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News from the North West and Southern Branches
Editorial

Andrew Millie, Professor of Criminology, Edge Hill University

2013 will be remembered as a sad year for British criminology with the passing of Stan Cohen, Terence Morris, Geoffrey Pearson, Barbara Hudson and Jock Young. It is hard to imagine criminology without any one of them and all will be missed. In the last issue of the Newsletter BSC President Loraine Gelsthorpe paid fitting tribute to Stan Cohen and Geoff Pearson. In this issue this is extended to Terence Morris, Barbara Hudson and Jock Young. A further tribute to Jock is provided by his friends and colleagues Keith Hayward and Roger Matthews.

In 2013 the BSC Conference was successfully hosted by the University of Wolverhampton. A highlight was a mock trial where criminology was defended by Loraine Gelsthorpe, with the assistance of Coretta Phillips and Shadd Maruna. The case for the prosecution was led by Steve Tombs, aided by Paddy Hillyard and Simon Pemberton. The audience didn’t know what to expect but were treated to some real debate with ‘criminology’ being seriously challenged. Shadd in particular gave an impassioned defence and Steve Tombs was an enthusiastic prosecutor, but in the end ‘criminology’ came out on top. The use of a real judge and well known criminologists in courtroom fancy dress added to the entertainment. Also at the conference Professor Joanna Shapland received the BSC Outstanding Achievement Award, presented to her by Stephen Farrall. Joanna’s important work on restorative justice is well known and there can be little argument that she is a worthy recipient. Stephen’s dedication and Joanna’s acceptance speech are included in this Newsletter.

Also in this Newsletter are two articles on the importation of ‘Super-prisons’ to the UK. There has been talk in the UK of ‘titan’ prisons, ‘super prisons’ and ‘supermax’ prisons for some time; and earlier this year it was announced that the first ‘super-prison’ for 2,000 prisoners is to be built in Wrexham, North Wales. A similar scheme is mooted for the site of Feltham YOI. This is a major change in penal policy for the Coalition partners. Much can be learnt from the US where ‘supermax’ has been in vogue for quite some time. Included here is an article by Loïc Wacquant who looks at the history and development of the supermax and the contradictions of the meta-prison - what he calls the ‘supermax swindle’. A further contribution is provided by Rob Allen who considers the British context to the use of massive prisons.

For the rest of the Newsletter there is the usual mix of news from the various groups and branches that make up the BSC. Most importantly there are details of the next BSC Conference in July 2014 hosted by the University of Liverpool. This already looks like it will be a great conference (and in a great city - for me with the added advantage of being just down the road!) I look forward to seeing many of you there. Finally, I just want to thank all those who have given their time to contribute to this Newsletter.

Happy Christmas and all the best for 2014!

Andrew Millie, December 2013
A letter from our President

Loraine Gelsthorpe, Professor in Criminology and Criminal Justice, Cambridge Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge

For those of you who did not make it to the BSC annual summer conference (in Wolverhampton this past year) I am pleased to report that Criminology survived the notion that it has outlived its usefulness - and makes no contribution! Being in the hot seat - defending Criminology - made me realise anew how important it is to continue to debate disciplinary boundaries and purpose, and to reflect on the impact of academic contributions to policy and practice.

There are certainly many opportunities to make contributions through consultation processes, whether this relates to triennial reviews of the Youth Justice Board, the Parole Board, or considerations of custodial arrangements for children (to mention but a few recent government consultation invitations). Whilst there are obvious practical challenges in the BSC getting groups of people together to submit evidence through such processes, I would nevertheless wish to encourage BSC specialist (and perhaps even regional) networks to do so. In some ways it seems as if academics have much less say in policy-making than hitherto (evidence-based policy being overshadowed by political interests) but there is nevertheless strong encouragement to speak up about what we can learn from research.

The BSC did have direct opportunity to engage with policy-makers in September 2013 when we held a joint seminar with the Ministry of Justice and Home Office (kindly hosted by the British Academy) to discuss the futures of crime, considering the ‘crime drop’, the implications of police data on domestic violence for policing strategies, and the implications of changing conceptions of and evidence relating to ‘adolescence’. We hope that such seminars will now be a regular feature in the BSC’s quest for both vision and voice.

The BSC has also recently participated in an Academy of the Social Sciences’ (AcSS) review of learned societies and their impact. Learned Societies such as our own are long established in the UK intellectual landscape. Open access arrangements threaten the viability of such societies - where income is drawn from journal subscriptions - and whilst the BSC is in no immediate danger at all, we are beginning to think very hard about potential implications in the future. We are participating in wider debates so that we are fully informed.

Members of the BSC will be sorry to learn of the death of Professor Terence Morris in early July 2013. He was an outstanding academic, having joined the LSE in 1955 when criminology in the UK was still in its infancy. In 1962, he co-authored (with Pauline, his first wife) a major sociological study on an English prison, Pentonville. The study prompted a life long interest in the purpose of imprisonment, and more particularly generated campaigning energy against both capital punishment and life imprisonment. He was a strong critic of governmental policy, noting that this was often regressive rather than progressive. Professor Morris was also a reforming and enlightened magistrate - serving in this role for nearly 30 years.

Professor Barbara Hudson’s untimely death in September 2013 is another sad loss to Criminology. Barbara had a career which took her in and out different institutions (Lancaster University Centre for Youth, Crime and Community, Middlesex Probation - as a Research Officer, Northumbria University and then the University of Central Lancashire). Barbara was greatly involved in the European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control and much in demand as a speaker. Barbara’s work has been at the forefront of the Sociology of Punishment: ‘Who Needs Justice? Who Needs Security?’ (2012) in her co-edited volume Justice and Security in the 21st Century, (Routledge); ‘Regulating democracy: Justice, citizenship and inequality in Brazil’, in Regulation and Criminal Justice (2010) (Cambridge University Press), and ‘Justice in a time of terror’ (2009) in the British Journal of Criminology (48) are telling of her passion, for instance. Barbara’s
work over the years has made important contribution to the development of new perspectives on justice by providing a rigorous analysis of political and ethical theories that will remain highly relevant to criminology and penology students, academics, criminal justice practitioners and policy makers alike.

And more recently still, we are saddened to learn of the death of Professor Jock Young (see the obituary provided by Keith Hayward and Roger Matthews on page 5). Jock was awarded the British Society of Criminology Outstanding Achievement Award for 2012.

The new year will no doubt bring fresh challenges - but also opportunities to build on the work of those criminologists who have gone before us.

With every good wish for Yuletide, Christmas and other festivals, and for the New Year.

