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I. Editorial

Gifted teacher, critical criminologist and committed abolitionist Joe Heslop has sadly died at the age of 71. His close friend Andrea Beckmann has written his obituary for this newsletter.

As you may recall, the last May newsletter was dedicated to a call for a moratorium on prison building. We continue to focus and put pressure on this issue by the transcript of David Scott’s talk on “Austerity, Welfare Cuts and Prison Building”, Bickershaw Village Community Club, UK, the 29th June 2017. Scott stresses the link between austerity and imprisonment, and calls for both an end to austerity and a moratorium on prison building: “What I want to emphasise is that building a new prison is not only a further drain on scarce resources, but that prison bruises – that prisons hurt”.

European Group Journal *Justice, Power and Resistance*, Volume 1, No 1, is out. Next year the journal will present a special edition on Minorities, crime and (in)justice. Please find the call for papers for this edition at page 21. We would again like to remind our readers that the Group has no membership fee so subscribing to the Journal is a way for you to both support the Group financially, as well as getting a brilliant critical publication delivered to you three times a year. Please subscribe today! We also urge you to get your University and/or local library to subscribe.

For those of you going to Lesbos we ask you to please send us pictures from the conference so we can include this in our next Newsletter as well as save this for our archives. The Group will in 2018 celebrate its 45th anniversary and we invite you to take part in documenting the Groups history.

We are looking forward to seeing you at European Group annual conference in Lesbos in late August. All information about the conference can be found [here](#).

τα λέμε σύντομα,

Ida and Per
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II. Obituary: SMOKIN’ JOE

A gifted teacher, a critical criminologist as well as a committed abolitionist but most of all, a very close friend of many years, Joe Heslop, has died.

After long times spend amongst ‘communities of captives’ (some of the latter years were spend at Grendon) and having endured the ‘pains of imprisonment’ (Sykes 1958) as well as their collateral damage, Joe’s spirit was remarkably unbroken. While Joe had profound first-hand experience within ‘worlds of de-communication’ (Gallo and Ruggiero 1991) he himself was an eloquent ‘life-stories’ teller, a person always open to new cultural experiences and innovative ideas who felt a deep love for nature and a diversity of creatures, human and non-human animals.

To Joe abolitionism was never merely the ambition to abolish prisons but the endeavour to: ‘…achieve shifts in the political realm and thus to fundamentally transform ways of relating….’ (Beckmann, Moore, and Wahidin 2016: 7). He definitely has achieved such shifts time and time again, in the context of HE as well as in other areas of the ‘life-world’.

Demonstrating with his life what Maruna (2001) described as the enduring potential of human transcendence, Joe was always an empathetic listener, at his happiest with a cuppa and a roll up. Calm as well as calming in his demeanour, Joe was lovely to be around. He had a huge amount of life experiences to draw on and it was always intriguing to listen to him.
He often stayed at our house and over the years he became like an uncle to my daughter, known as the ‘man with the mouse’. We shared a strong friendship and felt kinship with each other, not least as some of my life was spend with and around people who also bore the stigma of ‘criminal’.

Together with some of our colleagues we attempted to resist the frequently soulless, managerial context that characterises the ‘life-world’ of contemporary English HE and we shared an office over years which became the bastion of our comradeship. Joe was very well loved by his students as well as by his colleagues and by the many friends he always was able to easily make along the many roads and sidewalks of his life. Joe’s many passions included the deep appreciation for and delight in the diversity of global foods and customs, a joy in discovering new tastes as well as the exploration of signs and symbols, their her/stories [‘histories’] as well as the calligraphing of them. Joe was also a great Germanophile, however, his biggest focus and meaning in his life was his devotion to his late wife Janet and most of all, his beloved son Daniel and grandson Max.

I saw him last a few weeks ago when - for once- the weather was fair in Northumberland. We set out and drove to Newbiggin by the Sea and enjoyed vanilla ice-cream from Caffee Bertorelli. This was a taste and space of powerful beauty in Joe’s memories as he used to come there for occasional treats in his youth. We laughed at the fact that Joe could not remember ever seeing a sign at the ‘Cresswell Arms’ pub that proclaims: ‘Last Pub before Norway’ before heading to Ashington for ‘some grub’ and then back to his house in Pegswood. He was pronounced dead on ‘Independence Day’ 2017.

