trafficking etc.: these do represent 
gestalts in how we see our primary orientations, and we 
cannot attend all the sessions that we might be interest-
ed in, so we might use my category SERIOUS CRIMES 
FOR GAIN as a higher level organising principle.

‘Crimmigration’ is not my specialist subject, but on what 
rational basis governments think that like King Canute, 
they can stop the tide of illegal migrants by communicat-
ing the message that if they fail to evade detection, they 
may eventually get sent somewhere else less desirable 
than Europe is an interesting example of the triumph of 
wishful political thinking over evidence. Smugglers of 
migrants to the UK now sometimes tip off the police be-
fore the crossings start, as it makes the migrants safer! 
Perhaps this is part of a rational harm reduction strategy 
on their part, in conformity with Greenfield and Paoli’s 
new book.

In my view, we need to follow George Orwell and con-
tinuously deconstruct & call out mis-labelling such as 
‘modern slavery’ & ‘human trafficking’ to describe the 
high-priced smuggling of voluntary migrants to our 
countries unless they really are kidnapped or conned. 
(They may be seriously exploited afterwards even if they 
are voluntary migrants.) If people are financially or sex-
ually exploited in a gross way beyond the routine levels 
prevalent in capitalist economies, then we should find 
another word to describe that, like ‘exploited’. But few 
are involuntary migrants or modern slaves in the sense 
that Jews and others were in Nazi times, or the Uighurs 
are in China today.

We are in an era of ‘truth decay’ as well as mostly volun-
tary privacy decay, in which celebrities’ obsession with 
self-advertisement of their holidays (or wholly neces-
sary public knowledge of soccer fixtures) help to ad-
terise their absence from home, and may make high 
value burglaries and robberies more likely. Paid ‘Influ-
encers’ are used to advertise dodgy cryptocurrencies 
and crypto platforms both on posters and social media, 
and regulators need to consider better ways of protect-
ing the public from their own gullibility, unless we adopt 
a tough attitude to victim’s rights and to their own ‘vic-
tim precipitation’. At the moment, it seems to be mainly 
financial compensation by media outcry, which is not a 
consistent ethical basis for distinguishing between de-
serving and undeserving victims, though it makes it so-
ciologically interesting.

I, Peter Reuter, Melvin Soudijn, Petrus van Duyne and 
some others present at the conference such as (alpha-
betically) Katie Benson, Nick Lord, Hans Nelen, Michele 
Riccardi, and Antoinette Verhage, have been conduct-
ing for some years a campaign to inject a more evi-
dence-based logic into the actions of the Anti-Money 
Laundering complex. (It sounds like a psychoanalitical 
construct, but thousands of lawyers, accountants and 
bankers benefit from rather than suffer from this com-
plex.) So far it is not obvious what the positive effects of 
our efforts have been, other than to give more analytical 
voice to those from the political left and right who see 
it as a symbolic rather than instrumental enterprise of 
crime control. But one thing I would highlight is the ten-
sions this generates between unrestrained finance cap-
ital and national/transnational attempts to govern the 
crime-stimulating consequences of free movement of 
illicit capital; and also whether the sheer cost in money & 
civil liberties is worth the so far undefined crime control 
benefits and what could be done to reduce those costs 
without losing the benefits. Once established, however, 
this constitutes a mass of jobs mandated or pressurised 
by governments and regulators, all of whose personal 
financial interests lie in the perpetuation of the system.

Nicholas Taleb of ‘black swan fame’ argues that we 
should not take notice of academics and others who 
have ‘no skin in the game’. This is a provocative but 
sometimes obnoxious position, since he does not ac-
knowledge enough that those with ‘skin in the game’ 
might have a vested interest in keeping it going, and 
sometimes it takes people from the outside to tell the 
Emperor that his clothes are offering less protection 
than he claims and/or believes.

The rhetoric around AML also leads in some countries 
to the use (mainly by the left, but also some law enforce-
ment) of terms like ‘professional enablers’ to stand for a 
range of lawyer behaviours from willing or blackmailed 
accomplice/ ‘Mr.Big’ to simply doing their job in regis-
tering businesses. As someone who grew up in the age 
of labelling theory as a critique of the control of ‘crimes 
of the powerless’, it is intriguing to see the pro-trans-
parency NGOs adopting similar tactics against the pro-
fessions, and using simplistic activity measures like ‘too 
low’ (how high is enough?) prosecutions and regulatory 
actions/penalties to assert that they are doing nothing 
to stop money laundering or Grand Corruption. If your 
professional activities are private, and there are profes-
sional secrecy obligations towards clients and people
you reject as clients, it is hard to defend yourself against such allegations (though that does not mean they are unfounded). So as you can see, there is plenty of quantitative and qualitative research and even thinking to keep us busy for some time.

I was one of the original founding group of the ESC and I am comfortable in being labelled as a traitor to Brexit, even though no one has hitherto applied that label to me. This award delights me both for itself (for who among us is truly without vanity?) and because the timing of it reflects 50 years of work since I started my PhD on the organisation and control of an obscure type of bankruptcy fraud that crossed both white-collar and organised crime. I am one of the lucky ones who followed what interested me and continue to do so.

Of course, much of my working life, like that of many of yours, is also filled with less interesting tasks. But compared with my father, who left school at 14 and either slept by the side of his tailoring bench or walked five miles home, and my mother, who got polio in the epidemic of 1913 aged 8 months and never walked unaided, my life has been pretty good, Covid notwithstanding. My father’s ancestors may have been driven out of this region by the Spanish Inquisition, and he was fortunate to be released from a camp and to get to England weeks before World War 2, unlike the rest of his family, who died in Germany. Before coming to England, my mother’s parents fled poverty and pogroms in rural East Prussia and then what is now the Russian enclave of Kaliningrad. So mine is a very European story, at least for a significant number of Europeans, even if, as David Baddiel has explored in Jews Don’t Count, Jews seldom feature in discussions of oppressed ethnic minorities today.

