

ANZSOC Newsletter

Volume 3, Issue 2 October 2006

From the desk of the President



There is a lot of news to report since my last column in February 2006.

A vital and pleasing Presidential role is facilitating the ANZSOC Prize awards. My thanks and appreciation to the chairs and members of the Awards

Committees for 2006, and my congratulations to the award winners, who were formally announced at the ANZSOC conference in Hobart (see story below).

In October 2005, then President Don Weatherburn put forward ANZSOC's nomination of John Braithwaite, Australian National University, for the Stockholm Prize in Criminology. Late in March 2006, we learned that John was awarded the Stockholm Prize, along with Friedrich Lösel, University of Cambridge. I am sure that every Society member would wish to join me in congratulating John for his outstanding and well-deserved achievement. (See story below).

At the 2005 AGM, Tony Krone was elected Secretary, as Russell Smith stepped down, after serving three years with tremendous dedication, skill, and knowledge. But late in January 2006, Tony had to step down to take a post in the Solomon Islands. Damon Muller was appointed Acting Secretary in Hobart. At the 2006 AGM in September, Damon was officially elected Secretary. It has been a pleasure working with Damon, who brings a fresh perspective to how ANZSOC business is conducted. Among other things, he has proposed a more streamlined way for people to become members of the Society, and he has identified areas to monitor membership benefits. His ideas, in part, have prompted changes to the Society's rules.

At the Special General Meeting in Hobart in February 2006, I called upon all the Committee of Management members to take an active role in the Society and to work with me in increasing the Society's size, revenues, stature and impact, and professionalisation. I have introduced several major initiatives.

New Agenda

The following proposals and allocations of ANZSOC funds were discussed and approved at the Committee of Management meeting in August 2006:

- The Office of Secretary to be supported by one day per week administrative officer
- Support for a one-day workshop for students and early career researchers to be held in conjunction with the conference, to begin in Adelaide 2007 (this would be in addition to the graduate seminars, but these have been reduced from six to two per year)

- Support for a Society Speaker, to begin at the Adelaide conference in 2007

Increasing our professionalisation and stature will require an increase in revenues. The sources of revenue generation are membership fees, journal royalties, and conference profits. I have identified these tasks to move the Society forward:

(1) Appointing a Membership Strategy Sub-Committee to canvass our options in taking a more pro-active approach to membership, in identifying a membership structure with variable costs and benefits, and in increasing the size of our membership

(2) Appointing a Student and Early Career Researchers Sub-Committee to consider activities to further the development and networking of our students and early career researchers. In addition to the proposed one-day workshop and graduate seminars, there will be a new position on the Committee of Management, a person to represent student and early career interests.

(3) Reviewing our website to facilitate on-line membership (new and renewing) and to offer more benefits to our members (such as a directory of members).

(4) Identifying an institutional sponsor (or sponsors) to support a Society Speaker, a person who would give a plenary address at the Annual Conference and at several cities (or other places) in Australia and New Zealand. In the interim, I have proposed a Society Speaker for the Adelaide conference in September 2007, in consultation with the Conference Convenors. The speaker is Mark Finnane.

The proposed changes and agenda for change have grown out of discussions I have had with members of the Long-Term Planning Sub-Committee, which I chair (the members are Russell Smith, Allan van Zyl, and Paul Mazerolle). I presented them to Society members at the September 2006 AGM in Canberra. (cont.)