Missing you very much Joe, with wonderful memories and much love,

Andrea Beckmann


London


Thank you for inviting me to speak at this important meeting this evening on “Austerity, Welfare Cuts and Prison Building”. I would like to follow on from points made by the previous speakers regarding the problems of austerity, but this time focusing on the flip side of reduced welfare spending – the increased emphasis on prisons and punishment. It seems to me that welfare and punishment are two sides of the same coin. Whilst welfare sanctions and the often disgraceful treatment of those on benefits show us that punishment and welfare are increasing interlinked, previous calls here have been for non-punitive welfare interventions regarding education, healthcare and the ending of austerity. I fully endorse these calls for non-punitive welfare services but I want to emphasise why, at the same time, we should also reduce reliance on punishment, starting with a rejection of the Tory prison building programme creating 10,000 modern prison places.
It is absolutely essential to acknowledge that funding for frontline welfare services has been cut to the bone and that local service provision around health, education and the amelioration of poverty are at breaking point. This must be reversed immediately. What I want to emphasise is that building a new prison is not only a further drain on scarce resources, but that prison bruises – that prisons hurt. Prisons are places of harm and injury that damage those they contain, those whose job it is to keep them there, and the wider community for which the prison is ostensibly justified to protect and keep safe. The harms of the prison place are less well known than the damage wrought by austerity but it is important that we are fully aware of how counterproductive the proposed rebuilding of HMP Hindley is likely to be for the local people of Bickershaw. This is why it is so important that we all stand firm and collectively call for both an end to austerity and a national moratorium on prison building.

What I would like to do is to identify how the current proposal to rebuild HMP Hindley here in Bickershaw is intimately connected with growing social and economic inequalities. In so doing I want to emphasise why it is important that at same time as saying YES to increasing budgets for vital front line welfare services, it is also crucial that at the same time we say NO to the prison and associated policies that only deliver ‘welfare through punishment’. To see the kind of decent society we want, where everyone has a chance to prosper and fulfil their potential and where people with physical, emotional and psychological difficulties are treated with dignity and respect, we need to stand together and collectively call for not only a reversal of austerity and welfare cuts but also for a reversal in the recent rise in prison populations.

There are a number of reasons why we should oppose the building of new prisons. I touch on only a few here. I do not go into detail about the broader limitations of the prison nor all the important moral objections, but let me immediately emphasise prisons do not work. Prisons have been failed institutions for centuries. Prisons are places of harm, suffering and death that not only fail to protect the community but also potentially create criminality and future harms to members of the broader community. Prisons do not have a strong moral defence and the proposed construction of a larger “mega” prison here in Bickershaw is on even more shaky ground. Let me briefly outline five of the main objections to the rebuilding of HMP Hindley.

1. **We need to send fewer people to prison rather than build more prisons**
   England and Wales currently have the highest rate of incarceration in Western Europe at 146 per 100,000 of the population. The rate of imprisonment of people
from Greater Manchester, however, is much higher at **193 per 100,000**. If sentencing were to fall in line with the national average, there would be 1,300 less prisoners from Greater Manchester. This indicates that we could close prisons in this region if only we had more sensible rates of incarceration. On 6th June 2017 there were 593 prisoners in HMP Hindley. Although in Greater Manchester prison sentencing is clearly too high, sentencing data indicates that there is no pressing need to increase prison capacity in the Wigan Borough. In fact, the data\(^1\) shows the opposite. Although the number of people from Wigan receiving prison sentences have increased by 15% in the last two years, in March 2017 there were 428 people in prison from Wigan Local Authority (to be specific, 409 prisoners with an address in Wigan and 19 prisoners who were homeless at the time of sentencing who gave Wigan Court as their address). This number is significantly below the existing capacity at HMP Hindley. To put it bluntly, there is no direct demand with regards to the sentencing of people to prison from the Wigan Borough to increase the capacity of HMP Hindley.

Instead of building a new ‘mega prison’ we should call instead for an immediate moratorium on prison building. The challenge facing politicians and the courts is how to reduce our reliance on the prison. We cannot build ourselves out of the current punitive binge. Instead there should be a message sent to the courts that enough is enough. The shame of being the highest incarcerator in Western Europe should be enough for us collectively to question our current use of prison sentences. No one should ever feel good about giving someone a sentencing grounded in the deliberate infliction of pain. Prisons are profoundly damaging and ruin lives. The prison and indeed other forms of non-punitive detention should always be sentences of absolute last resort. We should look to exhaust all other possibilities before the prison sentence is given even the slightest consideration. Alongside this we must constantly look to highlight alternatives that actually work in terms of addressing the needs of victims and perpetrators. This is clearly not what is happening. Politicians need to take seriously calls for an immediate and radical reduction in prison populations.

