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Dear comrades and colleagues of the European Group

Dear comrades and colleagues of the European Group,

Hello and welcome to the first newsletter of 2019! We have an exciting year ahead and very much look forward to working with you to continue and develop collaborations, share ideas and move forward with strategies of support and resistance in increasing restrictive and controlling times.

As you will see from the newsletter this month, the key way in which we aim to do that is through the European Group annual conference in Barcelona in September. This year, we strongly encourage presenters to offer examples of toolkits, strategies and collaborations which we can mutually learn from and develop on. As you will see from the call (below) this year centres on action – what have you and/or your colleagues done which have been successful in building strategies for social justice? What has happened that could have gone better that we can all learn from? Are there ways that other members of the European Group can help build support networks?

To that end, we invite you to read the full call (below) and take some time to read and reflect on the excellent contributions from members throughout the newsletter. As always, we very much appreciate it, and are happy to discuss contributions (email Vicky, Dani and Katja on europeanangroupcoordinator@gmail.com before the 25th of each month).

Enjoy February!

With best wishes,

Vicky Canning, Katja Simončič, and Dani Jiménez [coordinator team]
I. Barcelona 2019

European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control
47th Annual Conference
Can Batlló, Barcelona, 4, 5, 6 September 2019

RESISTING STATE-CORPORATE HARMs IN TIMES OF REPRESSION TOWARDS A THEORY OF INSURRECTION

[opening of the registration period: 20 February 2019]

Across the globe, there has been an undoubtable evolution of the intimate bond between states and corporations. The impacts have been prolific: as state-corporate power increases, the social, economic and political wellbeing of populations and ecosystems has degenerated greatly in many areas. Political repression has ensued across regions of resistance. Whilst wealth has increased for a minority elite, violent economic policies continue to inflict social, economic, emotional and political harms against some of the most powerless in society. Meanwhile, so-called ‘globalisation’ often imposes market totalisation: an essentially colonial dynamic to manage populations through the mechanisms of warfare and social control. Indeed, we are increasingly seeing the militarisation of police forces and borders, with armies patrolling the provinces of world ‘geoeconomics’: life becomes privatised, and death is outsourced.

In response to these shifts, the 2019 Annual Conference of the European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control will be held in Barcelona. Our objective is to give voice to those who resist, and offer the means to collaborate towards the collective construction of an insurrectional theory based on a variety of practical experiences. This is a chance to expand on a theory and practice which is based on the legitimate right to a dignified life. A theory to pull down the walls between discourses and struggles for justice, thus dissolving the divide between so-called ‘knowledge production’ and social organisation: it is always the latter what facilitates the former. We look forward to taking this opportunity to build activist and research agendas in this direction.

We particularly encourage papers and panels that draw together activism and academia, and bring to the table examples of where toolkits or actions for resistance have been successful – or not. We aim to build a mutual learning environment within which attendees and speakers can develop ideas to move forward in various areas across the spectrum of social inequality and multiple oppressions or violence.

The call for contributions is organized under streams pertaining to the titles of the European Group’s Working Groups. Please submit a summary of your contribution (máx. 600 words) to the relevant stream by 20 April 2019.

See: http://www.europeangroup.org/
**Working Groups / Streams:**

**Prisons, Detention and Punishment**  
Simone Santorso ([Simone.santorso18@gmail.com](mailto:Simone.santorso18@gmail.com))

**Policing and Security**  
Georgios Papanicolaou ([g.papanicolaou@tees.ac.uk](mailto:g.papanicolaou@tees.ac.uk))

**Crimes of the Powerful**  
Samantha Fletcher ([Samantha.Fletcher@mmu.ac.uk](mailto:Samantha.Fletcher@mmu.ac.uk))

**Fear and Looting in the Periphery**  
Dani Jiménez ([dif@unizar.es](mailto:dif@unizar.es)), Ale Forero ([aleforero@ub.edu](mailto:aleforero@ub.edu)), 
Ignasi Bernat ([ignasi.bernat@gmail.com](mailto:ignasi.bernat@gmail.com)), Rita Faria ([rfaria@direito.up.pt](mailto:rfaria@direito.up.pt))