Contents

President's report	1
Secretary's report	2
ANZSOC activities	3
ANZSOC Conference perspectives	3
British Society of Criminology	5
Stockholm Criminology Prize	5
Background to ANZSOC conferences	6
Conference photos	6
Member profile: John Braithwaite	7
Student research profiles	8
ANZJCrIm Editor's report	9
What's happening in criminology?	10
ANZSOC Awards 2006	11
Government reports	12
ANZSOC officers	13
2007 ANZSOC Conference	14

Changes to the Rules

A number of changes to the Rules were discussed and approved at the Committee of Management meeting in August 2006. They were unanimously approved at the AGM in Canberra. The changes were made for these reasons: (1) to increase the representation on the Committee of Management to include the Newsletter editor and a person to represent the interests of students; (2) to give the Committee greater flexibility in establishing the membership structure and fees; (3) to streamline the process of becoming a member (by permitting the Secretary to approve new members) and to use language that anticipates electronic mechanisms for new and renewing members; (4) to offer pro-rata fees for new members, to limit benefits only to paid members, and to strike those from the membership registry who have not paid fees for 24 months (although they may re-join); and (5) to respond effectively to vacancies amongst the Office Holders by permitting the Committee to appoint a member of the Society, not just a member of the Committee, to fill a vacancy.

All of us in the Society are indebted to Russell Smith for his time and care in preparing the documents, and within a short period of time, for vote at the 2006 AGM.

The proposed changes are then approved by our regulator. I understand the revised rules were approved by the Victorian Registrar of Incorporated Associations on 10 October 2006.

Why change?

At the Hobart Special General Meeting in February, Jackie Fitzgerald of BOCSAR asked an important question, why would the Society want to increase its revenues and become larger?

My response is that the Society cannot continue to operate, nor contemplate expanding, by relying on the voluntary labour of already overworked professionals. We must take a professionalized approach in all the activities we undertake and are expected to undertake. Further, I know that we can have a larger impact. Ultimately, my longer term goal (10 or 15 years) is that the Society has an Executive Director, whose task is to manage all the Society's administrative and membership work, including the running of the Annual Conference. The initiatives, discussed above, are one step in a 3- to 5-year plan of change.

In the past several years, the Society has operated on a conservative model of spending only the interest on our term of deposit. Now it is time to invest in a plan for future growth, with a vision of what the Society can be. I would like to see the Society, the Annual Conference, and the Journal have a stronger and more visible presence in criminology and in public affairs, and for the Society to take a leadership role in bringing along the next generation of researchers, lecturers, and policymakers in our field.

Kathleen Daly, President, ANZSOC

Secretary's Report

The last couple of months have been pretty busy in the office of the Secretary. The membership renewal notices were sent out in June, and have been steadily streaming in ever since. If your renewal is due and you haven't quite got around to sending it in yet, please do so (we don't charge late fees, but if you leave it too long you may miss an issue of the journal). If you're unsure about the status of your membership, just drop me an email to check. We've also had a bunch of new people join (many of whom are students, which is always good to see), and a few leave (mostly people retiring from the field). Overall, however, we are having a strong growth in membership numbers.

The Committee of Management will have met twice by the time you read this: once at the Conference in Hobart in February and then virtually via conference call in August. The minutes of these meetings and the September AGM will be available on the ANZSOC web site.

Probably the most important work the Committee has been undertaking from my perspective is streamlining the process of joining the Society. We are also exploring the options for joining and renewing membership online and an ANZSOC email mailing list. In the absence of our own mailing list (and even in the eventual presence of it), we encourage ANZSOC members to sign up to the University of Sydney's CrimNet mailing list (email Crimnet@janus.law.usyd.edu.au). It is low-traffic and of high relevance for those interested in criminology.

Damon Muller, Secretary, ANZSOC

ANZSOC Activities in Criminology

Review of the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research

The Professional Affairs and Ethics Sub-committee, chaired by Russell Smith, prepared a submission on this Review. The Sub-Committee raised six areas of particular relevance to criminological research in Australia and New Zealand at present. These were:

1. The definition of human research, especially the extent to which research involving public source material should be included, the extent to which research using de-identified data should be included, the extent to which qualitative research is included, and the scope of the exception relating to administrative agency auditing processes and routine testing;
2. The application of the Statement to government departments and consultants in the private sector, and how to negotiate restrictions on the publication of privately-funded research;
3. The chilling effect on research of communicating to subjects information about low level risks associated with the disclosure demands made by courts and law enforcement agencies, and the balance between risks and benefits where illegal activity is exposed;
4. How researchers should deal with situations in which research could involve them in criminal liability, particularly from witnessing or being present during the commission of crimes by research subjects;
5. The problem of multi-site research and how to ensure that research is not unnecessarily reviewed by multiple HRECs with respect to the same substantive ethical issues; and
6. The difficulties of justifying covert or partially covert research.