### 2. Rebuilding is not about rehabilitation but saving money

Whatever the government rhetoric, the rebuilding plan at HMP Hindley is all about saving money. It is about punishing people cheaper. Let us take HMP Berwyn, which opened in February 2017 as an example. It is estimated that the cost of a place for a prisoner in HMP Berwyn will be £14,000 p.a. This is at least £10,000 cheaper than the annual cost of a prisoner in a similar category of prison. The redevelopment

\(^1\) Thanks to Dr Robert Jones, University of South Wales, for sharing information he collated from Freedom of Information Requests.
of HMP Hindley is all about saving money rather than rehabilitating prisoners. This is not to deny that HMP Hindley is a humanitarian disaster. The inspection report by Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Prisons in November 2016 indicated that HMP Hindley failed every test of a “healthy prison” and this evidence strongly suggests that the existing prison should indeed be closed. The worst thing we can do though is build a new mega prison in its place.

When the original ideas for the mega prisons were first mooted about ten years ago they were referred to as “Titan prisons”. There was a broad based penological consensus that this was a very bad idea and the plans were largely abandoned in 2009. Speaking at that time David Cameron, then leader of the opposition Conservative Party, stated that the ‘idea that big is beautiful with prisons is wrong” Indeed for him mega prisons are ‘dangerous and inefficient’. Although there is not a great deal of existing research evaluating ‘mega prisons’ we do know that they are likely to be much more damaging to human wellbeing than smaller prisons. In the UK, when looking at HMCIP reports larger prisons are significantly less likely to achieve ‘good’ scores on safety and respect. According to research published in 2016 (Madoc-Jones, Williams, Hughes and Turley) “mega prisons” are much less likely to be considered as safe and controlled environments. According to one analysis of the data, HMCIP inspection reports on larger prisons are 5 times less likely to be considered as meeting basic requirements of a healthy prison and 7 times less likely to be considered as safe. Relationships between prisoners and prison officers are also much weaker, indicating an increased width of relationships which produce a greater sense of social distance between the two groups. This may lead to more entrenched hostility. The larger the prison then the more likely that it will be an unhealthy prison.

There undoubtedly are a wide range of unintended harmful effects of mega prisons, most notably increased mental health problems. Prisoners are perhaps even more damaged in larger prisons than in smaller prisons and so confinement in a mega prison may result in increasing risks to public safety. Recidivism rates do appear to be higher in mega prisons. They are simply ways of warehousing unwanted populations rather than rehabilitating people. In short, mega prisons do not work! When we consider this within the broader costs to a community in terms of higher re-offending this means that although they are cheaper to run society may actually incur greater costs.

And certainly the Prison Service has been under concerted pressure for a number of years to make substantial cost reductions. We have to understand the current drive towards the mega prisons within the context of austerity. What was formerly called
NOMS (National Offender Management Service) and now called HMPPS (Her Majesty’s Prison and Probation Service) has itself faced significant budget cuts. Compared to 2010 costings in public sector prisons, NOMS/HMPPS had to make cuts to its previous £3.4billion by £900 million (or 24% of its budget) by 2015. This meant annual cuts of approximately £2,200 per prisoner compared to the start of this decade. Public sector prisons have increasingly started to resemble private sector counterparts in terms of staffing levels and resources.

At the same time as there has been pressure to generate cheaper prison places there has also been a rise in political rhetoric around the principle of less eligibility. The doctrine of less eligibility is predicated on the assumption that harsh prison regimes will instil moral fibre, discipline and backbone into the criminal, thus eradicating the individual deficiencies that were major factors for his or her offence. The application of the doctrine of less eligibility therefore ensures that the upper margin of prison conditions are guaranteed not to rise above the worst material conditions in society as a whole and so, in times of social hardship, the rigours of penal discipline become more severe to prevent weakening its deterrent effect. Prisons have always been austere and harsh places, and as hardship grows on the outside the calls are inevitably for **cheaper and more basic prison regimes**. The current investment in modern prison places is to ensure that prisons are cheaper in the future and are based on more austere and dehumanising regimes. The proposals for low cost and low frills mega prisons are then **closely connected with weaker welfare provision in society as a whole**. In a famous and much used quote the Russian Novelist Theodore Dostoevsky one said that “the degree of civilisation in a society can be judged by entering its prisons”. This statement has never been truer. We should recognise that the prison is an index of the health and welfare of our society as a whole.

