Inside

Crime and criminal justice following the 2010 UK General Election
Contributions from: Jonathan Simon, Stephen Farrall, Juliet Lyon and Steve Savage

A tribute to Jean-Paul Brodeur
The 2010 BSC Conference

News from our journal Criminology & Criminal Justice
News from the society’s sub-committees & regional branches

British Society of Criminology
2-6 Cannon Street
London
EC4M 6YH
Email: info@britsoccrim.org
Web: www.britsoccrim.org

Reg. Charity No. 1073145
© 2010 BSC
## Contents

Editor’s Note ........................................ 1  
President’s letter ................................... 2

A Tribute to Jean-Paul Brodeur 1943-2010
*Phillip Stenning and Robert Reiner* ............ 3

**Features - Crime and criminal justice following the 2010 UK General Election**

What Criminal Justice Policies Might the Lib Dem-Con Government Pursue?  
*Stephen Farrall* .................................. 5

Crime and The New Politics: Will Cameron and Clegg Govern Through Crime?  
*Jonathan Simon* ................................. 8

More Accountability - Less Regulation? Coalition Plans for Policing  
*Steve Savage* .................................... 10

Justice Reform - Next Steps  
*Juliet Lyon CBE* ................................. 13

**Society News**

BSC 2010 at the University of Leicester: Latest News .................. 15
New Staff at the BSC: Welcome to Charlotte and Mandy .......... 16
Criminology finally gets its own Higher Education subject codes .... 16
Publications News .................................. 17
BSC Postgraduate Committee News .................. 18
BSC Youth Criminology/Youth Justice Network (YC/YJN) News .... 19
BSC Conference 2012: Invitation to Tender ....................... 20
Update on the Research Excellence Framework .................. 21
Regional News ...................................... 22
Editor’s note
Andrew Millie

Well, we now have a new Conservative-Liberal-Democrat Coalition Government in Britain. After 13 years of New Labour this will take some getting used to. For us as British criminologists, what impact will it have? One thing is certain, cuts are on the agenda that will be difficult to avoid. For this edition of the Society’s Newsletter we invited contributors to consider prospects for crime and criminal justice following the election. Some suggestions are provided by Mike Hough in the President’s Letter. Stephen Farrall of the University of Sheffield speculates by looking at past historical precedent, in particular the criminal justice policies of Thatcher’s Conservatives who came into power in a similarly difficult economic climate. Jonathan Simon of University of California, Berkeley (and soon to be Visiting Professor at Edinburgh University) asks whether Cameron and Clegg will ‘govern through crime’. Steve Savage of the University of Portsmouth focuses on the prospects for policing, including Coalition plans for elected police commissioners. Juliet Lyon of the Prison Reform Trust and Penal Reform International looks at the prospects for prison and justice reform. I’d like to thank Stephen, Jonathan, Steve and Juliet for agreeing to contribute, especially considering the short time I gave them! Hopefully these contributions will spark debate - debate that may continue during this year’s BSC Conference in Leicester, now only a few days away.

Also in this Newsletter BSC Conference Organisers Yvonne Jewkes and Neil Chakraborti provide the latest information. It looks like it’s going to be an excellent event and I’m especially looking forward to the Indian banquet! The Newsletter has also all the usual Society news, including news of new members of staff (welcome Charlotte and Mandy!). We have also included the latest news on the Research Excellence Framework.

Finally, it was sad to hear that Canadian criminologist Professor Jean-Paul Brodeur died earlier this year. Phillip Stenning and Robert Reiner provide a fitting tribute.

Andrew Millie, University of Glasgow, June 2010

Wanted: Organized person who likes filing!

The BSC has moved offices a number of times over the last few years. The paper records have suffered from this process and we need an organized person who can take on the filing and rationalization of these documents. The records are currently housed at the ICPR on the Aldwych so the post would probably suit a London-based student/freelancer. Rates of pay would be in the region of £10 an hour and there is probably around 30 hours work involved. Experience of record management would be an asset.

Contact Charlotte Harris at: charlotte.harris@britsoccrim.org.
President’s Letter
Mike Hough, ICPR, King’s College London

Post-election periods can be full of surprises. There are signs of unexpected mood-music coming from the coalition government. First we had David Cameron’s determination to avoid any ‘knee-jerk reaction’ to the tragedy in Cumbria. Was his measured response a new style of spin, or no spin at all? I hope the latter.

Then there are developments in the Ministry of Justice. Surprise enough to see Ken Clarke back as Secretary of State - albeit in a Ministry of Justice that hadn’t even been contemplated when he was Home Secretary in 1992. More surprising that he should publicly question why the prison population had doubled since he was Home Secretary, and call for a ‘more sensible’ prisons policy. Wasn’t this the sort of thing that we were hoping to hear in 1997 from the then Home Secretary, Jack Straw, after the dust had settled on New Labour’s election victory?

Of course there are two big differences between then and now: the Tories are in harness with coalition partners committed to halting prison building; and in any case there is no money in the Treasury kitty. That is a powerful pressure for a rethink on penal policy. The cloud of fiscal poverty may come with some silver lining.

However the scale of welfare cuts that the country faces could overall represent a really serious challenge for justice. So far, there has been no sign of a recession-fuelled spike in crime, but we must expect a return to growing income inequality, and - in time, if mainstream criminological theories aren’t completely off-beam - to a return to rising crime.

As the coalition government finds its feet, there are plenty of signs that ministers - and their advisors and officials - are casting round for new policy ideas with an open-mindedness that could be genuinely refreshing. It would be good sense for criminologists to respond in an equally open-minded and constructive way.

It would also be good politics to do so, as higher education must surely face even larger cutbacks that criminal justice!

Mike Hough, June 2010
A Tribute to Professor Jean-Paul Brodeur 1943-2010

Phillip Stenning and Robert Reiner
Keele University and London School of Economics

Canada, and the Western world of academic criminology, has recently lost one of its brightest stars, Jean-Paul Brodeur, the son of a Quebec police officer, came to criminology by a somewhat unusual route. His formal academic education was in philosophy, a discipline which he continued to feel was rather more intellectually and analytically rigorous than that of criminology, to which he eventually gravitated. Indeed that fastidious intellectual rigour was probably the characteristic of Jean-Paul which most impressed itself on the minds of the many fellow scholars and students who had the privilege of scholarly exchanges with him.

