Greetings!

I am delighted to welcome you to the heart of Adelaide for this year’s annual conference, hosted by Flinders University Law School and their Centre for Crime Policy and Research. The Conference Committee, which includes not only academics from Flinders, but also representatives from a range of government departments (as well as the team from All Occasions Management), has put together a terrific program. (The photo above is of a small group of that team, meeting in March of this year.) In 2015 we host, once again, a one-day postgraduate student forum ahead of the main conference. Indeed the first of these colloquia was convened by Flinders at the 2007 conference, and they have gone from strength to strength. Our commitment to students extends this year to halving the cost of the main conference for all student registrants. I want to congratulate all of our prize-winners, too, most of whom will be in attendance. As has been the case for a number of years now, these prizes are given out at various times during the conference, particularly at the beginning of plenary sessions rather than all at the dinner.

As promised in my last PacifiCrim column, I report here some of the ideas that have been emerging for the celebration of our 50th anniversary in 2017. A small group of us (Kathy Daly, Philip Stenning, Tara Renae McGee, Russell Smith, Antje Deckert, along with myself) have been working away for a year on some appropriate projects. The most significant is an edited volume on developments in Australian and New Zealand criminology over the past half century, to be published by Palgrave Macmillan. We also have an oral history project underway, a series of PacifiCrim features, a dinner in October 2017 at the University of Melbourne, a special logo, a web-based poll, a citation analysis, and a special (electronic) issue of our Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology which will re-produce selected papers from yesteryear. All appears to be in order for an appropriate set of acknowledgements of a significant milestone in our history.

We welcome back to our committee Kate Sweeney, as secretary. Kate is based at the Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC). I have just re-negotiated another twelve month contract with the AIC for their hosting the ANZSOC secretariat. Speaking of the AIC, this has been a tumultuous time for their staff recently, as the Coalition government has moved to incorporate the AIC’s functions into a more broadly-based Australian Crime Commission (ACC). The ANZSOC Management Committee has been keeping a ‘watching brief’ on developments and our correspondence with Minister Keenan led to a meeting between the CEO of the ACC, Chris Dawson, and myself in Adelaide in mid-July. That meeting was very productive, and I am confident that the creation of an independent research branch within the ACC (tentatively the Australian Crime and Justice Research Centre) will go a long way to allaying our concerns that criminological research in this country (as well as elsewhere) was going to be seriously compromised by the merger.
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President’s Column Cont’d

A reflection of the AIC’s history (by Russell Smith) can be found on pages 4-5. Before I leave the subject of the AIC I want to mention the recent retirement of Sylvia McKellar, who has been the executive assistant to the various directors of the AIC for as long as I can remember—Sylvia was with the Institute from February 1987 to September 2015, almost twenty-nine years. I first met Sylvia when she was part of the AIC conference team led by Dennis Challinger in 1988. She has always remained smart, savvy, indefatigable and entirely personable. Her steady and guiding hand will indeed be missed.

I want to encourage all ANZSOC members to attend the AGM which will be held at lunchtime on 26 November. There are a couple of constitutional matters which need to be dealt with, along with the usual elections and reports. Come along and find out how we spend our money each year (and where it comes from).

Finally, let me report on my various travels this year to allied conferences, including the Asian Criminological Society conference in Hong Kong in June, the British Society of Criminology conference in Plymouth a week later, the QUT Crime, Justice and Social Democracy conference in Brisbane early in July and the European Society of Criminology conference in Porto, Portugal in September. They were all excellent affairs and well attended by Australian criminologists (and many ANZSOC members).

At the BSC conference, a special award was given to John Lea for a lifetime of achievement in the field. I had not met John before, as he is a bit of a recluse and has always been somewhat overshadowed by his erstwhile research collaborator, the late (and great) Jock Young. I was reminded of the choice of textbook I made in my very first year of teaching criminology (in 1985) having convinced the business school that had hired me to teach commercial law that such an elective would be popular and useful. I wasn’t sure, however, what text to set. There were a number of options, pleasingly, but the choice was not easy. Was it to be Radzinowicz and King, or Chappell and Wilson (whatever edition we were up to) or Sallmann and Willis, or Findlay, Egger and Sutton? In the end, and mindful of student budgets, I chose Lea and Young’s What Is To Be Done about Law and Order? (1984). What a great read that was. I enjoyed every word, and still refer back to the dog-eared copy that I have. I mentioned this recollection of mine to John at the dinner where he received his award. He looked surprised that there was anyone old enough to remember the book, let alone an Australian securing him twenty sales a year after it had been published. I should add that business crime formed only a small discussion point in the class. I confess, three decades later, that the curriculum I taught bore little resemblance to the one that I was able to steer in the class. I can remember—Sylvia was with the Institute from February 1987 to September 2015, almost twenty-nine years. I first met Sylvia when she was part of the AIC conference team led by Dennis Challinger in 1988. She has always remained smart, savvy, indefatigable and entirely personable. Her steady and guiding hand will indeed be missed.

I’d also like to take this opportunity to congratulate all of our fantastic award winners. Well done! I encourage everyone to consider applying for one of next year’s awards.

We currently have 358 paid up members. Even though we have had many new members join this year, the figure is down from the same time last year because 100 members did not renew at the end of June. Our representatives are following them up.

Don’t forget that we would like to see all of our members at the AGM this year at lunch on the Thursday of the conference so you can hear about all that has been going on at the society in the last year, as well as having input on the next 12 months.

I do hope that you enjoy the conference. Please come and say hello to me while you are here and for those who are not yet members of the society, I encourage you to come and speak to me and I can assist you in joining.

Kate Sweeney ANZSOC Secretary
secretary@anzsoc.org

PacifiCrim Editor’s Note

Welcome to the second PacifiCrim newsletter for 2015. In this bigger than usual issue, Russell Smith (former ANZSOC President) reflects on four decades of the Australian Institute of Criminology as it merges with the ACC. Philip Stenning provides a thought-provoking analysis of the Criminology FoR code and its appearance (or lack thereof) in ARC grant successes, and Kathy Daly catches up with two former ANZSOC Student Paper Prize winners to provide a “where are they now” special column that will feature in the newsletter as one of the many ways we look forward to celebrating ANZSOC’s 50th Anniversary in 2017.

For the second time, PacifiCrim features a page acknowledging the successful graduations of our ANZSOC HDRs. We also recognise the recipients of the 2015 ANZSOC awards, including an insight from Eileen Baldry and Chris Cunnee (Allen Bartholomew Award winners) on what has motivated their research to date; a reflection on the Silk Road cryptomaket by New Scholar Award winner James Martin; a snapshot of Tim Prenzler’s edited collection, Professional Practice in Crime Prevention and Security Management (Adam Sutton Prize); and a frank overview of the NT circuit court system from the Allan Van Zyl Memorial Prize winner, Julian Murphy.

This issue also includes two criminology research snapshots: (1) responding to filicide; and (2) recent reforms to rape law in Victoria, which have sought to redress the complicated fault element surrounding consent. Monash HDR candidate, Rachael Burgin, also shares her reflections on a highly successful BSC conference, attended, once again, by a record number of our members. Thank you to all who have contributed to this packed issue.

I hope you all enjoy reading the newsletter with an eco-friendly coffee cup in hand, in the beautiful, sunny surrounds of Adelaide. Enjoy the conference!

Dr Asher Flynn
PacifiCrim Editor
asher.flynn@monash.edu

Secretary’s Report

I am very excited to return from maternity leave and take up the reins as ANZSOC secretary for another year, and to see everyone again at the conference in beautiful Adelaide. Such a great program has been put together!
Unjust Deserts: The Criminal Wasteland of the NT

Editor’s note: This piece is written by Julian R. Murphy; the recipient of the 2015 Allan Van Zyl Memorial Prize. Julian is a criminal defence advocate at the Northern Australian Aboriginal Justice Agency in Katherine, Northern Territory. His practice ranges from Supreme Court appearances to drink-driving pleas at remote circuit courts. He has presented papers on a diversity of criminal law and criminology topics.