3. **Most prisoners are people who have already been failed by society**

A third central argument is that increased emphasis on prison places must be understood within the context of the control of people who are first failed by society. It is important that we do not to reduce the problem to just the period of austerity since 2010 – prisons have a long and terrible history of failure going back centuries – but ideologically it is increasingly likely that people with personal troubles will be dealt with through the logic of punishment than that of welfare. Prisons become a default form of warehousing some of the most troubled and troublesome people in the community. The welfare of those most in need are missed, neglected or ignored in the wider community and only become highlighted as a problem when those people are sent to prison.
A very large number of the people we send to prison have grown up in care homes; experienced abuse as a child or witnessed familiar violence; can barely read or write and have been expelled or truanted from school; were unemployed or on benefits before imprisonment; and have multiple and often serious mental health problems. When a society is looking to cut back on welfare and allow growing social and economic inequalities not only are the most vulnerable and excluded failed in society but there is increasing emphasis on prisons as the answer to social problems. Let me draw your attention to the following data from 2016 on the social background of prisoners (see table 1).

**Table 1: Social background of prisoners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Prison Population</th>
<th>General Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taken into care as a child</td>
<td>24% (31% for women; 24% for men)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced abuse as a child</td>
<td>29% (53% for women and 27% for men)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed violence in the home as a child</td>
<td>41% (50% for women and 40% for men)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly truant from school</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelled or permanently excluded from school</td>
<td>42% (32% for women and 43% for men)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed in four weeks before custody</td>
<td>68% (81% for women and 67% for men)</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never had a job</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless before imprisonment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have symptoms indicative of psychosis</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified as suffering from anxiety and depression</td>
<td>25% (49% for women and 23% for men)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have attempted suicide at some point</td>
<td>46% for women and 21% for men</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Have experienced suicidal thoughts (suicidal ideation) in their lifetime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>55% for women</th>
<th>40% for men</th>
<th>14% for men and 4% for women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Have used a Class A drug

|                      | 64%           | 13%         |

Source: Prison Reform Trust (2016)

Rather than waiting until many people have broken the law we should address the welfare needs of people before they are sent to prison. This means **investing now in mental health services, education and the NHS**.

Prisons are places that take things away from people: they take a persons’ time, relationships, opportunities, and sometimes their life. Prisons constrain human identity and foster feelings of fear, anger, alienation and social and emotional isolation. For many prisoners, prisons offer only a lonely, isolating and brutalising experience. They are places of dull and monotonous living and working routines depriving prisoners of basic human needs. Combined with saturation in time consciousness / awareness, these situational contexts can lead to a disintegration of the self and death. It is essential that we take a holistic view and look closely at the people who break the law and start to understand the trauma, hardship and injury that people have experienced throughout their life-course.

4. **Reduced welfare spending and increasing economic inequalities are directly linked to increases in prison sentences**

There is also a global connection between rates of imprisonment and the amount of GDP spent on welfare. **An important study** of welfare-spending and rates of penal incarceration in 19 member countries of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 2006 found that the seven OECD countries in the sample with the highest levels of imprisonment had below average welfare-spending, whereas the eight countries with the lowest number of prisoners all had above average welfare-spending. In other words, the more we spend on welfare the less we feel the need to use the prison sanction.

There is also a direct correlation between social and economic deprivation in the UK and prison sentences. The ten most deprived areas – that is those with the greatest welfare need (including a number in the North West of England) - have some of the highest rates of imprisonment in the country whilst the ten least deprived areas in the country have remarkably low incarceration rates. Data on the rate of imprisonment within the most deprived local authority areas in England is at least **six times greater** than the rate within the least deprived local authority areas in England, although generally it is much higher than this.
To briefly illustrate this relationship let me here just focus on three areas (out of the top ten least and most deprived areas) in 2015.²

Table 2: Examples of prison rates in most deprived areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Prisoner Numbers</th>
<th>Per 100,000</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>147,231</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1.47231</td>
<td>211.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>478,580</td>
<td>2133</td>
<td>4.7858</td>
<td>445.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>530,292</td>
<td>2542</td>
<td>5.30292</td>
<td>479.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Examples of prison rates in least deprived areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Prisoner Numbers</th>
<th>Per 100,000</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe</td>
<td>114,474</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.14474</td>
<td>28.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Sussex</td>
<td>145,651</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.45651</td>
<td>27.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wokingham</td>
<td>160,409</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>35.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the tables above we see figures from some of the most deprived areas in the country in 2015. In the most deprived areas – such as Liverpool and Manchester – the data shows that these areas have sentencing rates over 440 per 100,000. By contrast, in some of the least deprived areas - such as Rushcliffe, Mid Sussex and Wokingham the data shows that these areas have rates of less than 40 per 100,000.

