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I. Editorial

Prison building is once again on the political agenda if not a practical reality in countries all across Europe. This special issue of the European Group Newsletter brings together a number of calls for prison building moratoriums in Northern Europe. The purpose of bringing together (in English and original languages) the prison building moratoriums from Belgium, England and France is three fold.

First, the intention is to provide a platform for anti-prison activists in these countries and raise awareness of their current struggles against the prison industrial complex. We hope that members of the European Group will offer support and solidarity to comrades in these three countries, perhaps sharing stories of resistance and strategies that have been adopted elsewhere that may be of mutual aid to all.

Second, the three moratoriums may provide a helpful resource for anti-prison activists in other countries where prison building programs are under-way or are being planned for the near future. The moratoriums may therefore provide a template from which others can adopt a similar statement in their own country. A prison building moratorium is a first step in reversing penal expansionism and sending a message to governments that more prisons is not the answer. We also include the Working Group on Prisons, Punishment and Detention which explores how a moratorium can be used in this way as part of a broader prison abolitionist strategy.

Third, in bringing these moratoriums together we hope to start momentum towards a pan European call for an end to prison building across the whole of Europe. In coming weeks the European Group Steering committee will discuss the fine details such a moratorium and start to generate further signatures.

This special issue of the newsletter is then hopefully the start of a process which will result in generating greater solidarity, capacity building and awareness of anti-prison strategies across Europe.

***

An introduction to this topic and the work against prison building is provided by David Scott’s article Sentencing the Poor to a Life of Misery, which concludes by: “attempting to expand the debate on prison building so that it includes a consideration of economic inequalities and the importance of addressing the needs of victims of social injustice”. Scott brings us the important insight that: “Prison is never part of the answer if our question is how are we to achieve social justice. There should be an immediate moratorium on prison building”

Prison issues is a core topic for the European Group, and a designated working group has long experience of working with these issues – the Working Group on Prison,
Detention and Punishment. You will find the working group manifesto at page 25. If you would like to be part of this working group you can contact the working group coordinator Victoria Canning (Victoria.Canning@open.ac.uk).

The European Group Journal: Justice, Power and Resistance, Volume 1, Issue 1, is out. As you will see from the table of content for this issue to be found on page 29, this issue promises highly interesting and important readings. 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 30.

We would like to bring the attention to a slightly prolonged deadline for papers to the European Group annual conference in Lesbos. The new deadline is 26 May. We will be able to offer some assisted place for the conference. See more information about the conference and assisted places here.

In solidarity,
David, Ida and Per
II. Sentencing the poor to a life of misery

Prison is never part of the answer if our question is how are we to achieve social justice.

Transcription of talk for NO MEGA PRISON IN WIGAN meeting, Monday 3rd April 2017

Dr David Scott
The Open University

Build A Mega Prison?

On the 22nd March 2017 it was announced that HMP Hindley is to be part of the Tory governments’ £1.3bn prison development programme which aims to redesign the penal estate so that it can increase current capacity by 10,000 new places. Although the exact details of the proposed redevelopment at HMP Hindley have not been made public, the government are set on a path of building new ‘mega prisons’ which can hold between 1,500 -2,000 prisoners. The expectation is the proposed redevelopment of HMP Hindley will result in a much larger prison. As more than £250 Million was allocated for the construction of HMP Berwyn (which has capacity for 2,106 prisoners), and around £170 million has been earmarked for the demolishing and rebuilding of HMP Wellingborough (which will have capacity for at least 1,600 prisoners), we can anticipate that the costs of redeveloping HMP Hindley will be well in excess of £100 million.
The new prison will cost millions of pounds at the same time as we are making severe cuts to welfare services.

It is important at the outset to recognise that resistance against the proposed new ‘mega prison’ in Wigan is not an isolated campaign but rather part of a wider struggle for social justice. The Tory governments’ prison building plans must be understood with the context of the nationwide austerity package resulting in public service cutbacks which are moving us away from welfare interventions focussed on meeting need and taking us towards an intensification of punishment and penal orientated interventions which aim to regulate, control and discipline difficult and vulnerable people in impoverished communities. This broader Tory policy of delivering ‘welfare through punishment’, exemplified in the current prison building programme, will do nothing to help the people of Wigan, Greater Manchester or those in and around Northwest England.

Not only will more prisons fail victims of ‘crime’, they will also generate more victims of social injustice.

In this talk I briefly contextualise the proposed rebuilding of HMP Hindley within the expansionist penal policies of England and Wales since the early 1990s. Drawing upon a human rights framework, I move on to discuss HMP Hindley itself, and argue the government has got it partly right – HMP Hindley should be demolished. This is followed by a consideration of the case for rebuilding the prison. In so doing I explore data on crime and punishment in Greater Manchester, making some direct connections to Wigan. My talk concludes by attempting to expand the debate on prison building so that it includes a consideration of economic inequalities and the importance of addressing the needs of victims of social injustice.

Prison is never part of the answer if our question is how are we to achieve social justice. There should be an immediate moratorium on prison building.

An Expansionist Penal Policy

Prison populations have been rising in England and Wales since 1993. In December 1992 there were just over 40,600 people in prison in England and Wales. By December 2011 the average daily population stood at over 88,000. In the last five years the prison population has remained relatively stable at around 86,000. Despite the calls of a small number of politicians to reduce the prison population, it is clear that the Tory Government is set on an expansionist prison policy. In November 2015 the Tory government announced that it planned to build nine new mega prisons. This came off the back of previous attempts to build “Titan” prisons that were first mooted in 2007, and which eventually led to the opening of HMP Berwyn in Wrexham, Wales earlier this year. In November 2016 the locations of 2 proposed mega prisons were announced at Wellingborough, Northampton and Glen Parva, Leicester, both on sites of existing prisons. If (re)built these new ‘mega prisons’ will be two of largest prisons in the country.
England and Wales currently have the highest rate of incarceration in Western Europe (146 per 100,000 of the population). We already over-use the prison sentence as a nation.

Liz Truss has claimed that new prisons are about improving the ability of the prison to rehabilitate. Let us be clear from the outset – reformed prisons since the 1800s have never been successful in rehabilitating offenders. Prisons are more likely to generate illegal activities than eradicate them. The current rebuilding plan is about saving money. It is about punishing people cheaper than what we do now. Let us take HMP Berwyn 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 current annual cost of a prisoner in a similar category of prison.

The redevelopment of HMP Hindley is all about saving money rather than rehabilitating prisoners.

Demolish HMP Hindley

HMP Hindley is a Cat C adult male prison with serious problems. It is a human rights disaster. In an inspection last year Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Prisons provided a damning report. "The regime at Hindley ... Possibly very worst the inspectors had ever seen of this type of prison" (Peter Clark HMCP, November 2016). Of the current prison population in HMP Hindley, about 33% are under 21; 27% have a declared mental health problem; 40% are currently on the drug treatment casework load; 16% have developed a drug problem whilst in the prison; and only 14% of those prisoners eligible to be so are currently in educational classes. There is virtually no purposeful activity.

There is virtually no evidence of Hindley meeting the basic requirements of what the HMCIP call a “healthy prison”.

Prisoners live in "stark" unhealthy and unclean conditions. According to the November 2016 HMCIP Report the prison is "dirty, insufficiently furnished and poorly ventilated".