**Social Harm**  
Christina Pantazis ([C.pantazis@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:C.pantazis@bristol.ac.uk))  
Simon Pemberton ([s.pemberton.1@bham.ac.uk](mailto:s.pemberton.1@bham.ac.uk))

**Historical, philosophical and artistic approaches**  
Stratos Georgoulas ([s.georgoulas@soc.aegean.gr](mailto:s.georgoulas@soc.aegean.gr))

**Conference co-ordinator team:**  
Ale Forero – [aleforero@ub.edu](mailto:aleforero@ub.edu)  
Ignasi Bernat – [ignasi.bernat@gmail.com](mailto:ignasi.bernat@gmail.com)  
Dani Jiménez – [dif@unizar.es](mailto:dif@unizar.es)
En todo el mundo, el vínculo íntimo entre estado y mercado ha sufrido evidentes transformaciones a lo largo de las últimas décadas. Los efectos nocivos de ese cambio han afectado a una mayoría de la población mundial, a sus condiciones de vida y a sus entornos sociales y naturales. La represión política se extiende a todos los territorios en resistencia. La llamada globalización impone una totalización del mercado por medio de dinámicas esencialmente coloniales, de ahí que la gestión de las poblaciones tienda a emplear lógicas y métodos de guerra y control social. Las policías hacen guerras locales, los ejércitos patrullan las provincias “geoeconómicas” del mundo, la vida se privatiza y la muerte se subcontrata.

Por todas estas razones, el próximo mes de septiembre en Barcelona, la 47ª Conferencia del European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control quiere dar voz a quienes resisten, con el objetivo último de construir colectivamente una teoría insurreccional basada en una suma de experiencias prácticas. Una teoría basada en el legítimo derecho a una vida digna. Una teoría para derribar los muros entre discursos y luchas por la justicia, eliminando la división entre la llamada “producción de conocimiento” y la organización social. Porque es siempre la segunda la que construye lo primero, y no al revés.

Os animamos a presentar experiencias que pongan en común la actividad de la militancia social y el trabajo académico, ejemplos en los que las herramientas, métodos y acciones de resistencia hayan tenido éxito – o no. Nuestra intención es construir un espacio de aprendizaje mutuo en el que asistentes y ponentes desarrollen propuestas encaminadas a avanzar en diferentes frentes de lucha contra la desigualdad social y sus múltiples formas de violencia y opresión.

La recepción de contribuciones se organiza en base a los títulos de los diferentes Grupos de Trabajo del European Group. Os pedimos que enviéis una versión resumida de vuestras contribuciones (máx. 600 palabras) al grupo de trabajo correspondiente antes del 20 de abril de 2019.

Ver: [http://www.europeangroup.org/](http://www.europeangroup.org/)
Grupos de Trabajo / Sesiones:

**Cárcel, Encierro y Castigo**
Simone Santorso ([Simone.santorso18@gmail.com](mailto:Simone.santorso18@gmail.com))

**Policía y Seguridad**
Georgios Papanicolaou ([g.papanicolaou@tees.ac.uk](mailto:g.papanicolaou@tees.ac.uk))

**Crímenes de los Poderosos**
Samantha Fletcher ([Samantha.Fletcher@mmu.ac.uk](mailto:Samantha.Fletcher@mmu.ac.uk))

**Miedo y Saqueo en la Periferia**
Dani Jiménez ([dif@unizar.es](mailto:dif@unizar.es)), Ale Forero ([aleforero@ub.edu](mailto:aleforero@ub.edu)).
Ignasi Bernat ([ignasi.bernat@gmail.com](mailto:ignasi.bernat@gmail.com)), Rita Faria ([rfaria@direito.up.pt](mailto:rfaria@direito.up.pt))

**Enfoques históricos, filosóficos y artísticos**
Stratos Georgoulas ([s.georgoulas@soc.aegean.gr](mailto:s.georgoulas@soc.aegean.gr))

**Daño Social / Social Harm**
Christina Pantazis ([C.pantazis@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:C.pantazis@bristol.ac.uk))
Simon Pemberton ([s.pemberton.1@bham.ac.uk](mailto:s.pemberton.1@bham.ac.uk))

