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I. Editorial

After the shock of the US election it is hard to find words for the anxiety we feel. We can't even start to mention all the areas we fear will have an enormous harmful impact, locally in the USA and its global effect. We will nevertheless mention one particular area that is of great distress for us at the moment – the development of the US criminal justice system and prison industry. Not only is a man elected as president who among other beliefs thinks that restoring voting rights to ex-felons is “crooked politics”, who wants to mandate the death penalty for convicted cop killers, believes that US crime rates are out of control and supports prison privatization – the Republican Party has a majority in both chambers. That the Correction Corporation of America’s stocks skyrocketed the moment the election result was clear gives a warning of where we might be heading.

We fear these new powers, we fear the election of the new high court judges, we fear a further militarization of the police force and criminal justice institutions, we fear the criminalization and maltreatment of immigrants, and we fear continuous attacks on minority populations.

To address the ever more pressing and harmful development of the prison industry we present in this newsletter Daniel Achutti, Raffaella Pallamolla and Fabricio Pontin’s article about the increasing prison population in Brazil, soon to outnumber one of the world leaders in that regard, the USA. They paint a picture of the postcolonial judiciary system, with prisons dominated by the young, black, and poor population accused of drug and property crimes. The authors agitate for the need to “adopt a position of arduous defender of human rights; recognizing the slaver-authoritarian heritage of the Brazilian system of law, while trying to overcome it.”

We will also address the UK prison policy. In last month’s newsletter (9/16) David Scott wrote a respond to UK Justice Secretary Liz Truss’ speech Prisons: places of safety and reform to the 2016 Conservative Party Conference. In this November newsletter
Scott follows up with a respond to the UK government's white paper *Prison Safety and Reform*, published 3 November, with his article *Failing Prisons: Carnage, Bloodbaths and Numbers of Prison Staff*.

We are certain the election and the prison industry also will be a pressing issue for those participating at the American Society of Criminology (ASC) Conference in New Orleans this November and the ASC Critical Criminology Division. This year a lifelong commitment to such engagement will be given attention. We would like to congratulate our long standing member Vincenzo Ruggiero for the well-deserved 2016 Lifetime Achievement Award from the Division of Critical Criminology, American Society of Criminology.

*Congratulazioni Vincenzo!*

The European Group Annual Conference 2017 will be hosted in Mytilene, Lesbos. Please save the dates 7-10 September. The main topic of the Conference is: Uncovering Harms: States, corporations and organizations as criminals. More information and call for papers to come in the December newsletter.

Our task, encouragement and determination are to fight against injustice and for emancipation. This year has proven it more needed than ever. Stay strong!

*In solidarity,*

*Ida and Per*
II. Few notes on Brazilian penal system: live or let die

By: Daniel Achutti, Raffaella Pallamolla and Fabricio Pontin

Achutti and Pallamolla are assistant professors at Unilasalle (Brazil). Pontin is post-doctoral researcher at PUCRS (Brazil).

Analyzing Brazil is not an easy task. The intricate, almost impenetrable, characteristics of the country’s political institutions and organizations are hard to grasp even to those used to deal with politics in Brazil. If one attempts to tackle the specifics of the penal system in the country, then, one will find out sooner rather than later that the system offers more than meets the eye – indeed, that the full picture might be rather complex. Before proceeding further, perhaps we should write a few words about Brazilian democracy and its justice institutions.

Brazilian democracy and legal culture. Notes from the field.

According to Debora Pastana (2009), the democratic-political opening of the 1980’s in Brazil must be approached with care, stressing the precarious, fragile state of Brazilian democracy, which is characterized by a disproportionate and fragile electoral and party system and by a marked absence of the exercise of citizenship, as Brazilian society is shaped by an intense socio-political combination of patronage and authoritarianism (Pastana 2009: 44).

Pastana illustrates her arguments resorting to opinion polls that, during the period between 1995 and 2004, showed a low population adherence to democratic principles and ideals. In particular, she quotes from the study "Democracy in Latin America", carried out by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), which ‘attested to the widespread popular discontent with democracy in Brazil, also reinforcing the growing distrust of the Brazilian citizen with its Democratic institutions’ (Pastana 2009: 45).

Among the reasons given to explain such observation, the author points out that despite the exercise of political rights through direct elections, a large part of the population does not even recognize the meaning of the term democracy - a sad testament to the degree of social inequality and markedly authoritarian social control in the country. With such a contrast, citizens do not see ‘the necessary and fundamental correlation between political, social and civil citizenship’, remaining tied up and inert in the face of ‘the consolidation of a society of exclusion, of a democracy without citizenship, of a citizen without rights’ (Pastana 2009: 47).

Such a reality, says Pastana (2009: 47), also reflects on the functioning of criminal justice system. While the political opening allowed new debates about citizenship,
with the constitutional recognition of democracy and especially of individual and collective rights and guarantees, once the subject changes to criminal justice system these ideals are abandoned and violent and authoritarian mechanisms are solemnly allowed to take their place without further resistance. This contradiction is verified (Pastana 2009: 48) in the behavior of legal professionals, who do not realize that the way in which they act only contributes to the maintenance of an unequal and selective system:

> without directly identifying that it provides a public service which by definition should be democratic, this field acts selectively, imprisoning mainly the poor, repressing popular movements and protecting themselves from any outside intervention (Pastana 2007: 49).

Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2008), while analyzing access to justice and the possibility of concrete exercise of this right, concludes the same, noting that beyond effective demand (which is the most known aspect of this right, related to its judicial discretion) and potential demand (which is the right to procedurally claim for the right to access justice), there would still be a third type of demand, called suppressed demand, which is characterized by the demand of vulnerable people who know their rights, but who do not have conditions of claiming them when violated, because they feel powerless to do so before the judicial system:

> [they are] totally discouraged whenever they enter the judicial system, whenever they contact the authorities, who crush them by their esoteric language, by their arrogant presence, by their ceremonial way of dressing, by their crushing buildings, by their labyrinthine secretaries, and so on (Santos 2008: 31-2).

According to Pastana (2009: 57-61), this form of action reflects the perception of legislation as instrumental reason of legality, imported from the Portuguese law faculties onto the first legal courses in the country, and which has been a continued influence in Brazilian jurists. The function of the magistrate, for example, is still seen by many as that of being a mere enforcer of the law, a true "slave of the law", which cannot consider anything beyond the law or outside the process to issue its decision.