Loraine Gelsthorpe, December 2013
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This book examines the state of access to criminal justice by considering the health of the lawyer-client relationship under legal aid. In the largest study of its kind for some two decades, ethnographic fieldwork is used to gain a fresh perspective upon the interaction that lies at the heart of the criminal justice system's equality of arms. The research produces two contradictory messages: in interview, lawyers claim a positive relationship with their clients while, under participant observation, there emerges quite the opposite. Paying more heed to what was seen than what was said, it is supposed that these lawyers were able to talk the talk but not walk the walk. The lawyers respect their clients with wanton disrespect; making fun of them, talking over them and pushing them to plead guilty - despite protests to the contrary. The evidence is damning for this branch of the legal profession - and fragile for the clients who depend on them. What is responsible for this malaise... inadequate financial remuneration? Increased time pressures? Lapsed ethical training? Whatever the origin, this book is intended to show the profession that there is a problem - one that could get worse unless they choose to learn from the mistakes made by the lawyers in this study.
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A Tribute to Jock Young 1942-2013

Keith Hayward and Roger Matthews
University of Kent

Jock Young, one of the world’s preeminent criminologists, has died at the age of 71. More than any other criminologist of his generation he shaped the nature and direction of the discipline and has been at the forefront of almost every major development in the sociology of crime and deviance over the past four decades. Revered and respected for his scholarly activities, he will also be remembered for his charisma, humour and famously warm and relaxed manner that inspired all those who knew and worked with him.

Jock was the leading light of an intellectual movement inspired by the radical political currents of the 1960s that questioned conventional ways of thinking about crime and its control. Despite subsequent shifts of perspective, this radical sensibility remained undimmed throughout the entirety of his long and immensely distinguished career. He was instinctively sceptical of organised coercive power and consistently took the side of those affected by it. In later work he was a fierce critic of short-sighted ‘get tough’ policies and a vigorous opponent of defeatist claims that ‘nothing works’. He was also critical of the tendency among criminologists to transform the fascinating and vibrant subject of crime and justice into an abstract and lifeless academic enterprise. Instead, he urged sociologists and criminologists to appreciate the richness and diversity of social life.

William Young was born in Vogrie Nr Gorebridge in Midlothian, Scotland. At five his family moved to Aldershot. His grammar school education in the Hampshire military town was a formative experience, not least because it furnished him with a nickname that stuck: Jock. The school enforced mandatory attendance in a uniformed Cadet Force. The regimentation and hours of ‘square bashing’ did not sit well with Jock, who, along with a motley group of conscientious objectors, rebelled and formed an anti-Fascist/pro-CND group to oppose the school’s enforced military ethos. It was the first salvo in a career characterized by dogged resistance to unquestioned authority, arbitrary elite power and unthinking conformity. Despite, or perhaps because of, this rebellious streak, Jock was an outstanding student. He particularly excelled in science and had secured a place at University College London to read biochemistry. But a chance encounter with the radical criminologist Steve Box convinced him to change track and switch to sociology instead.

In 1962 he enrolled at The London School of Economics, where he would go on to complete his formal academic training. At the LSE he became inspired by new developments in American sociology such as symbolic interactionism and labeling theory. While this work greatly influenced Jock, just as significant was the countercultural revolution taking place outside the University seminar room. These were heady times: R D Laing was promulgating his anti-psychiatry message in public readings at the Roundhouse and the Rolling Stones were hard at work shocking the post-war British establishment. It was this countercultural sensibility that inspired Jock to co-found the first National Deviancy Conference (NDC) in 1968. Avowedly anti-institutional and highly critical of orthodox criminology, the NDC instigated a decade-long series of interdisciplinary conferences based around emerging research in new ‘the sociology of deviance’. It was at the first NDC that Young presented his first conference paper, ‘The role of Police as amplifiers of deviance’. Like the NDC itself, the paper was a reflection of changes underway in British society in the 1960s. It was also the foundation for his first major work, The Drugtakers, a ground-breaking 1971 study of bohemian counterculture in 1960s Notting Hill. This text, together with Folk Devils and Moral Panics, authored by his great friend and fellow LSE student, Stan Cohen, trail blazed the concept of ‘moral panic’, one of the few criminological concepts to be adopted for general use beyond academia. Equally influential was his

Jock was one of a number of radical LSE graduates who decamped to Middlesex Polytechnic (as it then was) in the late 1960s and early 1970s. During this period the social science department there was a hotbed of radical and socialist thought where many of the staff could be heard punching out articles on manual typewriters for journals like *New Left Review* and *Socialist Worker*. Soon after arriving, Jock established a single honours degree and set up one of the first Masters programmes in criminology in the country. In the 1980s he headed The Centre for Criminology, which rapidly developed a reputation as a leading criminology unit. It was during this period that Jock laid the foundations for a more engaged ‘realist’ criminology that argued for critical criminologists to take crime more seriously. He argued that ‘law and order’ was indeed a socialist issue, insisting that the victims of crime are predominantly the poor and the marginalised. His work in this period also had strong policy and educational dimensions. In the 1980s he conducted research into crime victimisation in several London Boroughs, and acted in a formal advisory capacity to London’s Metropolitan Police Authority. Working closely with members of the Labour Party during the Thatcher years he encouraged a rethink of their approach to crime and policing. However, Jock was disappointed with the way in which New Labour dealt with the crime issue after it came to power in 1997, pointing out that Tony Blair’s stated commitment to ‘get tough on crime and the causes of crime’ tended in practice to concentrate disproportionately on the first half of the equation. Throughout his long tenure at Middlesex, Jock was offered professorships at several more ‘prestigious’ Universities, but turned them down. Unlike most career-minded academics he always maintained an endearing humility and was indifferent to the trappings of status. He also enjoyed London, particularly his beloved ‘Stokey’ (Stoke Newington). He remained at Middlesex for thirty-five years before moving first to New York City, where he took up a position at John Jay College of Criminal Justice in 2002, and later back to the UK, where he held a position at the University of Kent, playing an active role there in developing cultural criminology. In 2009 he returned once again to New York, this time as Distinguished Professor of Criminal Justice and Sociology at the City University of New York’s Graduate Center. His years in America inspired further intellectual development, culminating in the publication of the final two volumes of a trilogy of monographs – *The Exclusive Society*, *The Vertigo of Late Modernity* and *The Criminological Imagination* - that documented the cultural shifts associated with late modernity.