Cells were dirty, covered in graffiti and lacked basic amenities, including pillows, clean bedding kettles and televisions. We saw one new arrival who was placed in a cell without a water supply ... Most communal areas were dirty and some landings, particularly on the upper floors were filthy ...

HMP Hindley is an affront to human dignity. It is a degrading and dehumanising and violates basic human rights.

There is a repressive and authoritarian staff culture. The prison is run on huge amounts of lockdown which has "clearly inhibited development of positive relationships". 66% of prisoners are locked in their cells for 18 hours every day. According to the HMCIP "Prison officers were disinterested and relationships appeared distant". High numbers of prisons feel unsafe, with many prisoners deliberately isolating themselves through fear. The HMCIP note that in the period
under consideration there were 126 incidents of "use of force", and 86 recorded incidents regarding the full use of "control and restraint". This is double the "HMCIP norm. Batons were drawn on 17 occasions in previous six months to the inspection. In November 2016 132 prisoners were in the segregation unit and one prisoner had been segregated for 79 days.

**HMP Hindley is a place of fear, intimidation, bullying and violence. It is a place which presents considerable dangers to all who enter within its walls.**

The HMCIP also point out that cell bells are often left unanswered, there is limited access to listeners and "poor day to day care for prisoners in crisis". There were 75 incidents of self-harm between April-October 2016 and 161 ACCT (suicide watch reports) were opened in six months prior to the inspection. A prisoner took their own life in Hindley in February 2016. There has also been a systematic failure to implement recommendations of *Prison and Probation Ombudsman* on previous deaths in the prison in 2012.

"The regime at Hindley is totally inadequate" (*HMCIP, 2016*). It fails to provide duty of care. It is a blot on the landscape. A place of harm, suffering and death. It should be closed at the first possible opportunity.

Currently the vast majority of prisoners in Hindley are from the North West region (approx. 92%) – 8% from outside of region. A new mega Prison – which will increase capacity by around 1,000 places - will mean that a great many more people will be housed inside the prison - so a new ‘mega prison’ will be painful and damaging to people and communities all around the country.

**Should we build a new prison in its place?**

1) **Sentencing in Greater Manchester (and elsewhere)**

We have already noted that England and Wales is a country with an imprisonment rate which is very high - too high - and that prisons are more likely to harm people rather than help them. But what about the picture in Greater Manchester? Let's' briefly consider some data on prison sentences.

According to data from the National Offender Management Service, in March 2014 5285 people (with an address in Greater Manchester) were held across the prison estate in England and Wales. With a 2.73 million population (approx.) this means that the rate of imprisonment of people from Greater Manchester at that time was 190 per 100,000.

In March 2014 1903 people (with an address in Tyne and Wear) were held across the prison estate in England and Wales. With a 1.1 million population this means that the rate of imprisonment of people from Tyne and Wear at that time was 170 per 100,000.

If we were to crudely apply this rate to Greater Manchester (which would of course require further research exploring the complexities and nuances of undertaking

---

1 With thanks to Dr Robert Jones, *University of South Wales* for sharing this information.
comparative analysis rather than just looking at the raw data out of context), the number of people in prison would be reduced by 630 places from 5285 to 4655.

Based upon the current population of HMP Hindley (568), a sentencing approach in line with people from Tyne and Wear would allow for the complete closure of HMP Hindley.

The national rate of imprisonment in England and Wales is 146 per 100,000, so if Greater Manchester sentences to imprisonment were to merely come into line with national average, this would see even further reductions in demand and so even more prisons could be closed. So prison sentences would fall to 3998, which is a reduction in 1287 prisoners.

The problem is that there are too many prison sentences. The answer is not to build a new prison but to look more closely at sentencing practices in Greater Manchester (and very possibly elsewhere, as people with a Manchester address will be sentenced to prison by courts in Manchester but also courts in other parts of England and Wales) and to reduce number and length of prison sentences.

Focussing on the regional sentencing data is not without limitations. Potential differences in levels of seriousness of offence in different regions would need to be analysed alongside the equally, if not even more important consideration, about the social background of the offenders before firm conclusions could be drawn. Certain groups – Black and Minority Ethnic, homeless, unemployed, on benefits, previous convictions and so on – have a disproportionately much higher likelihood of being imprisoned than the ‘median’ person in society. Who the offender is a big factor in determining whether the y get prison sentence or not.

Without over-stating the statistical evidence presented above, it is clear that people from Greater Manchester are more likely to be sentenced to imprisonment than people from many other places around the country. This requires further analysis.

ii) A new prison has nothing to do with local ‘crime’ rate

The relationship between “crime” and punishment is a complicated one, but there are few things that we can highlight to help us understand if this is relevant for the debate today. The first, and crucial point, is that whilst prison populations have been rising since the mid-1990s, for much of the last 20 years recorded crime has been falling. Given the abysmal recidivism rates following imprisonment we can rule out immediately that this is because of the rise in prison population.

Prisons are more likely to generate criminality than act as conduits for rehabilitation.

We have a problem with recorded crime rates in Greater Manchester. According to Government inspectors the integrity of the data is suspect:
Though there is some evidence that recorded crime has increased in Greater Manchester in the last two years - Statistics show 216,493 crimes were reported last year (2016), up 18,907 on the previous year (2015)– this must be understood in the context of problematic recording practices in the past. This is especially so when it comes to data on sexual and interpersonal violence, as it appears that it was these very serious incidents that the Greater Manchester police were failing to appropriately record.

The police and the criminal process is failing victims of crime in Wigan and Greater Manchester. The data on recorded ‘crime’ in Greater Manchester is not a safe basis for promoting a new mega prison.

iii) Will a Mega Prison make Wigan safer?

Whilst there has been increased number of reporting of sexual offences, which went up by 30 per cent (from 473 in the 12 months to March 2015 to 615 in the 12 months to March 2016) and other violent crime, this cannot be considered without also taking into account the problems of recording crime in the past. Further the Wigan Council
Strategic Plan (2011) noted that only 17% of violent crime in Wigan is committed by a stranger.

A large proportion of violent crime occurs in “night spots” of the town centres where a lot of heavy drinking occurs on weekend evenings. Most violent crime victims are males aged 17 – 24 years.

Recommendation 30: Publicise the very low risk of being the victim of violent crime by stranger.

So let me do that here for them. According to data from 2015 indicates that WIGAN has lowest homicide, attempted murder and conspiracy to murder rates per year in Gt Manchester at 1.5 per 1000,000 people.

So why build a new mega prison in Wigan? Why not spend the £100 million on making Wigan a safer and stronger community? Why not use the money instead to build social justice?

Economic Inequality and Social Justice

Whilst there is only a weak correlation (if at all) between recorded crime rates and the form and nature of punishment in a given society, there is a much stronger correlation between prisons and social and economic inequality. First we can absolutely sure that whatever the rhetoric about jobs and financial investment by Tory politicians, the prison will not bring prosperity to Wigan. Study after study in the USA on “prison towns” have blown the myth that prisons create wealth for communities surrounding a new prison. In fact, they can do the opposite, certainly in terms of reducing the value
of property next to a prison. It is often national or international corporations who reap the profits of a prison (re)build.

*The people who will benefit from the prison will be not local people – either victims or offenders – but big business.* There is no evidence from the building of HMP Berwyn that the local community has benefitted substantially from the £240 million invested in the prison.