Santos, in turn, relates directly the characteristics - and the problems - of the dominant legal and judicial culture to the training of juridical actors, and especially of judges. When describing the traditional judges of Portugal, the author mentions the possible similarity of this picture to Brazilian judges - but emphasizes that, evidently, since this is a general rule, many magistrates (the exceptions) may feel wronged by such a description (Santos 2008: 68). Without meaning, however, to describe the entire Portuguese judiciary, and recognizing the limitations of his description, Santos mentions that, for the most part, one perceives the domination of

---

1 For more about the Brazilian mode of operation in judging, the Brazilian documentary “Bagatela” (Dir. Clara Ramos, 2010) is illustrative.
a normativist, technical-bureaucratic culture, based on three main ideas: the autonomy of law, the idea that law is a totally different phenomenon from everything else that occurs in society and is autonomous in relation to this society; a restrictive conception of what that right is or of what are the proceedings to which the law applies; and a bureaucratic or administrative conception of processes (Santos 2008: 68).

According to the author (Santos 2008: 68-71), this dominant culture manifests itself through the following characteristics:

(a) by the priority of civil and criminal law, which, as large branches of law in the faculties, guarantee their autonomy, determining the general mode of interpretation and application of law (Santos 2008: 68);

(b) through a generalist culture, where only the magistrate is in a position to resolve disputes and, therefore, can solve all of them: since the law - general and universal - is the only parameter to solve conflicts and the magistrate is its reliable interpreter, the jurisdiction of the judge must be equally general and universal (Santos 2008: 69);

(c) by a model of systemic non-accountability, where the autonomy of the law becomes the autonomy of its operators, where the bad results of the judicial system are attributed to the law, and under no circumstances to its operators. The symptoms of this lack of responsibility, according to the author, would be three: first, when there is a problem, one is never found responsible for it, those responsible are always the others, other instances, institutions or powers; second, within the same court, under the same structure, there are different performances; and third, there is a low level of effective disciplinary action. These symptoms reflect the idea of the lack of accountability of legal operators, with a low level of disciplinary control, in which bad results caused by the system are always attributed to other spheres - notwithstanding the existence of similar structures with different performances within the same court (Santos 2008: 69);

(d) the fourth characteristic reflects the idea of a privilege of power, in which legal operators fail to perceive the agents of power as ordinary citizens with equal rights and duties: "it is an authoritarian culture that makes political power, necessarily and 'understandably', to have some privileges within justice", reflecting on a certain fear of investigating and judging people attached to political or economic power as if they were other person (Santos 2008: 69-70);

(e) a bureaucratic assumption is pointed out by Santos as the fifth characteristic of the dominant legal culture, which is characterized by the "preference for all that is institutional, bureaucratically formatted", by a bureaucratic management of the processes, in which procedural progress is only apparent with the use of procedural (rather than substantive) decisions, and of the repulse to adopt alternative measures for conflicts resolution, given their low bureaucratic formatting (Santos 2008: 70);
(f) the maintenance of the *society away of the processes* follows, since the bureaucratic judge has a comprehensive knowledge of the law and its relation to the specific case, but he does not know the relation of the case with the reality: "it does not consider cases until society, violations of human rights, people in suffering, and lives wronged are squeezed out of the files." As he does not know how to interpret reality, the judge becomes a victim of the dominant ideas, among them the idea that the judge should not have an opinion of his own, but only to apply the law (Santos 2008: 70). Thus, judicial decisions tend to reflect the position of a reduced political class, which can be compared to what Luiz Alberto Warat (1982) called the *common theoretical sense of jurists*;

(g) finally, the author points to the *independence as self-sufficiency* as the last characteristic of the dominant judicial culture, materialized by the confusion between independence and individualism, marked by a strong aversion to teamwork, by the absence of a goal-oriented management, by the opposition to interdisciplinarity, and thus "an idea of self-sufficiency that does not allow learning from other knowledge" (Santos 2008: 71).

Salo de Carvalho (2010), when working on the cultural formation of Brazilian legal operators, emphasizes that the current criminal justice system reflects ‘the *inquisitorial thought* institutionalized since the colonization that consolidated throughout the process of formation of the national state’, characterized by a central magistrate and other supporting actors in the procedural scene. The power, in the Brazilian configuration, ‘is highly concentrated and directed exclusively against the suspect-accused-defendant’ (Carvalho 2010: 76), who is the object under investigation to elucidate the real truth about the facts.

The configuration of an inquisitorial model of revelation of truth, according to the author (Carvalho 2010: 94-5), is *naturalized* in the cultural formation of legal operators and favors an imposing administration of conflicts, promoting and consolidating the scenario of authoritarian and bureaucratic judicial and investigative practices.

Such characteristics, which mark both the jurists' belief system and the problems of democracy and the culture of criminal justice in Brazil, can be seen as symptoms of a system of justice that privileges the administrative solution of judicial processes rather than a satisfactory resolution in each case, according to the expectations of the parties involved. The central preoccupation with technical and bureaucratic questions overlaps the actual content of each process and hides, among sheets, stamps and certificates, the true reason for the existence of a lawsuit: a conflict involving real people.
Who are we arresting?

The cultural configuration above, which shaped - and continues to shape - the formation of Brazilian jurists, played a fundamental role in the structuring of a repressive and notably authoritarian criminal justice system, where democracy seems to be still far away. If we take Nicola Lacey’s (2008) statement into account, when she says that to know if a country is truly democratic it is interesting to observe the configuration and the practice of the criminal justice system, then it is possible to note that Brazilian democracy is still very weak.

The consequences of such cultural development could not be other: Brazil had approximately 622,202 (six hundred twenty-two thousand, two hundred and two) people imprisoned in December 2014 (latest updated data available). This figure represents the highest prison population in its history and places the country in fourth place in absolute numbers in the world, behind only the United States, China and Russia. Proportionally, there were 307 people arrested per 100,000 inhabitants (30th in the world ranking).

What makes these numbers scary, however, is not only the quantity itself, but the historical process of the last decades: the growth of the Brazilian population between 1995 and 2014 was of approximately 50 million inhabitants (from 155 to 203 million), which is a 30% increase in population. However, the prison population in the same period showed an approximate growth of 320% (from 148 to 622 thousand).

The number of prisoners without a final conviction (pre-trial detention) was around 40%, and the prison occupation rate was 161% above the limit. Between 2008 and 2014, Brazil had the highest growth of the prison population among the four nations with the largest incarcerated populations: while the United States (-8%), China (-9%) and Russia (-24%) presented a negative change in the period, Brazil had a considerable increase (+ 33%). According to the National Survey of Penitentiary Information of June 2014 (Infopen 2015: 15), if Brazil maintains this rate of imprisonment growth, in 2018 its prison population will surpass that of Russia.

São Paulo was the Brazilian state with the highest number of prisoners (219,053), with the second highest proportional rate of incarceration (497.4 inmates/100,000 inhabitants), behind only the State of Mato Grosso do Sul (568.9).

Considering the twenty-six Brazilian states and the Federal District, none of them have enough places to allocate the prison population in the terms of the federal

---


legislation. In the case of the State of Pernambuco, in fact, the prison occupation rate was 265%, which means almost three prisoners per vacancy.