Prisons are a socialist issue. Prison rates are directly connected to inequalities and insufficient emphasis on the welfare of our fellow citizens. We must say NO to the prison at the same time as we say YES to equity, social justice and social policies that aim to meet human need.

5. Negative impact on local people and environment

Despite government rhetoric, we can dismiss any talk that the rebuilding of Hindley will create jobs and prosperity in Bickershaw or surrounding area. There have been a number of very detailed studies in the USA exploring the relationship between prison towns and economic growth. One study found that residents of areas with new prisons did not gain significant employment advantages compared to those without prisons. In other words, unemployment rates, wages and overall incomes between prison towns and other comparable areas without a prison were virtually the same. When comparing new prison towns across the USA with other towns of a similar size, Besser and Hanson (2004) also found that there was no discernable

² This data was kindly shared with me by Dr Rob Jones, University of South Wales
differences between unemployment rates from 1990-2000 between the towns. Like King et al, (2003) they concluded that building a new prison did not create jobs for local unemployed people. At a similar time to the above studies there was a further comprehensive analysis of prison towns in the USA by Hooks, Mosher, Genter, Rontolo and Loboa who explored the impact of prison building and job growth in the USA from 1976-1994. In a follow up study, expanding the period to 2004, Hooks et al (2010) found once again that the evidence shows that rather than promoting economic prosperity and creating new jobs, in both urban and struggling rural communities, prisons may actually impede employment growth. Hooks et al (2010) conclude that “our research into employment growth suggests that prisons are doing more harm than good among vulnerable counties”. The reasons why prisons failed to provide economic stimulus to the local economy include:

- There are not necessarily new jobs as prison officers moved from other prisons to fill the new jobs;
- There is the possibility of adverse local impacts of prison labor through prison industries and low cost prisoner labour;
- There may be a paucity of local skills or direct connections between local skills and the services required by the new prison.

The new mega prison is, however, very likely to create a number of harms to the local community. One of the main concerns I want to highlight here is the presence of asbestos in the prison and perhaps also contaminating the land surrounding the prison. Asbestos is regarded as a major international health issue and there were calls as recently as June 13, 2017 by the World Health Organization calling for its total elimination on a global scale.

Although in the 1990s asbestos was removed from the roofs on A, B, C and D wings in HMP Hindley, there are concerns that there is still a vast amount of asbestos in the older 1960s buildings. There are then a number of urgent questions that in the public interest we need answering.

- We urgently need confirmation if there remains asbestos in the fabric of the buildings of HMP Hindley. In a 2011 survey of the estate it indicates that asbestos was present in the prison. Is this still the case?
- How many currently serving prison officers at HMP Hindley have received national training on asbestos awareness? How many staff have received this training in the last 5 years?
- There is a PSO (prison service order) requiring the inspection of asbestos at HMP Hindley. What is the current level of risk for prisoners and staff (this should be on an electronic register of asbestos held at the prison)?
• Asbestos becomes a serious health risk if fibres are released into the air. The Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012 stipulates that before any building work can be undertaken in areas that might contain asbestos there is a legal obligation to identify where the asbestos as well as its type and condition. There is then an obligation to assess the risks and subsequently manage and control them. Have any independent assessments of the risk of asbestos been undertaken since 2011?

• Given that there are plans to demolish the existing prisons have any refurbishment and demolition surveys (which will require the contractors to visit the prison and sample the asbestos) yet been undertaken? If so, what are the findings of the risk assessments regarding any disturbance or deterioration of the asbestos?

• What will be the cost implications of removing the asbestos in HMP Hindley before demolition? Independent assessments indicate that the costs for the removal of asbestos can sometime cost up to £0.5 Million. Which body would be responsible for funding the removal of the asbestos?