Jock Young’s writings have been translated into 11 languages in 15 countries, and he has been honoured on numerous occasions. In 2008 he was awarded the American Society of Criminology’s Sellin-Glueck Prize for Outstanding International Contributions to Criminology, and in 2009 received a Lifetime Achievement Award by the Critical Criminology Division of the same society. Most recently, in 2012 he was the recipient of the British Society of Criminology’s Outstanding Achievement Award.

His death will leave an immense void in a discipline which owes so much to his singular vision and path-breaking originality. All those who knew and loved him will feel that the world has suddenly and tragically become less full of humour, colour, and meaning.

He is survived by his wife Jayne, his sons Jesse, Joseph and Fin, his step-daughter Anny, and brother Graham.

*Note: An abridged version was printed in the Guardian as follows:*
Presenting the BSC Outstanding Achievement Award to Joanna Shapland

Stephen Farrall
University of Sheffield

The BSC’s Outstanding Achievement Award - awarded to my dear colleague Joanna Shapland relates directly to research which she directed for the Home Office and then Ministry of Justice. The research involved the first ever randomized control trial for restorative justice (RJ) and has been a key driver - some may say the key driver - in the current government’s plans for the criminal justice system via the Crime and Courts Act 2013 as these relate to restorative justice. The research was ambitious from the outset - and cost an eye-watering £1.3m. Her research team’s findings have pushed RJ to the fore of current thinking on how we deal with those affected by crime and do appear to offer a more progressive and socially just criminal justice system. The study explored the consequences of involvement in RJ schemes for adults who had committed serious offences, such as robbery, burglary and violent offences. The findings suggested that:

- “The majority of victims chose to participate in face-to-face meetings with the offender, when offered by a trained facilitator;
- 85% of victims who took part were satisfied with the process;
- RJ reduced the frequency of re-offending, leading to £9 savings for every £1 spent on restorative justice.”

This is one of a few truly ‘land mark’ studies in policy-related criminological research in the modern-era. But this is not all that Joanna has accomplished of late; since stepping down as the Editor of the British Journal of Criminology, Joanna has edited the International Review of Victimology, co-led (with Tony Bottoms) a very successful longitudinal study into why people stop offending funded by the ESRC, Directed the Centre for Criminological Research at the University of Sheffield, and undertaken two further projects with colleagues for the Ministry of Justice (one of which has morphed into a European-funded project). And been Head of the School of Law since 2009. Joanna’s research contributions go far, far further than the Award which we, as the BSC, are recognising today, but nevertheless it is important that we today recognise the importance of this particular research project and the reflected glory it confers on all of us who in various ways can claim an association with it - as co-researchers, as colleagues or simply as fellow members of the British Society of Criminology.
I am delighted - and very surprised - to receive this honour, the Outstanding Achievement Award from the British Society of Criminology. It means a lot to me to be nominated for and to receive an award from my peers, particularly for research, and I am very grateful to Stephen Farrall and to the British Society of Criminology.

The award particularly references the research and subsequent work on explaining the research to government, to policy makers and to practitioners on restorative justice. That research is definitely not just my research. It would never have been done or drawn to a conclusion without the sterling efforts over seven long years of the team of researchers based at the University of Sheffield: Anne Atkinson, Helen Atkinson, Emily Colledge, Jackie McKay, Jim Dignan, Jeremy Hibbert, Marie Howes, Jenny Johnstone, Gwen Robinson and Angela Sorsby, together with Becca Chapman and Rachel Pennant of the then Home Office, and NFO Europe, the survey company. I also really need to thank those who were running those three schemes and putting up with the evaluators, whilst trying to - and succeeding in - delivering very high standard restorative justice. For Justice Research Consortium, that was Larry Sherman and Heather Strang, now of the Institute of Criminology at Cambridge. For CONNECT it was Ben Lyon. And for REMEDI it was first Philip Gilbert and then Steve Jones.

I don’t think if we’d known in 2001 what we were taking on we would have done it. The sheer scale has been astounding - over 10,000 e-mails have flown through my mailbox. Because restorative justice is about bringing together those affected by a crime and encouraging them to discuss together what happened, what effects it has had and what should happen as a result, it really needed a very multi-method approach. And it got it - being around the schemes, observing the conferences and mediation sessions, interviewing both victims and offenders, interviewing staff running the schemes, wading through forests of Police National Computer data, calculating reoffending rates and costs and benefits.

Some things are still very fresh in my memory - how, with a few researchers, can one cover a conference in Newcastle, one in a prison near Reading, a mediation in Rotherham, another conference in a rural area near Gateshead? Train timetables and Metro timetables to the fore. And sitting on the floor in an extremely dusty windowless basement of a magistrates’ court in London in a heatwave, flicking through towering piles of paper court records (and filing them on the way) to find a match for a female 30 year old fraudster convicted on a certain date. There are some real advantages to randomised controlled trials - and they’re not just about removing the real selection effects of agreeing to participate in restorative justice on reoffending. They’re also about the lack of information on offenders in court papers and victims in all papers, to do proper matching. But most vivid of all are the reactions of individual participants to restorative justice itself - the ability to communicate, to describe the effects the offence has had, to outline hopes and plans for the future. So my - and our - main thanks must go to the thousands of participants in the research, who agreed to try something very new, and also to be researched along the way.

After the research, and doing the analysis, and writing up the research, and rewriting it to satisfy funders and so forth, came the perhaps hardest task – to explain what it meant to policy makers and practitioners. Criminal justice is built on certainty and lack of change in what the law is. Changing
criminal justice - allowing a new way of doing things to come into play, particularly for adult offenders and more serious offences - is worse than changing the direction of an oil tanker - because oil tankers are not usually quite so certain that the way things are is the right one. It was very difficult to get across to policy makers the lessons of the restorative justice research - though eventually we managed to do so.

I’m not just talking here about restorative justice in terms of the difficulty of achieving change. From way back in the 1970s and 1980s, when I was researching first mitigation in the criminal courts and the process of sentencing, and then the experiences of victims with criminal justice, it has been very clear to me that the perceived experiences of victims, defendants and witnesses with criminal justice are very like each other – and very different from what the professionals in charge of those domains think they are. The criminal justice system in this country and in others has now tried to do helpful things in relation to victims and witnesses - though it seems to be currently going backwards in relation to defendants and legal assistance. But it is still extraordinarily difficult for victims to find out from the police or the CPS what is happening in their case, for witnesses to find out where and when they are supposed to be going to court, or for victims to plough through the bureaucracy which is claiming compensation from the Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority. No wonder the European Union in 2012 gave up on its previous Framework Decision issued ten years earlier and issued a new Victims Directive, hopefully with a few more teeth.