A written submission was presented to the Chair of the Review on 31 March 2006 and the Joint Working Group is considering all the submissions at present. It is hoped that the final document, to be called the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, will provide a valuable tool for use by Australian researchers in their continued efforts to maintain high standards of research integrity.

Matters for future examination will include the need to review how Human Research Ethics Committees (HRECs) are making use of the new Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, ways of providing advice and assistance to criminological researchers about issues of concern, and the extent to which criminological research may be being impeded by HRECs.

Russell Smith
Vice-President, ANZSOC

Conference Perspectives

Perspectives on the 19th Annual Conference of the Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology Conference held in Hobart at the Wrest Point Conference Centre in February 2006

Report by Amber McLean

Amber McLean (Institute of Criminology, Victoria University of Wellington) won the ANZSOC Student Paper Prize for her paper, 'The Legality of Humanitarian Intervention in Cases of Genocide: The Right or the Wrong Side of the Thin Red Line?', under the supervision of Elizabeth Stanley.



ANZSOC President Kathleen Daly presents Amber McLean with her ANZSOC Student Paper Prize at the Hobart Conference.

It was a huge surprise when Kathy Daly told me that I had won the Student Paper Prize and would be given free registration for the ANZSOC conference in Hobart. I had never been out of New Zealand, and so had to hastily arrange a passport. On arrival at my accommodation I made the hotel manager laugh when I asked whether I needed to watch out for spiders and snakes!

The Conference was an amazing experience for me as a not-long-finished Honours student. To be able to see people like Penny Green in person, for example, and hear her speak, especially after writing a book review of her work, was quite inspiring. That is not to take anything away from the wonderful lecturers at Victoria University, and I would like to acknowledge my Honours lecturers - Philip Stenning, John Pratt, Jan Jordan and Lizzy Stanley - for encouraging and assisting me to reach my potential, and especially Philip and Lizzy for being so generous with their time when I needed to edit the submissions for the ANZSOC award competition.

I was a student volunteer and member of Philip Stenning's 'Sunshine Team' for the 2005 Wellington Conference, but it was an infinitely more pleasurable and relaxing experience to be able to attend whichever sessions I pleased in Hobart. Here are some of the sessions that stood out for me (and apologies to the presenters if I have taken something other than you intended from your papers):

- As a lawyer, I found the sub-plenary with Justice Slicer and Judge White on the topic of human rights and the judiciary very refreshing and insightful - perhaps they felt they could be more candid in the company of socially progressive criminologists. Justice Slicer emphasised the need to avoid overdefining human rights. He also highlighted/ explored the tension between states using human rights to support their arguments for more restrictive legislation (such as post 9/11 security measures) and academics/civil society using human rights rhetoric to defend their liberal stances. Both men spoke with passion about the importance of an independent judiciary in a free and democratic society.
- Chris Cunnen's presentation on aboriginal art as a critique of human rights abuses and the law was very interesting from the perspective of a Kiwi. Chris posed some pertinent questions for critical criminology: what values do we attach as criminologists to certain types of knowledge? do we privilege certain types of discourse?
- Having been carefully (but none too subtly) guided by Philip Stenning towards a focus on private policing at Honours level, the 'Policing and Governance' session held particular interest for me. Peter Grabosky and Julie Ayling spoke about public police outsourcing both the provision and financing of certain services, while Rick Sarre posed challenging questions on the grey area that is the powers of private police.
- I should also mention what a pleasure it was to have the Governor invite us all to his majestic residence for drinks on the first night, and what an entertaining spectacle the Conference dinner turned out to be!