In Wigan **18.8% of children** (12,875 children) **live in poverty.** 20% of children live in families that claim out of work benefits. Worklessness is main cause of child poverty. There are two foodbanks in Wigan, which are a modern index of poverty.

*The Median gross weekly pay of full time employees in Wigan is €427.50pw. In the Northwest it is €460.30pw. Nationally it is €507.20pw.*

*Life expectancy is lower than the average* for England and Wales for both men and women. There are significant variations in the health of people in Wigan. According to *Wigan Council in 2011* life expectancy (for ‘able bodied’ / non-disabled) varies from as low as **47 years** in men and **51 years in women** in the poorest areas to 62 for men and 65 for women in the most affluent area. Life expectancy for people with **severe mental illness** is **up to 25 years less** than general population.

---

Source: Wigan Health Profile,
Currently about 45% of the over 65 population needs some form of social care, and there are 7000 “very high need older people”.

There is a shortage of social houses in Greater Manchester as a whole. It is estimated that only 4000 new homes are constructed each year, compared to the required 9,000 to 10,000 for GMCA area, of which Wigan is part.

CLOSE HINDLEY PRISON AND USE THE MONEY ALOCATED TO:

- BUILD SOCIAL HOUSES
- PROVIDE SOCIAL CARE FOR ELDERLY
- REDUCE CHILD POVERTY
- INCREASE LIFE EXPECTANCY BY TACKLING ECONOMIC INEQUALITY

It is now well documented that prisoners have much greater health problems than most people in society. More prisoners will place increased stress on local National Health Service resources. This can actually lead to an impoverishment of health provision in the wider community. More prisons will mean more pressure on the ambulance service. There has been overall a 52% rise in emergency services callouts to prisons since 2011. It costs £300 for each ambulance call out, and it is estimated by the BBC that the bill for ambulance call outs to prisons in 2014-15 is likely to top £2.3 million (and that does not include subsequent hospital treatment costs). Once again, the local people of Wigan and Greater Manchester will lose out. It would be better, most cost effective and much more humane to address mental health problems through appropriate provision in the community and local hospitals. Wigan Leaders Group have also identified a major shortfall in funding for local health services facilitating the health and well-being of people in the borough of Wigan.

Our analysis shows that by 2020/21 commissioning organisations in Wigan Borough will have a total cumulative saving requirement of £136m. £60m of savings have been identified to close this gap, leaving a shortfall of £76m. This gap will be met by schemes yet to be identified ….

Building a new prison can only put even greater pressure on already over-stretched local healthcare provision.

There is also a crisis of funding for schools in Wigan. Under the new National Funding Formula Wigan schools will be the 109th poorest funded in the country.

There will be an 8% reduction funding for school children between 2014-15 and 2019-20. The Wigan Schools Forum inform us that:

Under the new Formula from April 2017, 88 out of 99 primary schools and all secondary schools in the Borough will receive less funding than in 2016-17.
For those lawbreakers who have substance use problems provide interventions that can rehabilitate. Residential therapeutic communities [TC’s] are not only cheaper than prisons but can also deliver better (or at very least no worse) rehabilitation rates than prisons. Indeed it is estimated that TC’s can offer a **£200,000 net benefit over the ‘career’ of a substance using offender.**

**CLOSE HINDLEY PRISON AND USE THE MONEY ALOCATED TO:**

- **INVEST IN THE AMBULANCE SERVICE**
- **INVEST IN EDUCATION AND SCHOOLS**
- **INCREASE FUNDING FOR NHS (UPGRADE CHORLEY HOSPITAL)**
- **OPEN RESIDENTIAL THERAPEUTIC COMMUNITY IN WIGAN**

A new prison will not help build life – it will only destroy it. By building a new prison we are not just putting money into the pain infliction industry – we are also shifting focus away from welfare support. In a time of budget cuts, austerity and the rise of personal debt the very last thing that we need to be spending money on are **warehouses of suffering and death.** The money that will be invested into new prisons would be better spent on creating meaningful jobs, education provision for adults and children, child care support, local libraries and better local transport infrastructure. Investment in the above will in the long run save the local council money.

_The new prison will undoubtedly have hidden consequences and harms for the people of Wigan and surrounding area and very little, in the end, to benefit them. It is just sentencing the poor to a life of misery._

This is not something just restricted to Wigan or even Greater Manchester. It has both broader regional and national implications, but the waste of good money on a new mega prison should be fully debated in the lead up to the **Mayoral Election in May 2017.**

Thank you for listening.
III. a) Belgium

Appel pour un moratoire sur la construction de nouvelles prisons en Belgique


Le gouvernement actuel annonce sa volonté d’en construire davantage : à Vresse-sur-Semois, à Lantin, à Verviers, à Leopoldsburg, à Wavre et à Paîve. Ainsi que les prisons de Haren et de Termonde, pour l’instant bloquées par la mobilisation des citoyens.

La construction d’une méga-prison à Haren est emblématique de la fuite en avant qui nous mène droit dans le mur. Elle devrait être la plus grande de Belgique, d’une superficie de 51.000 m² de bâtiments, et 15.000 m² de surfaces extérieures, et détruirait l’un des derniers grands espaces verts et arables de Bruxelles. Composée de huit entités, elle permettrait l’enfermement de 1200 détenus. Le coût total de cette seule méga-prison, sur les 25 années que prévoit le contrat du « partenariat-public-privé » négocié dans une complète opacité, est estimé à plus de 3 milliards d’euros. Cette somme colossale engloutie dans les murs d’une seule prison n’est, bien entendu, plus disponible pour la Justice, qui est chroniquement sous-financée. Elle ne l’est pas non plus pour la prévention de la délinquance, ni pour la réinsertion des détenus. Il est désormais connu que la désocialisation qu’entraîne la privation de liberté sur les détenus, la coupure d’avec leur famille et la société, l’absence de programme de suivi et d’accompagnement ont des effets dévastateurs sur leurs capacités à se réinsérer dans la société, à trouver un emploi, un logement.

En Belgique, environ 50% des détenus récidivent, témoignage de l’échec cuisant de la prison comme peine de justice. L’enfermement devait dissuader la délinquance, or, elle est parfois l’école du crime.

---

2 Voir les données de l’Institut national de criminalité et criminaliste (INCC).
3 Soit 120 millions d’euros par an en moyenne, ou 7% du budget annuel de la Justice en 2016, qui rapporté au PIB est l’un des plus bas d’Europe.
La construction des nouvelles prisons, et de la méga-prison de Haren en particulier, nous met devant un choix de société. Rappelons que les prisons sont avant tout des prisons pour les pauvres. Pas parce que les pauvres commettent plus de délits, mais parce qu’ils sont davantage condamnés tout au long de la chaîne pénale. Le constat dressé dans le dernier rapport 2016 de l’Observatoire international des prisons de Belgique est sans appel : « la plupart des détenus possèdent une position socioéconomique faible. La plupart n’ont pas de diplôme. 30% seraient analphabètes, 45% n’auraient que leur CEB. Avec un parcours de vie empreint de ruptures avec les institutions premières d’inscription au sein de la société, que ce soit au niveau de la famille, de l’école ou du travail… ».