After 18 months as a criminal defence lawyer in the Northern Territory, I am in danger of becoming inured to the injustice meted out to Aboriginal people on a daily basis. It is not uncommon to see Aboriginal people pleading guilty to offences they could legally defeat, for the simple reason that they cannot get bail and would spend longer on remand waiting for a hearing than if they just pleaded guilty and were sentenced to time served; an uncomfortable defence lawyer practice known as ‘pleading them out.’

There is rarely a single actor – judicial officer, defence counsel or prosecutor – to blame for these situations. The fault lies in the system; a system founded on the false logic of punishment and deterrence. That these supposed rationales for sentencing have been debunked in the academic sphere and in more enlightened parts of the world means little in a jurisdiction where the chief legal officer has declared injustice to be non-existent. And so the machine chugs on. Its de-prioritisation of rehabilitation ensures a self-perpetuating cycle, as offenders inevitably reoffend and incarceration rates soar.

Nowhere are the systemic problems more apparent than at remote circuit courts. On a typical circuit court day, the Magistrate and court staff will arrive in a light plane at around 9am and set up a temporary court in one of the government buildings, often no larger than a shipping container. The defence lawyers and prosecutors may have already arrived by road the night before and attempted to conference clients ahead of the next day’s hearing. Inevitably, there is often not even a punitive aspect to sentences as fines are regularly imposed that will simply accrue against the offender’s Centrelink balance and never be paid.

Injustice is by no means limited to the remote circuit court, nor even to the court system generally. Policing is the second grand arena in which Aboriginal people suffer injustice at disproportionate levels. Extraordinary legislative regimes have given the police and other arms of government exceptional licence to impinge upon the rights of intoxicated people; with the overwhelming majority of people affected by these laws being Aboriginal. In 2011, police were given the power to take a person into ‘protective custody’ if that person was not adequately able to care for him or herself by reason of intoxication – a fundamental philosophical shift away from the traditional justification for arrest and police detention being strictly for criminal investigation and charge. In 2013, the Government went further and provided that a person taken into protective custody three times in a two month period could be detained at a mandatory rehabilitation facility for up to three months. Most recently, in 2015, the legislature introduced unprecedented ‘paperless arrest’ laws permitting police to arrest and detain a person for up to four hours (or more if the person is intoxicated) on suspicion of a fine-only offence. What this means in practice is that a person can be arrested and detained for committing offences such as ‘making undue noise’ and ‘neglecting to keep a clean yard’; offences which if brought before a court, would result in no period of detention at all.

The Attorney-General has commended the paperless arrest laws as ‘a form of catch and release’, but some of the people ‘caught’ by these laws are never released – they die in detention. On 12 August 2015, two harrowing NT coroner’s decisions were handed down: one pertaining to the death of a man in the Darwin watch house on ‘paperless arrest,’ the other to the death of a woman who was being detained against her will in a mandatory rehabilitation centre in Alice Springs. The recommendations of those decisions – a sweeping review of mandatory rehabilitation and the repeal of the ‘paperless arrest’ laws – show how lessons in NT criminal justice must be learnt the hard way, if they are learnt at all. But, counter-intuitively, this is what makes the NT such a fulfilling place for criminal lawyers and criminologists to work. Every point at which the system is broken presents an opportunity for positive change.

Julian Murphy, 2015 Allan Van Zyl Memorial Prize Recipient

Circuit courts conducted in this way fulfil almost none of the traditional aims of the criminal justice system. There is no individualised justice, as time constraints require courts to sentence offenders on scant information, almost solely relying on their age and prior record, rather than any relevant personal circumstances.
Four Decades of the Australian Institute of Criminology

In the mid-1960s, Sir John Barry, a Justice of the Supreme Court of Victoria and prominent supporter of penal and criminal justice reform, recommended that the Commonwealth Government establish an Australian Institute of Criminal and Penal Science to be funded and maintained by the Commonwealth. Sir John was also instrumental in establishing ANZSOC in 1967, becoming its inaugural President. After a period of intense lobbying and negotiation, the Gorton Government eventually heeded the concerns of government bureaucrats, academics and criminal justice policy-makers regarding the paucity of national crime statistics and research, and introduced legislation into the Commonwealth Parliament in 1971 to establish the Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC).

On 6 April 1971, the Criminology Research Act 1972 (Cth) received Royal Assent and the Institute began life as a statutory authority of the Commonwealth, with a Board of Management composed of three members appointed by the Commonwealth Attorney-General and three members representing the States. Funding of $40,000 was provided by an Australian Government Grant for the first year of operations. The Act also established the Criminology Research Council (CRC) that was charged with administering a research fund made up of contributions from all jurisdictions. The aim was for the Institute to conduct criminological research and training, and for the CRC to provide funds for academics and others to undertake research of national policy relevance for Australia.

In the 1970s, the discipline of criminology gradually began to take hold, beginning with the creation of a Board of Studies in Criminology at the University of Melbourne. This provided the first academic foundation for criminology in Australia, with a Diploma course of four compulsory subjects. The Diploma provided early academic training for those seeking both theoretical as well as empirical research skills to teach or work in government criminal justice positions.

On 1 February 1973, Judge J H Muirhead (then of the Adelaide Local and District Criminal Court) was appointed Acting Director and on 16 October 1973, an official opening ceremony for the AIC was held at the National Library Theatrette, at which the then Attorney-General, Lionel Murphy QC, addressed those present. Judge Muirhead started work at an office in Civic in Canberra in 1973, and oversaw some of the early research conducted by the (small) staff of three Senior Criminologists, Harold Weir, David Biles and Mary Dauntion-Fear, and other administrative staff.

The Institute’s research focus was eclectic, with some academics subsequently lamenting its positivist emphasis on the collection of data, while others in Canberra criticised some of its work as not being of primary interest to the Commonwealth, which provided most of its funding. Nonetheless, the Institute has provided research and policy analysis on an extensive range of criminological topics over its 44 year history including:

- Monitoring trends in violent crimes such as homicide, firearms offences, sexual violence and human trafficking;
- Investigating white collar crime, fraud and crime involving new technologies;
- Evaluating the effectiveness of crime control measures such as closed-circuit television, electronic monitoring of offenders, restorative justice, anti-money laundering controls and capital punishment;
- Assessments of boutique criminal justice topics including fisheries crime, farm crime, ATM robberies, cloud computing and carbon trading; and
- Support for victims of both violent crimes and Commonwealth offences, and avenues to enhance the rehabilitation of offenders.

The Institute’s staff not only provided research and advice for governments throughout the country, but also supported some major policy initiatives during its four decades. Some of these landmark initiatives included:

- Providing research funding from the Criminology Research Fund for separate juvenile offender surveys in South Australia, Queensland and Victoria;
- Spearheading the UN Crime Prevention initiative through the UN Congress on Crime Prevention & Criminal Justice agenda;
- Establishing the JV Barry Library’s Computerised Information from National Criminological Holdings (CINCH) database of criminology information, based on material collected and catalogued by the library;
- Developing a strong research program from the 1980s into economic and organised crime that included research into all forms of economic crime, fraud, and particularly fraud against Commonwealth entities such as welfare, health and revenue fraud;
- Undertaking some of the first criminological research, funded by the Telstra Foundation in the mid-1990s, into telecommunications and computer crime, leading to the publication of a number of internationally recognised and award-winning books that provided a theoretical and empirical foundation for understanding cybercrime;
- Supporting the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody and developing a national monitoring program into all deaths in both corrective and police custody;
- Hosting the inaugural National Committee on Violence in 1990 that provided a blueprint for responding to violent crimes of all types throughout Australia;
- Establishing a longitudinal monitoring program into drug use of detained offenders in the late 1990s, which continues to track drug market changes; and
- Producing ground-breaking bushfire arson research publications in response to a request from the Bushfire Cooperative Research Centre during the Australian Millennium drought period.

John Muirhead and AIC Staff in 1973
The Institute’s Directors have used their own professional backgrounds to shape the specific research outputs of the Institute, which have included work on correctional management, art and antiquity theft, drug offences, crimes against older persons, and child abuse and neglect. In all, these Directors have guided the Institute through four and a half decades of research and policy advice.