As the first person in my family to have any higher education – I never met anyone with a PhD until I went to university – my parents (as well as I) would be delighted and not a little surprised at this honour. I remain legally and spiritually ‘European’ and it is a particular pleasure and honour for me to receive this European Criminology Award. There remains much for all of us to discover, explain and – if we wish and can – to act upon. I hope I shall be around for a bit longer to contribute to those tasks, but I am very confident that they will outlast me. Criminology in general, and the areas in which I have worked in particular, is a never-ending story.
I was delighted and most grateful to receive the 2022 European Society of Criminology Young Criminologist Award in the beautiful, sunny city of Malaga. This was a real highlight following the long pandemic pressures and isolation that we have all experienced. I am most grateful to the award panel and the Society, along with Professor Mary Bosworth and Dr Cathie Traynor who kindly helped me to develop the article before publication. My award-winning article fuses my core research interests: prisoner deaths, prison regulation/oversight (seeking to steer imprisonment rates and conditions) and the regulatory functions of voluntary organisations/NGOs. It can be read here: Tomczak P (2022) Reconceptualizing multisectoral prison regulation: Voluntary organizations and bereaved families as regulators. Theoretical Criminology, 26(3): 494-514.

I am particularly passionate about stimulating further scholarly and practical attention to prisoner deaths and prisoner death investigations around the world. This article forms a ‘call to arms’, seeking to stimulate pan-European (and beyond!) scholarly attention to these long-overlooked yet vital topics that are, too frequently, a central part of the experience of imprisonment.

Since 2015 when I started studying prisoner death investigations, I have become increasingly concerned about the numbers of prisoners who die year on year around the world—despite being almost totally dependent on the state whilst imprisoned. The UN estimate that prisoner mortality rates are up to 50% above those in non-imprisoned populations, yet there is a real lack of scholarship on prisoner deaths, a topic which should be of central concern for criminologists. We simply do not know how many prisoners die each year globally. Available data are likely substantial underestimates due to undercounting and tendencies to count only deaths occurring physically within prisons. Nor do we fully understand how this issue disproportionately affects prisoners marginalized in terms of e.g. race, gender, disability, foreign national status or pretrial detention (Tomczak and Mulgrew, 2022).

Each prisoner death is problematic in its own terms, but the effects extend far beyond those individual bereavements. Prison deaths can cause (enduring) harm across stakeholder groups including prisoners, bereaved families, prison staff and death investigators, and negatively affect staff wellbeing, staff absence and prison regimes. Prisoner suicides can also lead to further deaths through a phenomenon known as ‘clustering’, potentially compounding the harms, costs and risks of each individual death. ‘Clustering’ can occur due to changes in prisoner behaviour, prison regime disruptions and changes in staff practice, including increased fear and risk aversion after each death (Tomczak, 2022). As I highlight in the award-winning article, unsafe prisons not only imperil the health and well-being of prisoners and staff, but also reduce safety outside.

Prisoner health and prison social climates are positively correlated with reoffending rates and prison health is public health (see Tomczak, 2021). Each year, reoffending in England and Wales costs more than £18.1 billion, while creating new harms daily, such as trauma and absence from work (Newton et al, 2019). Link et al (2019) explore
how poorer prisoner mental and physical health correlate with higher reoffending rates by influencing employment, family contact, financial problems and crime. Auty and Liebling (2020) demonstrate that higher moral, relational and organisational quality of prison life supports better outcomes for prisoners upon release. Globally, around 30 million people are released from custody annually, so prisons are a vector for (community) transmission of infectious diseases, which disproportionately impact marginalised communities (Kinner et al, 2020).

I have extensively studied the series of investigations that follow prisoner deaths in England and Wales, which are almost always undertaken by the police, Prisons and Probation Ombudsman and Coroner. Although prisoner death investigations are mandatory under international law, and are almost always undertaken by multiple bodies, the only account of the full investigation process that I have come across is my own, which is obviously geographically limited and also forms my earliest work on this issue (Tomczak, 2018).

Whilst I will continue to study prisoner deaths and death investigations myself and with my research team, that is insufficient for the scale of this universal issue. I am open to collaborate on comparative studies or studies from other jurisdictions. Moreover, I have provided an introduction to this vital issue and some references to my own publications that I urge you to disseminate to other interested scholars and students. I would be more than happy to assist studies in other jurisdictions if I can be useful and can be contacted at Philippa.tomczak@nottingham.ac.uk or @PhilippaTomczak.

Philippa Tomczak is Principal Research Fellow and Director of the prisonHEALTH Research Group, University of Nottingham, UK


IN MEMORIAM:

The European Society of Criminology mourns the passing of Cristina Rechea Alberola on June 26, 2022, in Valencia, Spain. She was a Founding Member of the ESC and a Board Member from 2000-2002, organizing the second ESC Conference in Toledo, Spain in 2002. We, her friends, colleagues, and mentees, write this obituary in her honor. Cristina was born in Valencia in 1944. A psychologist by training and expert in visual perception, she obtained her doctorate at the University of Santiago de Compostela, where she continued her academic career and obtained her Cátedra (full professorship). In 1990 she transferred to the University of Castilla-La Mancha in Albacete for a second career in criminology. There, she was a founding director of the first Master’s Program in criminology in Spain.