Pendant que des milliards sont engloutis dans les prisons du Masterplan, la pauvreté et la misère se sont aggravées à Bruxelles - huit des communes belges avec le plus bas revenu moyen du pays se trouvent toujours à Bruxelles - et aucune politique actuelle ne permet d’inverser cette tendance.

Nous n’avons pas besoin de plus de prisons, mais d’un projet de société qui donne une place digne à chacun, qui mette un terme à la misère et qui renforce les liens de solidarité. Plutôt qu’un énième « masterplan prisons, nous voulons un « masterplan justice et solidarité » capable d’offrir à tous un futur avec avenir.

Pour ces raisons, nous appelons à un moratoire immédiat sur la construction de toute nouvelle prison en Belgique. Nous appelons également à l’organisation d’états généraux citoyens de la prison pour tourner la page du désastre carcéral en cours.

**Oproep voor een moratorium op de bouw van nieuwe gevangenissen in België**


---

6 CAAP, Offre de services faite aux personnes détenues dans les établissements pénitentiaires de Wallonie et de Bruxelles, 2013-2014.
8 Zie de cijfers van het Nationaal Instituut voor Criminalistiek en Criminologie (NICC) [https://nicc.fgov.be/](https://nicc.fgov.be/)

De bouw van een mega-gevangenis in Haren (Brussel) is tekenend voor de vlucht vooruit. Die gevangenis moet de grootste worden in België, met een oppervlakte van 51.000 m² aan gebouwen en nog eens 15.000 m² supplementaire oppervlakte errond. Ze vernietigt zo één van de laatste grote groene ruimtes en akkerbouw van Brussel. De gevangenis zou bestaan uit acht eenheden en toelaten om 1.200 gevangenen op te sluiten. De totale kostprijs van Haren alleen, onderhandeld via een "publiek-privaat samenwerkingscontract" dat loopt over een periode van 25 jaar, wordt geschat op meer dan 3 miljard euro⁹. Deze kolossale som, die wordt verzwolgen door de muren van een gevangenis, is vanzelfsprekend niet langer beschikbaar voor Justitie, die al chronisch onder-gefinancierd is. Het bedrag is er evenmin nog om aan preventie of aan re-integratie va gevangenen te doen.

Het is nu alom bekend dat de gevangenis catastrofale effecten heeft. Ze veroorzaakt een breuk met de familie en de maatschappij en zorgt niet voor opvolging of re-integratie. In België bedraagt de graad van recidive zo’n 50 %¹⁰. Het cijfer getuigt van de rampzalige mislukking van de gevangenis als manier om aan ‘recht’ te doen. Opsluiting zou mensen moeten afbrengen van misdaad, terwijl men in de gevangenis vaak het vak kan leren.

De bouw van nieuwe gevangenissen, en die van de mega-gevangenis van Brussel in het bijzonder, stelt ons voor een maatschappelijke keuze. De gevangenissen zijn op de allererste plaats gevangenissen voor de armen. Niet omdat arme mensen meer misdaden plegen, maar omdat zij door het gehele strafstelsel als eerste geïsoleerd worden. De vaststelling in het rapport 2016¹¹ van het Observatoire international des prisons over België spreekt boekdelen: "de meeste gevangenen hebben een lage sociaaleconomische positie. De meesten hebben geen diploma, 30% is analfabeet, en 45% heeft alleen een getuigschrift van lager onderwijs". Hun leven zit vaak vol met breuken vanaf hun eerste contact met de instellingen, zowel op gezinsvlak, op school of op het werk ...¹³". Terwijl miljarden worden opgeslokt door de gevangenissen van het Masterplan, is de armoede en miserie in Brussel er alleen maar op verslechterd; de acht Belgische gemeenten met het laagste gemiddelde inkomen van het land bevinden zich nog steeds in Brussel en er is geen beleid dat deze trend zal ombuigen.

We hebben niet meer gevangenissen nodig, maar een samenlevingsproject dat aan iedereen een volwaardige plaats biedt. Een project dat een einde maakt aan armoede

---

⁹ Een gemiddelde van 120 miljoen euro per jaar, of 7% van het jaarbudget voor Justitie in 2016
en solidariteit versterkt. In plaats van een zoveelste "Masterplan voor de gevangenissen", willen we een 'Masterplan voor rechtvaardigheid en solidariteit" dat in staat is om aan iedereen een toekomst te bieden.

Om deze redenen roepen wij op tot een onmiddellijk moratorium op de bouw van nieuwe gevangenissen in België. We roepen op tot de organisatie van een Staten-Generaal van de burgers om de rampzalige pagina van het gevangeniswezen definitief om te draaien.

Call for a moratorium on the construction of new prisons in Belgium

The number of people incarcerated in Belgium doubled between 1980 and the 2000s, rising from 5 000 to more than 11 000. This carceral explosion cannot be explained by any rise in crime rates which remained stable over the period. It should instead be understood as an expression of the punitive turn that has affected most European countries since the 1970s and 80s. Successive governments have responded to the penal clampdown by constructing new prisons. In the space of 30 years, the number of prison cells has increased by 176%. In the last decade, new prisons have been built under the pretext of combatting prison overcrowding: in Ittre (2003), Hasselt (2005), Marche-en-Famenne (2013), Leuze-en-Hainaut (2014) and Beveren (2014). Yet, the rate of overpopulation in 2015 stood at 10%. On clear conclusion may be drawn: the more prisons we build, the more people we put in them.

The current government has stated that it wishes to build even more prisons: in Vresse-sur-Semois, Lantin, Verviers, Leopoldsburg, Wavre and Paifve. There are also plans to build prisons in Haren and Termonde but these constructions have so far been stalled due to popular opposition.

The construction of a mega-prison in Haren is emblematic of a kneejerk policy that is leading us towards disaster. This prison is intended to be the biggest in Belgium, with 51 000mm² of buildings and 15 000m² of outside space. It will destroy one of the last green spaces in Brussels. Made up of eight different blocks, it will imprison 1 200 people. The total cost of this mega-prison alone is estimated at 3 billion euros, to be paid off over 25 years under the terms of the public-private partnership that was negotiated away from the public spotlight. The colossal sum of money ploughed into the building of just one prison will not of course be available for the legal system which is chronically under-financed. Nor will it be available for crime prevention or rehabilitation initiatives. It is well-known that the desocialisation caused by confinement, the rupture with family and social ties, and the absence of adequate support and follow-up have catastrophic consequences on the ability of formerly incarcerated people to reintegrate into society, to find a job and a home.

---

14 See the statistics from the National Belgian Institute of Crime and Criminal Lawyers (l’Institut national de criminalité et criminaliste - INCC).
15 This represents about 120 million euros per year on average, or 7% of the annual budget for the Belgian Ministry of Justice in 2016 (the latter is one of the lowest in Europe as a percentage of GDP.)
In Belgium, approximately 50% of people who have been incarcerated reoffend\textsuperscript{16}, demonstrating the crushing failure of prison as a sentence. Far from turning people away from offending behaviour, the prison is often a school of crime.

The construction of new prisons, and of the Haren mega-prison in particular, forces us to take action as a society. It should be remembered that prisons are predominantly for the poor. This is not because the poor commit more crime, but because they are disadvantaged throughout the penal process. The conclusion reached by the International Prisons Observatory in its most recent report from 2016\textsuperscript{17} is unequivocal: “most prisoners have a weak socioeconomic position. Most of them have no qualifications. 30% are reported to be illiterate, 45% only have a basic primary-school diploma. Throughout their lives, they have had problems integrating into social institutions such as the family, school or work”\textsuperscript{18}.