Back in the late 1970s in the magistrates’ court, the judiciary was trying to deal with unrepresented defendants for many quite serious cases. In the civil courts in the 1990s, doing a civil justice audit, I watched District Judges trying to cope with one civilian 40 year old male driver representing one multinational firm against another. The judges found it really difficult, not because they weren’t trying, not because they were out of touch - they were amazing in how they tried to explain legal concepts in everyday language (perhaps a model for law lecturers!). They were finding it difficult because ordinary people find it difficult to grasp what is relevant legally and what is evidence – and what isn’t. I don’t think the current reductions in legal assistance have been thought through. Legal assistance isn’t required because it’s welfare, or for scroungers, or because those accused or suffering deserve everything coming to them, but because we live in a country which values the rule of law, and the values of justice. And so it is important that people can defend themselves and important that victims know what is happening. It’s about trust and confidence in our legal system, our courts and our police. And that is something that once lost, is extremely difficult to regain.

At a previous BSC conference dinner, many years ago (you can see the grey hairs coming out here), Professor Sir Leon Radzinowicz stormed at the assembled criminologists. We were too passive, too cosily bedded in our ivory towers, too dependent on funders so that we were self-censoring ourselves in our research and our research topics. I subsequently published that speech in the British Journal of Criminology1 because I thought it was so important. I think today it is even more important in these times of change, of recession and of insecurity. I said to the International Society of Criminology in 2011 that we as criminologists were failing to think about the economic recession and its effects - and its potential implications for the informal economy. I think that is still so, with a few honourable exceptions. We need to be listening closely to what people are saying, the citizens of each country. We need to be challenging the accepted wisdom where it no longer serves much use. We need to be thinking carefully about what should be crime, how policing can be done to preserve trust and confidence, what it means to encourage desistance from crime by persistent offenders. But I hope - and yes, I’m sure - that this conference, from its programme, will set itself those tasks of examining and of challenging.

Joanna Shapland, July 2013

---

Supermax Swindle:
On the contradictions of the meta-prison*

Loïc Wacquant
University of California, Berkeley
Centre de sociologie européenne, Paris

Having doubled its confined population in twenty years despite flattening crime rates and having recently regained its title as the leading incarcerator in Western Europe, Britain is struggling to figure out where to warehouse the 85,000 bodies it holds under penal restraints. How to replace aging, decrepit, and overcrowded facilities and build new ones while limiting correctional outlays? How to manage the “worst of the worst” inmates in austere conditions and yet continue to invoke the empty promise of “rehabilitation”? How to sell endless carceral expansion as a social good to the citizenry despite its glaring failure to cure the malady of street crime? The building of “titan prisons” patterned after the large-scale custodial establishments common in the United States has been proffered as the miraculous elucidation of these dilemmas. Fittingly, the Ministry of Justice recently announced that Britain’s first “super-prison” would be built at the cost of £250m on the site of an abandoned Firestone factory on Wrexham Industrial Estate: as industrial employment vanishes, penal contraptions mushroom to enforce the new economic regime of casual jobs and restricted social rights for the unskilled fractions of the postindustrial working class as well as to boost the evaporating legitimacy of political elites (Wacquant, 2014a).

To assess the potential impact of this new item in the “transatlantic trade” in penal policy, it is instructive to reflect on the roots, rationale, and spread of the “Supermax” in the United States. It reveals that, far from resolving the contradictions of hyperincarceration, the “prison within the prison system” has only displaced and exacerbated them. One can predict a similar fate for Britain’s lurch toward titanic incarceration.

It is often forgotten that, during the 1960s and into the mid-1970s, the United States was a global leader in progressive penality, much as it had been about a century earlier when Gustave de Beaumont and Alexis de Tocqueville crossed the Atlantic to learn about American innovations in humane punishment for the benefit of European rulers.1 Through practical experience and in-depth policy analysis, federal authorities had arrived at the view that the prison is an institution that feeds, rather than fights, crime; that the building of custodial facilities should be stopped and juvenile confinement phased out; and that only a vastly enlarged effort at rehabilitating inmates, whose constitutional rights were just beginning to be recognized and enforced by the courts, would improve the output of criminal justice. Local authorities were experimenting in correctional reform on multiple fronts, from jail processing to community mental health to prisoner unionization, with the aim of limiting the scope and injurious effects of captivity. The inmate count was going down slowly but steadily; decarceration was on the agenda; and mainstream penologists, historical analysts, and radical critics were nearly unanimous in holding that the penitentiary had entered into irremediable if not terminal decline. With some 380,000 behind bars circa 1973, the United States seemed poised to hoist the banner of liberty aloft again and to lead other nations onto the path to “a world without prisons” (Dodge, 1979; Irwin, 1980; Zimring and Hawkins, 1991).

1 Tocqueville’s celebrated account of Democracy in America originated in a year-long mission across the republic, carried out with Gustave de Beaumont on behalf of the French government, to inquire about carceral practices in the United States. It led to the publication of the landmark study, On the Penitentiary System in the United States and its Application in France (1833; trans. Carbondale, Southern Illinois University Press, 1979, Introduction by Thornsten Sellin).
Then came the *triple backlash* to the socioracial turmoil of the 1960s and the stagflation of the 1970s that turned penal trends around on a dime and sent the country into a carceral frenzy on a scale, span and duration unknown in human history. The first was a racial reaction against the advances of the civil rights movement and to the partial closing of the social gap between blacks and whites; the second a class reaction against the broad gains of labour at the bloom of the Fordist-Keynesian regime; and the third a political reaction against a welfare state perceived to cosset and coddle undeserving categories, *primus inter pares* the welfare recipients and street criminals newly “painted black” in the wake of the ghetto riots of 1964-1968 (Wacquant, 2009; 2014b). These three strands coincided and converged into a sweeping reengineering of the state and propelled the deployment of a disciplinary poverty policy mating restrictive “workfare” and expansive “prisonfare” that has turned the United States into the undisputed world champion in incarceration, with 2.4 million behind bars (representing fully one-quarter of the planet’s population under lock) and nearly 8 million under justice supervision, even as criminal victimization first stagnated and then receded during that same period. The United States also became a major exporter of punitive penal categories, discourses, and policies: with the help of a transnational network of pro-market think tanks, it spread its aggressive gospel of “zero tolerance” policing, judicial blackmail through plea bargaining, the routine incarceration of low-level drug offenders, mandatory minimum sentences for recidivists, and boot camps for juveniles around the world as part of a neoliberal policy package, fueling a global firestorm in law and order (Jones and Newburn, 2006; Seri, 2012; Wacquant, 2009).