Dr. Rechea led an active research agenda, attracting local, regional, national and European funding for projects on juvenile delinquency, women and crime, and victimology. She became the founding director of the university’s Criminology Research Center in 1999. Her first projects were on crime measurement, which she believed was essential to establish an empirical tradition in Spanish criminology. Thanks to Cristina, Spain was included in successive waves of the ISRD (International Self-Report Delinquency Study). Cristina was a strong believer in collaboration and partnerships and gave her time unselfishly to many projects. A curious and generous scholar, she organized many seminars and conferences on diverse topics and was an advocate of professional associations. She also loved to host scholars from other countries and welcomed graduate students from abroad. She was a founding member and the first President of the Spanish Society for Criminological Research in 2008 and received its highest award, the Rafael Salillas Award, in 2008. After her retirement, in 2017 she received an award from Fundación Diagrama for “professional commitment” noting her “inestimable and extensive research on juvenile delinquency, opening up new areas of psychosocial analysis and avenues for research at the European level that have led to a significant improvement in psychosocial and socio-educational interventions that occur in this field.”

Dr. Rechea remained in Albacete until her retirement in 2015, having developed both graduate and undergraduate degrees in criminology, and having mentored many young scholars, particularly women, who thrived under her unwavering encouragement and sound methodological guidance. She had directed 18 doctoral dissertations in her career, 12 of which were during her time in Albacete. Cristina was a loyal and indefatigable defender of our discipline throughout her career and long into retirement. Her latest projects were editing a collection of criminology textbooks in Spanish for Editorial Síntesis (https://www.sintesis.com/criminolog%C3%A9-Da-354/) and acting as an advisor to organizations and foundations related to criminology, such as Fundación Atenea and Fundación Fiadys. She was so active in retirement that we had to clear our topic for her libro homenaje (Festschrift) with her so it would not compete with books in her collection. A pioneer in Spanish criminology, she will be a model for young scholars for years to come. Fluent in French and English along with her native Spanish, and appreciative of different perspectives, she embodied the values of the ESC. She leaves behind...
many former students and friends who will never forget her.

Rosemary Barberet is Professor of Sociology at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, City University of New York, New York, USA

Raquel Bartolomé is Associate Professor of Psychology at the Department of Psychology, University Castilla-La Mancha, Albacete, Spain

Esther Fernández-Molina is Associate Professor in Criminology and Criminal Law at the University of Castilla-La Mancha, Albacete, Spain

Selected works of Cristina Rechea Alberola are below. We also note the research methods book edited in her honor upon her retirement, with chapters by former students, colleagues and friends: (1) https://www.uclmtv.uclm.es/la-fundacion-diagrama-distingue-a-la-uclm-con-uno-de-sus-galardones-profesionalidad-y-compromiso; https://youtu.be/kHAaCYuuOTs


In recent years the European Journal of Criminology has seen a steep rise in submissions, which cover a wide range of topics relating to crime and criminal justice. To support an effective and efficient peer review process, Associate Editors (AEs) have become a key asset of our Editorial Team. We are currently seeking new AEs and are inviting applications. We hope to attract a wide range of applicants from early career to established scholars who want to be involved in shaping European criminology.

THE ROLE OF AN AE

AEs are integral to the peer review process. They play a vital role in shaping and supporting that process, following papers from submission through to final decision. An AE’s main responsibilities are to determine if the new submissions they are assigned are suitable for peer review and to recommend suitable reviewers; the Managing Editor then invites and follows up with reviewers (a detailed explanation of an AE’s responsibilities can be found here). AEs provide insights on assigned papers and their reviews and revisions, as needed to support the decision process. All of this is managed entirely through the online SAGE Track system (training is provided), with support from the Managing Editor. We aim to maintain a team of six AEs, each of whom can expect to handle one or two papers per month, though these will not always be evenly distributed across the year. Papers are assigned to AEs by area of expertise as much as possible, while balancing all the AEs’ separate workloads.

AEs also discuss review processes with the EiC, meeting as an Editorial Team to discuss matters relating to the journal (remotely; approximately every two to three months). Together with the EiC and the Managing Editor (along with support from SAGE), AEs help shape the peer review process, the publication experience, and the quality of the papers published in the journal.

Along with the experience of working with international scholars on the European Society of Criminology’s flagship journal, AEs are remunerated with access to SAGE publications and have their registration fees covered for the European Society of Criminology Annual Meeting. AEs gain experience with the publishing industry and the peer review process, are exposed to a wide range of international scholars and scholarship, and receive the satisfaction and professional recognition of contributing to a fundamental part of the dissemination of criminological knowledge.

PRACTICALITIES

We are looking to diversify our team, ensuring wide representation of different areas of expertise, regions of Europe, and levels of experience. We welcome any applications. Presently, areas of expertise we are particularly interested in are: policing, psychology, prisons, sexual offending, cybercrime, crime and place, transnational crime and terrorism, and social scientific methods (qualitative and/or quantitative).

Following an initial settling-in period, the role is for two years, though often extendable to four years depending on interest and availability. To apply, please send a CV and brief cover letter to the Managing Editor at ejc@crim.cam.ac.uk explaining your area of expertise and reasons for interest in joining the Editorial Team. You may also contact us if you have any questions regarding this call. Decisions will be taken based on suitability for the role and fit with the current Editorial Team; please indicate if you are happy for us to retain your details for consideration at a later date when additional positions become available.
Florence, one of the most beautiful and visited art cities in the world, is an open-air museum, was placed in the UNESCO’s World Heritage List in 1982. The Historic Centre of Florence attracts millions of tourists each year.