We also need to be conscious of the many other harms to local people that will be generated by the new prison. House prices will go down, there will be higher volume of traffic and pollution, and noise pollution during the building programme. Weekends of local people will also be disrupted due to building work. In the long terms local health provision will be drained. A larger prison in Bickershaw will seriously undermine mental health provision and place greater stress on the ambulance service. The bill for ambulance call outs to prisons in 2014-15 was £2.3 million. In the four male prisons in Greater Manchester, from February 2016-February 2017, the ambulance service responded to 551 incidents, costing the local NHS £165,000. If Hindley doubles in size it is likely to drain the local NHS of more than £40,000 every year for this alone. There is no evidence that the new prison will bring new jobs to the local community. Cheap prison labour may actually undermine local jobs as prisoners are still paid only £10-15 per week. The category of the new prison is still unconfirmed, but the prison will be larger and a more obvious landmark in the community with perhaps much greater external security.

**Alternatives: invest in communities not prisons**

What should we do instead? To answer this we only need to look at social and economic inequalities in the surrounding area. For the reasons given by the speakers earlier, it is essential that we address child poverty and improve current provision for mental health, education and healthcare for all.
To address wrongdoing what we need is an emphasis on community safety and rehabilitation. We should though focus on interventions that have a proven track record of addressing problematic conduct rather than simply regurgitate a failed and failing institution: the prison. Radical alternatives include therapeutic and other intentional communities, civil law and family conferencing, community interventions that allow offenders to restore and redress the harm that has been done, community interventions that build attachments and give people a sense of local ownership and pride in their local communities, intensive educational support that helps children to get basic qualifications and life skills, healthcare interventions that can address problems around mental health and substance usage. We need to make healthcare and education our priorities right now to help prevent future problems. Building prisons rather than investing in welfare services simply generates new and deeper problems that we as a society will have to spend enormous amounts of money on in 10 to 15 years-time. Prevention is better than cure.

As mentioned earlier, it is essential that we understand people who break the law through their “life-course” (that is consider their experiences across their whole lives rather than just the criminal act itself). This means spending the time to learn about and understand of who breaks the law and who is criminalised. It also means that if we care about the harms that are faced by children we should also be concerned about these very same people when they grow up into adults. That their lives are complicated, problematic and that they may have become difficult people because of the problems they have faced doesn’t mean that their adult lives should be written off. Rather, we need to look at these issues and press home right now why it is so important to have decent care for all children, the need to abolish of child poverty, to have decent welfare support for all so that they can care adequately for their own children. The children who are harmed today will the adults filling our prisons tomorrow.

We know that that in profoundly unequal societies the criminal law is disproportionately used to control those who are at the bottom of society. It is the poor, not the rich, who fill our prisons. Prisoners have done wrong and we as a society should address that wrongdoing, but we must do it a way which meets the needs of victims and creates a safer and more just society as a whole. This means investing in our health services, investing in our schools, building social housing and creating jobs that people want. It means respecting basic human dignity and putting people before profit. One thing we can be absolutely certain. Rebuilding HMP Hindley will do none of these things.
Thank you for listening.
IV. EG Press Publications

Available from

EG Press

Women Crime and Criminology: A Celebration
Edited by: Helen Monk and Joe Sim
Includes contributions from Frances Heidensohn, Richard Collier and Carol Smart as well as an introduction by Helen Monk and Joe Sim.

Beyond Criminal Justice
Edited by: J.M. Moore, Bill Rolston, David Scott and Mike Tomlinson
An Anthology of Abolitionist Papers presented to conferences of the European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control.

Emancipatory Politics and Praxis
David Scott (with Emma Bell, Joanna Gilmore, Helen Gosling, J M Moore and Faith Spear)
An anthology of essays written for the European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control, 2013-16

Penal Abolitionism
Edited by: Andrea Beckman, J.M. Moore and Azrini Wahidin
Papers from the Penal Law, Abolition and Anarchism Conference Volume I

For further details please visit:
http://www.egpress.org/
Cadenza: A Professional Autobiography

*Thomas Mathiesen (with the assistance of Snorre Smàri Mathiesen)*

The English translation of Mathiesen’s important account of his career as a public intellectual and activist

**Emerging Voices**

*Critical Social Research by European Group Postgraduate and Early Career Researchers*

*Co-ordinated and Edited by Samantha Fletcher and Holly White*
*Associate Editing by the Emerging Voices Collective*
*Preface by Steve Tombs*

This collection of twenty-six short chapters introduces the scholarly and activist work currently being undertaken by emerging voices in the European Group.