The AIC moved offices four times from its original location in Civic, to Cooleman Court (Weston Creek); Colbee Court (Phillip); the former Lakeside Casino building in Civic; and to its final home, the former Griffith public library building in Leichhardt Street (Griffith).

Contracted work has come from every state and territory, all major Commonwealth entities, a variety of private sector organisations (Australian Bankers’ Association, PricewaterhouseCoopers, KPMG) and international bodies, such as UNODC, UNAFEI, UNICRI, the United Kingdom Home Office, the US Department of Justice, the Thai Government, and academic departments in major universities throughout the world. The Institute has also been a training ground for policy analysts and criminologists with former staff securing Chairs and leading research posts in Australian and overseas universities, and obtaining senior policy roles in government and industry. The Institute organised regular major conferences as well as numerous smaller Roundtable discussions and Fora for the most senior policy advisers, and for students and early career scholars. It has conducted formal training programs in such diverse topics as new correctional programs, white collar crime, identity fraud and program evaluation. In terms of return on government investment, the Institute has been highly successful and, as has often been remarked by those astounded at the extent and quality of its outputs, ‘punched well above its weight’.

On 8 October 2015, the Institute was incorporated into the Australian Crime Commission, marking its cessation as a separate Commonwealth entity, 42 years after its official opening in October 1973.

Dr Russell Smith, Principal Criminologist, AIC 1996-2015

On October 17, our President, Rick Sarre, was awarded an Honorary Doctorate by the Faculty of Social Sciences at Umeå University, in northern Sweden. The award was given in recognition of his interest in, and contributions to, the research conducted at the Law School, his editing prowess, and his taking part in the formal evaluation in 2010 of the police education programme offered by the university. Since his sabbatical in Umeå in 2004, Rick has visited on a number of occasions and has hosted visiting researchers from the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of South Australia in Adelaide.

Dean of Social Science, Professor Dieter Müller awarding the Doctor Honoris Causa to Rick Sarre
Beyond Imprisonment in Victoria—Criminological Horizons

On 13 May 2015, the fourth Criminological Horizons event, *Beyond Imprisonment: Innovation and Reform Opportunities for Victoria* was held at the Wheeler Centre in Melbourne. The event was a great success with a capacity audience of government and non-government stakeholders, academics, students and criminal justice practitioners. The public panel discussion was facilitated by journalist and former Labor MP, Maxine McKew, who guided the expert panel through an informed and lively discussion on the state of imprisonment in Victoria. The panel compromised three criminal justice experts who drew on evidence-based research and practice to engage the audience with considered dialogue on the issues associated with the prison system in Victoria today.

Karenza Louis-Smith from the Australian Community Services Organisation (ACSO) drew from the ACSO motto “create another chance” to emphasise the importance of providing offenders with the chance to change through employment, housing, and developing the capacity to re-connect through relationships. Also highlighting the difficulties experienced by offenders, ANZSOC member, Professor Mark Halsey (Flinders University) drew from his expansive research with offenders to explain that people can be born into or become trapped within circuits of exclusion, which then makes contact with the criminal justice system more likely. Professor Halsey argued that for many of these individuals, their situation is not a life choice, it is a response to their life circumstances. He noted that people don’t choose to be abused as children or to develop mental health problems or acquire brain injuries, but trauma and damage was a common thread in the many prisoners he had spoken with over the past decade. He also reflected on the need to recognise prisoners as people, not clients or files, and see the full complexity of their lives and the options that simply aren’t available to them. In doing so, Professor Halsey encouraged politicians to get tough on the causes of crime, not tough on crime. The third panellist, Michelle McDonnell from the Federation of Community Legal Centres, similarly argued for a shift away from law and order politics to focus on evidence-based approaches, such as problem-solving courts. She emphasised the need for public and politician education, which can be achieved through fact-sheets similar to those they produce through the Smart Justice initiative/program. There was also general agreement from the panel on the lack of funding for the types of services needed for the rehabilitation of prisoners, and a lack of current focus on services which are about building relationships and working through past trauma.

Rebecca Powell, The Border Observatory, Monash University

Adam Sutton Crime Prevention Award 2015

*Editor’s Note: Professor Tim Prenzler is the recipient of the 2015 Adam Sutton Crime Prevention Award.*

Adam Sutton was a passionate advocate for crime prevention and a pioneer in applied crime prevention research in Australia. It is therefore a pleasure and an honour to receive this award that bears his name and perpetuates his memory. The award is for an edited book *Professional Practice in Crime Prevention and Security Management*, published in 2014 by Australian Academic Press. I managed to coerce nine authors into contributing chapters, I co-authored two chapters and I was the sole author of three chapters. The book is designed to provide a clear and up-to-date guide as to what works and what constitutes best practice across a range of crime prevention and security management applications. The collection fills a gap in the literature concerning the integration of environmentally-oriented crime prevention science and practical security work.

The first section of the book – ‘Effective Crime Prevention: From Theory to Practice’ – reviews the evidence base in crime prevention. It emphasises the need for a multi-dimensional approach – including early childhood, community development and criminal justice interventions – while focusing on the successes of situational prevention and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). The section includes an analysis of social justice issues in these areas; stressing the importance of egalitarian and democratic principles in policy and practice, and the value of focusing resources on vulnerable sections of the population. Examples involving equity principles include enhanced security in public housing, public transport and public spaces; and reducing opportunities for young people to engage in lower level crimes (such as burglary and motor vehicle theft) that serve as stepping-stones to criminal careers. A case study approach illustrates large-scale achievements in reducing crime, including through public-private partnerships.


This book was rattling round in my head for about ten years and it was hugely satisfying to see it in print. It conveys a good news story: that crime can be greatly reduced, often by means that facilitate environmental amenity and social equity. What I also like about the book is that the publisher is a local small business in the area where I live, it’s printed in Australia, and it’s one of the cheapest books around! Just $34.95.

*Professor Tim Prenzler, University of the Sunshine Coast*
Late June – early July saw the British Society of Criminology’s (BSC) annual conference in beautiful Plymouth. The wealth of attendees from Australia and New Zealand were welcomed with Plymouth’s ‘hottest day of the year’ (or so the locals tell me!), a sunny 26 degrees.

The conference theme Criminology: Voyages of Critical Discovery, was an astute nod to Plymouth, the port town that has been the departing site for many a voyage of critical discovery. In the spirit of reflecting on some of these discoveries, and the impact they had on those across borders, the conference centred on three plenary panel discussions: ‘New Directions in Criminology’; ‘Rediscovering Restorative Justice’; and ‘Immigration Detention: Confinement in a Global World’. These plenaries reflected the strong critical focus in criminological research in Australia, with ANZSOC members Professor Kathleen Daly (Griffith University) and Professor Sharon Pickering (Monash University) leading the discussions for panels two and three. Professor Daly urged a re-conceptualisation of restorative justice as a mechanism for achieving justice, while Professor Pickering presented on criminological engagement with border deaths, and the challenges and discomforts of research in the field.

The conference attracted a large turnout of postgraduate students who presented at the main conference, and at the preceding postgraduate day where Professor Joe Sim (Liverpool John Moores) delivered the thought-provoking highly entertaining plenary, ‘Confronting State Power in “Iron Times”: The Case for a Utopian, Criminological Praxis’. Postgraduates from over the UK, NZ and Australia presented their research on a range of topics, including policing, youth justice and gendered violence, just to name a few, in front of a large turnout of senior, mid and early career researchers.

The conference reflected the broad scope of critical research in the criminological sphere, with high quality presentations across themed sessions. The wine reception and conference dinner provided excellent opportunities for informal networking with leading academics across the UK and of course, with the ANZSOC members in attendance. The conference dinner was opened with an impassioned speech by Kevin C Dooley, who shared his lived experience with the criminal justice system, and reminded us all of the importance of the research that formed the basis for our conference presentations. Special thanks to the conference organising committee, for their tireless work putting together a stimulating and successful event.

A big thank-you as well to all the criminology undergraduate students who volunteered on the day, demonstrating their enthusiasm to be involved in such ‘voyages of critical discovery’.

In 2016, the BSC conference will be held in Nottingham, with the theme ‘Inequalities in a Diverse World’, and given the strong turnout and high quality of presentations both from ANZSOC members and our colleagues at the BSC, it is surely one not to miss.