I did manage to cram one 'touristy' event into my brief visit - I made sure to stop off at the historic Richmond jail, and bought souvenirs and took photos. But the whole Conference really was such special event. I met a wide range of people, from academics, to Judges, to Police, to Ombudsmen, and all in the spectacularly picturesque setting of the Wrest Point Casino. And while I managed to restrain myself from having a flutter on the tables this time, I may not fare as well in Adelaide. See you there!



*The ANZSOC Management Committee at Hobart
Back L-R: Rick Sarre, Paul Mazerolle, Frank Morgan,
Matthew Willis, Russell Smith, Allan Van Zyl.
Front L-R: Bronwyn Naylor, Kathleen Daly, Jan
Jordan, Damon Muller, Julia Davis, Christine Bond*

Conference Perspectives

Report from David Indermaur, UWA.

Most Australian criminologists look forward to attending the ANZSOC conference, not least to catch up with friends and colleagues and to become familiar with what is happening under the broad banner of criminology in Australasia. ANZSOC conferences are generally good fun and each one is different; the conference organized in February by Rob White and Kate Warner was perhaps one of the most different yet.

This first Tasmanian ANZSOC conference put its theme of human rights at centre stage through its choice of plenary speakers. Views differ on the merits of focusing our conferences on a theme. A key characteristic of criminology is its multidisciplinary nature, and choosing to focus too strongly in one area risks alienating some of our colleagues. Few however would disagree that human rights is a direction that should be endorsed. To add to this unique focus the conference was held in possibly the most beautiful setting of any ANZSOC conference yet. Hobart is a jewel with its wonderful natural backdrop of mountain and sea. Rob White, Kate Warner and their team did a great job in planning and running the conference, and the Wrest Point Resort was a good venue: everything worked and the facilities were first class. Importantly (for conference participants are somewhat like prisoners in this respect) the food was great.

Another interesting aspect of the first Tasmanian ANZSOC conference was the overlap with the International Conference of Penal Abolitionists (ICOPA). A flood of new characters from that conference appeared on the last day of the ANZSOC conference. For me this provided an unexpected and welcome opportunity to hear one of the great names in critical criminology, Hal Pepinsky, who is obviously on a journey to practice what he preaches in terms of an inclusive and peacemaking criminology. For me this was a highlight of the conference.

What's happening in Criminology in Australia?

Tell us about your conferences, seminars, visiting criminologists, conferences you've attended, student papers, great websites etc. for inclusion in future editions of ANZSOC Newsletters
Email: bronwyn.naylor@law.monash.edu.au

British Society of Criminology Glasgow 2006



Rick Sarre, Philip Stenning, Andrew Goldsmith in Glasgow

The conference this year was held in July at Glasgow Caledonian University. For those of us giving up our winters to attend, the sun did shine through much of the conference. Indeed, some of the Antipodean participants were even complaining about the heat!

The event was well attended. Criminology in the UK is in rapid growth mode: schools and programs are springing up across the country, and the papers seem to be dominated by job opportunities for budding criminologists. The conference opened with a re-launch of *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, now the official journal of the British Society of Criminology.

There were two plenary sessions; the first with Loraine Gelsthorpe (Cambridge) and Richard Sparks (Edinburgh), and the second with Clive Norris (Sheffield) and Kelly Hannah Moffat (Toronto). Gelsthorpe asked 'What is criminology for?' while Sparks re-visited the theme of legitimacy. Norris looked at the issue of surveillance, and Moffat considered the 'conceptual architecture' of risk based penalty. There were some lessons here for future plenary speakers and conference organizers, as well as for the audience. One plenary was marred by an apparent lack of preparation by one speaker, another by problems with the technology and a near stoush between the plenary speaker and the session chair over the time available to speak!

The social side of the conference went well. There was a civic reception at the Glasgow City Chambers, presided over by the Lady Mayor of Glasgow. Those who attended the dinner at the Old Fruitmarket enjoyed themselves, while the conference dinner at the Thistle Hotel featured a Ceilidh, a Scottish kind of dancing opportunity.