Becoming after a relatively short while the Directeur of the Centre International de Criminologie Comparée at the Université de Montréal, Jean-Paul established himself as a leading figure in Canadian and Francophone criminology. A tireless workaholic, who nevertheless found time to practise (oh, so well!) the gourmet culinary arts, the breadth (both in terms of topics, and geographically) and depth of his contribution to criminological understanding and knowledge was remarkable. His first major published work in this field - a study of the history of commissions of inquiry into police in Canada, 1895-1970 - remains a key source on the politics of policing in Canada. Jean-Paul’s interest in commissions of inquiry, however, was not just academic; he served as research director to many of Canada’s most important commissions of inquiry throughout his career. These included the Canadian Sentencing Commission, the Keable and Duchaine Inquiries into the F.L.Q. crisis in Quebec, the Malouf Inquiries into the Stanley Cup riot in Montreal in 1992 and into the role of Montreal Community Police Service, and the Commission of Inquiry into the Conduct of Canadian Military Forces in Somalia, to name only some. In addition, he headed up several research projects commissioned by the Law Reform Commission of Canada. In 1990 he became a member of the Royal Society of Canada.

Jean-Paul’s first and foremost criminological interest was police and policing. His most well-known theoretical contribution in this field is undoubtedly his seminal article “High Policing and Low Policing: Remarks about the Policing of Political Activities” published in the journal Social Problems in 1983, and inspired by his experience as research director for the Keable and Duchaine Inquiries. He published an updated paper on this topic in light of post-9/11 events in 2007 in Policing - A Journal of Policy & Practice. He wrote eruditely on many other policing topics, including police deviance (informed by, and informing, his work as a member of the Comité d’examen des plaintes de la Sûreté du Québec), undercover police work and, most recently, the use of force by police, in which he interrogated Egon Bittner’s ideas, and in particular his claim that access to the use of force is the key defining characteristic of police. He organised some important international conferences in the 1990s, bringing together a wide range of scholars to discuss comparative policing issues, and police effectiveness and reform. These papers were edited and published by him as Comparisons in Policing: An International Perspective (Aldershot: Avebury 1995), and How to Recognize Good Policing: Problems and Issues (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1998).
Jean-Paul also played an important role in the development of policing policy in Canada’s First Nations communities. Working with Carol LaPrairie and Roger McDonnell, he undertook critical research into the policing of remote Cree communities in Quebec’s James Bay region during the early 1990s which has had a lasting impact in these and other First Nations communities in Canada.

His most recent book, *The Policing Web*, is happily in press with Oxford University Press, and is due to be published in August. This is a major contribution to the study of policing, and an outstanding scholarly achievement. It is a pioneering attempt to synthesise and offer a theoretical analysis of the huge volume of research on policing that has accumulated around the world, but mainly in North America and Britain, since the beginnings of empirical research on the subject a half century ago. It offers a theorization of policing that is derived from the seminal conceptualization offered by Egon Bittner in the 1970s, refining it and using it as an organizing principle for an encyclopaedic exploration of policing history and current practices and variants. The Bittner definition in terms of the police capacity to deploy legitimate force is expanded to encompass the broader idea that the police are authorized to use a variety of means to achieve order that are ordinarily illegitimate for citizens. This combination of sophisticated theory and a wide knowledge of policing in many countries (but mainly the US, UK, Canada and France) makes the book a major achievement both as a text for study and an original, provocative contribution to understanding and knowledge.

Quite apart from his prodigious published output, however, Jean-Paul was an inspiring mentor to a generation of up-and-coming criminologists in Quebec and around the world. For all these reasons, he will be greatly missed, by policing scholars in particular, and by criminologists more generally. But we can be grateful that he has left us a legacy of exceptional scholarship which will be an inspiration for generations of scholars to come.

**References**


What Criminal Justice Policies Might the Lib Dem-Con Government Pursue?

Stephen Farrall
School of Law, University of Sheffield

Predicting what might happen in politics is no easy task (after all, as Harold Wilson noted, “a week is a long time in politics”); similarly predicting what might happen with regards to crime policies is also no easy task. However, given what we know about recent history and what we can discern about the current Lib Dem-Con government, what might the current government do about crime and criminal justice? In order to provide a sketch of what we might expect, we need, of course, to examine stated policies. However, there are also lessons to be learnt from previous incoming Tory-led governments. Let us start with the stated policies...

The Queen’s Speech
The Queen’s Speech only made reference to criminal justice at one point: that relating to a Bill that will “make the police service more accountable to local people, create a dedicated Border Police Force and set out measures to tackle alcohol-related violence and disorder”. The main things which this Bill (if passed) would do are to produce increased police accountability through directly elected individuals, tighten immigration controls, and provide the police with “stronger powers to tackle alcohol-fuelled crime and disorder”. All of this sounds like fairly standard fare; but might other ‘hidden impacts’ on the CJS and crime in the UK be lurking behind other policies? Let us consider the last time we had a Tory-led administration elected on the basis of an economic crisis.

Past Historical Precedent
Margaret Thatcher’s first government was elected in May 1979. Some of the parallels with the current situation are striking: a weak, Labour-led administration which had been losing popularity in the polls and an election fought over an economic crisis. Other parallels emerge on closer inspection too: Thatcher at the time of her election both as leader of her party (in 1975) and as Prime Minister was not popular amongst her own parliamentary party. Hailsham and Carrington (two Tory Grandees) had both wanted rid of her in 1977, and it was not really until June 1982 (after the Falklands War) that her position as leader became unassailable. Similar problems may of course come to haunt both Cameron and Clegg (respectively Leaders of the Tory and Liberal Democratic Parties); right-wingers in the Tories and left-wingers in the Lib Dems may withdraw support from their party leaders if their performances and policies do not impress.

But of the similarities between 1979 and 2010 it is the construction of their being an economic crisis which is perhaps the most important for the criminal justice system and crime. The construction of the economic basis to the crisis of the Winter of Discontent and the country’s economic decline more generally, coupled with Thatcher’s relatively weak position meant that she needed to share power with the Wets in her government. This meant that, in drawing up her first cabinet, she prioritized the Treasury in terms of getting ‘her’ key personal and had to let the other two ‘big’ offices of State (Home and Foreign) go to Wets (Whitelaw and Carrington respectively).

Does this mean that there was little Thatcherite influence on the criminal justice system? Yes and no. Clearly, focusing on the economy and passing various legislation aimed at consolidating her electoral base (such as the right-to-buy one’s own council house) meant that there was less policy focus on...
matters of crime in the early administrations (of course, there was plenty of talk about crime, especially from Thatcher herself). Following this, after the 1983 general election the focus of activity was social security reform, further discounts on council housing and shifts in economic policy. The Miners’ Strike (1984-85) also soaked up a lot of attention, of course. As such, criminal justice policies were: a) not a major part of the policy landscape (despite the Thatcherite instinct to be tough on wrong-doing); and b) any policies which were pursued were often left to the paternalist left-wing of her Party (her Home Secretaries were the rather ‘damp’ Whitelaw, Brittan and Hurd with only Waddington (Oct 1989-Nov 1990) a ‘dry’).