Rachael Burgin, PhD Candidate, Monash University
What FoR?

Many people (among whom I include myself) have argued that criminology is not usefully considered as an academic discipline as such, but rather as a multidisciplinary field of research focusing primarily on crime, and social and policy responses to it, including criminal justice responses. This ‘field of research’ has been occupied by scholars from a very wide range of ‘traditional’ disciplines – sociologists, lawyers, psychologists, historians, political scientists, geographers, international relations, anthropologists, medical scientists, forensic scientists and (more rarely) economists, philosophers and theologians. At Griffith where I currently work, our academic staff in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice currently includes an evolutionary biologist. Yet even now, a century after this field was first labelled ‘criminology’ in the early 20th Century (Radzinowicz, 1966), there remains debate and disagreement about its scope (see most recently Bosworth & Hoyle, 2011).

Since the 1970s, universities have established independent (that is, separate from other disciplinary departments) schools, departments, centres and institutes of criminology which offer undergraduate, and later postgraduate, degrees in criminology. An increasing number of applicants for jobs in these institutions have graduated with criminology degrees, including PhDs in criminology, and do not have degrees or research training in the ‘traditional’ disciplines. The result has been that criminology is increasingly viewed as a ‘discipline’ in its own right. Until 2010, the Australian Research Council (ARC) did not have a disciplinary ‘field of research’ (FoR) category called ‘criminology’. Many criminological research grant applications, for ARC Discovery Projects for instance, were submitted under the then “Law, Justice and Law Enforcement” FoR (39000), and funding applications under this FoR were quite successful; in 2008, for instance, 11 projects which could be considered ‘criminological’ were funded under the 39000 FoR.

In 2010, a new FoR (1602), labelled “Criminology”, under the broader “Studies in Human Society” (16000) FoR, was introduced for Future Fellowship applications. In the following year, this ‘Criminology’ FoR was introduced for Discovery Project applications, and was included for DECRA (Discovery Early Career Research Awards) applications when these were introduced in 2012. As the following table shows, very few applications submitted with the 1602 FoR as their principal FoR have been funded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Discovery projects</th>
<th>DECRA’s</th>
<th>Future Fellowships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data on what proportion of all applications for criminological research projects that were submitted with the 1602 FoR as their primary FoR during the six years from which these 18 successful applications arose, are not readily available. But there is good reason to believe they represent a very small percentage of those applications. Significantly, an analysis of successful ARC Discovery Project applications in the DP2015 round indicates that receiving funding for what might be considered ‘criminological’ research (using a broad definition of ‘criminology’) is not less likely to be funded now than in earlier years. Indeed, for the DP2015 round, using a broad definition of ‘criminology’, I identified 30 projects that were funded, but only one carried the 1602 FoR as the primary FoR. The other 29 had been submitted under a dizzying array of 16 other FoRs including “Other Biological Sciences” (0699), “Artificial Intelligence” (0801), “Computer Software” (0803), “Data Format” (0804), “Information systems” (0806), “Communication Technologies” (1005), “Public Health and Health Services” (1117), “Business and Management” (1503), Human Geography (1604), “Policy and Administration” (1605), “Political Science” (1606), “Sociology” (1608), “Psychology” (1701), “Law” (1801), “Historical Studies” (2103) and “Philosophy” (2203). What this analysis inevitably suggests is that submitting applications for criminological research funding with the 1602 “Criminology” FoR as the primary FoR is potentially not a good idea, since success for such applications seems to be so low. This raises, I think, three questions: (1) Why is this the case? (2) Does it matter (beyond warning applicants off the 1602 FoR)? And, (3) if it does matter, is there anything that ANZSOC could and should be doing about it?

The answer to the first question is not readily apparent. Two suggestions have been made by colleagues, neither of which is very palatable. Some have suggested that the reason 1602 FoR applications have such low success is that they are typically assessed by ARC Panels that do not include anyone who would be considered a ‘criminologist’, and consequently would not appreciate the significance (in terms of ‘discovery’) of a criminological research proposal. It is not true that such panels have never included members who would be considered to be ‘criminologists’, but it is true that this is the exception rather than the norm. The second suggestion is related to the first, namely that because these panels rarely include any criminologists who understand the various ‘factions’ which make up the field, and because the field, and the ‘pool’ of possible reviewers is relatively small, their choices of reviewers may not be well informed or appropriate, and this may result in an unusually high number of negative reports by reviewers who do not share the applicants’ view as to what is important and significant criminological research. Certainly some of my colleagues have experienced such ‘rogue’ reviewers, who seem to have assessed their applications not in their own terms, but because the research that they are proposing is not the kind of research that the reviewer does or considers worthy of support. Whether either of these is a convincing explanation of the low success rates for applications made under the 1602 FoR remains a matter of speculation.
What FoR? (Cont’d)

The answer to the second question (does it matter?) is yes. This is because in order to successfully apply under some other disciplinary FoR, the applicant will almost certainly have to demonstrate credentials in that discipline (including publications in the discipline’s main journals). For many academics in schools and departments of criminology at the moment, this is not a problem; as noted earlier, most still have training and degrees in other disciplines, and many have published in their disciplinary journals and not just in criminology journals. The DP2015 round seems to confirm this. But as more early career academics graduate with criminology or criminal justice degrees, without any training or degrees in any other discipline, and publish primarily in criminology journals, it seems likely that their ability to avoid the 1602 FoR and successfully apply under other disciplinary FoRs will be very limited. So even if this is not a problem now, there is reason to think that it may increasingly become a problem for early career criminologists in the future.

In response to question three, my own view is that the Society, as the representative body for criminologists in Australia and New Zealand, should raise this issue with the ARC, arguing for more routine inclusion of criminologists on the Panels which decide on these applications, and more care in choosing reviewers for applications. It does seem quite ironic that the 1602 ‘Criminology” FoR appears to be the least successful FoR for criminologists, thus it should not be difficult for the Society to make a persuasive argument for change.

This issue, however, may be considered in a wider context. It may be that similar concerns are relevant for the relatively low ratings of criminology schools and departments in the ERA, and the fact that criminology is not rated separately in such worldwide rankings of universities as the Times Higher Education, CUWR/Shanghai rankings. That, however, is a subject for another article.

References

Professor Philip Stenning, Griffith University

2015 Australian and NZ Student Abstract Award Winners

The London Spikes: homelessness, liberalism and hostile architecture

The controversy sparked by ‘anti-homeless’ spikes in London in June last year precipitated much public and political debate about homelessness and ‘hostile architecture’. Such structures, the public both claimed, and was assured, are antithetical to the values that underpin the city of London and liberal-capitalist society more broadly. This was expressed by widespread outrage at the callous illiberalism of installing blunt metal studs in spaces where rough-sleepers are known to seek shelter. This paper examines the notion of ‘hostile architecture’, critiquing the discursive positioning of it as an ostensibly ‘new’ feature in the urban landscape, as well as the positioning of it as contra the foundational ideals of the West. The paper then offers a workable definition of hostile architecture, differentiating it from other forms of embedded and environmental social control. Situated as central to the controversy was the most conspicuous figure of homelessness, the urban rough sleeper. The paper examines this figure and its disruption of the ‘clean and safe’ spaces of the (neo)liberal city, which are increasingly structured according to the exigencies of consumer-capitalism, which precipitates and necessitates technologies such as the spikes. Ultimately this paper argues that the public backlash against the spikes can be better understood not as resistant to widespread processes of urban securitisation and urban gentrification, but counterintuitively, as a product of them.

Imprisoned fathers paternal identity and involvement with their children

It is estimated in New Zealand that at any one time, up to 20,000 children may have a father in prison. International research has shown that many men lived with at least one of their children before being imprisoned, and attempt to reconnect, often unsuccessfully, with their families on release (Kjellstrand, Cearley, Eddy, Foney, & Martinez, 2012). If these relationships can be maintained in prison, this can help these fathers reintegrate into their community, and desist from offending on release (Visher, 2013). This exploratory qualitative research looks at imprisoned fathers’ perception of their ability to parent and maintain relationships with their children from prison. Drawing on a comprehensive literature review and narrative interviews with 38 prisoners in New Zealand, this paper will focus primarily on the fathers’ involvement with their children while in prison. This is dependent on many factors including the father’s relationship with his children’s mother, the prison context, including the distance from the family home, and the father’s view about whether he thinks it is in the best interests of the children (and/or himself) for the children to visit. Although prisoners have very little agency while in prison, the research shows that they are able to have control over who visits, who they talk to on the telephone and who they write to.