In terms of age, most of the prison population is composed by young people, who are 18-24 (31%), 25-29 (25%) and 30-34 years old (19%). In general terms, 75% of prisoners are between 18 and 34 years old.

Concerning education, 6% of inmates were illiterate, 9% were literate but without regular education at all, and 53% did not completed basic education. Only 7% had completed high school, and less than 1% had completed an undergraduate course.

Regarding crime, 27% of prisoners are accused of drug trafficking, while 38% are accused of crimes against property. And, finally, while 51% of the Brazilian population self-declares as black, the percentage rises to 67% among inmates. Out of every three prisoners, two are black.

In summary, Brazilian inmates are young, black, with little schooling, mostly accused of drug trafficking or property crimes.

---

According to the article 88 of the Brazilian Law on Penal Execution (Law n. 7.210/1984), each inmate should be placed in individual cells, in good environmental condition, with a minimum of 6 square meters.

About the incarceration of black Brazilian youth, see: Carvalho 2015.
Considering also that, in 2009, approximately 671,078 (six hundred seventy-one thousand, seventy-eight) persons served alternative penalties or measures\(^6\), the approximate total number of persons in contact with the legal system of crime control reached 1,293,280 (one million, two hundred and ninety-three thousand, two hundred and eighty).

One must add the awful conditions of Brazilian prisons to the picture presented above. From north to south of the country the situation is very similar: in the south, the city of Porto Alegre has a prison (Central Prison of Porto Alegre) with capacity for 1,800 people, which currently houses approximately 4,600 inmates (most of them are prisoners without a definitive sentence).\(^7\) In the northeast, in the city of Recife, the Anibal Bruno Prison, previously considered by the National Justice Council (NJC) as the worst in the country, has a capacity of 1,800 people, but contains 7,000 prisoners.\(^8\)

---

\(^6\) This information was available on the Ministry of Justice website and references 2009, but there was no information on subsequent years. When looking for the update of the data in the same address, on March 27, 2016, it is stated that the page is no longer available. Also, it was not possible to find updated information on the number of people serving alternative sentences or measures on the Ministry of Justice website. The data mentioned above was available on February 10, 2012 at the following electronic address: http://portal.mj.gov.br/main.asp?ViewID={47E6462C-55C9-457C-99EC-5A46AF02DA7}&params=itemID={3862B1F-FD61-4264-8AD4-02215F659BF2}&UIPartUID={2868BA3C-1C72-4347-BE11-A26F70F4CB26}.


It is possible, thus, to recognize a strong crisis of legitimacy of the criminal justice system in Brazil, and this is tied to a crisis in the forms of social regulation, manifest in the ‘lack of credibility and efficiency of the legal system, the failure of public policies to restrain violence, the depletion of the repressive model of crime management, communication and participation deficits aggravated by the authoritarian practices of the legal agencies, etc.’ (Sica 2007:1).

Beyond such crisis, Brazilian penal system is marked by a racial segregation: sooner or later, the strong arm of penal law shows its historic heritage in the slave, white-supremacist, system that is so deeply connected to the origins of the institutional order in Brazil. Focusing on black young males, the penal system works to incarcerate those who have always been the guilty ones, independently on what they’ve done. As far as the penal system is concerned, the fact that these individuals have been born as poor black men seems to be enough for them to be suspicious everywhere.

Final considerations. For a less unequal Brazil.

To Santos (2008:71), the possible ways to change the framework of bureaucratic legal actors involve a necessary revolution in law schools, which, through the attempt to extirpate everything that is not strictly legal, ‘ended up creating a culture of extreme indifference or exteriority of law in the face of the changes experienced by society’, maintaining a regular distance from social concerns and forming professionals who are not committed to their own work. In this sense, the technical-bureaucratic culture must be replaced by a techno-democratic one, which allows the construction of a more democratic and just society (Santos 2008:71).

In addition, it is fundamental that teachers also get trained to deal with contemporary problems, instead of comfortably hiding behind codes and laws that, at best, will only lead the student to the legal mode of perception of the world, but does not enables them to understand that in every juridical problem lies a real situation, with people of flesh and blood, who will sooner or later be the object of interference of this knowledge transmitted in a non-dialogical way. Only an intercultural and interdisciplinary education, guided by the logic of citizen responsibility, can help address the three pillars of normativist culture mentioned by the author (Santos 2008:76).

Finally, Santos (2008:76-8) points out that schools for magistrates (and it would also be possible to include lawyers’ and public prosecutors’ schools) should avoid repeating the same mistakes of law schools and, instead, should train judges and other members of the judicial community to see laws and society in an actual
continuum, rather than in radical, procedural, separation. Thus, the continuous access to an interdisciplinary knowledge is the least that we can demand, otherwise the cases will be judged by people who do not follow the development of the societies where they live.

Critical criminology, in such a context, has an important role to play in Brazil and in Latin America: it is important to unveil the fallacies covered by the architecturally thought-out words that structure modern penal law and turn them into a familiar, palatable, almost common, language. Since the incarceration rates and numbers are increasing, and there is no sign that it can decrease in the coming years, especially after the parliamentary coup carried out by the Brazilian former vice-president and its political party (PMDB), it is important at first to recognize what is going on and make it public; further, one should adopt a position of arduous defender of human rights; recognizing the slaver-authoritarian heritage of the Brazilian system of law, while trying to overcome it. Looking at the future and planning a less unequal Brazilian society is an obligation of us all.

References
III. Failing prisons: carnage, bloodbaths and numbers of prison staff

By: David Scott

On the 3rd November 2016 the Conservative government published its vision of the future of the Prison Service in England and Wales. The policies included in their white paper *Prison Safety and Reform* ranged from proposals aiming to raise prison standards; enhance the autonomy and accountability for prison governors; intensify and increase the transparency of prison monitoring; further recognise the needs of vulnerable prisoners (specifically defined in the white paper as women and young people); expand capacity for adult prisoners by creating 10,000 new prison places; and build 5 new community prisons for women. Claimed to be the “the biggest overhaul of prisons in a generation” by Justice Secretary Liz Truss, all of these proposals merit careful consideration and critical reflection. Liz Truss herself has emphasised the importance for penal policy to be shaped by "evidence" and "data", and this at least in part is the rationale behind the increased emphasis on measurement, monitoring and inspection in the white paper. Yet, the public debate in both days preceding and following the publication of the white paper have been focused almost exclusively on one particular set of issues: prison officer staffing levels and prisoner violence.