But - and it is one of those rather big ‘buts’ - the social and economic policies which she pursued had huge impacts on crime and hence the criminal justice system. As I and others have argued elsewhere (Farrall and Hay, 2010; Jennings and Farrall, 2010; Farrall and Jennings, 2010) the economic, housing, social security and education policies pursued between 1979 and 1990 had the effect of forcing crime onto the political agenda. This was:

- the result of economic policies which increased inequality and strengthened the relationship between unemployment and crime (Jennings and Farrall, 2010);
- housing policies which had the by-product of creating the spatial concentration of poverty, ethnicity and social deprivation (Farrall, 2006; Farrall and Hay, 2010);
- social security policies which became ‘meaner’ in an attempt to reduce the expenditure incurred (in part) by high levels of unemployment but which allowed levels of inequality to go unchecked (hence increasing crime, Jennings and Farrall, 2010); and
- education policies which encouraged school heads to exclude unruly pupils, thereby creating a pool of disaffected young children without very many forms of formal or informal social control (Farrall and Hay, 2010).

As such, Thatcherite social and economic policies did have big impacts on crime in that: a) acquisitive crime rose dramatically during the 1980s and 1990s; and b) public fear of crime and recognition that crime was an important issue both rose too (Farrall and Jennings, 2010). This ‘production’ of a social problem (‘rising crime’) could not be left alone for long, and it was that most Thatcherite of John Major’s two Home Secretaries (Michael Howard) who launched his now famous crusade on crime with the mantra “prison works” in 1993. From 1992 and the expulsion of the UK Pound from the Exchange Rate Mechanism, Major was looking around for a way of promoting the rapidly fragmenting Tory Party; crime and law and order was one such target. Crime thus came to the fore as a policy concern for Major’s government as a result of earlier social and economic policies, public concern and far wider economic factors relating to the UK Pound.

What can this tell us about what Cameron and Clegg may do? The answers, of course, have to remain sketchy. Partly this reflects the fragility of coalition governments in the UK (since the Second World War, there has only been one similar pact, that between the Labour Party and the Liberal Party in the late-1970s, and this lasted less than 18 months). It remains to be seen if the Lib Dems can carry their grass-roots supporters and Grandees with them, or if Cameron can hold together what looks like a marriage of convenience past a referendum on proportional representation (expected to come to a head around May 2011). With very large cuts to public expenditure expected, it is likely that there will be a rise in unemployment. With few jobs left in the heavy manufacturing sectors, these job cuts are likely to hit middle class families, either directly in terms of the loss of salaries, or indirectly in terms of the loss of opportunities for sons and daughters graduating from university. Despite claims that the cuts of the Thatcher years will be avoided (Clegg, interview with The Observer, 6th June 2010), there are still signs that the cuts are going be very deep. And unlike the mood in 1979 (or even 1945), there is no sense amongst the public that there must be some sort of sharp change in the direction in the way the country is run; in any case there is very little left to de-nationalize.
So where does this leave us? My prediction is that there will be no major policy attention given to criminal justice in the foreseeable future; the economy and cuts to social and health provision will take up too much ministerial attention. So I am not expecting anything like the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act and the activity which that generated. Prison places may fall (it is more expensive than community disposals, after all), so we may see a very quiet shift in sentencing patterns (after all, no Tory PM would want to publicly announce this) - and if this sounds unlikely, bear in mind that it was the Tories who last presided over a fall in prison numbers in the late-1980s (although this was most likely the result of restrictions placed on the sentencing of young people introduced by the 1982 and 1988 Criminal Justice Acts, itself the result of ideas initiated in the 1970s (Faulkner, 2001: 110)). Increased sentences for those convicted of carrying knives and a pledge to increase prison places may see the number of prisoners increase - but these will have to be paid for and justified financially. It is also likely that there will be cuts to police paperwork, but probably at the expense of the police accepting greater involvement of the public at setting policies (via elected police chiefs) and an increase in private sector involvement in the CJS. If the coalition lasts long enough for the public to grow comfortable with Cameron, then the Lib Dems will be ditched at the earliest possible publically-acceptable point (after the next general election around 2014-15 - if they get that far). At this point one might see more subtle shifts in thinking in terms of criminal justice, but these will probably not go far beyond what the Labour Party had initiated (‘community payback’).

This leaves us with a government which will focus on the economy, and, as such, if there is any major activity on crime and criminal justice it is likely to be reactive rather than proactive. These reactions may either be to sudden events on a par with the murder of James Bulger (although the response to the Cumbria murders suggest that it would take a lot to produce a reaction on crime-related issues) or the consequences of their economic and social policies downstream (Farrall and Jennings, 2010), assuming that their coalition stands the tests of time.

If this all sounds rather like ‘much of the same’, I suspect that is because we will get much of the same. The economy is going to be the focus, not crime, and until the economy is ‘fixed’ crime will find it hard to push itself onto the policy agenda (Farrall and Jennings, 2010). In any case, as Tim Newburn reminds us: “It is clearly the case that political positioning by the main parties has narrowed the range of opinions expressed on issues of penal policy and has privileged punitive discourses” (2007:458). Newburn’s is probably as close to a decent prediction as we will get, for a while at least; the tenor for debate and policy has already been set. However, as I wrote at the start, a week is a long time in politics...

I would like to thank Colin Hay and Will Jennings for comments on an earlier draft of this paper.
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Crime and The New Politics: Will Cameron and Clegg Govern Through Crime?

Jonathan Simon

University of California, Berkeley, and Visiting Professor and MacCormick Fellow, Edinburgh University, 2010-11

In the years since publishing “Governing through Crime: How the War on Crime Transformed American Democracy and Created a Culture of Fear” (Simon, 2007) I have had the privilege of visiting the UK several times and to consider the differences and similarities in the policies and politics of crime in both countries. The first version of the idea was an essay published in 1997, the same year as Tony Blair’s New Labour triumph. At the time I thought that the UK under PM Thatcher was a good example of why crime as a tool of governance was not a necessary element of rightwing rule (as some in the US continue to think of it) as she had done very little aside from some moralistic rhetoric to build up crime control into a general framework of rule. Even PM Major’s late enthusiasm for prisons (expressed most memorably by his Home Secretary Michael Howard, that “prison works”) seemed a possible campaign handoff from the first US President Bush.