One of the most startling products of this unforeseen surge and unprecedented expansion of the penal state has been the invention of yet another American “peculiar institution”: the so-called supermaximum security facility, aka, the supermax prison. It arose from within the entrails of the correctional administration, in the early 1980s, just as carceral hyperinflation was accelerating, ostensibly in a technical effort to seclude the “worst of the worst inmates”, those deemed too disruptive or dangerous to mix with the general population or even to be handled by conventional high-security wards (Shalev, 2009). As a flood of convicts seemingly impervious to penal discipline and splintered by gang-fueled racial violence met a new generation of prison wardens committed to neutralization as the primary, if not the sole, mission of their overcrowded establishments, this “no-nonsense” contraption officially designed to tame recalcitrant and predatory prisoners through intensified isolation solidified. Bureaucratic mimetism, lavish federal funding, and the wish to signal penal severity to lawbreakers, politicians and the media then fostered its proliferation across the nation. By the year 2000, as the United States passed the red mark of two million inmates, such facilities were present in three dozen states and held 2% of the country’s prisoners, amounting to some 25,000 convicts - twice the entire carceral population of the Scandinavian countries. Despite their dubious constitutionality and apparent violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (of which the US is a signatory country), extreme physical austerity, constant social sequestration, the extinction of programming, and enduring sensory deprivation became the normal parameters of long-term detention for these inmates.

In sum, instead of rehabilitating convicts, the United States *rehabilitated the prison* and turned it into a device for the punitive containment of marginality and the reassertion of state sovereignty on the outside. Then it fashioned a new neutralizing “*prison within the prison*” to discharge the same function inside the bloated penal system, granting the supermax a pivotal place in the panoply of “unthinkable punishment policies” (Tonry, 1999) that have propelled the drive to hyper-incarceration in the age of revanchism. Just as the penitentiary is massively overused as a *vacuum cleaner for the social detritus* of a society ravaged by economic deregulation, welfare retrenchment, and ethnoracial anxiety, supermax facilities are grotesquely overused inside to subdue and store the *refuse and the refuseniks of carceral rule*. The supermax prison thus stands as the hyperbolic product and iconic...
expression of the ravenous remaking of the American penal state,\(^2\) for which incapacitation has supplanted rehabilitation and the invisibilizing of problem categories become a prime technique of government. So much to say that its study has much to contribute to our understanding of the internal and external politics of punishment in contemporary society.

The boundaries of the “supermax” are wooly, its genealogy disputed, and its demography imprecise in the very country where it was invented (see Naday et al., 2008). This is for a simple reason: it is an administrative notion, designed by and for correctional professionals, that has been smuggled into the social science of the prison without sufficient scrutiny. And, as Robert Merton (1987) reminds us, before we rush to explain any social phenomenon, we must imperatively take pains to establish it and specify its defining properties. So what, then, constitutes a “supermax” facility: is it the physical layout, the regimen to which inmates are subjected, the types of convicts simultaneously brought together and apart in it, the reasons behind their segregation or the effects that this type of confinement has on them, or some combination of these? More precisely, does it take a dedicated establishment and a distinctive design permitting direct and permanent close supervision? How many daily hours of solitude and how little human contact must inmates endure for the facility which holds them to qualify? What about the frequency of lockdowns and the routine use of leg restraints and waist chains, are they defining or derivative features, essential or accidental? These questions apply ad libitum to every characteristic used to depict this or that presumed instance of a “supermax” or deviation from it. Let me essay the following specification: “supermax” designates a species of meta-prison, a prison for the prison, a facility dedicated in all or most of its aspects (architecture, technology, activities, schedules and social relations, etc.) to redoubling the treatment that the penitentiary inflicts on those most recalcitrant to it, and therefore geared to dissolving - or, rather, “disappearing” 1 - the gaps, failings, and contradictions of that treatment. In the current era, the meta-prison transposes the philosophies of neutralization and retribution from the outside to the inside of the carceral institution,\(^3\) applying them, as it were to the “meta-criminals” who repeatedly violate the laws of the administration of penal sanction. It is the materialization of reflexive punitive penality, that is, punishment turned back onto itself and not just redoubled but squared. Rather than “a routine and cynical perversion of penological principles,” as argued by Roy King (1999: 182), the neutralizing prison-inside-the-prison is a straightforward extension of current punishment policy to the carceral institution itself that brings the simmering “crisis of penal modernism” to a boil by simultaneously singling out and entombing those inmates who embody it (Garland, 1995).

This analytic specification allows us to displace the United States from its purported Archimedean position, which stems from historical usurpation and not analytic necessity. It enables us to distinguish and explore two dimensions along which countries may vary and journey: the degree to which they differentiate and autonomize the meta-prison within the penal apparatus it serves and the extent to which this meta-prison prioritizes the practical imperative of safety and security as the foundation of carceral order over and against other possible penal purposes (deterrence, neutralization, retribution, rehabilitation). This conceptualization also suggests that we can fruitfully employ the supermax and germane contraptions as a magnifying glass for comparative justice inquiry, insofar as it acts as practical revelator of the characteristic traits, structural evolution, and enduring contradictions of a given national carceral system.

There is urgent need for further international research into the social determinants of regimes of criminal confinement so as to connect the phenomenology of imprisonment as everyday lived reality at ground level and the revamping of punishment as a core state activity at the macro-institutional level.

---

\(^2\) More so than the death penalty, whose return after the mid-1970s is a legal accident overdetermined by the deep class bias of criminal justice and which plays a decorative (and distractive) role in the overall economy of punishment in America (pace David Garland, 2010).