The day before the publication of *Prison Safety and Reform*, Steve Gillan, General Secretary of the *Prison Office Association* [POA], received enormous publicity in the British media when he claimed that as a consequence of a 25% reduction in the number of prison officers in the last six years, prisons were now places of “carnage and bloodbaths” that might result in prison officers losing their lives at hands of violent prisoners. His claims were evidenced with a mixed set of data pointing to the high levels of recorded prisoner violence, self-inflicted deaths and recorded assaults on prison officers. This apparently intimate relationship between staff levels,
prisoner physical violence and death has become ‘common sense’, with politicians and media commentators alike assuming such connections are obvious. No one in the media has yet questioned or contextualised the data behind this particular explanation of our failing prisons. Such a narrow focus not only distracts attention away from the many other significant limitations of the ‘transformative’ proposals in *Prison Safety and Reform*, but also closes down opportunities for a detailed debate on the nature of the problems confronting penal confinement and the promotion of alternative policies. The focus of the media, in part orchestrated by the POA whose claims are also largely uncritically reproduced in *Prison Safety and Reform*, are however predicated upon a number of assumptions that do not stand up to historical scrutiny. These include assumptions about (1) violent prisoners undermining rehabilitation; (2) prison officer staffing levels; (3) the rise in recorded assaults on prison officers; and (4) self-inflicted deaths of prisoners. Let us then critically consider there four assumptions in turn.

**Pathologised prisoners**

One of the key goals of *Prison Safety and Reform* is to remove obstacles to prisons undertaking their central goals of rehabilitating prisoners and reducing reoffending. The explanation proposed for the failure of rehabilitation in prison is prisoner violence. It should perhaps come as no surprise to see that the white paper blames prisoners themselves for the failings of the penal system. Unlike prison officers, they were denied a voice in the formulation of its proposals. Explaining failing prisons through the lens of interpersonal physical prisoner violence is a way of both pathologising prisoners as dangerous people and distracting attention away from some of the other more hidden but equally harmful forms of violence in prison. It also provides a coincidence of interests between the agendas of Government and that of the *Prison Officers Association* [POA]. In drawing upon only a recent analysis of the data on prisoner violence, a particular understanding of physical and interpersonal violence and an explanation grounded in notions of individual prisoner ‘abnormalities’, an opportunity has been created for such an historically unlikely alliance to develop and prosper.

The white paper states that since 2012 there have been significant rises in recorded incidents of prisoner violence. It boldly states that in 2016 there were 65 assaults in prisons every day. These alarming figures appear to support the claim that the key problem is prisoner violence. Consequently, the white paper informs us that as “reform can only take hold in a safe and disciplined prison environment” it is essential to reduce prisoner violence so we can achieve “a more stable estate, in which staff and prisoners have the time and headspace to address the causes of re-offending”.

15
At the start of her foreword to the report, Justice Secretary Liz Truss approvingly cites the words of penal reformer Elizabeth Fry from 1819: “The better the actual state of our prisons is known and understood, the more clearly will all men see the necessity of these arrangements by which they may be rendered schools of industry and virtue”. Indeed, many of the arguments in *Prison Safety and Reform* have been made before. Let us take as an example the words of the notoriously authoritarian prison commissioner Sir Edmund Du Cane. Writing in 1872 he stated that:

... all the officers are to bear in mind that their duty is to reform as well as to punish and that the conditions to ensure good health of body are to be attended to carefully.

Similar sentiments to those of the 2016 prison white paper can also be found in some of his words in 1885 when he wrote:

Every means possible should be adopted for developing and working on the higher feelings of the prisoners, directly by moral, religious, and secular instruction, and indirectly by ensuring industry, good conduct, and discipline, through appealing to the hope of advantage or reward, as well as by fear of punishment. (emphasis added)

To combat violence and reinvigorate the reformative potential of our failing prisons Justice Secretary Liz Truss and the white paper, have openly returned to the rhetoric and ideas of the Victorian era (and before): moral reform, habituated virtues, industry, discipline and control. These principles are considered of such great importance because they reflect the Government’s understanding of the causes of violence in prison. According to *Prison Safety and Reform* the reasons for the increases in violence are fourfold:

(1) More people who have been convicted of violent ‘crimes’ have been sent to prison;
(2) There are an increasing number of prisoners, especially those who are young men, who have significant anti-social attitudes and poor self-control;
(3) There has been a dramatic increase in the number of psychotropic drugs entering prisons;
(4) There has been a decline in the number of prison officer numbers which hinder their rehabilitative functions.

Whilst all four of these assumptions have significant limitations (because many people are sent to prison for different offences over their criminal career, focus on criminal offences is a lot less helpful than first seems in terms of understanding prison populations; there has been a reduction in the numbers of young people/children placed in custody in the time frame analysed; prisons systematically generate the need and desire for drug taking as a means of coping with the deprivations and harms it creates on a daily basis), here I shall focus only on the fourth aspect of the Government's explanation for violence and failing prisons: the role of the prison officer. Like the quotation of Fry cited by Liz Truss, the aim of this discussion is to help provide a better knowledge and understanding of the actual state of our prisons.

**Our dedicated and brave staff**

*Prison Safety and Reform* is clear in how it identifies the problems facing the prison and how they can be solved by reversing the decline in prison officer numbers. The white paper draws upon statistics which show:

> The number of Band 2 to 5 frontline operational staff reduced from 29,660 on 31 March 2012 to 23,080 on 31 March 2016. As violence has increased it has become harder to retain existing staff, thus creating a vicious cycle of staff pressure and violence.

Reductions in prison staff have led to increased levels of prisoner violence and placed intolerable “operational strains on the dedicated and brave staff that work in our prisons”. There is to be an immediate increase in prison officer numbers (in total 2,500 new officers) and in the first instance 10 prisons with the highest rates of violence will be targeted for staff-prisoner ratio increases. Overall the aim is to have a dedicated prison officer with a case load of six prisoners who will not just be “security guards and minders but also mentors”. In so doing “frontline staff will be given the time and the tools they need to supervise and support offenders so they can turn our prisons into places of safety and reform”. To meet the requirement of safety, discipline and reform there will be a major recruitment drive to attract new staff from the armed forces. The white paper states:

> We want to increase the number of former armed forces personnel working in prisons. Many will have developed skills in leadership and people management as well as the strength of character to strike the balance – as prison officers have to do – between discipline and support for prisoners.
A new “Former Armed Forces Personnel to Prison Officer Programme” jointly organised by the Prison Service and the Ministry of Defence Career Transition Partnership (CTP) is to be developed to help ensure the new recruits are from the army. Indeed, the white paper notes that this initiative is already underway. The prison officer will also be expected to change the way that they work in the coming years.

In future, all prison officers working on residential units will carry out this dedicated officer role. Their role will be to help each of their prisoners on the path to reform by supporting and challenging them so that they are motivated to engage in purposeful and productive activity during their time in prison. We expect these dedicated officers to act as mentors for their prisoners – listening out for problems, supporting changes in attitudes and behaviour, and defusing tension and frustration.