In the fifteenth-century Florence, a self-governed, independent city-state with a population of 60,000, became – with its writers, painters, architects, and philosophers – the cradle of Renaissance culture. Renaissance shifted mankind into the centre of the known cosmos and humankind became its measure.

Florence’s museums, palaces, and churches house some of the greatest artistic treasures in the world. The most popular and important sites in Florence to visit are the Cathedral, the Baptistery, the Uffizi, the Bargello, the Accademia and the Opera del Duomo. The churches of Santa Maria Novella and Santa Croce are true art galleries, and the library of San Lorenzo is a magnificent permanent exhibition of Michelangelo’s architectural genius. Here you can wander in some of the oldest streets in the city until you reach the Arno River, cross the Ponte Vecchio and experience the “newest” area of Florence, the Oltrarno. You can also spend a day at
the Boboli Gardens or climb the hill to the church of San Miniato al Monte to experience an enchanting view over Florence.

Due to Florence’s artistic and architectural heritage, it has been ranked by Forbes as one of the most beautiful cities in the world.

With such relevant philosophical and scientific inheritance, with its beautiful Mediterranean climate, good and healthy food and great shopping, Florence is the ideal place to host the 23rd Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology, which will take place 6 – 9 September 2023. The submission deadline is 15 April 2023 and all participants of accepted submissions have the be registered for the conference by 1 June 2023.

The plenary speakers are voices from Europe and other continents, and include Georgia Zara and Laura De Fazio from Italy, Fernando Miró-Llinares from Spain, Jianhong Liu from Hong Kong, Paul Knepper from the USA, and Klaus Witold from Poland.

As the local organizer I’m honored to be able to host the ESC annual conference and look forward to a large attendance that I’ll go out of my way to accommodate. Florence is ready to welcome you!

USEFUL INFORMATION

Congress Venues
Palazzo dei Congressi & Palaffari
Piazza Adua, 1
50123 Florence

Palazzo dei Congressi is a historical venue hosted inside the 19th century Villa Vittoria. This building boasts a prestigious congress hall, the Florence Auditorium, opened in 1969.

Palazzo degli Affari, located in front of Palazzo dei Congressi in Florence, and just a few steps away from the main railway station of Santa Maria Novella, this venue faces a centuries-old park, with rare and original trees and plants. Opened in 1974 and planned by architect Pierluigi Spadolini, Palazzo degli Affari is a modern, flexible, and multifunctional venue.
The site of the **Educatorio di Fuligno** is located just a few steps away from Palazzo dei Congressi. It is one of the many institutes that, in 14th century Florence, offered assistance and hospitality to those in need and it is now a cultural centre for formation and education.
Recently, the new European Working group on Organized Crime and Criminal Networks was established. Organized crime and organized crime groups are major societal problems, as they cause serious damage to communities and society at large. They do not only directly threaten the security and livability of society but also systematically undermine – even at the local level – the formal and informal foundations of the rule of law and civil society. Members of organized crime groups, despite representing a small share of total offenders, are responsible for a disproportionate amount of serious offending. In light of the relevance of the topic, organized crime research by scholars in Europe (and beyond) has been blooming since the early 1990s. However, until recently, a European Society of Criminology Working Group on this research topic was still absent.

The goal of the working group is to bring together young and more established researchers, facilitate research on organized crime and criminal networks, and create opportunities for further collaboration. The working group welcomes researchers interested in any organized crime-related topic, including, but not limited to, production and trafficking of illegal goods (e.g., drugs, firearms, waste, wildlife), money laundering, human trafficking, illegal governance, mafia-type organizations, outlaw motorcycle gangs, and criminal networks. We pay attention to offenders’ criminal careers, co-offending networks, modus operandi of organized crime groups, impact on society, reactions and approaches (regulation, law enforcement) to organized crime, and policy discussions.

The activities of the working group will include the organization of thematic panels at the ESC annual conferences, arranging pre-conference meetings between members of the working group, and fostering collaborative work on edited volumes and special issues of scientific journals. We will organize our first panel sessions and social meeting at the next ESC conference in Florence.

We encourage all ESC Members with an interest in organized crime and criminal networks to join the working group, share their expertise, and contribute to building a research network in this subject area. We hope that our working group will also stimulate young researchers to join and learn/share about the various studies and methodologies in research on organized crime and criminal networks. If you are interested in joining or would like to know more about the working group, please contact the chairs Sjoukje van Deuren (s.van.deuren@vu.nl) or Cecilia Meneghini (cm2130@cam.ac.uk).

Kreseda Smith & Artur Pytlarz
ESC Rural Criminology Working Group

Following two years of restrictions, and the establishment of this Working Group in such difficult times, Artur and I have been overwhelmed by the success of the Working Group panels at the recent Malaga conference. Despite only being established in 2020, we hosted four panels, with fifteen presentations and many audience members coming to listen to our speakers. The panels represented the broad and open approach we have taken to all aspects of rural criminology, with papers ranging from female rural arsonists to ghost marriage in rural China. It was an amazing representation for our first in-person conference as a Working Group.

As a result of the Working Group establishment, Artur and I have become involved with the 14th Biennial International Conference on Criminal Justice and Security in Central and Eastern Europe organised by Prof. Gorazd Mesko. I am a plenary speaker, Artur sits on the organising
panel, and the Working Group are co-organisers of the conference. This conference takes rural and urban safety and security perspective beyond the European lens and considers how this can be achieved in coordination with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. This is an exciting link that the Working Group is building.