Whilst billions are wasted on mega-prisons, poverty and hardship have got worse in Brussels – eight of the Belgian municipalities with the lowest average income in the country can be found in Brussels – and no current policy seems capable of reversing this trend.

We do not need more prisons but rather a genuine project of social transformation that gives a dignified place to all, which puts an end to hardship and which reinforces solidarity. Rather than yet another “prisons masterplan”, we want a “masterplan for justice and solidarity”, capable of offering all a better future.

For these reasons, we call for an immediate moratorium on the construction of any further prisons in Belgium. We also call for the organisation of citizens groups on imprisonment to allow us to turn the page on the carceral disaster that is unfolding before our eyes.

Signataires:
Merci d’envoyer votre NOM et votre FONCTION/PROFESSION par mail à Jean-Baptiste Godinot \textit{jbgodinot@rassemblement-r.be} et/ou Luk Vervaet \textit{vervaetluk@gmail.com}

Ondertekenaars:
Dank om uw NAAM en FUNCTIE/BEROEP via mail op te zenden naar Jean-Baptiste Godinot \textit{jbgodinot@rassemblement-r.be} en/of Luk Vervaet \textit{vervaetluk@gmail.com}

Signatories:
Please send your SURNAME and your PROFESSIONAL STATUS by e-mail to Jean-Baptiste Godinot \textit{jbgodinot@rassemblement-r.be} and/or Luk Vervaet \textit{vervaetluk@gmail.com}

\textsuperscript{17} http://oipbelgique.be/fr/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Notice-2016.pdf
b) France

Construction de nouvelles prisons : une politique qui mène droit dans le mur

Communiqué de presse interassociatif réagissant à l’annonce de la construction de 10 000 places de prison supplémentaires

69 375 : c’est le nombre de personnes qui étaient détenues dans les prisons en juillet dernier, la France atteignant ainsi des taux de détention inégalés depuis le 19e siècle. Contraignant 3 à 4 personnes à partager des cellules de 9m2 en maison d’arrêt et autour de 1 500 personnes à dormir chaque nuit sur des matelas posés au sol. Au mépris du principe de l’encellement individuel et de la dignité des personnes, près de 15 000 personnes sont en « surnombre » et une quarantaine de maisons d’arrêt connaissent un taux d’occupation de plus de 150%.

Pour y remédier, le gouvernement annonce la construction de 10 000 nouvelles places de prison pour l’horizon 2024. Une réponse ambitieuse et audacieuse ? Non, une vieille recette qui a déjà fait la preuve de son inefficacité et que les gouvernements successifs continuent pourtant de nous servir comme la seule solution pragmatique... restant sourds aux résultats de nombreuses études et statistiques qui la pointent au contraire comme inopérante, que ce soit pour endiguer la surpopulation carcérale ou pour réduire la récidive.

Que disent les chiffres ? Que depuis 25 ans, près de 30 000 places de prison ont été construites, un effort immobilier inédit entraînant une hausse de 60% du parc pénitentiaire. Sans effet cependant sur la surpopulation car dans le même temps, le pays a emprisonné toujours plus et de plus en plus longtemps, sous le coup de politiques pénales essentiellement répressives. Des politiques qui seraient rendues nécessaires par une insécurité grandissante, entend-on dire. Une idée reçue là aussi démentie par la réalité, le taux de criminalité étant globalement stable, les homicides et violences sexuelles ayant même diminué ces dernières années. En France comme ailleurs, la courbe du nombre de personnes détenues n’est pas tant liée à celle de la délinquance qu’aux choix de politiques pénales des gouvernants. Des politiques qui se sont concrétisées dans notre pays par l’allongement de la durée moyenne de détention et par une incarcération massive pour des petits délits, avec une augmentation de plus de 33% du nombre de détenus condamnés à des peines de moins d’un an de prison en cinq ans.

Surtout, construire plus de prisons, ce n’est pas mieux protéger la société. Au contraire. La prison produit ce qu’elle entend combattre : elle aggrave l’ensemble des facteurs de délinquance en fragilisant les liens familiaux, sociaux ou professionnels, favorise les fréquentations criminogènes, et n’offre qu’une prise en charge lacunaire – voire inexistante – face aux nombreuses problématiques rencontrées par la population carcérale en matière d’addiction, de troubles psychiatriques, d’éducation, de
logement, d’emploi, etc. Conséquence : 61% des personnes condamnées à une peine de prison ferme sont réincarcérées dans les cinq ans. Des chiffres qui tombent à 34 et 32% pour une peine alternative à la prison comme le travail d’intérêt général ou le sursis avec mise à l’épreuve. Tandis que les moyens manquent cruellement aux personnels et aux structures qui assurent l’accompagnement socio-éducatif et l’hébergement des sortants de prisons et personnes condamnées en milieu ouvert, le gouvernement prévoit d’injecter trois milliards d’euros supplémentaires aux cinq milliards déjà engloutis dans l’accroissement et la sécurisation du parc pénitentiaire en une décennie.

Où s’arrêtera cette fuite en avant carcérale ?

A l’heure où plusieurs de nos voisins européens ferment des prisons, où les États-Unis réalisent que l’incarcération de masse les a menés dans une impasse coûteuse et inefficace, la France, elle, fait le choix d’une continuité aux coûts économiques, sociaux et humains exorbitants. Pour lutter efficacement contre l’inflation de la population pénale et carcérale, c’est d’une politique pénale humaniste, ambitieuse et audacieuse, visant à investir massivement dans la prévention, l’accompagnement et le suivi en milieu ouvert, dont notre société a besoin.

Action des chrétiens pour l’abolition de la torture (ACAT-France)
Association national des juges de l’application des peines (ANJAP)
Association des secteurs de psychiatrie en milieu pénitentiaire (ASPMP)
Avocats pour la défense des droits des détenus (A3D)
Ban Public
CASP-ARAPEJ (Centre d’action sociale protestant – Association réflexion action prison et justice)
CGT-Insertion Probation
Citoyens et Justice
Emmaüs-France
Genevi
Ligue des droits de l’homme (LDH)
Observatoire international des prisons, section-française (OIP-SF)
Prison Insider
Secours catholique
Syndicat des Avocats de France (SAF)
SNEPAP-FSU
Socapsyleg
Syndicat de la magistrature (SM)
Press release: New prison builds: a project that spells disaster

Paris, 19 September 2016

69,375 people were detained in prison in France in July 2016, representing the highest rate of incarceration since the 19th Century. People are forced to share 9m2 cells with three or four others. Approximately 1,500 people are forced to sleep on mattresses directly placed on the floor. In total disregard for the principle of single cell occupancy and human dignity, certified normal prison capacity is exceeded by 15,000 people and over 40 jails hold 150% their capacity.

To tackle the problem, the government has announced the construction of 10,000 new prison places by 2024. Does this represent an ambitious and audacious response? Far from it: this age-old response has already proved ineffective, yet successive governments continue to sell it as the only pragmatic response regardless of the results of numerous studies and statistics which reveal it to be ineffective, whether in terms of tackling prison overcrowding or reducing rates of recidivism.