**Equipo coordinador de la conferencia:**
Ale Forero – [aleforero@ub.edu](mailto:aleforero@ub.edu)
Ignasi Bernat – [ignasi.bernat@gmail.com](mailto:ignasi.bernat@gmail.com)
Dani Jiménez – [dif@unizar.es](mailto:dif@unizar.es)
II. Scientific Skepticism and Political Commitment. For Stan Cohen

Stanley Cohen passed away on 7 January 2013 at the age of 70 in London. For this, Stan’s intellectual and political ethic, we should continue to fight.

Thank you again, Stan, and thanks to our colleague and comrade Professor Stratos Georgoulas for this contribution.

See the English, Greek, Spanish, Slovenian, Finnish, Lithuanian, and German versions [see here: http://www.europeangroup.org/?q=node/167].

Also thanks to the EG National representatives for the translations.

Social frustration across Europe, the expansion of neo-fascism, and an orthodoxy of “realism” that leaves us with no air for hope and at the same time a deafening silence from the academy. What is it? Six years after his death, this question will help to revisit Stan Cohen’s legacy, work that has left its mark on radical criminological and sociological thinking.

It was in the late 1960s when Stan, along with other pioneers and young researchers, found themselves in Berkeley, California, deciding to begin working on a scientific stream of critical sociology in the study of crime and social control. A few years later, at the age of 30, Stan Cohen published the renowned book ‘Folk Devils and Moral Panics’ (1972), in which he introduced the concept of the moral panic to explain how rigid repressive policies are legitimized in the social field by dominant media discourses. In the following years, this particular train of thought – and those affiliated with it - were attacked by the academic establishment. Many lost their jobs and were unemployed; others have been “surrendered” to a stream of left-wing realism. In any case the career of these individuals was characterized by honesty, doubt and marginalization.

In the final few years of his life, Cohen raised a question through his publication on the relationship between scientific skepticism and political commitment. The simplified view of the question is what Cohen himself experienced and recorded in this article, but I imagine it is quite common in our field today. In an attempt to harm Cohen’s dual belief - in being a sociologist and socialist in England – for which many marginalized him. They called him a “professor” at the political party, and socialist/trade unionist/non-sociologist at the University. In the first case, the need for constant controversy made him susceptible to the criticism of some insignificant ones, specifically that his writing was difficult to understand for non-academic audiences. In fact, the real criticism was, of course, that he was not a “controlled”, indestructible organ. However, the second criticism is interesting; his “colleagues” at the University - as they could not judge the essence of his work - instead criticized his political and trade union engagement which, according to his critics, diminished the importance of his work. This double attack becomes ludicrous when you hear it from a distance, but when it is experienced, you know it has material consequences.

The essential aspect of this matter is not ludicrous; it also gives me a working hypothesis to explain why, when there is global social unrest, University professors (with relatively few exceptions) seldom stand at the level of the circumstances. The dipole of the question is often not experienced as a single reality, but is divided into two separate worlds. Scientific skepticism does not please the political and administrative elite, which determines both the prestige and the material rewards of researchers-intellectuals. The easy way out is to have a left political commitment (as a vote, a friend or even a member), while your scientific work is determined by a framework of the reproduction of the established knowledge. You may
appear talking about the future of the left but also to write without questioning anything, reproducing instead populist issues – those which the market wants you to study. That so called “left” intelligentsia is easily recognized when reading its scientific articles and books, not from a membership card or signature in support of a left party before elections.

Real left intellectualism is scientifically consistent, honest, and as Cohen has noted, it must be characterized by the following: Challenges to the dominant scientific examples; conceptual categories and methods of research; and not to follow those that are simply “fashionable”. Recognize the great “enemies” and attack them for deconstruction. Such is the expansive positivism, the determinism, the reification, the supposed “neutrality” of science, and the refusal of politics in science. Claiming a new social structure that can be characterized by opponents as romantic, utopian and politically irresponsible, but in essence history has shown that it is not only desirable but also a conclusive necessity.