Further future direction for the Working Group include, initially, expanding our membership list across Europe and beyond to coordinate discussion and collaboration with researchers on all things rural crime and security. This will allow us as a community to be best placed to identify and explore emerging trends in rural criminology, such as the increasing role of technology in crime prevention, but also offending, and the changing nature of rural crime in light of global geo-politics. Some of these topics were touched upon during our conference presentations, and so provide opportunity for further development.

Stefano Caneppele, Christine Burkhardt & Gian Maria Campedelli
ESC Working Group on Crime, Criminal Justice and COVID-19 Pandemic

Since the beginning of 2020, the world was confronted with the spread of COVID-19. The repercussions of the health crisis itself and the implementation of emergency measures were many and diverse. Health and safety challenges, as well as lifestyle changes, have affected different aspects of crime and the criminal justice system (e.g., police, courts, prisons, and probation). This exceptional historical period has prompted many researchers to analyze the evolution of the crisis originated by the pandemic and its consequences from different perspectives. During the online ESC conference in September 2020, several researchers presented papers related to the COVID-19 pandemic. This raised the idea of the ESC Working Group on Crime, Criminal justice, and the COVID-19 pandemic (WG CCJC). The group, established at the end of 2020, aims at facilitating research and dissemination of findings, and at encouraging collaborations across Europe. Among its specific objectives there are: a) Examining to what extent crime and the criminal justice systems have been affected by the COVID-19 crisis; b) Promoting knowledge and research on this topic among European researchers; c) Establishing comparative research across Europe; d) Creating a network for information exchange, findings dissemination and international collaboration; e) Organizing regular meeting between the working group members as well as a specific panel at the ESC annual conference. As with any other ESC WG, the WG CCJC is open to all ESC members who are involved or interested in research projects related to crime, criminal justice, and the COVID-19 pandemic. If you like to join the working group, please send an email stating your name, affiliation, and a brief description of the research project you are working on to wg_ccjc@unil.ch. Currently, 40 scholars from all over Europe joined the group and presented their work in thematic panels at the Eurocrim 2021 and Eurocrim 2022. For these first years, the group is co-chaired by Stefano Caneppele and Christine Burkhardt (University of Lausanne) with the support of Gian Maria Campedelli (University of Trento).

By the end of 2020, the Working Group has been active through meeting and dissemination activities. A website, hosted at the University of Lausanne, provides an update about our members concerning the news, research projects, publications, and scientific events. At least twice a year, we organize meetings to prepare the organization of prearranged panels.

For the 2021 ESC online conference, a total of 6 panels were presented under the CCJC section, comprising 21 presentations including topics on the impact of the pandemic on online frauds, corruption, policing, probation, and the correctional systems in several EU countries.

For the conference, we also produced two working papers that conducted systematic reviews on Covid-19. The first one investigated the main academic findings on crime trends and police published in English between February 2020 and July 2021 to review the time period investigated, the geographic area, the data used, the analytical strategies and the results (Jaccoud, Burkhardt, Caneppele, 2021). In total, we identified 128 manuscripts. Concerning crime trends, most of the results confirmed the drop and the U-shaped recovery for property crimes and street crimes in general while cybercrime and domestic violence seem to have increased during the lockdown. Concerning the police, it played an important role in ensuring that government health guidelines were enforced. The public’s trust in the police rose at the beginning of the crisis but the rise was only temporary. After the easing of the health guidelines, this trust declined as the police were still required to enforce some rules. The second review undertook a mapping of the ongoing projects related to COVID-19 (Ribeiro, Burkhardt, Caneppele, 2021).
This research aimed to identify, using different keywords, all current projects carried out in English, French, German, Spanish or Portuguese. To be selected, the project had to (1) focus on the impact of COVID-19 on different areas of criminology, (2) be carried out in one of the five languages mentioned, and (3) be conducted by a legitimate research organization. Our results highlight the research question, the periods and geographical areas covered, and the methodologies used. In total, the keywords chosen were able to report on 68 projects in progress in various fields of criminology, such as prisons, policing, domestic violence, or cybercrime.

For the 2022 ESC conference in Malaga, a total of 11 panels with 48 presentations were held under our Working Group on a wide range of topics related to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on crime and the criminal justice system.

For the next months, we work on other events. In February 2023, we are planning a hybrid workshop hosted by colleagues of Università Vita-Salute San Raffaele Milano on “Rules and compliance in times of COVID-19”. The event, which is held three years after the first lockdowns in Italy, aims at stimulating a broader debate about the concepts of citizenship, rules, and democratic systems. In the forthcoming months, the Working Group continues to work on the arrangement of panels for the next ESC conference in Florence and plans to update the exercise done in 2021 on the academic publications and on criminological research projects which dealt with the impact of COVID-19 on crime and the criminal justice system. In Florence, we would be happy to discuss with our colleagues the future development of the group and its evolution: COVID-19 was a disruptor in many criminological fields, but, after the extraordinary momentum and the spike of the academic studies, we should already consider the legacy and the evolution of the group when, after some years, the interest towards the topic naturally could fade away.


Restorative justice (RJ) is a burgeoning field of study and practice. While it emerged primarily within the criminal justice setting over the last four decades, other applications can also be observed in schools, workplaces, communities, in complaints procedures and even in transitional settings. The field of restorative justice given its applied character is interdisciplinary and brings together people from different professional backgrounds, be it as researchers, practitioners or policy makers. Restorative justice is consequently increasingly discussed during the ESC conference on a variety of topic areas.