When a more detailed and historical lens is used to view our failing prisons and the levels of prison staff within them, a number of difficulties with the assumptions of the white paper become quickly apparent. When we look at staffing levels (and certainly the numbers of prison officers employed in a given year) the claim that staffing levels are dangerously low becomes untenable. Prisons have never had high numbers of paid prison staff. In the eighteenth century it was common for jails and prisons, such as Clerkenwell Bridewell, Newgate Prison or Kings Bench Debtors Prison, to have only one or two paid turnkeys (as prison officers were referred to at that time) for every 100 prisons and sometimes only 3 or 4 members of staff in total. By the early to mid-nineteenth century the vast majority of prisons still had less than 10 staff (of which not all would be turnkeys) and only very rarely were more than 20 staff employed at a prison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Number of Prisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: McConville, 1981

Prisons at this time were not in the main run by prison officers but rather by prisoners who undertook nearly all of the key functions of the prisons, including locking and unlocking other prisoners. It was not until the Prison Act (1865) that it was legally forbidden to appoint prisoners as staff and the end of ‘prisoner warders’ was not completed until perhaps as late as 1877. From the 1870s numbers of paid prison warders (they were not called Prison Officers until 1921) increased and staff prisoner-ratios began to stabilise at around 1 member of staff for every 6 prisoners.
towards the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century. Prison warders (as prison officers were referred to at that time) constantly complained of being understaffed. One early prison officer autobiography, *Men in Cages* by H.U. Triston written in the 1930s, but referring often to the situation in prisons at beginning of the last century, is particularly revealing about the differences between the official and the ‘real’ staff-prisoner ratios at that time:

... the number works out to about one warder for every five prisoners. That, at first glance, may seem plenty, but it is misleading. You have to allow for a small percentage being sick, more on leave, some on night duty, on clerical work, escorting prisoners to courts or other jails, and various other causes. So, in practice, it is rarely that you find more than one warder to twenty prisoners—often one officer has to supervise forty or fifty men. ...

These words of H.U. Triston in 1938 lead us to an important caveat when exploring prison officer and prisoner staff ratios and that is the amount of hours served in the prison at a given time and the quality interactions between prison officers and prisoners. From the 1800s right the way through to the 1980s prison officers worked extraordinarily long hours often in poor working conditions and for relatively low pay. From the 1930s the POA began to exert some influence and as prison conditions in general improved so did prison officer wages. Officers for decades could be on duty for more than 72 hours per week (an average of more than 10 hours a day). Following the “Fresh Start” Initiative in 1987 prison officer contracted hours were reduced to 39 hours and compulsory overtime was ended. Prison officers have since worked longer than 39 hour weeks, but the amount of time they spend in the prison is certainly much shorter than in much of the previous 100 years. When thinking about prisoner staff ratios one of the key things to consider is the amount of actual contact between prisoners and prison officers, something which has been conspicuous by its absence in the white paper.

With the exception of the war years (1914-19, 1939-45) when large number of prison officers were recruited into the army, as the early twentieth century progressed the staff - prisoner ratio remained relatively stable. In the 1950s there was 1 prison officer for every 6 prisoners and this ratio was to fall still further in the next four decades. Significantly, no comparative decrease in prisoner reoffending rates can be mapped onto the falling prison officer-prisoner ratio over this extensive historical period of time. Indeed, the ‘reformed’ prisons have never been effective in terms of reducing recidivism (reoffending) rates throughout their 200 year history dating back to the opening of the ‘General Penitentiary’ at Millbank, London in 1816. There are of course problems when measuring reoffending rates (which are always an underestimate) and official data on the number of prison officers compared to prisoners, but there is no historical statistical evidence connecting rises in prison officer numbers with improved rates in the rehabilitation of prisoners thus supporting the claims made in *Prison Safety and Reform*. 
Alongside the concerns highlighted by H.U. Triston about the accuracy of the claimed staff-ratio levels, the prison officer-prisoner ratio is also different depending upon the penal establishment. This was especially the case following the increase in security and creation of different categories of prisons following the Mountbatten Report in 1966 and the following review of policy by criminology professor Sir Leon Radzinowicz. Thus, for example, data from September 1976 indicates that the prison officer-prisoner ratios were as low as 1 prison officer to every 1 prisoner at the dispersal prison HMP Gartree, but less than 1 prison officer for every 6 prisoners at the lower security HMP Appleton Thorn. Different staffing levels continue to shape the contemporary picture, with high security prisons having low staff-prisoner ratios whereas lower security category prisons having much higher ones (such as HMP Sudbury, which has 8 prisoners for every officer). The universal conflation of numbers between recorded violence and staffing levels that has been presented in the media and by the POA and Justice Secretary Liz Truss is not then as informative as first seems. It is not possible to link rates of daily violence across the penal estate with general data on staff numbers as the claims made can only really be asserted on an individual prison basis.

By 1990 the prison officer-prisoner ratio had decreased to its lowest ever level of 1 prison officer to every 2.3 prisoners. Since 1993, though the number of prison officers employed has increased, because prisoner populations more than doubled the prison officer-prisoner ratio increased to 2.8 prisoners by 2010 in public sector prisons. In March 2016 the ratio was 1 prison officer to every 3.6 prisoners, which brought public sector staff ratios largely in line with private sector prisons. If the proposed new 2,500 officer are factored in, the ratio will fall to 3.3 prisoners to every prison officer in public sector prisons. The closeness of staffing levels between public and private as of March 2016 is perhaps illuminating in understanding why the POA focussed so heavily on staff-prisoner ratios when located in historical context they were (still by quite some margin) some of the lowest ever in prisons in England and Wales. Whilst the picture is distorted by hours worked, levels of contact and problems in comparing data compiled in different ways across the last two hundred years, what can be conclusively asserted is that the case has not been made for the claim that prison staffing levels have in impact of reoffending rates.
Punch bags and crying wolf
In the recent media coverage of prison reform the **POA General Secretary Steve Gillan** has highlighted the growing level of violence in prison, and especially the remarkable increase in the number of recorded assaults against prison officers. He noted the POA "will not stand by and watch our members become punch bags on a daily basis". Various data has been presented to us as facts about the levels of prisoner violence against prison officers. These have been reproduced in the white paper *Prison Safety and Reform*.

Prison safety has declined since 2012. Levels of total assaults across the prison estate and assaults on staff are the highest on record, and are continuing to rise. Comparing the 12 months to June 2016 with the calendar year 2012:
- total assaults in prisons increased by 64%;
- assaults on staff rose by 99%;
- the number of self-harm incidents increased by 57%

Leaving aside for one moment the problematic conflation of prisoner self-harm with acts of interpersonal violence against other people, the figure of greatest significance here is the figure that there has been a 99% increase in assaults on ‘staff’ in the last twelve months. This has led to the POA claiming the situation has deteriorated so significantly that prison officer lives are now at risk. The white paper has responded to this concern by calling for “a robust and swift response” to the rise in assaults. It also highlighted that killing a prison officer would result in a life sentence.