There were the usual grumbles from those staying in university accommodation about the relative starkness of the rooms. The food provided at the conference was pretty standard UK conference fare; not a lot of choice, but for those of us with longer UK memories, better than it used to be. Those of us giving papers had a patchy experience with the technology available to panel presenters. Personal charisma and oral dexterity were more important for successful presentations than ever.

Andrew Goldsmith, Flinders University

Stockholm Criminology Prize

Arriving in Stockholm late on a warm summer night is a special experience, with the sun low in the sky until nearly midnight and a soft blue light through the night making it feel like an endless late afternoon. The city is extraordinarily beautiful, built on 14 islands with majestic buildings lining its waterfronts and countless quays hosting boats of all descriptions. It was a majestic setting for the inaugural Stockholm Prize in Criminology and Symposium in June 2006.

The Symposium was opened in the Aula Magna at Stockholm University. Delegates from some 40 countries were welcomed by officials including the Swedish Minister for Justice. There was a solid contingent of Australian criminologists including one of the two prize winners, Professor John Braithwaite from ANU. Later in the day, he and fellow prize winner Professor Friedrich Lölösel of Cambridge University delivered addresses to the Symposium on their research, focusing on the work that had so impressed the international prize jury: Braithwaite on restorative justice and responsive regulation, Lölösel on the effectiveness of correctional treatments.

The pinnacle of the three-day event was undoubtedly the Stockholm Prize ceremony and dinner in the Blue Room of the City Hall, a magnificent building which is also the venue for the annual Nobel Prize ceremony. Justice Minister Thomas Bodström presented plaques to the two prize winners, who made eloquent speeches recognising their academic colleagues and the prize sponsors. Professor Braithwaite made particular mention of the warm and collegial environment of both the ANU and ANZSOC.

In the words of Professor Lawrence Sherman, co-chair of the prize jury, the award recognised the best of what criminology has to offer. The recognition of two criminologists with quite different backgrounds and approaches was also noted, with Braithwaite having formulated and refined a number of highly innovative criminological theories and Lölösel having pursued systematic empirical research on the effectiveness of correctional treatment. The two share a prize amount of 1 million Swedish Kronor (\$AU 180,000).

The Stockholm Criminology Prize and Symposium now holds a special place in the calendar of criminological meetings and will continue to do so annually. It was a great experience to attend the inaugural event.

Gregor Urbas, Australian Institute of Criminology



John Braithwaite receiving his award in Stockholm

The Background to ANZSOC Conferences - where they began

The 20th ANZSOC conference to be held in Adelaide in September 2007 will be a milestone in the history of the Society, but may prompt the question: why have we had only 20 annual conferences during the nearly 40 years that the Society has been existence?

The answer can be found by perusing the Society's website (www.anszoc.org). We can see the development of the Society in three phases. The first phase lasted from the inaugural meeting of the Society in 1967 to around 1974. During this period the principal challenge, and achievement, of the Society was to publish a scholarly journal four times a year, under the editorship of Dr Allen Bartholomew.

The Society held biennial general meetings which nearly always included a guest speaker, and other occasional meetings were held to take advantage of the visits of significant criminologists. The annual Barry Memorial lecture was established in 1972, administered by the University of Melbourne. The presentation of Barry medals to outstanding students was included a few years later.

These developments were welcomed by members but there were increasing requests for opportunities to meet with other criminologists from around Australia and New Zealand.

The second phase, from 1975 to 1984, saw the Society take the first steps towards conducting conferences by aligning itself with the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science (ANZAAS). A new section of their congress was designated for Criminology and Forensic Sciences, which were held in locations around Australia.

Members participated in the ANZAAS congresses, presenting papers and joining in the discussions, but few thought this arrangement was a satisfactory alternative to a dedicated criminology conference such as held by the American Society of Criminology.

The Society's third phase began with the first annual conference in Melbourne in 1985. The conference organiser was Christine Alder; she was no doubt relieved to report back to the Executive of the Society that the conference had been a success and had, in fact, returned a profit to the Society of \$121.70. Later conferences, held in virtually every Australian capital city and in New Zealand, have generally been considerably more profitable than that!