The idea of a Working Group specifically dedicated to restorative justice came after the ESC conference in Sarajevo in 2018 where a number of papers on RJ had been submitted but were presented in a number of panels not relevant to those papers. The working group was subsequently created and launched in Ghent in 2019 by Dr Kerry Clamp (University of Nottingham /UK) and Dr Estelle Zinsstag (Edinburgh Napier University/ UK and KU Leuven/Belgium) – see also the report in the newsletter of that year.

The aims of the working group include:

- Bringing together researchers working on restorative justice and creating an international and intergenerational network; and

- Facilitating research agendas and collaboration on restorative justice projects (such as seminars, summer schools, publications and funded research projects)
and maximising the international dissemination of research results.

A number of specific objectives to realise these aims include:

- Promoting communication between restorative justice researchers;
- Organising thematic restorative justice sessions at the annual ESC meetings;
- Establishing cross-national research networks and promote international collaboration on restorative justice research; and
- Offering a ‘best academic article’ award for outstanding research in the restorative justice field.

The working group counts now a very international group of over 50 members and during the pandemic we organised panels online with each time a full day of papers during the Eurocrim conferences of 2020 and 2021. We have also been meeting in between, one year a survey about the interest and wished activities was conducted among our members to make sure the Working Group was really serving our community as needed, the results of which were then discussed during a meeting. The meetings usually include some discussion on substance, with a paper presentation and then some networking activities. Last September, the group met again in Malaga at the ESC (photo) and participated in a number of RJ focussed panels.

All ESC-members involved or interested in RJ related research are invited to join. Therefore, if you are a member of the ESC and would like to join, please send an email stating your name, position, affiliation, and a short introduction to your work to both of us at estelle.zinsstag@kuleuven.be Kerry.Clamp@nottingham.ac.uk.

Estelle Zinsstag

Best Academic Article on Restorative Justice Prize

Academic research on restorative justice is burgeoning with many more journals and books showcasing the high-quality research on the topic appearing internationally. It felt only natural that as part of the activities of the recently created ESC Working Group on Restorative Justice a prize would be organised to recognise and support that.

The prize was created in 2020 by the chairs of the ESC Working Group on Restorative Justice, Dr Estelle Zinsstag (UK/Belgium) and Dr Kerry Clamp (UK). Each year a call for nominations or self-nominations of articles is launched for articles published in peer reviewed journals in the 18 months prior to the call. The chairs then make a shortlist which is subsequently discussed in a panel meeting constituted of Em. Prof Lode Walgrave (Belgium), Prof Grazia Mannozzi (Italy) and Prof Frieder Duenkel (Germany).

From the prize’s inception, three international publishers, Taylor and Francis/Routledge, Sage and Eleven have come together to sponsor it, enabling the winner to receive a small sum of money and books.

The articles are examined on the following criteria:

1. ORIGINALITY: The paper should present a novel topic or approach to the study of restorative justice and/or draw novel conclusions from the existing conceptual/theoretical literature.

2. SOUND METHODOLOGY: There should be a clear articulation of methods used. This does not necessarily mean that it has to be an empirical paper, just that the conclusions have been drawn should be logical and explicated.

3. ADVANCE SCHOLARSHIP: The paper should advance the field, normatively or empirically. This could be by producing novel insights through an interrogation of practice in new areas, drawing on other disciplines in unique ways to spark or reignite interest in or a rethinking of the approach to the study of restorative justice.

In 2020 six articles were shortlisted:

1. Willis, R. & Hoyle, C. (2019). The good, the bad and the street: Does ‘street culture’ affect offender communication and reception in RJ? European Journal of Criminology (online first/19(1)).

2. Pointer, L. & Giles-Mitson, A. (2019) Sustained restorative dialogue as a means of understanding and


The winner was the article by Blagg, Tulich and May in *Contemporary Justice Review* (Taylor & Francis).

In 2021 five articles were shortlisted:


That year the panel decided to give a main prize and a runner up prize with the winning one going to De Haan and Destrooper for their article published in *The International Journal of Restorative Justice* (Eleven) and as runner up Marder for his article in *Contemporary Justice Review* (Taylor & Francis).

In 2022, five articles were shortlisted:


The winner of this year’s prize is Jennifer Llewellyn for her article published in *The International Journal of Restorative Justice* (Eleven).

Every year the winner was able to be there when the award was announced, generally during the WG annual meeting, or sent a small video recording to officially receive the prize.

The new call for nominations/self-nominations is open for the 2023 Best Academic Article on Restorative Justice and if you read or have written an exceptional academic article on RJ, please send it to both Dr Estelle Zinsstag (estelle.zinsstag@kuleuven.be) and Dr Kerry Clamp (Kerry.Clamp@nottingham.ac.uk). We look forward to reading all your exciting new research!
Over the last ten years or so, green criminology has become an increasingly important theme at the Criminology Department of the Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR). Not only it is an important teaching topic, but it has also been widely used as an overarching approach to develop empirical research aiming at raising awareness and improving public policies.

Green criminology at EUR is studied in the realm of geopolitical inequality, and corporate and organised crime. This counts both for the way it is embedded in our teaching and in our research agenda. The two master’s programmes in criminology at EUR (1) start with a module on Globalisation, Digitalisation and Crime, in which themes like global inequality, poverty and human rights play a central role. This also sets the framework for the study of green criminology - with a focus on deforestation. Subsequently, environmental crime is one of the three cases students in the modules Corporate & White-Collar Crime & Governance (Dieselgate (2)) and Organised Crime & Governance (wildlife trafficking) study in groups, and on which they write a policy advice. Green criminological topics are also quite popular as graduation research projects for master’s students.