Feuerbach’s 11th(*) became a “t-shirt slogan” and everyone forgot the ten previous ones. Yes, the question is to change the world, but this presupposes, as Marx himself said, to give the right content to philosophy, to turn it into a revolutionary theory. Theory becomes the driving force of history when it becomes a guide to revolutionary action.

Political commitment only when combined with scientific skepticism in academia can be true, sincere, and socially rewarded. Ethical and political positions should also be clear in the scientific field: the commitment to contribute to the reformulation of the scientific and political agenda for the benefit of people’s needs. Of course, we should know that such a position is likely to be punished by the establishment, both in academia and the state. We all remember the murder of our two American colleagues in El Salvador those who were studying the Junta’s social injustice. Murderers crushed their brains and the tools of their work, computers and typewriters because they considered them dangerous. But the alternative is to be false – no matter how much you try to hide it, is finally revealed.

(*) The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to change it (K. Marx 1845).

Stratos Georgoulas - University of the Aegean
III. Spain: Concern over the campaign against our colleague and comrade Iñaki Rivera

Organización Mundial Contra la Tortura


Spain: Concern over the attack campaign against Mr. Iñaki Rivera, Director of the OSPDH (Observatory of the Penal System and Human Rights) and SIRECOVI (Warning System for Cases of Institutional Violence)

Geneva-Paris, 20 December 2018

Mr. Fernando Grande-Marlaska Gómez
Minister for Home Affairs

Mr. Ángel Luis Ortiz González
General Secretary of Penitentiary Institutions, Spain

Mrs. Ester Capella i Farré
Counselor of Justice of the Generalitat de Catalunya, Spain

Mr. Amand Calderó i Montfort
General Director of Penitentiary Services of the Generalitat de Catalunya, Spain

Subject: Concern over the attack campaign against Mr. Iñaki Rivera, Director of the OSPDH (Observatory of the Penal System and Human Rights) and SIRECOVI (Warning System for Cases of Institutional Violence).

Dear Sirs,

Dear Madam,

In the framework of its joint programme – the Observatory for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders (the Observatory) –, the World Organization against Torture (OMCT) and the FIDH address you to show their concern for the campaign of attacks against Mr. Iñaki Rivera, human rights defender and Director of the Observatory of the Penal System and Human Rights (OSPDH) [1] and the System of Registration and Communication (SIRECOVI) [2].
According to the information received, following the participation of Mr. Iñaki Rivera in a program of the Catalan public television TV3 on 23 November, a campaign of attacks against him was started by officials of the penitentiary system [3]. Mr. Rivera has received serious disqualifications and stigmatization, one of the unions of prison officials announced a legal action for slander and insults against them, and the officials have promoted prohibition of Mr. Rivera’s entrance to the penitentiary centres of Catalonia.

This campaign of attacks occurs in the framework of the presentation of a SIRECOVI report on institutional violence [4] where at least 106 cases of institutional violence are recorded in Catalonia between December 2016 and September of 2018, 67.9% of which would have occurred against incarcerated people.

The Observatory stresses that this disturbing campaign of attacks against Mr. Rivera, OSPDH and SIRECOVI is not a timely event, but adds to a long list of serious attacks against him since 2004 including insults, disqualifications, threats and acts of harassment in retaliation for their legitimate human rights work by denouncing cases of torture and/or ill-treatment against persons deprived of their liberty.

This campaign of attacks has been followed with concern on the part of the Observatory, as well as by various international mechanisms. In 2015, the United Nations Rapporteur on Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment expressed his concern at allegations of reprisal against members of the OSPDH for having denounced acts of torture commited by Officers in the penitentiary center of Quatre Camins [5]. In addition, the list of issues prior to the submission of the seventh report of Spain before the UN Committee Against Torture calls on the Spanish state to report on the investigations carried out after the allegations of reprisals against the members of the Observatory of the Penal System and Human Rights, as well as the alleged obstruction of their work of supervision of the human rights situation in the centres of deprivation of liberty in Catalonia [6].