Once in power New Labour embraced crime as a defining domestic policy problem proving that the right has no particular advantage in governing through crime, but that linked to right rhetoric (“tough on crime, tough on the causes of crime”) with it, is fully consistent with efforts by left of centre politicians to manage the problems of governance and legitimacy. When I visited for several weeks in September 2007 to speak about the book at the British Society of Criminology and at several UK universities, Gordon Brown had just taken the helm and as the Labour Party conference was set to open, some friends here were assuring me that Brown would end New Labour’s fixation with governing through crime. It seemed plausible to me. Like Robert Kennedy, and like Bill Clinton, Tony Blair combined the kind of moralistic and muscular liberalism, with a religious streak (associated in the case of the former two with prolific personal sinning) that finds in a tough punitive, prosecutorial approach to wrongdoers just the right tonic for self and society. Brown, the chief architect of New Labour’s economic success, and a personal preference for social justice politics, seemed like someone who might well tack back on New Labour’s governing through crime strategy. But once the Party conference began it was clear from the very first ministerial speech (a message on health care festooned with promises to equip NHS nurses with cameras in their uniforms to record assaults by patients) that this turn was not going to be a quick one.

Brown turned out to be either unable or unwilling to pull back from New Labour’s crime posture. As I visited the country again in September of 2008 (when Brown’s popularity was at a high and a snap election seemed imminent) and February of 2009 it seemed New Labour was instead doubling down. As I walked through Nottingham’s charming but economically challenged central district I was passed by a bus festooned with a full length billboard promising the reader that when it came to anti-social behaviour, “you see it, you say it, we stop it.”

So as I embark on a year long visit to the UK beginning in August, I am excited and fascinated to see what the coalition government of the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats will do with their surprising, if thin, parliamentary majority. David Cameron has long signalled that he was prepared to question the “culture of control” that had become an orthodoxy under New Labour, with his criticisms of ASBOs and over expansive anti-terror measures. He deliberately wrapped his campaign in Obama
like themes of hope, change, and the ability of the electorate to accept calm and rational arguments about the complex problems facing Britain without recourse to constant reinforcements of fear (the very opposite of crime based populism). Mr. Clegg remains a mystery to me but his party has a noble tradition of civil libertarianism that would serve the country well at this hour. Indeed, both parties have a historic opportunity to truly define a new politics that leaves behind the familiar 20th Century fights about how to solve the social problems of industrial societies (crime, ill health, unemployment) to grapple with new threats of climate change, globalization, and infrastructure underinvestment. In its own way, New Labour used crime as a way to signal its commitment to the old social problems at a time when it was abandoning its traditional class based approach to those problems. In redefining the Tories, Cameron faces a very different legacy, one that requires no effort to reinvent the “society” (which Mrs. Thatcher famously questioned the existence of). Indeed both the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats have historically been wary of losing British liberties to a coercive state acting in the name of the social.

Most importantly, the Cameron/Clegg government enters power at a moment when economic issues so starkly threaten the nation’s middle class self image that potential to lead the country into a self absorbed panic about the basic decency of character and culture, as Tony Blair did as shadow Home Secretary after the murder of toddler Jamie Bulger in 1993, is very unlikely. If Cameron and Clegg are going to survive as a government they will need to launch a series of major (and controversial) budgetary and political reforms that will leave little room for largely symbolic anti-crime and terror measures. They will also have to cut the deficit without appearing to be placing those cuts on the backs of Britain’s poor and middle class. The expensive prison estate is an obvious place to begin deep cuts.

Jonathan Simon is Adrian Kragen Professor of Law University of California, Berkeley, and Visiting Professor and MacCormick Fellow, Edinburgh University, School of Law, 2010-11

References
More Accountability – Less Regulation?
Coalition Plans for Policing

Steve Savage
Institute of Criminal Justice Studies, University of Portsmouth

One of the stranger features of the General Election of 2010 was the virtual absence of high profile, hostile, debate over policing, given the truly radical nature of some the proposals which one political party at least - the Conservatives - had committed to. More specifically, the notion of introducing directly elected police commissioners as an alternative to the local police authorities, one would have thought, could have been pounced on by the other major parties and presented as a dangerously reckless measure, not least because of outspoken opposition to the policy by a number of key senior police chiefs. That it was not picked up in this way may have been due to the generally low decibel level of ‘law and order’ politics in this General Election; or it may have been a deliberate strategy by the Conservatives to downplay a measure which might have them portrayed as ‘anti-police’, something they of all parties would be desperate to avoid. Whichever way, what could be one of the most fundamental reforms of police governance in British history seemed to have slipped through as an electoral pledge largely unchallenged and now exists as part of the menu of policies for policing for the incoming Government. What complicates matters of course is that the government in question is a Coalition and not a Conservative Government as such. What, then, are the prospects for policing within that Coalition?

As in virtually all areas of policy Coalition plans for policing at the time of writing are very much at the formative stage, as negotiations and compromises continue. However, there are reasons to believe that forging an agreed policing policy and a reform agenda may be particularly difficult. Within the Conservative Party alone there are differing views on what stance to take with the policing sector. On the one hand there is the more traditionalist Conservative approach (embodied above all in the politics of Margaret Thatcher) which holds the police to be what Loader and Mulcahy (2003) referred to as ‘sacred’, a ‘special case’ within the public sector to be given privileged treatment and allowed to wield influence, not only over policing policy itself, but also wider criminal justice policy. On the other hand there is the more sceptical approach, probably in the ascendancy, which not only holds the police to be ‘just another’ public service but, if anything, a particularly unreformed and under-modernised public service - as such to be treated very much as ‘profane’ rather than ‘sacred’. Add to this mix, through Coalition politics, the Liberal Democrat Party’s own philosophies on policing - concerns over extensions of police powers, more ‘localism’ in policing, and so on - and the picture becomes very complex. So where does Coalition thinking on policing appear to be going?

We can begin with what seem to be firm commitments, as presented in the ‘Joint Plan for Government’ issued on the 7th June 2010. The main proposal, as indicated, related to the creation of police commissioners as directly elected individuals who would ‘oversee’ the work of the local police. This was presented as an extension of police ‘accountability’ by forging a direct link between the local electorate and local policing policy and performance. There seemed to be an element of compromise in the Coalition proposal. Earlier Conservative plans would have given the directly elected commissioners control over ‘policing strategy’ and the setting of the budget, whereas reference would now be made to a more arbitrary ‘oversight’ role for the commissioner, and one subject to “strict checks and balances” by locally elected representatives. This might have reflected in part the fact that the Lib Dems had committed not to elected police commissioners but to largely ‘directly elected police
authorities’, not dissimilar to previous thinking within the Labour Government. Nevertheless, the proposal still amounted to a major reform of police governance and one which both the Metropolitan Police Commissioner and the President of the Association of Chief Police Officers expressed serious reservations over - along the lines that it could ‘politicise’ policing and hamper the ‘independence’ of the police.