James Petty is a PhD candidate in Criminology at the University of Melbourne. His research interests include homelessness and poverty, urban and public space, theories of citizenship, drug policy, critical and cultural criminology, feminism and queer theory, comic books and ethics. His doctoral thesis examines the ways that homelessness is framed in the language of ‘crisis’.

Sheridan Harmos is in the third year of her PhD in Criminology at the University of Auckland. Trained as a child psychologist, she had previously worked for the Family Courts, and for an NGO whose home visiting program focused on vulnerable families with a new born baby. She also volunteered for the Howard League at an Auckland prison.
ANZSOC HDR Graduates—2013 to 2015

Editor’s Note: This page recognises the successful graduations of some of our 2013, 2014 & 2015 ANZSOC HDRs. This is a very special and significant moment in one’s academic career, and the ANZSOC committee wants to recognise this, while also sharing the depth and breadth of research being completed. Congratulations!

2013 PhD Graduates
Dr Marietta Martinovic, RMIT
The Evolution of Home Detention Based Sanctions Frameworks in the USA and Australia up to 2013: A Comparative Case Study
Supervisors: Dr Marg Liddell and Professor Manfred Steger

Dr Marietta Martinovic

2014 PhD Graduates
Dr Gavin Knight, Griffith University
Calls for Service and Police Effectiveness: The Role of Performance Management Systems
Supervisors: Professor Anna Stewart, Dr Jaqueline Drew and Professor Lorraine Mazerolle

Dr Gavin Knight

2015 PhD Graduates Cont’d
Dr Simon Little, Griffith University
Impact of Police Diversion on Re-Offending By Young People
Supervisors: Professor Anna Stewart and Dr Troy Allard

Dr Simon Little

Dr Helena Menih, Griffith University
An Ethnographic Study of Female Homelessness in Brisbane
Supervisors: Dr Catrin Smith and Professor Philip Stenning

Dr Helena Menih

2013 Masters Graduates
Ms Una Stone, RMIT
I’m Still Your Mum: Mothering Inside and Outside of Prison
Supervisors: Dr Marg Liddell and Dr Marietta Martinovic

Una Stone

2013 Masters Graduates Cont’d
Ms Danielle Atherton
The Relationship Between the School Environment and Antisocial Behaviour
Supervisors: Dr Marg Liddell and Dr Marietta Martinovic

Ms Danielle Atherton

Ms Patti Thyssen, RMIT
The Attitudes and Perceptions of Sworn Victoria Police Personnel in Relation to the Implementation and Ongoing Enforcement of the Victoria Police Cannabis Cautioning Program
Supervisors: Dr Marg Liddell and Dr Alan Ogilvie

Ms Patti Thyssen
Despite claims from some that Australia is now in a ‘post-feminist era’, issues of gender inequity and disadvantage are still a reality in Australia. The importance of having young women’s voices contributing to public debate and providing leadership on issues of gender equality was the catalyst in forming Melbourne’s innovative new organisation, Women’s Melbourne Network (WMN). WMN is a grassroots feminist network that creates a space for people to share, learn and engage in the movement towards gender equality. Formed in 2013, WMN hosts monthly events, initiated and coordinated solely by its volunteers, in which a public platform is provided to debate issues relevant to gender equality, to facilitate leadership opportunities for young women and to engage the public in issues from a feminist perspective. Proudyly auspiced by the YWCA Victoria, membership of WMN is open to all and available by contacting them at https://www.facebook.com/womensmelbournenetwork.

A key concern of WMN is the gendered nature of sexual violence. Across Australia, 1 in 5 women have been affected by sexual violence since the age of 15. Yet it remains one of the most under-reported forms of interpersonal violence, and one of the most difficult offences to proceed from report to conviction. Since the advent of second-wave feminism, academics and activists have demonstrated how the justice system’s approach to sexual offences is prejudiced by assumptions about victim behaviour. These assumptions have traditionally been based on negative views about the credibility of women and children as victims. On 1 July 2015, major reforms came into effect that sought to simplify Victoria’s notoriously complex rape laws and respond to some of these critiques. With this in mind, WMN sought to provide an important opportunity to reflect on the criminal justice system’s role in addressing the gendered issues involved in sexual offences, and their disproportionate effect on women.

On 2 September 2015, WMN, supported by the Victorian Women’s Trust, hosted the Consenting to Change expert Q & A panel moderated by Anna Seddon (WMN co-convenor and Melbourne University law student), to explore the Victorian legal reforms. The panel comprised four leading legal and gender experts including Her Honour Judge Meryl Sexton of the County Court of Victoria, Greg Byrne AO, Special Counsel of the Department of Justice and Regulation, Carolyn Worth, Manager of the South Eastern Centre Against Sexual Assault, and ANZSOC’s own Dr Asher Flynn, Senior Lecture in Criminology at Monash University. The panel presented an engaging discussion on consent and the new fault element, rape myths and misconceptions, and the challenges of rape law reform, to a sold out audience at the Victorian State Library.

Her Honour Judge Sexton led the discussion of how the previous fault element for rape had become increasingly complex, and how this had led to more appeals and retrials. She suggested this limited the jury’s ability to understand the law and may have led them to apply their own views and misconceptions of rape to the trial. From the perspective of someone who helped create the law, Greg Byrne explained how the new reforms aimed to reduce these complexities by shifting the fault element’s focus from the strength of the accused’s belief in consent to the reasonableness of that belief. This focus requires the accused to prove that their belief was reasonable, given the circumstances of the alleged offence, including what steps they took to ascertain consent. Mr Byrne noted that this change should allow for greater consideration to be given to the consent-negating circumstances, as listed in the Act, and the communicative model of consent that these are based on.

The panel explained that the Act aimed to improve how sexual consent was understood within the context of a trial. Dr Flynn drew from her research examining consent and how traditional discourses of “real rape” and “real rape victims” have continued to pervade the criminal justice system, reinforcing broader social myths and misconceptions about what constitutes rape; the impacts of which blur social understanding of legal and illegal behaviour. She argued that the reforms are a step forward from previous laws, but there remain problems around the reasonableness test, which has the potential to excuse non-consensual sexual acts, and place the focus back on the actions of the victim. Carolyn Worth drew from her wealth of experience working with victim-survivors to highlight the problematic misconceptions held about rape and rape victims in particular. She explained how negative perceptions of rape victims stopped or deterred victims from pursuing action through the criminal justice system. Concerningly, these misconceptions translated onto the victim-survivor herself, who would then take on blame and shame for her victimisation experience.

The panel placed the reforms in the context of the wider societal assumptions that influence the prosecution of sexual offenders. Though the perception and treatment of victims has improved considerably in Victoria, the panelists emphasised that greater socio-cultural change was also needed. In particular, greater education on the meaning of consent is vital to change prejudiced assumptions commonly held about rape and consent. Dr Flynn and Ms Worth also noted the importance of coupling law reform with non-legal mechanisms and responses to sexual violence that can recognise the lived experiences of victim-survivors through alternate avenues. Legislatively, these reforms are another step towards improving this understanding within a trial. However, real change to how we as a society treat these offences can only occur by shifting society’s focus from the fault of the victim, to the meaning of consent.

Anna Seddon, Co-convenor WMN
Greta Williams, External Communications Coordinator WMN
Where Are They Now?
Profiles in Criminological and Socio-Legal Adventures

In 1999, ANZSOC established the Student Paper Prize and the New Scholar Award. Since then, there have been about 25 recipients. What, I wondered, have they done since receiving ANZSOC’s accolade? What criminological and socio-legal adventures have they had? Where do they live and work today? I proposed to the ANZSOC 50th Anniversary Committee that we establish a regular column in *PacifiCrim* to learn about and celebrate the achievements of all the student and new scholar award winners. In this inaugural column, we meet Lisette Aarons and Silva Hinek, who were the first to receive ANZSOC’s Student Paper Prize.