Schedule 21 to the Criminal Justice 2003 – in which Parliament has set out guidelines for the courts on sentencing for murder – provides the starting point for the murder of a prison officer (like that of a police officer) in the course of their duty to be a whole-life order.
When we talk about violence against prison officers and their likelihood of being murdered by a prisoner we need to consider this in historical context. Indeed since 1850 only eight members of staff (and not all of these prison officers) have been killed in prisons in England and Wales. For at least the last 160 years the role of the prison officer has been remarkably safe, at least from physical violence perpetrated by prisoners. In 1923 The Stanhope Committee compared the ‘fatal and serious accidents as a percentage of staffs in a representative year’ across five occupations, finding that prisons were actually one of the safest places to work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railways</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miners and quarries</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factories and workshops</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Police</td>
<td>10.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison staff</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Stanhope Committee, 1923

This has not stopped the POA largely crying wolf about the threat of prisoner violence in the past. In 1954 at the annual conference of the POA delegates passed a number of resolutions noting the increasing threat of violence against them by prisoners and the importance of the Prison Commissioners (who at that time were the bureaucratic body with oversight for the prison estate) to protect prison officer safety and to punish prisoners more severely. Eleven years later, in 1965, prison officer Derek Lambert was killed at Portland borstal by a prisoner. It had been the first death of a prison officer for some 30 years in England and Wales. It proved to be an isolated incident and in the 51 years since the death of Derek Lambert there has not been another murder of a prison officer (this is excluding the death of prison officers in the specific political context of Northern Ireland since the start of the troubles in 1969, where in the last 46 years 31 prison officers have been killed). The reality of serious physical violence upon an officer by one or more prisoners is rare. In fact, there are many examples of prisoners going to the aid of officers in dangerous situations rather than using violence against them.

The current focus of the white paper on prisoner assaults on prison officers and prisoner violence has presented data on the rate of such incidents in the last 4 to 6 years. Again the hypothesis is that reducing prison officer numbers increases the dangerousness of prisons. This may well be the case, but the evidence currently presented by the Justice Secretary, the media and the POA does not actually do this. First, in the period from 2000-2009 – i.e. before the reduction of prison officers, there was a 61% increase in the number of recorded assaults in prisons. The 2010 POA Annual Report informs us that there were 2,500 assaults annually on prison officers during a five year period from 2004 -2009. Indeed, certain prisons in 2009 had extremely high levels of assaults on officers before the staff reductions, such as Hindley YOI, then the largest child prison in Europe, where that year there was a 967% increase in recorded assaults on staff.
In 2011 the POA noted that not only were assaults on prison officers by prisoners “subject to fluctuation” but that they were generally going down. It was also noted by the POA that in 2011 on average one prison officer each week required hospital treatment following an assault by prisoners, indicating that there were 52 serious assaults a year on prison officers at that time. This evidence clearly does not fit the POA narrative of the prison as a place of danger, nor does the physical threat of violence by prisoners seem particularly large at this point. In 2011 the Operational Highlight Report section produced by the Offender Safety, Rights & Responsibilities Group [OSRRG] noted the following points: “The figures for assaults on staff are down, possibly explained by reporting inconsistencies, rather than a real reduction in numbers”. The POA later highlighted that no central records were held on the number of assaults on prison officers that were not prosecuted by the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS)

There are 2,800 assaults on POA members in England and Wales each year. A high proportion of those assaults are not reported to the police and the proportion that are, do not see support from the CPS. That scenario must change and change quickly. Assaults on our members are getting more and more serious. The National Executive Committee is on record as stating that our health and safety will never be allowed to be compromised in any circumstances.

Thus, on the 17th April 2012 POA General Secretary, Steve Gillan, decided it was time to act to reverse the trend of a decline in recorded data on prison officer assaults. The final part of his message to members of the POA is reproduced at length below.

**Always report assaults**

The POA will not allow it to treat our members as second class citizens. I accept the CPS may be under pressure to save money but we will not permit it to hide behind ‘not in the public interest’ just because the prisoner is already serving a sentence. POA members have human rights, they are not punch bags and prisoners and psychiatric patients held in secure hospitals should have no hiding place from the full weight of the law when it is broken, nor should they receive preferential treatment from the CPS. Where we find an injustice we will continue to hound the CPS until they get our message that an assault on as a POA member is very much in the public interest and should be pursued as such. If they are assaulted at work I urge all POA members to report the incident to the police and inform your local committee where the CPS do not prosecute, so that we in turn can turn our attention to the prosecutors in order that they are brought to task where they are abdicating their responsibility.

Steve Gillan
General Secretary
The data on assaults on prison officers cited in the white paper *Prison Safety and Reform* is detailed only from 2012 onwards; that is, after the above identification of failing reporting practices among prison staff and very low data on prison officers attending hospitals outside of prison with injuries. The large statistical increases in the number of assaults on officers reported in the media should be understood within the context of the low and declining numbers of prisoner assaults on prisoners prior to 2012. A much longer timeframe of is required to get a more accurate picture of the dangers posed to prison officers from prisoners. In light of the April 17th message from Steve Gillan, any data on prison officer assaults since 2012 should not be taken as an incontrovertible truth, but rather subjected to the greatest of scrutiny. Such data certainly should not be adopted without question to inform penal policy.

What the POA has not called for in the last few years is for prisoners to ‘always report assaults by prison officers’. There are considerable numbers of anecdotal accounts and published writings by prisoners, prison officers and other prison staff to indicate that prisons have always been places where physical assaults have been perpetrated by prison officers and prisoners. Official reports from the Gladstone Report of 1895 through to the Woolf Report of 1991 have received evidence testifying to prison officer brutality and investigative journalists, academics, activists and politicians have all recorded evidence of prison officers assaulting prisoners in the past. The latest scandal, at the Medway Secure Training Centre earlier this year (*BBC Panorama, 11th January 2016*), even caught staff brutalising and assaulting child prisoners on camera. Recorded statistics, however, would indicate a significant under-reporting of such incidents. If prison violence is to be taken seriously, and if there is a genuine commitment to prevent those forms of violence that are likely to prevent prisoner rehabilitation, then one of the first policy initiatives should be the creation of safe opportunities for prisoners to report excessive force during control and restraint and other forms of physical and sexual violence perpetrated by prison officers.