The adherence to the notion of an elected commissioner seems to have stemmed from two related sources. Firstly, the influential centre-right think tank the Policy Exchange had proposed some years before (Loveday and Reid, 2003) that Britain adopts the US model of an elected mayor who has the power to appoint a police chief to deliver to his/her mandate for policing the locality, the justification being that this would strengthen the ‘local accountability’ of the police. The other source was the approach to the policing of London which emerged under the mayorship of Boris Johnson. Johnson was notably determined to have his views on how London was to be policed taken notice of, as (elected) mayor, and for his evident dissatisfaction with the then Commissioner Sir Ian Blair - too liberal, too Labour? - to find some expression. He managed to strengthen his position by becoming Chair of the Metropolitan Police Authority - the local police authority for London. The subsequent resignation of Sir Ian appeared to demonstrate, if crudely, how an elected individual could help shape policing in a locality. The Coalition proposal for a national model for police governance reflects elements of both the Policy Exchange case and Johnson’s stewardship in London, but it stopped short of dismantling the principle of ‘constabulary independence’ by still allowing for a chief constable to maintain operational independence, whilst working under the elected commissioner. Whether this would be sustainable under the new scheme is a mute point, and police chiefs will need some serious persuading.

Another set of Coalition proposals appear to make way for greater efficiencies in policing. The Coalition talks of ‘reducing time-wasting bureaucracy’ which ‘hampers’ policing - which may cover areas of police recording actually set up to monitor police activities such as stop and search. Reference is also made to a full review of terms and conditions for police employment, which is ironic given that the last Conservative Government did precisely that (in the shape of the notorious Sheehy Inquiry) but was forced by an effective police lobby to back down from implementing key recommendations. At the very least, such a review should once again challenge the ‘special case’ status of the police vis-à-vis other public services, and will most likely call an end to extensive overtime payments, dual patrolling and other ‘traditional’ features of the British way of policing.

The Coalition also announced plans to extend the ‘naming and shaming’ strategy advanced by the Labour Government, whereby detailed figures on crime and other police-related data by force and borough are made public through web-sites. It is proposed that the police will be required to publish monthly local crime statistics, another form of holding the police ‘accountable’. Alongside this requirement, police forces will be tasked to hold regular ‘beat meetings’ to make themselves answerable to local residents for their performance. With the notion of elected commissioners, such measures offer a shift towards more ‘localism’ in policing services and, potentially at least, a way from the centralism evident in much of Labour’s push for police reform.

It would however be naïve to hold these measures as outlined in the early days of the new Government as the full story. Two underlying forces will be at work in the longer term to shape policing further. One is, of course, the crisis in public expenditure. The efficiency measures announced already will not go anyway near far enough, in themselves, to deliver the ‘more for less’ requirements for the police which are now confronting all public services and which will only become more demanding. In this respect there seems little doubt that the agenda of force restructuring will return, and with a vengeance. The Labour Government attempted to tackle this issue by requiring forces to come up with
proposals for force mergers with their neighbouring forces (referred to by one chief constable as a form of ‘speed dating’!), in the hope that the 43, almost independent, police forces of England and Wales - largely the same configuration of policing as that forged in the early 1970s - would be restructured into something closer to 20 ‘strategic forces’. Although these plans were abandoned for short-term political reasons, the thinking behind them remains within the system. If the British police service is to deliver the level of ‘efficiencies’ to be required of it in the medium to longer term, and the gains in effectiveness which it will also be expected to deliver, it would seem nigh on impossible to do that without serious movement on the force restructuring front. Arguably, that is just a matter of time. The other underlying force likely to shape policing in the future is more ambiguous, and may be a sign that the ‘sacred’ status of policing still survives to an extent within the Conservative leadership. In the months leading up to the General Election Conservative discourse on policing included the populist sentiment of ‘common sense policing’ and ‘good coppering’. Indeed, another Coalition proposal for policing involves the revision of health and safety laws to ‘ensure common sense policing’ - on the grounds that officers should feel free to do ‘what is right’ rather than what health and safety regulations deem to be ‘safe’. This may be seen as prioritising ‘common sense policing’ over regulated policing. The attack on ‘bureaucracy’ and ‘paper-work’ as the enemy of ‘getting on with common-sense policing’ are an expression of this. Although, as we have seen, the new Government wishes to push through measures to increase (local) accountability, it seems less committed to increased regulation; indeed regulation seems part of the problem of British policing rather than the solution. Revealingly, in November 2009 the then Shadow Home Secretary, Chris Grayling, bemoaned the ‘lack of discretion’ for police officers and the plethora of bodies ‘with the right to inspect policing in this country’. He commented favourably on only one of those bodies, Her Majesty’s Inspectorate - “the organisation that should really be the driver of inspection and best practice” (Grayling, 2009) - leaving the status of the other bodies, it would seem, in question. Does this mean that in the longer term we might witness the deregulation of British policing and see the reversal of the move to regulate policing more tightly which we have seen in recent years? One of the bodies whose status seemed in question was the Independent Police Complaints Commission.
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Justice Reform – Next Steps¹

Juliet Lyon CBE
Director of the Prison Reform Trust and Secretary General of Penal Reform International

Members of the British Society of Criminology are most likely to present a cogent case for prison reform on the basis of sound research evidence or on humanitarian grounds. Ironically, just now the best hopes for change may lie in circumstance and pragmatism. Few would argue with the new watch words for the coalition government’s justice policy: moderation, common sense and effectiveness. Combine this approach with the economic crisis, and the scale of public service cuts faced, and we could expect an authoritative drive to return prison to its place of absolute last resort in the justice system.

When the new justice secretary, Ken Clarke, was last in charge of prisons and penal policy, as Home Secretary, the average prison population in England and Wales (1992-1993) was 44,628. That figure now stands at over 85,000 (Prison Reform Trust, 2010) - a number Ken Clarke described after his appointment as “extraordinarily high”. The social and economic costs of increasingly early recourse to custody and increased sentence length have been immense. In the current climate it would be a form of economic madness to allow the prison population to continue to spiral out of control. Each new prison place costs £170,000 to build and maintain, and the cost per prisoner per year is £45,000. Total prison expenditure increased from £2.843 billion in 1995 to £4.385 billion in 2009-10.