**Lisette Aarons** won the Student Paper Prize in 1999 for her Honours thesis, “Art crime: an exploratory study of the illegitimate art market in Australia”, completed at the Department of Criminology, University of Melbourne, under the supervision of Professor Ken Polk. Lisette recalls that “Ken was such a fabulous supervisor. I was very lucky to have worked with and learnt from him”. Lisette published the paper, as sole author, in the *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* (2001), Vol 34(1), pp. 17-37.

Today, Lisette is Assistant Director for the National Centre for Crime and Justice Statistics (NCCJS), Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), Melbourne.

Lisette says that “1999 was a memorable year. I made my first trip to Perth to attend the ANZSOC conference and receive the Student Paper Prize”. Also in that year, she and her partner moved from “leafy, bayside Melbourne to the grey concrete world of Belconnen, Canberra”, where her ABS career began.

Lisette was initially “attracted to criminology precisely because I am not a ‘numbers’ person!” It is ironic, then, that her first and current job was (and is) with the ABS. In her first year at the ABS, she researched two areas: the potential impact of Y2K (otherwise known as the Millennium Bug) on the retail industry, and better ways to capture the knowledge-based economy in traditional economic models. That may not sound like criminology, but because of her criminological research skills, Lisette says that she was “well-equipped to approach diverse research topics”. In particular, she drew from “lots of background research, applied a framework to dissect the problem, sought feedback from experts, and modified my ideas and assumptions as the projects progressed”. This approach “should sound familiar to ANZSOC members”.

Lisette then got involved in survey methods. She developed and implemented questionnaire testing procedures “such as cognitive testing and focus groups, to ensure ABS social survey statistics were valid and reliable”. The testing procedures involved “designing and using qualitative research methods, interviewing research techniques and skills I had developed and used in my honours thesis and staying well clear of spreadsheets full of … (please don’t say the next word out loud) *numbers*”.

Although still in Canberra, Lisette shifted from the ABS to the Parliamentary Triangle in 2003. She worked as a social policy analyst with the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, where she was “a consumer of data”. She “used and analysed statistics (*numbers*)” to highlight policy areas for certain sub-groups, identify changes in social patterns, support policy development, and monitor policy implementation.

Then in 2005, Lisette moved back to Melbourne to take up a position at the NCCJS. She’s still there, after 10 years, and finds it a “challenging and constantly evolving area”. She’s worked on crime victimisation surveys; police crime data; and statistics on prison and community-based corrections, fraud, family and domestic violence, and firearms and substance use. “These are just some of the criminological topics I have had the opportunity to work on”.

She works regularly with colleagues in Commonwealth units or departments (Social Services, Attorney-General’s, Australian Crime Commission, Australian Institute of Criminology, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare); those in state and territory governments (police and justice/Attorney-General’s); and with non-government service providers. The aim of the NCCJS is to build and improve evidence to inform crime prevention, community safety, and justice policy. “I am passionate about improving the quality, nature, and range of data available to criminologists and public policy analysts. Luckily for me there’s still much to do in this area!”

Lisette says “I had no idea what I was embarking on when I enrolled in Criminology, but my undergraduate degree truly has laid the foundational capabilities I still use every day in my professional life”. Lisette is “still not a numbers person”, confiding that “my 10-year old son’s maths homework makes me shake in fear”. Despite this, she loves “uncovering and telling the stories hidden in data”. Lisette remains interested in art and art crime, and she hopes one day to conduct further research in the area. She has started a Postgraduate Certificate in Public Sector Management at QUT. She looks forward to attending ANZSOC’s 2015 conference in Adelaide, meeting current students and graduates, and hearing about their research stories.

********************************************************************************


Silva’s honours seminar paper analysed what, at the time, was a ground-breaking decision by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY), namely, to issue a criminal indictment against Slobodan Milošević, charging him with crimes in the former Yugoslavia committed during the Yugoslav wars. When the indictment was issued, Milošević was an acting head of state, and the paper outlined problems that were likely to arise because of this. Silva also asked “whether the Milošević trial could ever be fair, given his reputation around the world”.

She received her LLB(Hons) from the University of Auckland in 2001. When she left the university, she says, “I was determined to have a career in international law, preferably international criminal law”.

After clerking at the Auckland High Court (2001-2003), she relocated to The Netherlands to undertake an LLM from Leiden...
"I chose Leiden University because, at that time, it was one of the very few masters programs focused on international criminal law”. An added benefit was “the university was close to The Hague”, a city that is the hub of international criminal law and home to a number of international tribunals, including the ICTY. “I desperately wanted to work at the ICTY, and so Leiden was an obvious choice”.

Silva graduated cum laude from Leiden, specialising in international criminal law. Upon graduation, she was offered an internship at the ICTY and worked in the section of the Tribunal that provides legal support to the Judges (referred to as the “Chambers”). By this time, Milošević was in the custody of the ICTY, and his trial was ongoing. “As luck would have it, I was asked to intern for the Milošević trial chamber and work on the very case I wrote about in 2001”. After interning for four months, Silva was offered a paid position on the team. In that role she assisted the judges who were running the trial, conducted legal research, drafted decisions, and analysed evidence. After Milošević died in 2006, Silva continued to work in Chambers, this time on the Milutinović et al. case. In this case, six high-level Serbian political, military, and police figures were prosecuted for crimes committed in Kosovo in 1999. In the trial judgment in February 2009, Milutinović, a former Serbian President, was acquitted, while his five co-accused were found guilty of crimes against humanity and war crimes. Today, Silva still works in Chambers at the ICTY, now on the case of Radovan Karadžić. Former president of the Republika Srpska in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Karadžić is the highest ranking Bosnian Serb politician to be put on trial at the ICTY. The indictment against him alleges genocide, extermination, persecution and unlawful attacks on civilian populations, among other charges.

The Karadžić trial began in October 2009. Closing arguments were made five years later, from 29 September to 7 October 2014. The trial judgment is expected to be delivered in December 2015. At the time of writing, Silva continues to work on the case. Silva says that “working in the field of international crimes and war-related atrocities is not only exciting and interesting, but also extremely meaningful and rewarding”. She has published an article, “The Judgment of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in Prosecutor v Pavle Strugar” (2006), *Leiden Journal of International Law*. She also wrote an article about superior orders defence in international criminal law, published in the New Zealand Postgraduate Law e-Journal (2005). Her message to readers is, “I would urge every law student out there to consider international criminal law when making decisions about their future and their career”.

**Professor Kathy Daly, Griffith University**

### Allen Bartholomew Award Winners: Eileen Baldry & Chris Cunneen

Our argument in the article, *Imprisoned Indigenous women and the shadow of colonial patriarchy*, is relatively straightforward: to understand contemporary penal culture and in particular, its severity and excess in relation to Indigenous people and women, we need to draw upon an understanding of the dynamics of colonial patriarchy. We have come to this joint position through various avenues.

In the mid-1980s, Eileen was inspired by Gerda Lerner’s thesis in her iconic book, *The Creation of Patriarchy* (1986, Oxford University Press). Although there have been challenges to her work, and the development of vibrant and diverse discussions regarding patriarchy, Lerner’s fundamental argument re-conceptualised the millennia-long subordination of women, making gender central to an analysis of Judeo-Christian Western civilisation. Her work also spoke to the creation of class and hierarchy in the broadest sense. Importantly, she pointed to the underpinning of European colonialism by patriarchy. This provided Eileen with a slow burn analysis of the way White institutions in Australia, from invasion, developed in relation to Indigenous Australian women and girls, and positioned them at the lowest levels of the emerging Anglo-Australian social hierarchy.

Working with Wiradjuri women, Associate Professor Sue Green and Professor Juanita Sherwood, informed Eileen’s decades-long focus on women in the criminal justice system. This grew more in tandem as Eileen explored, more recently, girls and women with mental and/or cognitive disability in the criminal justice system, as it became apparent that Indigenous Australian women and girls within the legal system experienced significantly higher rates of mental and cognitive disability than their non-Indigenous sisters and Indigenous men.