The Observatory is concerned about the fact that this campaign is occurring in a context in which a tendency to misuse penal law is being observed against statements and messages protected by freedom of expression, including Critical remarks on the performance of state police forces, through the recourse to criminal types such as hate crime, defamation or enhancement of terrorism. These facts have a clear inhibitory intention and effect, negatively impacting the exercise of rights such as freedom of expression and assembly, which has been warned by the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) in sentences such as the case Toranzo Gómez v. Spain (Application No. 26922/14).

For all the above, the Observatory is respectfully addressing you to urge the authorities of the Spanish Government and the Autonomous Government of Catalonia to take all necessary measures to ensure the physical and psychological integrity of Mr. Iñaki Rivera and the other members of OSPDH and SIRECOVI, as well as to ensure that they can carry out their legitimate and essential human rights work without any obstructions or reprisals and with all guarantees established by the UN Declaration on Human Rights Defenders, which has just turned 20 years old.

Yours sincerely,

Sr. Gerald Staberock - OMCT General Secretary
Sr. Dimitris Christopoulos - FIDH President
The Observatory for the protection of human rights defenders (the Observatory) is a program created in 1997 by FIDH and the World Organization Against Torture (OMCT) whose objective is to prevent or remedy concrete situations of repression against human rights defenders. FIDH and OMCT are both members of ProtectDefenders.eu, the European Union Mechanism for Human Rights Defenders implemented by international civil society.

****

[1] The Observatori del Sistema Penal y els Drets Humans (OSPDH) of the University of Barcelona is integrated by professors, students, graduates, postgraduates and professionals who, through research, teaching and observation activities of the institutions of the penal system, work to promote the culture of human rights, to defend the rights and freedoms of people and to strengthen the principles and values of the democratic State of Law.

[2] SIRECOVI is a Warning System for Cases of Institutional Violence created and managed by the Observatori del Sistema Penal y els Drets Humans, Research Center of the University of Barcelona (UB). It is put into operation when a communication is received that a person has allegedly suffered ill-treatment or torture in places of deprivation of liberty (i.e. prisons, police stations, juvenile centers or detention centers for foreigners) or on the street by some agent of public authority.

[3] See press releases from prison officials' union organizations:


[4] The report is available here:

https://www.dropbox.com/s/i3nc1wsxzjxvguk/INFORME%20SIRECOVI%20CAST%20WEB.pdf?dl=0


[6] See CAT/C/ESP/QPR/7 available here:


Copyright © 2010 OMCT
IV. Tony Platt: “Criminal Justice Reform in the U.S. Has a Long History of Repressive Outcomes”

It’s good news that Congress is finally taking bipartisan action to authorize some modest changes in the federal prison system. But this criminal justice reform, like many of its predecessors, offers the illusion of real reform and has a sting in its tail.

On the positive side, the First Step Act gives federal judges some discretion in sentencing non-violent drug offenders. It also eliminates disparities in crack and powder cocaine sentences, provides incentives to reduce the federal prison population through early release programs, and expands job training, and health and educational programs inside prisons. Moreover, the Federal Bureau of Prisons can no longer shackle pregnant women with impunity. African Americans, who comprise 38% of federal prisoners, should get some relief.

The First Step Act (FSA), however, will cover but a fraction of the U. S. prison population since most prisoners are held in state prisons and local jails. And the FSA will not benefit all federal prisoners: those doing time for corporate fraud, government corruption, and peddling opiates, for example, are eligible to be considered for early release programs, while those convicted of violent crimes and abortion-related offenses are ineligible. The legislation also excludes 11,000 prisoners convicted of violating immigration laws, overwhelmingly for non-violent crimes.

The corporate security industry will especially benefit from the FSA’s recommendation to expand the use of electronic monitoring of those confined in home detention after early release, a trend that is under way throughout the criminal justice system. A decade from now I expect that incarceration will be not so much reduced as diversified.

“America is famously ahistorical,” a sardonic Barack Obama observed in 2015. “That’s one of our strengths — we forget things.” We especially forget that many benevolent criminal justice reforms turn out to have a nasty, repressive underside that expands rather than reduces the net of social control. Great harm is often committed in the name of reform.