As readers will know, despite its exorbitant cost, prison has a poor record for reducing reoffending - 49% of adults are reconvicted within one year of being released, and for those serving sentences of less than 12 months this increases to 61%. The National Audit Office (2010) estimates that reoffending by all recent ex-prisoners costs the taxpayer between £9.5 billion and £13 billion a year, and as much as three quarters of this cost can be attributed to former short-sentenced prisoners. It must be possible to improve on a flawed system in which 66% of people enter prison to serve less than a year and, after a few weeks or months, leave homeless, jobless, out of touch with their families, further in debt, and ready to offend again.

Local and national government can draw on lessons from abroad (see e.g. Justice Select Committee, 2009) where justice reinvestment and prisoner re-entry programmes - driven by economic necessity in many states in America including Florida and, most recently, South Carolina - have had considerable success at reducing crime and rates of reoffending. Closer to home, restorative justice with young people in Northern Ireland has delivered a reduction in youth crime, a drop in child custody and a 90% victim satisfaction rate (Jacobson and Gibbs, 2009). Integrated offender management schemes piloted in parts of England and Wales have achieved impressive results and are waiting to be rolled out nationally.

A breathing space from obsessive concentration on increasing prison capacity at all costs would give the government time to restructure the system so that local authorities, voluntary organisations, police and probation services work more closely together across professional disciplines to develop community solutions to crime that inspire public and judicial confidence.

¹ A version of this article appeared in the July 2010 edition of ‘The Magistrate’
There is broad public and Parliamentary consensus on investing in getting children out of trouble, diverting addicts and people who are mentally ill into effective treatment and, at the other end of the spectrum, informing and supporting victims, transforming prisoner rehabilitation and cutting reoffending on release. The new justice policy attempts to fuse these plans with public health and social policy, albeit on a shoestring. Reducing the numbers of people subjected to the enduring damage of unnecessary use of imprisonment is worth achieving per se.

The proposed wide-ranging review of sentencing could be useful. Judicial bodies have long raised concerns about the glut of legislation and the rafts of new offences and mandatory penalties. New ministers will need to examine the explosion in indeterminate sentencing - which has increased from 3,000 indeterminate sentences in 1992 to 12,822 in March 2010 (Jacobson and Hough, 2010). It will be important too, to look at the high number of recalls for technical breach of license and any unnecessary use of custodial remand.

Differential rates in use of custody up and down the country should be examined alongside availability of effective community measures. Many judges and magistrates would appreciate consideration of the scope for provision of review and an opportunity to be more in touch with the outcomes of sentences. The revised Sentencing Council should play a pivotal role. Overall the sentencing review must take account of current research evidence.

In the past the new Justice Secretary has been critical of the unchecked expansion of the prison population. In a debate on prison policy in the Commons in June 2007 Ken Clarke called for:

... a change of culture in which the platitudes about community sentences and making prison only for those who need it are turned into reality by returning proper discretion to the courts and ensuring that prisons are used only for violent, dangerous and recidivist criminals in conditions in which there is some hope that some of them will be rehabilitated (Hansard HC Deb. C1251, 19 June 2007).

As a moderate prescription for reforming our overcrowded and underperforming prison system the new coalition government could do a lot worse.
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BSC 2010 at the University of Leicester:
Latest News

The BSC 2010 Conference is hosted by the Department of Criminology at the University of Leicester and takes place from Monday 12th to Wednesday 14th July, with the Postgraduate Conference being held from Sunday 11th to Monday 12th July.

This year the conference welcomes no less than six keynote speakers and six special sessions. The two main plenaries will be shared by Reece Walters and Ben Bowling on Monday and Jeff Ferrell and Lilie Chouliaraki on Wednesday. On the middle day, internationally renowned human rights lawyer and founder of Reprieve, Clive Stafford Smith OBE, will be the guest speaker and, after the conference dinner, we will be entertained by Laurie Taylor.

The additional special sessions include:

- A *Hate Time Question Time*, featuring some of the leading international hate crime scholars; Barbara Perry, David Gadd, Jon Garland, Nathan Hall and Paul Giannasi;
- An Audience With Rex Bloomstein in which prison governor and academic, Jamie Bennett, will interview the critically-acclaimed, Bafta-Award winning film-maker Rex Bloomstein about his prison documentaries and other work;
- A Crime Film Stream which will show movies as diverse as ‘Fourteen Days in May’, ‘The Fear Factory’ and ‘Man on Wire’; and
- An Authors Meet Critics panel in which Ian Loader and Richard Sparks will discuss their new book ‘Public Criminology?’ (Routledge) and will face their ‘critics’, Martin Innes, Gordon Hughes and Reece Walters.

For the postgraduate delegates, there will be a big screen TV showing the World Cup Final on Sunday. On Monday evening conference delegates will be able to relax at a barbeque on the lawns at Oadby and can enjoy a few glasses of wine knowing that their accommodation is two minutes walk away. On the following evening, the conference dinner is an Indian banquet at Athena, a beautifully restored Art Deco cinema in the city’s Cultural Quarter.

We look forward to welcoming you to Leicester.

Yvonne Jewkes and Neil Chakraborti, Conference Organisers

SAGE Reception at BSC 2010

As part of their 45th anniversary celebrations, SAGE is undertaking a range of activities to promote and champion the impact that social science research makes on society. SAGE is partnering with the BSC to sponsor a stream at the conference on The Policy Value of Criminology, which has attracted some outstanding speakers. SAGE will also be sponsoring a drinks reception during the conference, to which all delegates are warmly invited. The reception will take place at 7.30pm on Monday 12th July.
New staff at the BSC: Welcome to Charlotte and Mandy

The BSC now has two members of staff, Mandy Ross and Charlotte Harris. Both work part-time and both are home-based.

Mandy, who has actually worked on a casual basis for the Society for many years and whose name may well be known to you, is now Membership Secretary, not only in charge, as her title implies, of all matters to do with membership - applications, renewals, expenses - but also distribution of e-bulletins and updating the website. Mandy can be contacted on the main BSC e-mail bsc@britsoccrim.org.

Charlotte is Senior Policy Officer, supporting the policy work of the Executive Committee. Her role involves: liaising with outside bodies such as government departments, HESA, HEFCE, other learned societies, the ESRC and the British Academy; and ensuring the legal requirements of running a charitable company are met. Charlotte can be contacted at charlotte.harris@britsoccrim.org.

Criminology finally gets its own higher education subject codes

Criminology is finally to get its own subject codes within the higher education system. Previously, there were no criminology codes in the Joint Academic Coding System - or JACS - which is used by higher education institutes and UCAS to code courses available to students. This meant institutions offering courses in criminology were using a range of codes in both Social Science and Law with the result that it was subsequently impossible to assess the numbers and variety of criminology students in result tables and listings.