\(^3\) The philosophy of neutralization and its aporias are dissected by Zimring and Hawkins, 1995). Their central arguments can be extended and adapted to fit the meta-prison.
For this we need precise empirical descriptions and analytic dissections of (i) the ordinary routines and practical workings of procedures inside custodial facilities of the kind offered, for France by Anne-Marie Marchetti (2001) in *Perpétuités* and for England by Ben Crewe (2009) in *The Prisoner Society*; (ii) the inner architecture and administrative functioning of criminal justice, and of the battles roiling the carceral sector within it, as supplied in the case of California by Joshua Page (2010) in *The Toughest Beat*; and (iii) the shifting position of criminal justice inside the structure of the local and national state, including how incarceration has become the ground, stake and product of struggles waged across the fields of government, politics, and the media, as sketched by Lisa Miller (2008) in *The Perils of Federalism* and Vanessa Barker (2009) in *The Politics of Imprisonment*. Pierre Bourdieu’s (1994) notion of “bureaucratic field” as the set of agencies that successfully monopolizes the definition and distribution of public goods, among them the “negative” government benefit of punishment, supplies a powerful tool for seamlessly integrating these analytic levels. By tying the fleshly experience of hyperconfinement in a supermax-style prison to the broader revamping of the state in the neoliberal era (Wacquant, 2010), it can help us discover under what conditions the theatre of sovereignty can come to take the perplexing form of a solitary soul in a twelve-by-seven-foot box of barren concrete.
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‘Titaning’ Our Belts

Rob Allen
Independent researcher and co-founder of Justice and Prisons
(www.justiceandprisons.org)

In a number of areas of penal policy, the Coalition government is looking to implement and extend approaches which have been developed and then discarded by the previous Labour administration. The controversial plans to outsource most of probation work were originally proposed back in 2003 and the plans in large part rely on unimplemented provisions of the Offender Management Act 2007. A second example is the recently announced proposal to scrap separate Young Offender Institutions (YOIs) for the 18-21 year old age group and instead to place young adults in the wider prison system, albeit with certain (so far unspecified) protections and arrangements to meet their distinct needs. This change was recommended back in 2007 but the Government then considered the time not right to abolish Detention in a Young Offender Institution (Allen, 2013a). The third and perhaps most surprising example is the decision to embark on the construction of a very large prison in North Wales for 2,000 prisoners and to consider a similar size establishment on the site of Feltham YOI in West London.

This looks very like plans for two of the three 2,500 place Titan prisons proposed by Lord Carter in his review “Securing the Future” in December 2007. Titans were initially approved as a way forward by then Justice Secretary Jack Straw but then abandoned after a consultation 16 months later. In April 2009 Straw told parliament that he “did see merit in Lord Carter’s proposals ... but most of those whom we consulted took a different view, and believed that the advantages were far outweighed by the disadvantages”.

The surprising aspect of the return of the Titans lies in the fact that both Coalition partners vigorously opposed the concept of very large prisons when first floated. The 2008 Conservative paper “Prisons with a Purpose” promised to “sell off old prisons and rejuvenate the prison estate, building smaller local prisons instead of the ‘titan’ prisons proposed the Government.” The paper asserted that such smaller, local prisons, provide better rehabilitation outcomes but suggested that clustering these would offer opportunities for economies of scale.

The Lib Dem Spring Conference in 2009 passed a motion calling for “an immediate end to the plan for Titan prisons, and a commitment to building smaller, ‘fit for purpose’ facilities, funded in part by the sale of often Victorian facilities in city-centre locations”.

The aim of this paper is to look at how and why this volte face has taken place. But it starts by looking at norms, experience and knowledge about the size of prison establishments.

Norms and research

The UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (SMRs) state that “it is desirable that the number of prisoners in closed institutions should not be so large that the individualization of treatment is hindered. In some countries it is considered that the population of such institutions should not exceed five hundred”. The SMRs date from the mid-1950s but 35 years on Lord Woolf’s 1991 inquiry into the disturbances at Manchester Prison recommended that the size of prisons should not

---

1 House of Commons Hansard 27 Apr 2009: Column 569. Available at:
www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmhansrd/cm090427/debtext/90427-0003.htm#0904275000003
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exceed 400. In fact Woolf referred to a 1988 Prison Service Design Briefing which described a capacity of 600 as providing the “optimum balance between the need for effective relationships and control of prisoners and economies of scale”; but the Inquiry report recommended that a 600 place prison would be better run as two prisons with 300 places.

Fast forward 13 years to then Prison Ombudsman Stephen Shaw’s investigation into the fire and disturbance at Yarls Wood immigration centre, where he noted that “developments in prison design since 1990 suggest that the maximum of 400 places suggested by Lord Woolf ... was unduly conservative. Recent prison experience, Shaw argued, demonstrates that larger prisons can operate successfully. He described economies of scale and the efficient use of public money as “proper considerations”, identifying as a critical element “that they must be capable of zoning down – both in times of emergency and to provide safe, more homely units to reflect the needs of different groups within the population” (Shaw, 2004: 164).

In approving larger prisons, Shaw seems to have had in mind something well short of Titans, remarking that “1,000 place prisons are no longer unusual”. North of the border, a review of the Scottish prison estate had concluded the optimum size for a new prison was 700. This was partly for reasons relating to management complexity and operational stability, but partly because of proportionality - getting the correct scale of prison in relation to the overall prison population and aligned with other facilities.

It was the Chief Inspector’s view south of the border which seems to have temporarily slain the Titan concept during Straw’s consultation. She told the Justice Select Committee in December 2007 that small prison do better in terms of safely, respect, purposeful activity and resettlement. “That is because they provide an environment in which people are known, in which relationships can develop, in which people are often closer to home.” The Inspectorate found large prisons, old prisons and private prisons were less likely to be safe. Smaller prisons were almost two-and-a-half times more likely to perform well in the Inspectorate’s tests of respect than large prisons holding more than 800 prisoners.

Purposeful activity and resettlement scores were not directly related to size however. Resettlement was predicted by the percentage of prisoners living within 50 miles of the prison; indirectly this finding would suggest local prisons closer to centres of population should produce better results.

Other research has been more equivocal. Back in 1980, a literature review by Farrington and Nuttall yielded no empirical evidence that prison size influences behaviour inside or after leaving prison. Prison offences were less likely in larger prisons, but it was impossible to control for the kinds of inmates in each prison. In a more controlled analysis there was a strong tendency for the more overcrowded prisons to be less effective. Size was only weakly related to effectiveness, and this association was reduced further after controlling for overcrowding. Since then Alison Liebling (2008 p 68) has concluded that “several analyses of prison life and quality provide empirical support for the argument that small is better”. Very recently, the Policy Exchange Think Tank ignored this work when publishing a report by a former prison governor with what they described as a potentially “game changing contention”. “For a long time,” they claimed, “it has been assumed, without evidence, that smaller prisons outperform larger ones. But size is irrelevant. When it comes to prisons, we prove that, contrary to popular myth, small is not good and big is not bad.” While the involvement in this report of private companies Sodexho and Carillion raises questions about its objectivity, it seems fair to say that there is no recent conclusive body of research that can decisively inform policy making about the

3 Quoted in Liebling (2008: 68)
4 Scottish Prison Service (2002: 15)
5 House of Commons Justice Committee (2008) Vol 2 Ev 70
6 HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2009)
optimum size of prisons in the UK. Much depends on how facilities are organised, staffed and managed within the perimeter. But Alison Liebling is surely right to warn that “larger prisons, with highly competent but remote governors may make the struggle for legitimate regimes and staff behaviour harder” (2008 p73).