Within the Erasmus School of Law, the Department of Law & Economics (notably in the person of Michael Faure) is, next to the Criminology Department, also engaged in this field, with studies on the relation between money laundering and environmental harm and on environmental criminal liability. With the Erasmus Initiative on Dynamics of Inclusive Prosperity (to which criminologists Lieselot Bisschop and Abby Onencan are also affiliated), the EUR’s Executive Board actively supports research on sustainability and the control of environmental harm as well.

Lieselot Bisschop investigates corporate crime and environmental harm and the sometimes thin line between them. In 2017, (with co-authors Staci Strobl and Julie Violettaz) she received the Outstanding Article Award from The American Society of Criminology’s Division of Corporate and White-Collar Crime for her work on the corporate and state responsibility for the disappearance of coastal land in the Louisiana Bayou (3).

Much of her recent work, mostly together with Abby Onencan and Sammie Verbeek, is on PFAS. These per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances consist of a range of over 4700 human-made chemicals which are used in cookware, jackets, firefighting foam, food wrappings, cosmetics, medical devices and many more products.
Since the 1930s, PFAS have persisted and accumulated in every living being and ecosystem. These synthetic chemical substances have been widely used throughout society, and are easily transported in the environment, thus polluting soil, water and air. They resist degradation, resulting in unprecedented persistence into the environment and in any living species.

In her master’s thesis, which received the second prize for the best dissertation of 2022 by the Netherlands’ Society of Criminology, Sammie Verbeek studied the PFOA scandal of the DuPont factory in Dordrecht (near Rotterdam). She examined which harmful emissions of chemical perfluorooctanoic acid took place between 1965 and 2012 in this DuPont plant, and how these harms were experienced by victims. She used a rich theoretical framework, bringing green criminology together with cultural criminological and victimological perspectives, as well as proposing the use of the concept of state–corporate crime, thus creating one cohesive, overarching framework.

Based on a case study of Chemours DuPont Dordrecht, an ongoing interdisciplinary study at Erasmus University Rotterdam combines approaches from green and state–corporate criminology, environmental philosophy, and public health to examine the historical and contemporary drivers and dynamics of industrial environmental harm. On 17 March 2023, Lieselot Bisschop held her inaugural address as a full professor, entitled, In Whose Interest? Public–Private Interactions in the Governance of Social Harm, also on this subject.

Abby Onencan was recipient of the 2022 EUR Open and Responsible Science Award in the Societal Engagement category for her study on the improvement of risk governance at a salt mine near the Ukrainian village of Solotyno. For this ‘ImProDiReT’ project, she has collected risk analysis geodata to evaluate environmental risks and support decision making (4).

Tim Boekhout van Solinge is probably the expert on deforestation in the Netherlands, conducting fieldwork mainly in Indonesia and in the Brazilian Amazon. His research on mining, Dutch investments in the Amazon, and about deforestation for the soy industry has been widely covered in the media as well. Next to his affiliation with EUR, he is an independent consultant for e.g. the United Nations, and leads the ‘Forest Forces Opens Extern’ foundation, which focuses on practical applications of criminology on forest crime hotspots in the Brazilian Amazon. There, he has been working closely together with indigenous communities, as well as with the Brazilian Public Prosecution Service.

On 9 December 2022, Karin van Wingerde held her inaugural address as a professor of Corporate Crime and Governance at EUR on Social control as crime: Responsiveness, reflexivity and tripartism in the governance of corporate harms. Her research also is a good reflection of EUR’s green criminological agenda: it is concerned with the question of how governments, businesses, and civil society groups interact in dealing with the harmful consequences of economic activities. She argues that, in the governance of business activities, certain public interests seem to be systematically overlooked, neglected and sometimes even harmed. This is not so much the result of ‘bad’ business, ‘bad’ government or a ‘weak’ civil society, but rather the result of the ways in which, in many Western countries, the governance of business activities has taken shape. This is illustrated with the case study of Tata Steel, one of the largest industrial polluters in the Netherlands which is increasingly under public scrutiny.

With this brief overview we hope to have given a picture of the kind of green criminological research we do at the Erasmus University Rotterdam. Seeing the recent appointments of full professors in this domain, and the funding we receive to be engaged in this kind of research, we hope to be able to share more of our studies with you in the near future.

Lieselot Bisschop, René van Swaaningen & Karin van Wingerde

(2) Including an animation video that has been nominated for the Annecy International Animation Film Festival in the category commissioned educational, scientific or industrial film: https://www.eur.nl/en/esl/news/education-animation-video-dieselgate-nominated-international-film-prize
The Newsletter format does provide a unique platform

After two full terms (plus a short covid-related extension) at the helm, I am leaving the editorship of the ESC Newsletter. It was a tremendous privilege for me to serve in this position. However, the time has come to move on, for me personally, but also for the Newsletter, which needs a boost of innovation and fresh ideas. But it is also right for the ESC Board for a new editor to come in; ESC offices of which should not be viewed as life peerages, and it is good for the society that a new person will now learn its ways as a long-term board member. And I am especially happy ESC Board’s choice as my successor, Rita Faria. Rita is already an established scholar, has been very active within the ESC for years. I am sure her editorship will be a resounding success.

A lot has changed in the ESC since I took over from my predecessor, Michael Tonry, and the Newsletter had to change with it. The membership grew from around 600 to close to 1300. Conference attendees number rose from 700 to 2000. ESC membership from outside Europe, especially the United States increased manifold – we are no probably experiencing similar trends with the Global South.

At the same time, advertisement income from publishers and universities dropped, as they were finding what they saw more effective ways of reaching their audience.