The new codes - to be introduced by the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) after consultation with the BSC, C-SAP (the Subject Centre for Sociology, Anthropology and Politics) and UKCLE (The UK Centre for Legal Education) will be Applied Criminology, Victimology, Criminological Theory, Criminal Justice Policy, International Criminology, Community Justice, Sociology of Law, Criminal Justice Management and Crime History. Figures will be available for the first time in the academic year 2012/13 to allow time for higher education institutes to reclassify subjects and, in turn, for UCAS to implement the new classifications.
Publications News

“Criminology & Criminal Justice” Expansion

The BSC and SAGE are delighted to announce that from 2011 Criminology & Criminal Justice will increase publication from 4 to 5 issues per volume. This is in recognition of the journal’s success to date - including its growing international profile and the increasing number of high quality articles being submitted. As has been previously announced, the journal will be edited from next year by a new team at the University of Leeds: Adam Crawford, Anthea Hucklesby, Susanne Karstedt, Clive Walker and David Wall.

As part of the strategy to continue the growth of CCJ, the incoming Editors welcome proposals for themed special issues on topics that fall within the scope of the journal. Proposals should be submitted by 1st October 2010 to ccj@leeds.ac.uk; full criteria can be found at http://crj.sagepub.com/ (where general article submission guidelines can also be found).

Warmest thanks and congratulations are due to the current editors, Gordon Hughes, Trevor Jones, Michael Levi, Matthew Williams and their colleagues at Cardiff University, who have produced four outstanding volumes of high quality scholarship.

Call for Papers:

“Papers from the British Criminology Conference”

If you are presenting a paper at this year’s conference in Leicester we would gladly welcome submissions to the 2010 edition of our online journal. Previous editions can be viewed on the BSC website at: http://britsoccrim.org/conferences.htm.

Papers from the British Criminology Conference is a peer-reviewed annual online journal that draws from the best papers presented at the BSC’s annual conference. The journal is international in scope, and welcomes contributions from conference participants from across the globe. Papers can be submitted under the following three categories: 1) Plenary papers; 2) Panel papers; and 3) Postgraduate papers. Submissions from postgraduate students will be considered for the BSC Postgraduate Paper Prize.

Submission guidelines are on the BSC and Leicester Conference websites. The deadline for submission is two months after the close of this year’s conference (1st September 2010). Please email to the journal editor Andrew Millie at: a.millie@lbss.gla.ac.uk.
BSC Postgraduate Committee News

The Postgraduate Committee continues to have an important role within the BSC, not only at the upcoming conference at the University of Leicester, but also within the regional branches of the BSC, an example given here being the BSC Midlands Branch.

The BSC PG Conference 2010
Staff at the Department of Criminology, University of Leicester (including members of the PG Committee) have put together a comprehensive and innovative programme of papers including those to support PhD students’ studies and also papers by research degree students. This latter element has become an increasingly important part of the focus of the PG conference and offers a valuable opportunity for speakers and delegates to test out their research, present findings and also develop new contacts. As a member of the committee since 2008 and a regular attendee, I can also vouch for the excellent nights out which follow the first half of the PG conference (I do believe this is what is referred to as ‘networking’?).

Student Criminologists and the BSC Midlands Branch
Postgraduate and undergraduate students are an active part of the Midlands Branch of the BSC. The Midlands branch was launched in March this year at the University of Wolverhampton, hosted by Jim Waddington, Martin Wright and Kate Williams with a speech given by renowned expert on police corruption, Maurice Punch. The event gave students an opportunity to pose questions to a leading academic and also to learn about the work of the BSC.

This was then followed up by a full day event at the University of Northampton, coordinated and hosted by Lystra Hagley-Dickinson with colleagues from the School of Social Sciences and Northamptonshire Police. This conference included input by current Masters students who presented their research theses - a very well attended event and also a very good insight for undergraduates thinking about future study. There was also a session specifically related to the work of the BSC, outlining the benefits of membership and the broader role it can play in academic careers. The final presentation for the day was given by Ben Bowling who explored understandings of policing, sparking insightful debates about the use of stop and search and the expectations we all have about the way in which the police work.

This event will be followed by another one day conference, planned for Spring 2011 at De Montfort University. This event will take some of the issues explored at Northampton and Wolverhampton including input from students and outside speakers, with a specific focus on criminology, criminal justice policy and the links with higher education. We hope to have further half or one day conferences to continue to offer the work of leading academics to a wider audience, promote the work of young researchers and build networks within the region.

We would welcome any suggestions relating to the PG committee, so if you have any ideas please contact either me (satherton@dmu.ac.uk) or my colleagues Lystra Hagley-Dickinson (lystra.hagley-dickinson@northampton.ac.uk) and Kate Williams (kate.williams@wlv.ac.uk).

Susie Atherton, De Montfort University
BSC Youth Criminology/Youth Justice Network (YC/YJN) News

Special Issue of CCJ
In May 2010 a special issue of *Criminology and Criminal Justice* (Volume 10 Number 2) was published, deriving from one of three YC/YJN conferences that were held in 2009. The themed issue - *Comparative Youth Justice Research and the Policy Process* - comprises articles by Mark Drakeford, Barry Goldson, Gordon Hughes, Lesley McAra, Susan McVie and David Smith. Taken together the articles aim not only to advance comparative research but also to interrogate critically the extent to which research-based knowledge and practice-based experience translate into the realms of policy in the youth justice sphere. For more information see: [http://crj.sagepub.com/content/vol10/issue2/](http://crj.sagepub.com/content/vol10/issue2/)

Forthcoming Book
In September 2010 an edited volume entitled *Youth in Crisis? ‘Gangs’, Territoriality and Violence* will be published by Willan. By building upon, extending and developing a series of questions that were initially discussed and debated at a second YC/YJN conference in 2009, the book promises to provide a challenging and authoritative analysis of core issues pertaining to urban youth identities, crime and social order. For more information see: [http://www.willanpublishing.co.uk](http://www.willanpublishing.co.uk)

YC/YJN at the BSC Conference
A specialist panel coordinated by the YC/YJN will convene at the 2010 BSC Conference in Leicester. Entitled *Youth Justice, Human Rights and Public Criminology*, the panel will be chaired by Loraine Gelsthorpe. It will provide an opportunity for presenters and participants to critically reflect on the relations (and fractures) between knowledge, human rights standards and youth justice policy formation and to consider the implications of the same for public social science.

Future events
The YC/YJN Steering Group will soon be planning the next sequence of Network events and invites suggestions, proposals and/or expressions of interest from interested parties.

Further information
For further information about the YC/YJN please contact: Professor Barry Goldson, School of Sociology and Social Policy, the University of Liverpool, L69 7ZA, UK, or email: b.goldson@liv.ac.uk

Barry Goldson, University of Liverpool
BSC Conference 2012: Invitation to Tender

The British Society of Criminology (BSC) invites tenders for the organisation of the summer 2012 BSC Annual Conference.