What do the figures tell us? Over the past 25 years, almost 30,000 prison places have been constructed, representing an unprecedented prison building drive and leading to a 60% increase in prison capacity. Yet, this has had no impact on overpopulation since France has simultaneously been imprisoning more people for longer periods of time as a result of increasingly repressive penal policies. It was often claimed that these policies were a response to a rise in crime. This is another popular misconception contradicted by reality: the crime rate has in fact stabilised in recent years and homicide and violent sexual crime has even fallen. In France, as elsewhere, the rate of imprisonment is not so much linked to the crime rate as to the penal policy choices of government. These policies have led to the lengthening of the average length of detention and the mass recourse to incarceration for minor offences – in just five years there has been an increase of over 33% in the number of people sentenced to less than a year in prison.

Above all, constructing more prisons will not better protect society. On the contrary, prison produces what it claims to cure: it exacerbates the causes of crime by weakening familial, social or professional bonds, it encourages offenders to associate with those who may have led them to commit crime in the first place, and it offers only the most basic assistance – if at all – to help incarcerated people tackle the numerous problems they face – addiction, psychiatric problems and difficulties finding work and accommodation on their release, for example. Consequently, 61% of people sentenced to prison are returned to prison within five years. These figures fall to 34% et 32% respectively for community sentences or probation. Whilst there are
chronic funding shortages for the personnel and the organisations that provide socio-
educational help and housing to people released from prison and for those under
supervision in the community, the government plans to pump a further 3 billion euros
into the prison estate, on top of the 5 billion already spent over the past decade.

When will this carceral disaster end?

At a time when several of our European neighbours are closing prisons, when the
United States has finally realised that mass incarceration has led them to a costly and
ineffective impasse, France has decided to adopt a policy of more of the same at an
exorbitant economic, social and human cost. To fight effectively against increased
criminalisation and the growth of the prison population, our society needs a penal
policy that is humanist, ambitious and audacious, that invests massively in
preventative measures and in providing assistance to offenders outside prison.
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Pressure mounts for immediate halt to prison building

On the 26th January 2017 The Guardian published a letter from the Reclaim Justice Network calling for an immediate halt to the government’s prison building programme. The statement, organised by the Network, has amassed more than fifty signatories from service delivery organisations, professionals, activists and academics.

A public meeting is to be organised to discuss the future of the building programme and the opportunities for building safe and healthy communities instead of prisons.

The letter printed in The Guardian can be read below.

Wednesday’s opposition day debate on prisons served to highlight the ongoing crisis in the system. At the same time, the government’s “prison-building revolution” is gathering pace, with plans to expand prison capacity by at least 10,000 places. This appears to be a revival of the “Titan prisons” policy opposed by penal reformers and mothballed in 2009. It should be halted immediately. For example, the new prison recently proposed for the site of HMP Wellingborough will more than treble its capacity to 1,600 and grand claims have been made about the opportunities that this will bring in terms of local jobs and financial investment. These plans are being rushed through without full public scrutiny and democratic debate.

The numbers of people criminalised and sent to prison have already spiralled out of control to a record high. Yet prisons do very little to address the needs of people experiencing harm or violence. Building more prisons is not the answer to the current acknowledged failings of the existing system. Rather than investing £1.3bn in building new prisons, the government should be prioritising policies that radically reduce the number of people in prison. This could include meaningful jobs, social housing, healthcare, education and transport – for all.

We are calling for an immediate moratorium on prison construction and a national debate about how to build a safer society and secure communities instead of continuing with a failed policy of criminal justice expansion. We need to build safe and healthy communities – not prisons.

Tom Kemp Reclaim Justice Network Professor Peter Squires British Society of Criminology Will McMahon Centre for Crime and Justice Studies Deborah Coles Inquest Andy Gregg Race on the Agenda Dr David Scott Open University Kate Paradine Women in Prison Jan Cunliffe Joint Enterprise Not Guilty by Association Jodie Blackstock Justice Dionne Nelson Women’s Resource Centre Chryssy Hunter Bent Bars Project Kevin Blowe Network for Police Monitoring Professor Phil Scraton Dr Sarah Lamble Birkbeck University Professor Pat Carlen Gina Stokes Anawim WWT Professor Joe Sim Pazuzu Gaylord Action for Trans Health Ian Marder Community of Restorative Researchers Margaret Gardener False Allegations Support Organisation Dennis Eady South Wales against Wrongful Conviction Kushal Sood Trent Centre for Human Rights Anny Darkwa Vision Housing Services Gerry McFlynn Irish Council for Prisoners Overseas

To receive updates, join the Reclaim Justice Network mailing list.

RECLAIM JUSTICE NETWORK: Social Justice Not Criminal Justice
https://downsizingcriminaljustice.wordpress.com/
IV. Prison, Detention and Punishment Working Group: 2013 Manifesto

1. This European working group provides a network and database for teachers, researchers, students and activists across Europe (and beyond) who have an interest studying prisons, detention and punishment. The working group will provide an opportunity to share our knowledge of sites of confinement and the operation of the penal rationale and help establish new links with activists and academics worldwide who critically engage with the current forms, extent and nature of detention and punishment. The working group will thus provide an opportunity to connect local campaigns with a wider global network through which we can collectively provide solidarity and support. The working group also aims to foster a greater understanding of contemporary penality; offer possibilities for collaborative research; and work towards emancipatory change. We recognise that, since the inception of the confinement project in the eighteenth century, the boundaries between different sites of detention have become increasingly blurred: prisons house foreign nationals and recalcitrant mental health patients; high security hospitals hold the ‘criminally insane’; immigration centres are run like prisons. The working group is committed to the abolition of penal confinement and other sites of involuntary detention. We also aim to challenge the logic and assumptions of the penal rationale and propose the development of non-repressive means of handling social problems and conflicts.

2. In many countries around the world there has been a proliferation in sites of confinement. More than ten million people are confined in prisons and many millions more are housed in other forms of detention. However, the rise of global hyper-incarceration and the analytical frameworks that underscore its assumptions have been challenged by a growing number of academics in their teaching and research, and by social workers, anti-prison activists, social justice-inspired social movements, members of the radical penal lobby, progressive members of the public, socialist politicians and students. An increasing number of organisations all around the globe are now directly challenging hyper-incarceration. The European working group aims to contribute to the development of abolitionist and anti-prison activism and to highlight the limitations of the current application of confinement. We acknowledge that the mobilisation of grass roots activists is absolutely necessary for any sustained radical transformation of current penal and social realities.

3. The working group aims to encourage members to formulate intellectual interventions and direct activism that can systematically expose the brutal realities of detention, penal confinement and community punishments and facilitate a reduction in the stigmatising effects and collateral consequences of
the application of the penal rationale. We recognise that it is essential that the experiences and voices of detainees are given a platform to air their views and that the brutal and inhumane realities of sites of confinement are brought to the attention of the wider public and those in positions of power. The working group supports the rights of activists and citizens, including those sections of the voluntary sector that are pursuing social justice and penal reductionism, to pursue their goals without domination by governmental or profit-making interests.