**Carnage and bloodbaths**

Ironically, there is evidence indicating that prisons really can be deadly for prison officers. This data, however, refers to the life expectancy of prison officers following retirement. At *only 18 months* this is one of the shortest life expectancy rates of all
occupations. The harm and danger of the prison place then comes not from violent and pathological prisoners, but from the prison place itself. The toxic and deadly fumes that prison creates are not restricted just to prison officers, but to those whose voice is generally not heard in the white paper *Prison Safety and Reform* – the prisoners. Whereas prison officers, and especially the POA, have been known to largely exclude the suffering, harm and death prison generates for prisoners, the current data on the self-inflicted deaths has been incorporated into the white paper narrative of pathological and violent prisoners blocking reductions in reoffending rates. *Prison Safety and Reform* notes that there were 107 self-inflicted deaths in prisons in the 12 months to September 2016. It has also been reported that the number of attempted hangings rose from 580 in 2010 to 2,023 in 2015; the number of attempted overdoses over the same period rose from 1,414 to 2,523. In other words, in 2016 a prisoner attempts to take their own life in prison in England and Wales every five hours.

Between 2012 and 2013 self-inflicted deaths rose from 60 to 74 – a 23% rise - and this number increased to 83 self-inflicted deaths in 2014. There were 242 deaths in total in prison in 2014, approximately one third of which were self-inflicted. The picture was even worse in 2015. 257 prisoners died this year, 89 of which were self-inflicted. Whilst this data appears over the last four years appears to support the claims of *Prison Safety and Reform* when placed in historical context the connection between prisoner deaths and prison officer staffing levels is much less clear.

The work of INQUEST and Professor Joe Sim is of great significance here in locating the problem of deaths in custody within historical context. In his research Professor Sim has uncovered detailed historical evidence indicating that prisons have always been places characterised by violence, suffering and death. For example, from 1795

![Deaths in Prison](Deaths in Prison.png)
to 1829 376 prisoners died in just one prison, Coldbath Fields, with an average of around 11 people dying every year. In the 15 years from 1848 – 1863, 423 prisoners were officially recorded as dying in prison, an average of around 28 each year. At Catham Convict Prison, 11 deaths were recorded in 1865 and a further 14 at the same institution the following year in 1866. The first official report into self-inflicted deaths in prison took place in the 1870s, where it found 91 official verdicts on prison ‘suicides’ over the seven year period 1873 to 1879 were recorded. There was not to be a follow up study until 1911, where it was found that 86 men and nine women officially recorded as suicides between 1902 and 1911. In 1913 Charles Goring’s study *The English Convict* also provided statistical data on prison suicides. The most significant finding here was that the suicide rate amongst prisoners was over four times as great as that of the general population. Indicative of the low level of political significance given to self-inflicted deaths of prisoners, it was over sixty years before the next major study of prison suicides was undertaken in the late 1970s. This study found that on average 13 people took their own lives every year in prison in the period 1958-1971.

Whilst there is evidence that the recorded rate of self-inflicted deaths in prisons in England and Wales were in decline for much of the twentieth century, the officially recorded figure indicates that for the last four decades the rate of self-inflicted deaths has risen substantially. In 1986 there were 21 recorded suicides in prison. The number of recorded ‘suicides’, however, leapt by over 100% in 1987 to 46. Official data show that there was another major incline of recorded self-inflicted deaths only seven years later, in 1994 when, for the first time, more than 60 deaths were recorded; and yet again, four years after that in 1998, when data recorded self-inflicted deaths in prison of more than 80 people. From 1994-2004 804 prisoners were officially recorded as committing ‘suicide’.

There are though difficulties with making historical comparisons around the numbers of self-inflicted deaths. As noted above, the data records are patchy and very few reports on deaths of prisoners have ever been produced. Further, the data prior to the 1990s refers only to those cases where there has been a suicide verdict from the coroner’s court. This means that a hidden, but potentially very large, number of deaths of prisoners have not been recorded. What the data appears to indicate, which of course should be considered as only a guide to possible trends, is that there is no obvious correlation between a decline in the historical rates of self-inflicted deaths and rises in prison officers staffing levels. Death has always been a present in prisons, but since the 1980s there has been a notable increase in the number of recorded self-inflicted deaths of prisoners, something which predates the data cited in *Prison Safety and Reform* by a number of decades. Indeed, looking at trends over the last four decades what we find is that we have had record rates of recorded self-inflicted deaths at the same time as there have been record high levels of prison officer – prisoner staff ratio. It should be reiterated once again that we should consider the data presented in *Prison Safety and Reform* with great caution because the evidence it cites does not necessarily support its policy proposals.
IV. The 45th European Group Conference 2017

Uncovering Harms: States, corporations and organizations as criminals

Save the Date!
September
7–10 2017

The 45th European Group Conference will be held in Mytilene, Lesbos, Greece

More information to come in the December Newsletter
V. Justice, Power and Resistance

*The Journal of the European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control*

Volunteers needed

Justice, Power and Resistance – Journal Subscription and Distribution Coordinators needed

To help manage the production of the Journal we need two volunteers:

A Subscription Co-ordinator to manage the Journal’s subscriptions, ensuring all requests are responded to, subscribers invoiced, payments recorded and the subscription list kept up to date. This person could be based anywhere as long as they have internet access.

A Distribution Co-ordinator to ensure that the Journal is distributed to all subscribers. Initially we anticipate this will be one person and UK-based. This role will involve taking delivery of all the copies of each edition, packing them into envelopes and using the subscription list provided by the Subs co-ordinator to address the envelopes and post the journals out. All the costs of postage and packaging will be reimbursed by EG Press (in advance if necessary).

For further details or to volunteer please get in touch with David (D.G.Scott@ljmu.ac.uk); Emma (bell.emma@neuf.fr) or John (jimmoore911@outlook.com)

Justice, Power and Resistance – Reviewers wanted

Future editions of the Journal will have, we hope, a lively and vibrant review section. However, this needs you, the members of the European Group, to contribute reviews. We are looking for a diverse range which will include the traditional academic book review but will also hopefully include reviews of a wider range of cultural events – films, fiction, poetry, plays, festivals etc. From 500 to 1550 words (possibly longer for review essays on more than one thing), these should be critical, engaging and informative.
If you are interested in writing a review, please contact the review editor – John Moore (jmmoore911@outlook.com) in the first instance to discuss your ideas and proposed review. We will try and get you copies of any books you particularly want to review. Also, if group members who have recently published material would like it to be reviewed, please let us know and we will see what we can do.

Don’t be shy – your Journal needs you!

Justice, Power and Resistance – activist contributions wanted

We are keen to publish accounts of activism from members in our new journal. These pieces can be short (1,000 to 1,500 words). The aim is to keep members of the Group informed about activist activities and the issues they are concerned with in the hope of forging new support networks. The European Group has a long history of connection to such activities and these links ought to be reflected in our journal.