Our annual conference continues to be the cornerstone of our professional development and vitally important to the British Society of Criminology and our members. In the past few years - Glasgow 2006, London 2007, Huddersfield 2008, Cardiff 2009 and this year at Leicester - the conference has attracted a diversity of delegates (practitioners, policy-makers, academics and students) from the criminological community across the world.

Therefore the Society is seeking an academic institution that will continue the tradition of the previous universities who have hosted our annual meeting - providing those in the criminological community with an opportunity to present the latest findings from their research, their experience of the criminal justice system and to debate the key issues of the day - while being open to innovation.

Among the items which should be addressed in tenders are:

1. Conference location, including national and international access;
2. Facilities for main plenary sessions, parallel workshops, publishers’ exhibitions, receptions, etc;
3. Range and quality of available accommodation, catering, etc, including the conference dinner;
4. Local academic and organisational capacity/experience;
5. Innovative sessions/events;
6. Postgraduate provision;
7. Social programme;
8. Sponsorship ideas for different elements of the programme;
9. Outline costings, including proposed delegate rates, for different categories of accommodation (if applicable) and delegate status (e.g. postgraduate students).

For an informal chat about any ideas, concerns or general information about what is involved, please contact Dr Mark Simpson (Chair of the BSC Conferences Committee) at: Mark.Simpson@tees.ac.uk. This year in order to simplify the short-listing process we have introduced an application form. If you are interested in tendering, a copy of this application form is available from the Society by emailing Dr Charlotte Harris at charlotte.harris@britsoc crim.org or by writing to The British Society of Criminology, 2-6 Cannon Street, London, EC4M 6YH. Completed forms should be submitted no later than Friday, October 15, 2010.

Looking forward - The BSC will also be organising Annual Conferences in 2013, 2014 and beyond. Organising the BSC conference is no small undertaking and institutions may wish to start considering planning tenders for conferences beyond 2012.
Update on the Research Excellence Framework

The BSC has lobbied HEFCE for a far more visible role for Criminology and criminologists in their next research assessment structure.

In its official response to HEFCE about proposals for the successor to the RAE, the Research Excellence Framework, or REF, the Society strongly critiqued the “invisibility” of criminology in the 2008 exercise. In particular, the report sent to HEFCE lamented the under-representation of criminological researchers on the three main Panels to which criminologists submitted in the RAE - Social Policy, Social Work and Social Administration (40), Sociology (41) and Law (38). Panel 40 had just three criminologists, as opposed to 5 social work and 8 social policy scholars, the Sociology Panel had just one and the Law Panel had no members with criminological expertise at all. In addition, while the BSC REF committee estimated that there were almost 2000 criminological submissions to the RAE, criminology was not identified as a discipline within the panel headings.

The current HEFCE proposal suggests that the number of panels will be reduced in the REF, rather than expanded, so the report recognized that it was unlikely that consideration would be given to the creation of a separate Criminology Panel. However, as well as greater Panel representation, the BSC response pushed for a greater use of the cross-referral process and criminologist ‘panel associates’ who could assess criminological work for panels whose main expertise lay elsewhere. The report pointed out that in the RAE, limited use was made of cross-referrals to other panels with relevant expertise. For example, the Law Panel failed to make any referrals to the criminologists sitting on the Social Policy Panel despite having no criminologists on the Law Panel to assess this work.

Elsewhere, the response was more positive supporting the concept of research assessment in general and welcoming the retention of peer-review and the recognition of ‘impact’ as a key aspect of research excellence, while expressing caution about how this could be measured. The potential use of citation metrics to measure impact was also a matter of concern in that many citation databases do not count citations in books and edited books, where much criminological research is published, and the timescales in criminological research mean that measuring citations for just two years after publication would be inadequate. Concerns were also expressed about the proposed methods for assessing ‘research environment’ which some members had felt would privilege those units that are already well-funded at the expense of units that produce world-class research despite the limitation of their research environment.

The response was prepared by a REF sub-committee of the BSC Professional Affairs Committee chaired by Professor Shadd Maruna (Queen’s University, Belfast), and including Professor Robert Canton (De Montford University), Dr Loraine Gelsthorpe (University of Cambridge), Professor Mike Hough (King’s College, London), Professor Kieran McEvoy (Queen’s University, Belfast), Professor Tim Newburn (London School of Economics) and Professor Sandra Walklate (University of Liverpool) following a survey of the BSC membership about their experiences of the RAE, outlined in Shadd’s article in the last BSC Newsletter.
BSC Regional News

South West
The South West branch was launched in May 2009. Since then, it has hosted guest speaker seminars, including one by John Pitts (University of Bedfordshire) on ‘Conceptualising the Violent Youth Gang’ in May 2010, and informal meetings at the University of Plymouth. Please contact Zoe James (z.James@plymouth.ac.uk) or Daniel Gilling (d.gilling@plymouth.ac.uk) for further details.

North West
The branch is planning a Symposium on Prisons to be held at University of Central Lancashire in September 2010. Please contact Dave Whyte (david.whyte@liverpool.ac.uk) for further details.

Midlands
As already reported in the section on the Postgraduate Committee, the Midlands branch was re-launched in March 2010. The inaugural lecture for the branch was held at the University of Wolverhampton when Maurice Punch from the LSE gave a lecture on police corruption. This was followed in May 2010 by a one day event celebrating 10 years of Criminology at the University of Northampton. It comprised a series of workshops and seminars on topics such as ‘Challenging Criminology’, ‘Cyber-crime’, ‘Policing Sex Offenders’ and a keynote lecture by Ben Bowling on ‘The Future of Criminology in Practice’. Please contact Tank Waddington (PAJ.Waddington@wlv.ac.uk) or Charlotte Bilby (calb1@leicester.ac.uk) for further details.

Wales
In 2009/10, seven seminars were hosted by the Wales branch, with talks from Welsh academics and speakers from outside Wales and the UK covering areas of members’ interests, such as devolution, prostitution and youth crime. Speakers included Jo Phoenix (Durham University), John Pitts (University of Bedfordshire) and Mark Drakeford (Cardiff University). One of the continuing aims for the branch is to hold seminars at more Welsh universities and, pleasingly, Glamorgan, Cardiff, Swansea, Newport and, for the first time, Bangor hosted seminars. Further details can be found by contacting Harriet Pierpoint (hlpierpo@glam.ac.uk) or by visiting the branch website at: http://criminology.research.glam.ac.uk/bscnewsletter/.

Harriet Pierpoint, University of Glamorgan