4. The working group prioritises the critical scrutiny of the justifications of the punitive rationale; punishment in the community, semi-penal institutions and probation hotels; and the wider moral and political contexts of the deliberate infliction of pain. The justification of detention of people in the interests of others should be critically scrutinised and located within its given social, economic, political and moral context. This does not mean we believe that nothing should be done, or that all forms of detention or deprivation of liberty are necessarily unjustified (especially those forms of detention provided for the best interests of the detainee), but rather that imprisonment and many forms of detention are an illegitimate response to wrongdoing, social harms and social problems. Sites of confinement fail to uphold human rights, meet the demands of social justice or provide transparent or accountable forms of state governance. The increasing reliance upon involuntary detention, prisons and other forms of detainment in recent times also draws attention to its very real threat to democracy. All forms of detention have faced consistently high death rates and intentional self injury; institutionalisation and disculturalisation; bullying and sexual violence; staff moral indifference; institutionalised racism; masculinist hierarchies of power; and broader vulnerabilities to systemic abuses through torture and inhuman and degrading treatment. What the different institutions also seem to share is an historical broad inability to satisfy the duty of care owed to those who they detain. We acknowledge also that detainees are predominantly poor, in bad physical and mental health, unemployed, and badly educated. It is the less fortunate, vulnerable and needy who are disproportionately detained and this draws direct connections with the need for a more socially just world.

5. The organisation of the European working group on prisons, detention and punishment is undertaken by a steering group that will consist of at least the following: a working group coordinator; the coordinator of the European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control; the secretary of the European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control. Members of the working group may also be invited to join a steering group. The working group will meet every year at the annual conference of the European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control and members are encouraged to organise other events, meetings and conferences throughout the calendar year to help generate ideas, networks and direct interventions. Such events may be full meetings for the whole working group or specially convened meetings of
local activists in one given region / nation. A separate mailing list will be maintained and other European Group media sources, such as facebook, youtube, twitter and crim-space, will be used to disseminate information about the working group and its activities. The working group coordinator will be elected at the European Group annual conference and full details of the membership of the working group will be detailed on our website www.europeangroup.org.

6. Members of the working group are committed to the reversal of the proliferation of sites of confinement and the utilisation of strategies drawing upon direct action and abolitionist praxis to facilitate radical penal and social transformations. Though strategies of engagement will vary from place to place depending upon local circumstances, we believe that to achieve our aims we must propose a number of direct interventions that are feasible here and now and that can exploit contradictions in the operation of penal power. We call for the following general interventions as a means to facilitate a long-term and radical reduction in the populations of those detained in sites of confinement.

i) An international moratorium on building new sites of confinement (prisons / asylums / immigration centres) and on the allocation of existing buildings and spaces as locations of involuntary detention

ii) An end to the privatisation of sites of confinement and the insidious expansion of the carceral state via the voluntary and private sector

iii) A detailed and critical interrogation of existing state detention, followed by a systematic call for governments to close the most inhumane, degrading and torturous sites of confinement without opening new houses of detention

iv) A virtual end to pre-trial detention and the abolishment of the antiquated notion of bail except for those who present a serious threat to society

v) The safeguarding and expansion of the legal rights of detainees. Post incarceration ex-detainees must be recognised as full citizens and given full and uninhibited access to employment, housing, other social and financial services and full access to political and civil society

vi) The decriminalisation of victimless and harmless acts, such as alcoholism, deviant sexualities between consenting adults, substance misuse and drug taking. The criminalisation of sex workers (who are often from working class backgrounds) is harmful and victimising and we propose alternative responses that protect and prioritise the safety of the men and women who engage in this work.

vii) The decriminalisation of infringements of migration laws

viii) To raise the age of criminal responsibility in all countries in the world to the age of at least 16

ix) To divert people with mental health problems, learning disabilities, severe physical disabilities, the profoundly deaf and people with suicidal ideation from the criminal process whilst at the same time ensuring any alternative
interventions are both ‘in place’ of a penal sanction and are not merely forms of ‘trans-incarceration’ to other sites of confinement

x) To immediately remove those people most vulnerable to the inherent harms and pains of confinement from places of detention

xi) To formulate and advocate radical alternatives to the criminal process and social injustices for individual and social harms that are feasible and could be implemented immediately or within a short period of time

xii) To propose that all governments prioritise meeting human need, recognising common humanity and facilitating social justice as the most effective means of preventing / dealing with human troubles, conflicts and problematic conduct
V. Justice, Power and Resistance: Critical Criminology
Volume 1, Issue 1 (April, 2017)

Editorial
‘Critical Criminology’

Articles
1. Vincenzo Ruggerio ‘Networks of greed’
2. Herman Bianchi ‘Abolition: Assensus and sanctuary’
3. Anne Alvesalo-Kussi and Liisa Lahteenmaki ‘Corporate criminal liability and abolitionism – An unholy alliance of corporate power and critical criminology?’
4. Massimo Pavarini ‘Strategy for combat: Prisoner’s rights and abolitionism’
5. Rosa Del Olmo ‘Limitations for the prevention of violence: The Latin American reality and its criminological theory’
6. Claudia Mantovan ‘Contested areas. Coexistence, conflict and governance in the districts near the railway stations of Padua and Mestre’
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1. Tammy Castle and Danielle McDonald ‘Intellectual activism and public engagement: Strategies for academic resistance’
2. Natacha Filippi The Birth of a Red Alarm Button: Against Institutional Violence in Barcelona – the SIRECOVI system’

Reflections
Justice, Power and Resistance ‘Thinking about justice’

Book Reviews
VI. CALL FOR PAPERS: Special Edition: Minorities, Crime and (In)justice

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

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.
In recent years the international academic community has made an effort to define and uncover harms by states, corporations and organizations. This effort is stemming from the point of view of protecting human rights and preventing social harms. These acts include loss of life, physical or other harm, and loss of property. The need for addressing harms by states, corporations and organizations is connected both with the need for appropriate orientation of formal criminal policy (law, police, administration of justice) and for the awareness of citizens, consumers, workers and social movements.

A root of the problem, the criminal-induced partnership between state, corporate capital, and organizations, does not lead to easy answers for a future “better” political management of the state. This raises issues of the advocacy of the public interest and universal human rights; it highlights the concept of social harm, and sets democracy and the collective as the dominant principles. This complex is the contemporary reality, and a criminology that takes a position upon this ought to highlight a broader social awareness and action for social change.

We welcome papers on the themes below which reflect the general values and Principles of the European Group. Please forward short abstracts of 150-300 words to the relevant stream coordinators by 26 May 2017.

For all general enquiries please contact Stratos Georgoulas at: s.georgoulas@soc.aegean.gr. For questions about the European Group, please contact the EG coordinator Ida Nafstad at: europeangroupcoordinator@gmail.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streams</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crimes of the Powerful Working Group Stream</strong></td>
<td>• Uncovering and examining harmful state-corporate relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilising Green/Eco-critical criminology to expose the crimes and harms of the powerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accountability in organisational, state and/or corporate crimes and harms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unmasking the crimes and harms of the powerful: new trajectories, developments, challenges and methodological concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Activism, protest and resistance endeavours seeking to reveal the crimes and harms of the powerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>“Special section”:</strong> This year we are seeking to have a special section within this stream dedicated to considering the current trajectories and developments in Turkey and we would particularly welcome papers to form a panel or specific stream related to the crimes and harms of the powerful in Turkey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-crash policing: developments and implications</strong></td>
<td>• Post-crash intensification of coercion and surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Policing the crisis in the European South: developments and comparisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capitalism, pacification and post-crash policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Containing the police counterattack: problems and prospects for police accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Citizens, activists, communities, movements: possibilities for resistance and alternative political programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social harm/Zemiology</strong></td>
<td>• Social harm an neo-liberal policies, developments, and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Financial crisis, recession and austerity and social harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poverty, inequality and social injustice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social harms relating to classism, sexism, heterosexuality, racism, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social harms arising from public/social policy (both in terms of interventions and the failure to act)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Theoretical/conceptual advances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Methodological advances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear and looting in the periphery: Approaching global crime and harm in (and from) the south(s)</strong></td>
<td>Criminological and socio-legal analysis of harmful and punitive processes under the current debtocratic regimes - 'approaching the South' or 'approaching a global conflict from the South'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main approaches</strong></td>
<td>• Critical perspectives and debates on the terms ‘peripheral’ and ‘South’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Categorising the ‘Souths’ through economic exceptionalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact: [samantha.fletcher@open.ac.uk](mailto:samantha.fletcher@open.ac.uk)