Such a growth, combined with the falling income has made the original business model of the Newsletter unsustainable, with printing and posting costs rising beyond what was feasible. This necessitated the biggest change during my editorship: the cessation of the printed Newsletter. I was very unhappy to let it go, but there was no alternative.

At the same time, the website of the Newsletter was renewed, with a blog functionality added. Regrettably, I failed to capitalize on this development in my last year as an editor, but at least my successor takes over visually refreshed, technically future-proof, and flexible platform, and she will have complete freedom to mould it to her vision of the Newsletter.

The visual design of the Newsletter is certainly one of its more recognizable features and is now part of the ESC identity. In this respect, I am happy with what I have done and what I leave for my successor.

Frequent delays were also “on brand” during my editorship – this is, however, hardly a tradition to keep.

But content is more important than the look or publishing timeline. One of the most positive changes in this regard is that so much more is going on inside the ESC that working group reports and various announcements now can run to 15–20 pages. However, what I am probably most proud of are the longer essays, such as those on the financial crisis, or the differences between American and European criminology, some of which now regularly surface in academic publications and conference presentations.

I do believe that the Newsletter format does provide a unique platform for more informal discussions of innovative ideas or personal insights, and that is why the ESC Newsletter will remain an important forum for many years to come. And it is good to know it will be in good hands.
What is an editor?

Some years ago, I won the Portuguese women’s championship in speedminton, a sport which is like badminton on steroids. I won the championship not because I was very good at it: I had the minimum of specialized equipment and used to play it for fun with some friends who were really taking it seriously. The thing was that I was the only woman who signed up for the championship and the most incredible thing happened: because I played against all the men, I won a gold medal despite having lost all matches! The situation was obviously laughable and, at first, I felt like a fraud. Being a PhD student back then, imposter syndrome was very present in numerous facets of my life. But a closer look at what had happened made me change the interpretation of the whole situation: I was the only woman who had had the guts to be in the tournament, who had showed up at the court and – I confess – I was really happy to spend some time with good friends, doing something out of the ordinary for me. So, I went into that tournament just channeling the energy (although not the playing skills, obviously) of Serena Williams or of Steffi Graf.

This anecdote summarizes what lead me to apply for the role of editor. Have I ever received any formal training in science communication or editing skills? Absolutely not. Do I have previous experience in editing newsletters? Yes, some, particularly with my department at the University of Porto; with the ESC WG-QRME, the working group on Qualitative Research Methodologies and Epistemologies from when I was co-chair; or with EUROC – the ESC Working Group on Organizational Crime. But being a member of the ESC since 2012 and having participated in most annual conferences since then makes me feel like being editor of “Criminology in Europe” is doable. It is like that experience of playing with friends. Particularly friends who are very good at what they do and with whom I learn a lot. Moreover, I get to be a part of a group in which there are people very dear to me. And at a time when research and academic life risks being packed with individualism, pressure to produce, quantification of metrics for evaluation’s sake, precariousness, and burnout, I think it may be a good thing to be part of a project for the sake of commonalities, collectivities and shared endeavour.

Being an editor is, for me, composed of moments when one is not working on their CV or publication list, but rather allowing others (with whom you may or may not share visions about criminological topics or methods) to have the center stage and showcase their work. Being an editor is being a mediator and facilitating other people’s work to be seen and admired. In the end, this is also the perspective of the ESC about its role in promoting European Criminology.

History repeats. And just as what happened when I was called to (lose) the first match of the speedminton championship, these first months of taking over the role of Editor have been hard, and I realized I had only a faint idea of what was ahead of me when I signed up for the place. Putting together this first issue of the Newsletter made me realize all the hard work that goes into it, but also the dozens or hundreds of people that are behind every issue: members of working groups, conference organizers, ESC board members, the editorial team of the European Journal of Criminology, colleagues paying
their homage or respect to others, recipients of awards, and so on. People who are, as I am, working for collective goals: the production and dissemination of criminological research across a whole continent!

Following on the work of my predecessors in the role, my vision for the ESC Newsletter is to have it as a common platform where members of the ESC are in communication – a project that has become even more interactive with the existing blog that has been and will continue to be updated with relevant and timely information. However, adding to the well-known regular content of the publication (such as working group reports, presidential messages and reports), I also wished to open more space for debate in the field. That is why I will reach out to all chairs of the Working Groups asking them to provide information on current activities and to use the blog as a mechanism to broaden their base and disseminate their work. That is also why there is a new section, the Dossier, which will be used to discuss particular criminological topics or themes. The goal is to offer different perspectives and a diversity of authors in the several issues that will come out each year. Still having in mind the idea of collectivity and communion, my choice of the topic to cover in 2023 was quite easy to make: environmental crime and degradation as cause and example of the most harmful collective risks felt nowadays. So, a Dossier in Green Criminology in 2023 made perfect sense and I am happy that colleagues from Rotterdam were generous enough to author the piece that is presented in the current issue.

Regular readers of the newsletter will notice that this issue is also larger than usual. This is because the former Editor-in-Chief, Csaba, and I decided on a form to transition that would feel natural. So, in reality, this first issue was co-edited by both of us – again, in a collective form that, despite some bumps on the way, allowed us to deliver the best issue possible. For that and for all the guidance, I am very grateful to Csaba and his friendship! I am aware of my lack of skills in some aspects, but I consider that I have yet much space to grow in this new role of Editor of Criminology in Europe. I’m channelling the energy of all the role models and fantastic colleagues I have met in this community, and I am proud to have had the guts to sign up for this. I am looking very much forward to these next years as Editor of the ESC Newsletter!