Race to the bottom?

If there is little in norms or research to commend Titan prisons, why are they back on the agenda? The answer lies clearly in the government’s efforts to drive down costs to make prison, in Chris Grayling’s words, not smaller but cheaper (see Allen, 2013b). The closest model for costs that we already have is HMP Oakwood near Wolverhampton which opened in April 2012. The average cost at Oakwood is £13,200 per place, less than half the average cost of existing prison places.

Some scepticism is in order about whether such low costs are reliable or represent a fair comparison. Running any institution or concern at less than half the average cost of a comparator seems on the face of it unrealistic, even allowing for economies of scale.

The government have emphasised that Oakwood’s low cost does not come with an impoverished regime - the specification for the prison requires standards as high as those in other prisons. But how it is working in practice should give very serious cause for concern. The local independent monitoring board have described how resource constraints impact on the prison. Drugs, alcohol and mobile phones are thrown over the fence but budgetary restraints have limited security cameras and extra netting. Lack of work placements for prisoners is causing unrest with a fifth of prisoners locked back in their cell at 9am. Prisoners have little faith in the complaints system and do not feel that the staff are able to resolve their issues.

The Inspectorate published a highly critical report confirming these problems. Some may reflect teething problems common to all new prisons or inexperience among staff (such as failure to tackle delinquency or abusive behaviour). Others may illustrate that the prison cannot be run safely or effectively at such a low cost. The Inspectors found a large backlog of assessments, sentence plans and reviews due to staff redeployment. Since the inspection, prisoners’ frustration at the inability of staff to get things done has led to at least two rooftop protests.

Conclusion

With a population of 670,000 North Wales probably needs a prison of no more than a thousand at most. Yet it will be getting a facility twice what is needed. The announcement of the prison emphasised the positive impact on the local economy. Despite talk of the rehabilitation revolution, such considerations show that the drivers of prison policy may be shifting with efficiency and economy trumping questions of impact on prisoners.

Lord Carter’s original review acknowledged the operational challenges associated with large prisons - the possibility of disturbances, difficulties in meeting the needs of special groups and in recruiting and managing large numbers of suitable staff. These issues still pose risks. He failed to note the change this marks to the purpose of imprisonment - away from an approach which seeks to minimise the exclusionary aspects inherent in detention and towards a model of exile in which offenders are held in large numbers apart from society. While economies of scale may be possible in the provision of food, education or drug treatment, “super jails” will struggle to prepare their residents for return to the various communities in which they live.

If the Coalition wish to revive Labour policies they would perhaps do better to look at the work of the Social Exclusion Unit which ten years ago stressed the importance of effective action on reception and release in reducing the likelihood of re-offending. All prisons should be required to ensure that they have staff with the appropriate skills in place “to preserve support mechanisms … in
liaison with agencies outside the prison.” Developing such liaison will inevitably be more difficult in Titan prisons as will the experience of families trying to keep in regular contact.

The MoJ is right to modernise the prison estate but their overall strategy is wrong. Rather than making the prison system cheaper not smaller, it should be the other way round. Economies could much more safely and easily be achieved by reducing the numbers in prison not the standards.
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The British Society of Criminology Conference
University of Liverpool, July 2014

Crime, Justice, Welfare: Can the Metropole Listen?

10-12 July 2014 (preceded by a postgraduate conference on 9 July)

Criminology, like other core social science disciplines, reflects a tendency to over-write the metropolitan experiences of the Northern hemisphere. Criminology’s starting point, therefore, is based upon the continual attempt to reinvent, improve, or make more just, a ‘rule of law’ society in the image of the hegemon. Such over-writing takes its toll on the ‘discipline’ in multi-faceted ways, all of which tend to contribute to hegemonic epistemologies and practices that serve to marginalise different ways of thinking about, and engaging with, an alternative criminological enterprise.

Taking as its starting point the intrinsic connections between crime, welfare and (in)justice, the conference will examine the counter-hegemonic potential of criminology, and explore how it might give ‘voice’ to those that stand outside the dominant narratives of the metropole.

Full details at: www.liv.ac.uk/law-and-social-justice/conferences/bsc/

Keynote Speakers

Three leading international scholars have been confirmed to present keynote addresses:

- Professor Raewyn Connell - University of Sydney, Australia: http://sydney.edu.au/education_social_work/about/staff/profiles/raewyn.connell.php
- Professor Chris Cunneen - The Cairns Institute, James Cook University, Australia: www.jcu.edu.au/law/staff/JCUPRD1_073482.html
- Professor Didier Fassin - Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey, USA - www.ias.edu/people/faculty-and-emeriti/fassin

Conference Venue

Based within the legendary city of Liverpool, the University is one of the great centres of research, knowledge and innovation: www.liv.ac.uk/about/. The conference will primarily be held at the University’s award winning Foresight Centre which is based in one of the city’s most impressive Grade II listed buildings; a site of great architectural significance.

The conference dinner will be held in the magnificent Crypt Hall in the Metropolitan Cathedral: www.liverpoolmetrocathedral.org.uk/venue-hire/the-crypt-hall/

Call for Papers and Conference Registration

The call for papers and conference registration will open on January 2, 2013. To register your interest and to be added to the conference mailing list please email: bsc2014@liverpool.ac.uk
The BSC Policing Network

The BSC Policing Network continues to grow and thrive. Professor Mike Rowe stepped down from the role of Chair in July after launching the group in 2011. Dr Megan O’Neill has taken over the role, with Dr Matt Jones as deputy.

The group co-sponsored the launch at the LSE on 25 November 2013 (with the Mannheim Centre for Criminology) of the *Future of Policing* book edited by Jennifer Brown. This text is a compilation of the academic evidence submitted to Lord Stevens’ Independent Commission on Policing, which published its report that morning – see: [http://independentpolicecommission.org.uk/](http://independentpolicecommission.org.uk/). The book launch was attended by Lord Stevens who said a few words as did Professor Robert Reiner.

The Policing Network is planning its next event to be a one-day seminar in May, on the possible theme of ‘Ethics and Integrity in Policing’. The Network has also launched a Twitter account: @BSCPolicingNet. The group’s website has been enhanced, and continues to post stimulating blogs on policing topics: [http://bscpolicingnetwork.com/](http://bscpolicingnetwork.com/). The new site includes a page for updates from the College of Policing.