If you are interested in submitting an account, please contact David (D.G.Scott@ljmu.ac.uk), Emma (bell.emma@neuf.fr) or John (jmmoore911@outlook.com)

Justice, Power and Resistance – Proof Readers wanted

We are looking for Group Members to volunteer to proof-read papers prior to the production of our journal. This is not intended to be part of the review process – that should have already been completed – but a final attempt to spot any spelling or grammatical errors. It is also a chance to read the papers before publication.

We will need you to keep to deadlines, so if you volunteer to be on our panel please be prepared to say no to any requests you are unable to turn around within the required timescale.

Hopefully, if we get a good panel of people, the task will not be too onerous.

For further details or to volunteer please get in touch with David (D.G.Scott@ljmu.ac.uk), Emma (bell.emma@neuf.fr) or John (jmmoore911@outlook.com)
VI. News from Europe and Around the World

Canada

Call for Submissions
Race, Gender and Law: A tribute to the scholarship of Sherene Razack


The Canadian Journal of Women and Law (CJWL) seeks submissions for a special issue 30(2) to be published in December 2018 on Race, Gender and Law: A tribute to the scholarship of Sherene Razack (guest edited by Gada Mahrouse, Carmela Murdocca, and Leslie Thielen-Wilson). The deadline for submitting articles for this special issue is September 1, 2017.

Dr. Sherene Razack is one of Canada’s leading critical race feminist theorists. She is especially known for developing an analytic that shows: 1. how racial violence is often legally and socially authorized and is integral to the making of states; and 2. how racial violence is gendered and sexualized. This special issue is in celebration of the 20th anniversary of her ground-breaking book Looking White People in the Eye (now in its fourth edition) and her important and on-going contributions to the interdisciplinary field of critical race feminisms and socio-legal studies.

We invite articles in English and French from academics, legal scholars, educators, and activists, working in the areas of gender, race, and law. We are interested in receiving articles that are explicitly informed by Razack’s methodology or any other important aspect of her work.

Submissions should be no more than 35 pages (10,000 words) and should conform to the Style Guide available on our website: http://bit.ly/cjwlsSubmit. Please send articles in word format indicating it is for the special issue on “Race, Gender and the Law.” to: cjwl-rfd@uottawa.ca
Appel à contributions

La race, le genre et le droit : commémoration des travaux de Sherene Razack

La Revue femmes et droit sollicite des textes pour un numéro spécial 30(2), à paraître en décembre 2018, sur la race, le genre et le droit : commémoration des travaux de Sherene Razack (rédaction assurée par les rédactrices invitées Gada Mahrouse, Leslie Thielen-Wilson et Carmela Murdocca,). Les articles pour ce numéro spécial doivent être soumis d’ici le 1er septembre 2017 au plus tard. La professeure Sherene Razack est une des théoriciennes féministes critiques de la race les plus influentes au Canada. Elle est particulièrement reconnue pour avoir élaboré une analyse qui montre : 1. comment la violence raciale est fréquemment autorisée sur les plans juridique et social et fait partie intégrante de la composition des États ; et 2. comment la violence raciale est sexospécifique et sexualisée. Ce numéro spécial commémore le vingtième anniversaire de son livre révolutionnaire Looking White People in the Eye (qui en est à présent à sa quatrième édition) et ses contributions majeures et continues au champ interdisciplinaire des féminismes critiques de la race et des études sociojuridiques. Nous sommes à la recherche d’articles en anglais et en français rédigés par des professeurs et chercheurs en droit, des juristes, des éducateurs et des activistes qui travaillent dans les domaines du genre, de la race et du droit. Nous sommes intéressés à recevoir des articles explicitement influencés par la méthodologie de S. Razack ou par tout autre aspect important de ses travaux.


Canadian Journal of Women and the Law/Revue Femmes et Droit is available online at:

Great Britain

Eleanor Rathbone Lecture
‘Hillsborough: Resisting Injustice, Recovering Truth’

Wednesday 15 February 2017
University of Liverpool

Professor Phil Scraton ‘Hillsborough: Resisting Injustice, Recovering Truth’.

The lecture will take place at 5pm.

For more information:
http://tinyurl.com/zjm5zva

Leverhulme Early Career Fellowships
Sociology at Newcastle University welcomes expressions of interest from postdoctoral researchers of any nationality who are looking to apply for a Leverhulme Early Career Fellowship. These prestigious fellowships are intended to support those at a relatively early stage of their academic careers. The objective is for fellows to undertake a significant piece of publishable research during the 36-month fellowship period.

We are keen to work with strong candidates to develop their application, and we invite expressions of interest for applications which align with the thematics of our research clusters and research centre:

· Power, inequalities and citizenship
· Identities, embodiments and selves
· Imagining pasts and futures
· Policy, ethics and life sciences (PEALS)

For more information on making an expression of interest, please see here. We will provide full support and guidance to develop those applications that we judge to be promising and that fit into one of the research areas listed above.

Please note: this is not an application to the Leverhulme Early Career Fellowship - it is an expression of interest in making a future application with the University of Newcastle as your host.

The closing date for expressions of interest is midnight (GMT) on Wednesday 2 November 2016 (the Leverhulme deadline is 2 March 2017).
Norway

Who get to be European?
In this MIGMA seminar migration scholars will present their research on shifts and contingencies in the normative climate on migrants and migration, asking the question what counts as Europe Proper and who are considered Proper Europeans.

Migration policies throughout Europe have shifted considerably in the last year. Expected levels of tolerance in Europe are not based on universal standards, but contingent on one's situatedness in hierarchies of Europeaness.

For some European nation states, to be strict on immigration is seen as being responsible. For other nation states, with similar policies, this may be considered intolerant.

This seminar will examine contemporary migration discourse in Europe from different vantage points, especially in contexts of how Europeans balance practices of inclusion and exclusion.

Speakers:
- Coherent Selves, Viable States: Eastern Europe, Statehood and Migration - Dace Dzenovska, Associate Professor Centre on Migration, Policy, and Society (COMPAS) at the University of Oxford
- Gender equality and homotolerance in bordering processes and citizenship politics - Christine M. Jacobsen, Professor and Head of Center for Women's and Gender Research at the University of Bergen
- Pulling the brake - May-Len Skilbrei, Professor Department of Criminology and Sociology of Law at the University of Oslo

For more information see:
http://www.jus.uio.no/ikrs/english/research/projects/migma/events/seminars/migma-research-seminar.html
Please feel free to contribute to this newsletter by sending any information that you think might be of interest to the Group to Ida/Per at: europeangroupcoordinator@gmail.com

Also feel free to contribute with discussions or comments on the published material in the newsletter

Please submit 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).

If you want to subscribe to the newsletter, do not hesitate to send a mail to europeangroupcoordinator@gmail.com