**Voices of Resistance**

*Subjugated knowledge and the challenge to the criminal justice system*

*Edited by Kym Atkinson, Antoinette Raffaela Huber and Katie Tucker*

A collection of papers presented at the Liverpool John Moore’s Centre for the Study of Crime, Criminalisation and Social Exclusion’s postgraduate conference held in 2016

**Anarchism, Penal Law and Popular Resistance**

*Edited by: Andrea Beckman, J.M. Moore and Azrini Wahidin*

Papers from the Penal Law, Abolition and Anarchism Conference Volume 2

For further details please visit:  
http://www.egpress.org/
V. Justice, Power and Resistance: The Journal of the European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control

The European Group has published the second edition of our Journal Justice, Power and Resistance. However, subscriptions have been very disappointing. We have no membership fee so subscribing to the Journal is a way you can support the Group financial as well as getting a brilliant critical publication delivered to your door three times a year. Please subscribe today.

Subscription Rates
(including the cost of postage and packaging)

Europe (excluding UK)
- 53€ Volume 1 (2017) All three Issues
- 100€ Volume 1 (2017) and Volume 2 (2018) - A total of six issues
- 120€ Foundation Volume (2016) [one issue]; Volume 1 (2017) [three issues]; and Volume 2 [three issues] - All of the first seven issues.

UK
- £45 Volume 1 (2017) All three Issues
- £84 Volume 1 (2017) and Volume 2 (2018) - A total of six issues
- £100 Foundation Volume (2016) [one issue]; Volume 1 (2017) [three issues]; and Volume 2 [three issues] - All of the first seven issues.

Africa, Asia and Latin America
- US$37.50 Volume 1 (2017) All three Issues
- US$75 Volume 1 (2017) and Volume 2 (2018) - A total of six issues
- US$87.50 Foundation Volume (2016) [one issue]; Volume 1 (2017) [three issues]; and Volume 2 [three issues] - All of the first seven issues.

USA & Canada
- US$60 Volume 1 (2017) All three Issues
- US$113 Volume 1 (2017) and Volume 2 (2018) - A total of six issues
- US$130 Foundation Volume (2016) [one issue]; Volume 1 (2017) [three issues]; and Volume 2 [three issues] - All of the first seven issues.

Rest of the World
- US$75 Volume 1 (2017) All three Issues
- US$150 Volume 1 (2017) and Volume 2 (2018) - A total of six issues
- US$175 Foundation Volume (2016) [one issue]; Volume 1 (2017) [three issues]; and Volume 2 [three issues] - All of the first seven issues.
To subscribe to Justice, Power, and Resistance please e-mail JPRsubs@outlook.com with the following details:

- Your name and the address you want your copies sent to.
- If you wish your subscription to cover Foundation Volume & Volume 1 (1 issue in 2016 & 3 issues in 2017); or Volume 1 (3 issues in 2017); or Volume 1 and 2 (3 issues in 2017 and 3 issues in 2018); or Foundation and Volumes 1 & 2 (all of the first 7 issues)
- **European Group Members who wish to take out a solidarity subscription should please specify the donation they wish to make to the Group.**

We will issue an invoice via PAYPAL which will allow you to pay by bank transfer, debit or credit card
VI. CALL FOR PAPERS: Special Edition: Minorities, Crime and (In)justice

Within the contemporary moment, we detect the (re)emergence of official narratives that serve to situate social problems within a logic of pathological, maladjusted and/or culturally unassimilable minority groups to legitimise state-enabled (and sanctioned) violence.

Simultaneously, across the globe, the oft-communicated advance of right-wing populism necessitates political reactions, often exerted through penal apparatus, which disproportionately affect, yet paradoxically legitimise, the state’s harmful incursion into the lives of minorities. Emergent processes of criminalisation are deliberately concealed, hidden away and perennially denied. Moreover, the recent intensification of systemic state-enabled violence against LGBTQ, racialised and religiously defined bodies are now met with an academic ‘strategic silence’ (Matheisen, 2004) or are empirically argued away (Harris 2009, Cohen 2001). This silence is now giving way to ‘dangerous criminologies’ located within the criminogenic and pathologising tendencies of realist(s) interpretations which uncritically serve to reaffirm the cultural and societal incompatibility of minority groups as (an)other.