Contact for the special section: [emilia@aegean.gr](mailto:emilia@aegean.gr)

Contact: [g.papanicolaou@tees.ac.uk](mailto:g.papanicolaou@tees.ac.uk)

Contact: [C.Pantazis@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:C.Pantazis@bristol.ac.uk) [S.Pemberton.1@bham.ac.uk](mailto:S.Pemberton.1@bham.ac.uk)

Contact: [aleforero@ub.edu](mailto:aleforero@ub.edu) [rfaria@direito.up.pt](mailto:rfaria@direito.up.pt) [djf@unizar.es](mailto:djf@unizar.es) [ignasi.bernat@gmail.com](mailto:ignasi.bernat@gmail.com)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime and Social Harm in the Traditional or 'New' Debtocratic Colonies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common axes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Criminal' policies [production, regulation and administration of social harm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Penal'-punitive policies [management, control, prosecution and penalisation]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prison, Punishment and Detention Working Group Stream**

- Resistance to control and prison
- Immigration detention and forced removal
- Prison and surveillance
- Surveillance outside the prison
- Racism, Islamophobia and incarceration
- Semi-penal institutions
- Punishment and structural violence
- Gendered Violence in Prison

**PANEL: Resisting The Mega Prisons**

At the 45th Annual Conference this year in Lesvos we would like to organise a panel on "Resisting the mega prisons". The UK government announced in November 2015 that it planned to replace older Victorian prisons that are now situated on expensive inner-city land with up to nine new and much larger prisons. This 'prison building revolution' in the main is a cost cutting exercise as the new prisons will be much larger (mega prisons) and built on cheaper land.

The recently opened HMP Berwyn, in North Wales, which holds over 2,000 people, is one of the largest prisons in Europe and is expected to cost £14,000 p.a. per prisoner compared to over £34,000 for prisoners currently being held in prisons of the same category. The other new 'mega prisons' are likely to follow a similar model.

Although there has been little new information released since the announcement of the new "mega prisons" i 2015, the government is without doubt forging ahead with plans to increase capacity of the prison estate by 10,000 places and to replace older prisoners with new ones. In November 2016 it set aside £1.3 billion to transform the penal estate. Two new prison sites have been identified in Wellingborough and Leicester and plans submitted to local councils. There is, however, grass roots resistance to the new mega prisons involving a coalition of abolitionist inspired groups. Resistance has included direct actions, noise demos, public meetings and media engagement to highlight the harms of the prisons and to discover where the other new prisons are likely to be situated. Local groups have risen up across the UK wherever plans for new mega prisons have been mooted.

We would like to take this opportunity to invite academics and activists to participate in a "Resisting the mega prisons" panel. We would like to hear stories of resistance, strategies for blocking planning and construction and ways of mobilising community action.
Call for Contributions

Sixth GERN Doctoral Summer School on Deviance, Crime and Social Control

To be held in Padua, Italy – 6-8 September 2017

The sixth GERN Summer School for doctoral students will take place in Padua (Università degli Studi di Padova, Italy) from Wednesday 6 September to Friday 8 September 2017. It will be organised by the Department of Philosophy, Sociology, Education and Applied Psychology (FISPPA) - University of Padua, and by the First-level Short Specialisation degree in Critical Criminology and Social Security.

Who is it for?
Research students undertaking doctoral research on deviance, crime and social control. This is an opportunity to present your research, have it discussed by leading European researchers and, if selected, published in an edited book. The summer school is probably most suited to research students in their second and third years. The summer school’s orientation is interdisciplinary: doctoral research projects from history, sociology, criminology, political science or other social science disciplines are welcome. The working language of the Summer School is English.

What does it include?
- Presentations and discussion of research by doctoral students
- Lectures and discussion sessions with leading European researchers
- An opportunity to learn about criminology around Europe and meet other doctoral students
- An opportunity to submit your revised paper for publication
What does it involve?
Doctoral students will need to send a detailed abstract of their paper (two pages setting out their theoretical framework, concepts and research findings/research plans), together with a letter of engagement from their supervisor, agreeing to help them, by 15 May 2017. We can admit up to about 24 students – initial acceptance will be made known by 1 June 2017. Those students who have been initially accepted will need to send their paper to be discussed at the summer school, of some 6,000 words (in English) by 15 July 2017 and final acceptance will be on receipt of the paper.

Abstracts, letters and papers should be sent electronically to [francesca.vianello@unipd.it], to [claudia.mantovan@unipd.it] and to [daniel.ventre@cesdip.fr].

What does it cost?
Students (or their institutions) will need to bear the cost of their own travel to Padua and accommodation and subsistence in Padua. Detailed Information will be provided later.

The cost of the conference will be 60 euros for students whose institution is member of GERN (and 140 euros for students whose institution is not a member of GERN), which will include tea and coffee, lunches and an informal dinner for all the participants on one night.

UK

The impact of colonialism on UK criminology, 10th May 2017
This event will consider the relationship between Britain's colonial empire and the development of criminology in the United Kingdom.

Please register here:
https://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/civicrm/event/info?reset=1&id=147

ABOUT THE EVENT
The relationship between Britain's colonial project and the landscape of contemporary British society has become a subject of greater interest in recent years to both researchers and social activists. One aspect of this is a growing understanding of how colonialism and slavery impacted on the development of the criminology in the colonial heartland. This event will seek to develop this discussion by focusing on three interrelated questions:
• How did colonialism shape criminology?
• How was criminology used as a tool of colonial rule?
• How is this subject relevant to the criminal justice system in the metropole?
SPEAKERS
- Wayne Morrison, Queen Mary University of London: 'British criminology and its forgotten other: Criminology’s silent colonialism.'
- Mark Brown, The University of Sheffield: 'Criminology on the Indian subcontinent: A novel form or ‘derivative discourse’?'
- John Moore, Newman University Birmingham: 'Can contemporary criminology be decolonised?'

WHO MIGHT BE INTERESTED
This cross-disciplinary event will be of interest to: anti-racist activists, sociologist, legal theorists, historians and criminologists.

EVENT FEE
There is no fee for this event and all are welcome, regardless of income. We are encouraging voluntary donations from those who can afford it to cover the cost of event organisation.
This seminar is hosted by Birkbeck Criminology Department.

VENUE, TIME AND DATE
May 10th, 2017 12:30 PM to 4:00 PM
Room M421, Birkbeck College, Torrington Square, London, WC1E 7HX
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