Chris’ particular interest in Indigenous women in prison arose from the work of the *Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody* during the late 1980s. The Commission had a very strong focus on the long-term effects of colonialism on Indigenous people, particularly in their contact with criminal justice, but a relatively weak analysis of the specific impacts on Indigenous women. Meanwhile, there were Indigenous women (such as Behrendt, Moreton-Robinson, Watson) who argued for the analytical importance of the link between gender and colonialism to understanding the situation of Indigenous people. The sense of silence around Indigenous women’s experience was heightened when the Royal Commission failed to look at the specificity of Indigenous women’s deaths in custody – which were different from men in some important respects. A number of national police custody surveys during the 1990s and early 2000s reinforced the profound need for a specific analysis of Indigenous experiences of Anglo-Australian criminal law. The surveys repeatedly showed that Indigenous women comprised around 50% of all women taken into custody. The last decades of extraordinary increases in Indigenous women’s imprisonment has reinforced the urgent requirement for an analysis that brings together colonialism, gender and criminology.

We discussed these issues at depth as we, with colleagues, worked on the *Australian Prisons Project*. The book emerging out of that project, *Penal Culture and hyperincarceration: the revival of the prison* (2013, Ashgate), pushed us to bring our analyses of the place of patriarchy, colonialism, and the hyperincarceration of Indigenous Australian women to a cohesive and satisfactory thesis that sought to understand and explain why such extensive punishment is meted out to such a comparatively large proportion of Indigenous women. We came to the position, as explored in the article, that although at a micro-level specific legislation and policy changes have had a negative impact on the imprisonment of vulnerable groups, it is within a broader context of the strategies and techniques of colonial patriarchy that we can understand why it is that particular social groups appear to be the targets of penal excess.
Research Snapshot: Addressing Filicide—Moving Towards Prevention

In 2009, ANZSOC’s Dr Danielle Tyson, along with Professor Thea Brown and Paula Fernandez Arias (Monash University) received cross-Faculty funding from Monash University to commence a study of filicides covering all child victims (0-18) who were killed by a parent or equivalent (mother, father, step-parent, or grandparent). Data were extracted from the cases files of the Coroner’s Court in the state of Victoria for the period 2000 to 2009. The aim of the research was to examine all cases of filicide in Victoria, in order to identify perpetrator characteristics and what factors were associated with the deaths, including parental separation, mental illness, domestic violence, gender and child abuse, and substance abuse. The study also sought to investigate the perpetrator’s help-seeking behaviour prior to the offence, and the nature of the interaction and outcome of service contact. The findings have been published by the research team who were guest editors of a themed issue on Filicide in the international journal Child Abuse Review (http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/car.v23.2/issuetoc).

In sum, the study found that while separation was a factor in many cases, more cases showed evidence of mental illness. Additionally, most perpetrators had some form of contact with community services, yet filicide still occurred. This gives rise to questions of how such services may be improved to facilitate better support and outcomes for families at risk.

These questions were the key focus of the 2015 Addressing Filicide Conference held at the Monash Prato Centre in Tuscany, Italy, on 3-4 June 2015. The conference was attended by domestic and international delegates from 12 countries. The entirely appropriate and important theme of this year’s conference was Moving to Prevention.

The conference showcased an array of empirical and inspiring research. Sessions ranged from a focus on large-scale, longitudinal studies of incidence of filicides for a given period in countries such as Japan, Europe and Australia; critical perspectives on classification systems, risk factors and explanations for different types of filicide; through to theoretical, design and methodological issues exploring the challenges of and different approaches to early intervention and prevention. There was a mix of four keynotes, plenary sessions, individual and co-authored papers, workshops, and importantly, many opportunities to meet and network with leading international scholars, lawyers, social workers, HDR students, medical professionals, counsellors and practitioners in the medieval surrounds of Prato.

The first keynote was given by Professors Rebecca and Russell Dobash (University of Manchester, UK) who focused, using evidence from the Murder in Britain Study, on the contexts and circumstances in which men murder children. Dr Adam Tomison presented the second keynote paper examining current patterns and characteristics of child homicide in Australia with a focus on the nature and extent of familicides, infanticides and homicides involving other adolescents. The third keynote was presented by Professor Colin Pritchard (University of Bournemouth, UK) who called for a reformulation of policy and practice that didn’t ignore structural poverty and its impact on child health and development.

The final keynote was presented by Associate Professor Myrna Dawson (University of Guelph, Ontario, Canada) who considered the use of the public health framework to understand the prevention potential of death reviews and recommendations.

In late 2014, the research team partnered with the AIC’s, Dr Adam Tomison, to undertake the second stage of the research, Filicide in Australia, 2000-2012: A National Report funded by a Criminology Research Grant. The objectives are to: identify the national, and state by state, incidence of filicide deaths of two groups of children (young children 0-17) and adult children (17+), who have been killed by a parent or parent equivalent, such as a step-parent or grandparent; to determine trends regarding the incidence of types of filicide events, of the victims, perpetrators and their families, and the factors associated with the victims, perpetrators and the deaths; and to identify areas for policy and program development.

The study will use data from the National Homicide Monitoring Data Base supplemented by data from the Monash Filicide Research Project and, where necessary, the National Coronial Information Service, Victoria’s Coroner’s Office and police files.

The third Addressing Filicide Conference will be held at the Monash Prato Centre, Tuscany, Italy, on 14-15 June 2017, and we hope that newcomers, along with many of the participants from the 2015 and 2013 conferences, join us to share new findings, and continue the conversations about what kinds of interventions might make a difference in helping to identify those families most at risk and prevent these tragic deaths.


Dr Danielle Tyson, Monash University
International Crime, Justice & Social Democracy Conference

The International Crime, Justice and Social Democracy Conference held at the Queensland University of Technology in Brisbane from 8-10 July 2015 saw almost 350 delegates attend from 19 countries and every continent (bar Antarctica). The conference included a mix of national and international keynote panels and multiple plenary sessions across the two days, with a postgraduate event held on the day before the official conference commenced. The success of the conference was measured in exceptionally strong feedback from participants, alongside record social media impacts including the hashtag #CrimJustConf2015 being tweeted 1,771 times during the conference and becoming the second trending topic on Australian Twitter on the conference’s first day.

To support HDR attendance and involvement at the event, ANZSOC awarded five postgraduate students a scholarship covering registration, airfares and accommodation. The five winners, Ben Chapman-Schmidt (Australan National University), Cara Gledhill (Monash University), Ashlee Gore (Western Sydney University), Bridget Mottram (Western Sydney University) and James Rodgers (University of Auckland) reflect on their conference highlights below.

Of late, criminology has embraced the digital revolution with open arms, and considerable research has been published on digital fraud, money laundering, black markets and theft. But though financial crimes committed online have received widespread attention, until recently there has been a significant blind-spot when it comes to violence committed over the internet and justice negotiated in digital space. It was thus a real highlight that several presenters spoke directly to this theme. Dr Michael Salter’s (WSU) presentation The Dick Pic traced an emerging form of gendered digital violence: subecting unsuspecting victims to unsolicited images of (often the sender’s) male genitalia. Though there has been much recent discussion about the use of explicit material to shame, stigmatise and blackmail the materials’ subjects, there has been little discussion on the use of sexual imagery to shame the viewer. Laura Vits’ (Monash University) presentation, Dick Pics on Blast furthered this discussion by illustrating how digital technologies can also be turned against assailants as tools of subversion and retaliation. These mechanisms for self-help have become vital tools for responding to online victimisation due to the state of pseudo-anarchy that prevails over digital interactions. In fact, as Rachel Loney-Howes (La Trobe University) discussed in her presentation Reimagining the Framework of ‘Real’ Justice through Online Anti-Rape Activism, digital self-help is often the only remedy for victims of crimes committed “IRL” (in real life) in the face of justice systems that still have difficulties processing even physical sexual violence. Together, these and other presentations expanded our understanding of the criminal possibilities of the internet and sowed a fertile field for future research.

I was very fortunate to receive one of five postgraduate scholarships to attend the 2015 Crime, Justice and Social Democracy Conference at QUT in sunny Brisbane. The biennial conference centres on themes of social justice, social democracy, human rights and inequalities and was attended by scholars from many corners of the globe.