When Charles Dickens visited Pennsylvania’s Eastern Penitentiary in 1842, the prison administrators showed off the latest reform: a Quaker-influenced regime that kept prisoners isolated day and night, working in their cells under a code of strictly enforced silence to supposedly motivate penitence and self-improvement. Dickens was horrified by what he witnessed — the “torturing anxieties and horrible despair of hopeless solitary confinement” that left prisoners “dead to everything.” The architects of the silent system, he observed, are indeed “kind, humane, and benevolent gentlemen,” but “they do not know what it is they are doing.”

During the Progressive Era (1890-1920) the child-saving movement created a juvenile justice system that promised to take the delinquent children of immigrants out of their urban communities and transform them into hardworking citizens. Instead, government agencies rounded up tens of thousands of working class youth for mostly petty infractions and sent them to highly regimented youth prisons for punishment — all without due process.

Field matrons working for federal Indian Services imagined that they were civilized Native American children by forcibly removing them from rural reservations and incarcerating them in faraway boarding schools where they were punished for “talking Indian.”
By the 1970s, the United States would imprison about one million juveniles annually, with youth of color comprising more than 40 percent of those arrested and incarcerated.

The child savers’ rhetoric of benevolence, backed up by unsentimental interventionism, set the stage for what followed.

During WWI, the federal government launched a national campaign against an epidemic of venereal disease in military camps. The Commission on Training Camp Activities provided medical services for male soldiers whom it treated as the victims of devious prostitutes and “charity girls” suspected of lax morality. The “constructive but firm” program established by the War Department resulted in the incarceration of some 30,000 women.

In the 1920s reformers shifted their moral zeal to the scourge of alcohol. The Treasury Department’s Prohibition Unit, staffed by five times more agents than the staff of the FBI, selectively enforced the law against the poor and the unlucky, while the wealthy drank in protected clubs or bribed their way out of arrest.

Between the two world wars, reformers in the eugenics movement justified the involuntary sterilization of tens of thousands of working-class women as a measure to reduce the birthrate of the “socially inadequate.”

After WWII, in the name of protecting family values and national security, thousands of mostly gay men lost or were denied federal jobs on the basis of their sexuality. One third of gay men experienced run-ins with the police, comparable to the experience of African American men today.

The post-WWII experiment in corrections was supposed to replace the exploitation of prisoners’ labor with diagnosis and treatment, analogous to hospital care for the sick and contagious. Instead state prison administrators used the indeterminate sentence as a cudgel to pathologize prisoners’ grievances and encourage mindless submission to authority.

In the 1980s fixed sentences returned, a reform intended to correct the arbitrariness of indeterminate sentencing. It resulted in prisoners serving more time than they had served a decade earlier and an unprecedented boom in prison construction. In 1950 a staff of 23,000 guarded all U. S. jails and prisons. Today more than 700,000 are needed to do the job, and the United States is number one globally in its rate of incarceration. The First Step Act will do nothing to change the United States’ ranking.

This does not mean, however, that all reforms are inherently repressive or self-defeating. Some promise to improve people’s lives without resorting to punitive measures. Following the United Nations’ human rights standards, we could ban the use of prolonged solitary confinement, minimize the differences between daily life inside and outside prison, and provide education and job training for those in need, irrespective of what kinds of crimes they have committed. We could also make extensive use of restorative justice programs as an alternative to incarceration.

If we want to act more boldly and imaginatively, we could also take up Justice Sonia Sotomayor’s call to address the problem of injustice at its root, namely how the police treat “countless people” as if they are not members of a democracy but subjects of “a carceral state, just waiting to be catalogued.” Now that would be a reform worthy of its name.

Tony Platt is a Distinguished Affiliated Scholar at U. C. Berkeley’s Center for the Study of Law & Society, and author of Beyond These Walls: Rethinking Crime and Punishment in the United States (St. Martin’s Press, January 2019).
V. Scholars for Academic Freedom in Brazil

Scholars for Academic Freedom in Brazil works to support Brazilian academics under threat following Bolsonaro’s recent election as President, the Escola sem partido agenda and concrete attacks on academics and academic freedom.