Megan O’Neill,
University of Dundee

Sponsors

Hart Publishing Ltd has again sponsored the British Society of Criminology Postgraduate Bursary Scheme enabling research students to attend the BSC annual conference free of charge. The BSC thanks Hart Publishing for its continued support of this scheme and would welcome additional sponsors – whether they are companies or individuals.

Please contact Charlotte Harris at: charlotte.harris@britsoccrim.org
The BSC National Award for Excellence in Teaching Criminology 2014

Applications are invited for the BSC National Award for Excellence in Teaching Criminology 2014 organised by the Society’s Learning and Teaching Network. The award is intended to highlight and celebrate the best practice in teaching criminology across HEIs in the UK. The criteria for nominations for this award are informed by the UK Professional Standards Framework for teaching and supporting learning: www.heacademy.ac.uk/ukpsf

Previous winners:

2013
The Criminology Programme at the University of Lincoln is part of the University’s School of Social and Political Sciences. Course content is truly multi-disciplinary and students are taught modules by subject specialists across a wide range of related disciplines, including social policy, politics and international relations. Although the staff within the School of Social and Political Sciences have their own academic disciplines, these have all been drawn upon to create an exciting, innovative and dynamic criminology degree. The programme also aims to ensure that students fully appreciate the value of academic research to policy and practice. Undergraduates are encouraged to see that crime does not exist in a vacuum, that it has complex causes and consequences which as a society we can only hope to understand through rigorous research and evidence-based policy-making. From the outset, undergraduates are encouraged to understand the importance of rigorous academic research in the social sciences, and to refine the critical-thinking skills required to undertake this type of study. The criminology course embraces the University’s ‘Student as Producer’ project, which gives students at all levels the chance to get involved in real academic research.

2012
Awarded to the Centre for Criminal Justice and Criminology at Swansea University for their undergraduate programme, plus Dr Giles Barrett of Liverpool John Moores University received a commended award for his work on internationalising the curriculum. Each of these award winners demonstrated alignment to the UK Professional Standards Framework (www.heacademy.ac.uk/ukpsf) and it was evident that their students both inform, and are informed by, the learning experiences developed with each institution.

2011
Awarded to the Criminology teaching group, School of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research at the University of Kent, with a ‘highly commended’ award going to the Open University

See the LTN Blog at http://bscltn.wordpress.com/teaching-tips/national-award-for-teaching-criminology/ for more details and a submission form.

Helen Jones and Liz Frondigoun
BSC Learning and Teaching Network
The BSC Women, Crime & Criminal Justice Network

The Women, Crime and Criminal Justice network organised a panel at the BSC annual conference in Wolverhampton. They have also held a business meeting in Leeds on 12 December where Professor Sandra Walklate reflected on her career as a criminal justice academic. The Network are making preparations for an oral history project which seeks to explore women’s involvement in the criminological academy and criminal justice policy and practice. Information on the Network can be found on the following Jiscmail account: wccj@jiscmail.ac.uk

Anthea Hucklesby, University of Leeds

The BSC Website

You may have noticed that the BSC Website is currently being updated. Access to the Members’ Area of the website is now through the following link:

www.britsoccrim.org/new/?q=members

BSC Publications

The 13th volume of the BSC’s Online journal “Papers from the British Criminology Conference” is published this month (December) containing papers that were presented at the 2013 BSC conference at the University of Wolverhampton. We wish to thank all those who submitted papers and to those who gave their time to review. If you are planning to speak at the 2014 conference in Liverpool, then please also consider submitting your paper to our journal.

Full details at: http://britsoccrim.org/new/?q=node/11

Following peer-review three papers were accepted for publication. These are:

- Lucy Welsh: Are magistrates’ courts really a ‘law free zone’? Participant observation and specialist use of language
- Deborah Platts-Fowler: ‘Beyond the loot’: Policing social disorder and urban unrest
- Daniel Briggs: Capitalismo extremo, ideology and Ibiza: A new perspective of youth deviance and risk on holiday

Andrew Millie, Edge Hill University
BSC Regional News

BSC North West Branch

The North West Branch of the BSC is now co-chaired by Professor Andrew Millie (Edge Hill University) and Professor Barry Goldson (University of Liverpool). We will be hosting a series of themed seminars the first of which takes place at Edge Hill University Wednesday 26 March 2014, 1-4pm, room SPS001 (Directions at: www.edgehill.ac.uk/location):

**Adolescent-to-Parent Violence: Current Issues and Future Priorities**
A Seminar of the NW Branch of the BSC & the Criminology Research Group, Edge Hill University

Speakers:
- Dr Caroline Miles, University of Manchester
- Dr Helen Baker, Edge Hill University
- Dr Amanda Holt, Lancaster University
- Discussant, to be confirmed

The seminar is free and open to all. If you intend to attend can you please confirm by email to Andrew.millie@edgehill.ac.uk or Helen.baker@edgehill.ac.uk. Also, please let us know if you require a parking space. After this the aim is to hold two to three seminars per year. Members of the NW Branch are also involved with the organisation of the July 2014 BSC Conference in Liverpool. More details can be found at: www.liv.ac.uk/law-and-social-justice/conferences/bsc/

BSC Southern Branch

The Southern Branch of the BSC continues its Seminar Series co-hosted by the Mannheim Centre for Criminology at the LSE. Forthcoming seminars are as follows. All take place in Room 1.09, New Academic Building, LSE (unless otherwise stated). Seminars start at 6.30pm, with wine from 6.15pm. We recommend arriving early to be sure of a seat. We hope you will also be able to stay for drinks with the speaker after the talk.

- 15 January 2014, Marian FitzGerald (University of Kent) (Title TBC)
- 12 February 2014, Kate Fitz-Gibbon (Deakin University, Victoria, Australia)
  *Replacing provocation in England and Wales: Examining why the new partial defence of loss of control has failed to achieve meaningful change*
- 12 March 2014, David Downes, Tim Newburn and Paul Rock (LSE) (Title TBC)
- 14 May 2014, Meredith Rossner (LSE/University of Western Sydney)
  *Just emotions: The ritual of restorative justice* (Room TBC)
- 11 June 2014, Coretta Phillips (LSE) and Deborah Drake (The Open University)
  *Emotion, subjectivity and prison ethnography: Engaging with the critics* (Room TBC)

Map of the LSE: www.lse.ac.uk/resources/mapsAndDirections/findingYourWayAroundLSE.htm
Directions: www.lse.ac.uk/resources/mapsAndDirections/travellingToLSE.htm
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