Despite the advances of critical counter-narratives to assuage such tendencies, we are again in the midst of State orchestrated and hegemonic narratives which serve to attribute contemporary social problems to the non-citizen and failed-citizen (Anderson 2013). This issue of the European Group journal welcomes papers and articles that reposition and centralise the ‘crime’ and criminal justice concerns of minority individuals, groups and ‘communities’ back onto the political and activist agenda. Furthermore, we also welcome contributions which appraise and challenge contemporary theoretical and conceptual thinking which simplistically serves to ‘other’ and impede minority perspectives (Phillips and Bowling, 2003).

Completed contributions, in English, should be submitted to one of the editors: Monish Bhatia (m.bhatia@abertay.ac.uk) or Patrick Williams (p.williams@mmu.ac.uk) by the deadline which is 15 November 2017. In the meantime, potential contributors are welcome to contact the editors to discuss potential papers.
VII. News from Europe and Around the World

Germany

February 2018

Biography and Violence: Violent Dynamics and Agency in Collective Processes and Individual Life Histories

Call for Papers for an International Conference at the Center of Methods in Social Sciences, University of Göttingen. Deadline: September 1st, 2017

Details can be found at Soziopolis under:

Norway

Upcoming events

28.08.2017
A half-day open seminar on current affairs in Nigeria will be hosted in Oslo by the Department of Criminology and Sociology of Law, University of Oslo, with contributions by Victor Adetula (the Nordic Africa Institute, Uppsala), Morten Boås (Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, Oslo) and by MIGMA researchers Jørgen Carling, Sine Plambech and Erlend Paasche.

11.09.2017
A joint PRIO-IKRS workshop will bring together criminologists from the University of Oslo and migration researchers from the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO), to discuss migration and how states seek to control it.

For more information about the MIGMA project see:
http://www.jus.uio.no/ikrs/english/research/projects/migma/index.html
Serbia

Late November, early December 2017
VIII Annual Conference of the Victimology Society of Serbia, Belgrade

Victims between security, human rights and justice: Local and global context
Belgrade, 30th November and 1st December 2017

For details see:

Conference call:  http://vds.org.rs/OsmaGKVDS_PozivEng.htm

Call for abstracts:
http://vds.org.rs/OsmaGKVDS_PozivZaDostavljanieApstrakataEng.htm

Conference fee and registration form:
http://vds.org.rs/OsmaGKVDS_RegistracioniListEng.htm

Contact: vdsconference@gmail.com
Web site: http://vds.org.rs/indexEng.html

UK

Death in Punishment conference

Please book now to secure your place for the forthcoming Death in Punishment conference.

This two day interdisciplinary, international conference will consider theoretical and practical issues relating to deaths in prison, probation and police custody. It will be particularly relevant to scholars and practitioners from criminology, law, health, politics and social policy.

Keynote speakers include:
• Deborah Coles (Director of INQUEST)
• Professor Nick Hardwick (Chair of the Parole Board, former HM Chief Inspector of Prisons)
• Professor Graham Towl (Member of the Independent Advisory Board on deaths in custody, former Harris Review member)
If you have any questions, or require further information please contact Philippa Tomczak (p.j.tomczak@sheffield.ac.uk)

Book online at: https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/law/research/clusters/CCR/conferences/death_in_punishment

We look forward to seeing you in October and will be delighted to welcome you to Sheffield!

***

18 and 19 September 2017

CCJS 30th Anniversary Conference at the University of Leeds

Theme: New Advances in Restorative Justice Theory and Practice

23 to 25 November 2017

// Call for Submissions will be open on June 15th 2017.

Position:

Right to Remain is recruiting!
Communications Officer, deadline 31 July

Right to Remain works across the UK supporting migrants to establish their right to remain with dignity, safety and humanity, and to challenge injustice in the asylum and immigration system.

We are recruiting a Communications Officer to develop and implement our communications around community solidarity in support of refugee and migrant rights, incorporating voices from the local communities that we work with across the UK.

You will be joining an expanding organisation (though we are still small with just four members of staff) and will be based in our London office, but the role requires
frequent travel within the UK.

As well as managing and developing our communications, you will be working collaboratively with other NGOs in the asylum/refugee and migration sector, and will assist in the day-to-day running of this small, committed and dynamic organisation.

Post: Communications Officer
contact: home@righttoremain.org.uk

***

Great opportunity to undertake research activity to support and deliver against the project: Migration in Middlesbrough. For further details go to Teesside University: http://www.tees.ac.uk/sections/jobs/.

Research Associate
POST NUMBER: T0634
Closing date: 30 July 2017
Professor Azrini Wahidin
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, and provide a web link (wherever possible).

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