We are agreed that the network should be as broad-based and inclusive as possible, without a specific political orientation or affiliation to any political party, but united instead around a shared democratic commitment to academic freedom, and working towards the following main aims:

- Increase international visibility for cases of persecution of Brazilian academics and for state and institutional initiatives threatening academic freedom.
- Organise material support and solidarity for academics suffering persecution in Brazil.
- Fundraise and prepare support in our own institutions for academics who may be forced to leave Brazil.
- Articulate this campaign with other international solidarity initiatives and build support beyond the academic community itself.
- Organise institutional initiatives to add to international pressure in defence of academic freedom in Brazil.

We propose to work on the following actions:

- Join with similar initiatives in the UK and elsewhere in Europe/US to build a single, inclusive network.
- Build network membership by direct contact with our existing networks, through subject associations and through other solidarity organisations.
- Develop dialogue with key academic organisations in Brazil.
- Work with key education trade unions and student organisations outside Brazil, to take on agenda of support for Brazilian academics.
- Identify university partnerships with Brazilian universities and with/via research funders and build pressure at institutional level, calling for special programmes e.g. to receive visiting academics needing to leave Brazil.
- Identify existing schemes and structures at overseas universities to receive Brazilian academics as visiting scholars/fellows.
- Initiate solidarity fund.
- Publicise/share relevant events activities.

To participate, you can join this closed Facebook group: https://www.facebook.com/groups/540115709748101/. If you are not on Facebook, you can contact David Treece (david.treece@kcl.ac.uk) to be added to the email list.

https://uk.uni.gl/news/call-for-papers.aspx

Nordic societies have been described as having qualities setting them apart from Anglophone countries, with relatively low prison populations and lenient penalties. Criminologists and sociologists have discussed the term Scandinavian Exceptionalism, with consistently low rates of imprisonment, humane prison conditions, and relatively short sentences. Yet from this perspective small, remote island societies as Greenland, Iceland, Faroe Islands and Åland have largely been neglected.

Supported by the Scandinavian Research Council for Criminology (NSFK) a working group, consisting of Nordic scholars, has met on several occasions to describe how conflicts and crimes are handled in these four Nordic island societies. In such small societies people are probably more visible to each other, mutually dependent, and daily life subject to strong traditions. How do they handle conflicts, crime and deviance? And how do they work out their local criminal policies?

Are problems of stigma and social marginalization in small societies more visible and more quickly resolved with in these places than in larger societies? Do small societies offer a better quality of reintegration than larger societies? Or alternatively: Is an offence, and an offender, perhaps more likely to be remembered in small societies, making re-integration to society more difficult in small societies than in larger societies?

We invite all scholars and practitioners who are interested in topics related to crime, deviance, punishment and stigma, to participate in this conference.

Conference language: Scandinavian languages, Greenlandic and English.

Further information and information about accommodation and travel to Nuuk will be announced at the website: www.uni.gl.

Please submit your abstract proposal before April 1, 2019 with a title, brief description (not exceeding 300 words), your professional affiliation, postal and email addresses to Annemette Nyborg Lauritsen anla@uni.gl. The proposals will be reviewed by a scientific committee.

Accommodation and travel expenses to be covered by participants. The fee for attending the conference exclusive closing dinner is 200 EUR (1,500 DKK). Participation in the closing dinner is 54 EUR (400 DKK). Students can participate in the conference for free (exclusive closing dinner). 20 places are reserved for students.

We look forward to seeing you in Nuuk.

Conference Organizers:

The working group supported by Scandinavian Research Council of Criminology; Criminality, Incarceration and Control in Nordic island societies

Departement of Social Sciences, Ilisimatusarfik / University of Greenland

Departement of Social Work, Ilisimatusarfik / University of Greenland.
A BIG THANKS to all the European Group members for making this newsletter successful. Please feel free to contribute to this newsletter by sending any information that you think might be of interest to the Group to Vicky/Katja/Dani at europeangroupcoordinator@gmail.com

Please try to send it in before the 25th of each month if you wish to have it included in the following month’s newsletter. Please provide a web link (wherever possible).

http://www.europeangroup.org/