On the first day, I attended a panel on Indigenous justice that turned out to be a particular highlight of the conference for me. Dr Jill Guthrie (ANU), Dr Amanda Porter (UTS) and Professor Chris Cunneen (UNSW) provided interesting and informative papers on justice reinvestment projects and the deployment of ‘community’ in discussions of Indigenous justice respectively. Dr Porter presented a particularly thought-provoking paper on Aboriginal community patrols in New South Wales and whether these could be considered a form of decolonised policing. Drawing from her PhD research which utilised Indigenous-centring methodologies, Dr Porter argued that community controls could not be considered ‘policing’ in any formalised Western sense of the word. She also cogently argued that criminology cannot be decolonised without being vigilant about whose voices are being privileged and paid attention to. Overall, this conference provided a unique forum for the discussion of criminological ideas which often fall on the margins of this discipline.

I am very grateful to ANZSOC and the QUT Crime and Justice Research Centre for the opportunity to attend.

Cara Gledhill (Monash University)

I was very fortunate to receive a postgraduate sponsorship to attend the 2015 Crime, Justice and Social Democracy Conference at QUT in Brisbane. This short piece includes my reflections on the keynote by Professor Máximo Sozzo (Universidad Nacional del Litoral) and the notion of a criminology of the global south. Professor Sozzo’s keynote discussed the incarceration rate of four countries: Ecuador, Venezuela, Chile, and Argentina. He contrasted the trends of these incarceration rates with the introduction of different penal policies, the politics of punishment, and the experiences each of these countries had with neo-liberal policies. The general conclusion was that the introduction of these policies led to a tough on crime rhetoric, which in turn caused a rise in the incarceration rates – even in cases where the incarceration rate was previously in decline. This keynote served as a springboard for further discussions in a session entitled Southern Criminology and the Global South where a panel group consisting of eleven national and international senior criminologists argued that criminological discussions often took place within a ‘northern’ perspective – consisting primarily of European and North American modes of thought and research sites. The panel contended that there should be an effort made to further criminological knowledge from perspectives of the global south and that research and researchers should develop methods that are based on the experience and perspectives of those who are located within, or identify as being part of, the global south. The panel asked for further input and discussions as to the role that criminology within the global south could take, and what responses could be made to the current identified critiques.

James Rodgers (University of Auckland)
At the formal welcome to country, Aboriginal elder Joe Kirk of the local Turrbal clan reminded us that the site of our conference was a traditional sacred place for Aboriginal “women’s business”. This provided an apt context for the continued critical discussions on the issues of violence against women, which remains one of the biggest local and global gendered burdens. Following on from this theme, the parallel session Current Issues in Addressing Intimate Partner Violence provided insightful updates on Australia’s progress in terms of educational training and legal reform in the area of violence against women, while also highlighting the important broader social and cultural context in which this violence takes place. Associate Professor Molly Drageiwicz and Amy Gurd’s (QUT) presentation Domestic Violence Education in Australia: Recommendations and Realities provided a critical reality check; despite being the focus point of professional recommendations, they found no degree or program currently available that systematically deals with the dynamics of domestic and family violence. The effects of subpar institutional education and training were also raised as issues in the subsequent presentation by Dr Danielle Tyson (Monash University), Debbie Kirkwood and Mandy McKenzie (DVRCV) examining The Impact of Feminist Law Reforms for intimate partner homicide. Despite finding some positive effects of reform, they argued that there remained a discernible lack of understanding of the dynamics of domestic and family violence, especially when faced with controlling behaviour that is non-physical. The final presenter, Professor Walter DeKeseredy (West Virginia University) spoke on Pornography and Violence against Women highlighting the broader social and cultural context in which violence against women becomes socially meaningful, including the intersections of the ‘culture of pornography’ and male peer support. Ashlee Gore (Western Sydney University)

As a PhD student, I find there is a lot of pressure to do things right: to use the right methodology, the right theory, and to have the right ideas. However, when you put a group of seasoned academics in a room with free rein to discuss these things, there seems to be a less uniform idea of exactly what “right” is.

The Postgraduate Event provided the opportunity to have a free and easy discussion around these contrasting ideas, with a wonderful mix of workshops facilitated by international guest speakers. One of these sessions was on the topic of research and methods, facilitated by Professor Walter DeKeseredy (West Virginia University) and Professor Joe Donnermeyer (Ohio State University), with Professor Loraine Gelsthorpe (Cambridge University) also in attendance. Many interesting topics emerged from the effortless conversation within the room, with Loraine and Joe highlighting the importance of having a whole toolbox of methods and theoretical frameworks that you can draw on (even though you may have your favourites!)

However, it was the existential note of happiness that the workshop ended on that has resonated with me. Walter and Joe pondered the treadmill of doing research purely with the goals of publications and tenure. Even if your work is being published in the “right” journals and you’re saying all the “right” things, what’s the point if you’re not passionate about it? What’s the point if it doesn’t make any difference or significant contribution to the field? What’s the point if it doesn’t make you happy? And that reminds us to always keep the broader picture in mind of what we do.

Bridget Mottram (Western Sydney University)
The emergence of the online drugs trade represents an exciting opportunity for scholars engaged in the study of cybercrime, conventional organised crime, illicit drug distribution and the global War on Drugs. This study represents one of the first scholarly attempts to conceptualise the online drugs trade, and also to assess its growing impact upon drug users, organised crime groups and law enforcement agencies tasked with enforcing drug prohibition.

The article introduces a new criminological concept – the cryptomarket – which is defined as an “online forum where goods and services are exchanged between parties who use digital encryption to conceal their identities”. The subject of the article is the infamous (and now defunct) cryptomarket Silk Road. At the time of publication, Silk Road was responsible for facilitating the sale and distribution of tens of millions of dollars worth of illicit drugs to countries around the world, including Australia. While Silk Road was recently shut down as a result of a transnational policing operation, dozens of other cryptomarkets have emerged in its wake. This has caused considerable concern among law enforcement agencies tasked with enforcing drug prohibition, as well as generating significant interest amongst criminologists and other scholars from disciplines as diverse as computer science to sociology.

The article employs original empirical research gathered from cryptomarkets to explain how these sites function and maintain operations in the face of determined opposition from some of the world’s most powerful law enforcement agencies. A key aspect insulating cryptomarkets from the attentions of policing agencies is their location on an encrypted part of the Internet called the “Tor Network”, otherwise known by its more evocative public moniker, the “Dark Net”. By hosting data and communications on the encrypted Dark Net, cryptomarket users are able to anonymously advertise illicit drugs, conduct sales and transfer money (in the form of the electronic currency Bitcoin) without being exposed to government authorities.

Digital encryption is only one factor explaining the growing popularity of cryptomarkets. Equally important are the internal mechanisms that allow these illicit sites to self-regulate. Like legitimate “surface web” trading sites, such as eBay and Amazon Market, cryptomarkets employ user-generated customer feedback to allow online sellers to establish a reputation for quality services and products. Any consumer who purchases online is able to provide feedback regarding the perceived quality of drugs they purchased.

This feedback is publicly visible to other prospective customers, and is also used to automatically rank dealers in comparison with their competitors. For popular drug categories, such as cannabis and ecstasy, there are literally thousands of online dealers available at the click of a button, each offering a range of competitively priced products. The levels of service and quality of illicit drugs that are offered by online drug vendors are typically superior to their offline counterparts. The article explains how drug distribution networks facilitated by cryptomarkets are more efficient than those maintained by conventional organised crime groups.

A key finding presented in the article is that cryptomarkets represent a potentially much safer alternative than the conventional illicit drugs trade. Consumers are able to source cheaper and less adulterated drugs via a cryptomarket than they could via a street dealer. Perhaps more significantly, online drugs are delivered via traditional postal services. This means that large sections of the conventional illicit drugs supply chain – including international traffickers, wholesalers and street level dealers – are rendered redundant. This limits opportunities for internecine violence between organised crime groups involved with illicit drug distribution, as well as protecting drug dealers and consumers from the arrest and prosecution by law enforcement.
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