Our journal is extremely useful and highly readable, but some Society members may regard the annual ANZSOC conferences as the most rewarding aspect of membership. There is no doubt we have come a long way from the early days of nearly four decades ago.

See you in Adelaide in September 2007.

David Biles, Consultant Criminologist and Professorial Associate, Charles Sturt University
The author gratefully acknowledges the advice of John Myrtle and John Dawes in the preparation of this article.

Conference photos



Thanks to Natasha Bouhours for the conference photography. For more photos see <http://www.anszoc.org/conferences/2006/>

Member Profile: John Braithwaite

The ANZSOC Newsletter profiles people currently influencing Australian and New Zealand criminology. The Editor and Communications Sub-Committee welcome suggestions for subjects for future issues.

This edition profiles John Braithwaite, ARC Federation Fellow and Professor, Regulatory Institutions Network (RegNet), Research School of Social Sciences at the Australian National University, and a past vice-president of ANZSOC (1991 - 1996).

John Braithwaite is one of Australia's best known criminologists and is considered by many as a leading scholar in the fields of restorative justice and responsive regulation. A second-time Federation Fellow, John is the founder and a researcher at the Regulatory Institutions Network (RegNet) within the Research School of Social Sciences at the Australian National University in Canberra. He has developed his theory on restorative justice and responsive regulation through research in a wide range of fields such as business and white-collar crime, juvenile and adult 'traditional' crimes, coal mine safety, nursing homes and global peacekeeping.

John Braithwaite was born and raised in Ipswich, Queensland. He studied Arts with Psychology and Anthropology majors at the University of Queensland where he completed his PhD in Sociology. After a period of teaching and a postdoctoral Fulbright Fellowship in the University of California, Irvine, John received a criminologist position at the AIC. During the 1980's he was appointed Director of the Australian Federation of Consumer Organizations, before joining the Research School of social Sciences at the ANU. John says that he does not consider himself an anthropologist or sociologist (the disciplines in which he was trained), nor as a criminologist (the discipline that adopted him), but rather a committed interdisciplinary social scientist.

John has published numerous books and hundreds of journal articles. Among his books, to name only a few, are *Markets in Vice, Markets in Virtue* (2005), *Restorative Justice and Responsive Regulation* (2002); and *Crime, Shame and Reintegration* (1989). For his work, John has won numerous international prizes. In 2002 he won the Sutherland Prize of the American Society of Criminology for lifetime research contributions in criminology. In 2004 he and Peter Drahos won, for their book *Global Business Regulation*, the Grawermeyer Prize of US\$200,000 for Ideas for Improving World Order, the most distinguished prize in international relations after the Nobel Peace Prize. John was also awarded the highest honour of the Law and Society Association in the US, the Kalven Prize, in 2004. In 2005 he was awarded the International Society of Criminology's highest honour the Prix Emile Durkheim, and indeed was described in the Prize citation as 'The New Durkheim'. Recently, John was the inaugural winner of 2006 Stockholm Prize in Criminology with Friedrich Lösel, for 'outstanding achievements in criminological research or for the application of research results by practitioners for the reduction of crime and the advancement of human rights'.

In addition to his research work, John has been active for 30 years in social movement politics in Australia and internationally, such as the social movement for restorative justice, the consumer movement, the peace movement and development NGOs. He has been a consultant to many regulatory agencies, served from 1983-7 as a member of the Economic Planning Advisory Council was chaired by the Prime Minister, was a Part-time Commissioner with Australia's national antitrust and consumer protection agency between 1985 and 1995 and served as a member of the Council on Business Regulation (1994-1996) which reported directly to Cabinet on a review of all laws which impose a regulatory impact on business.

John is married to Valerie Braithwaite, a renowned researcher herself, and has two children, Ben (24) and Sari (21). But John says that his life really revolves around his dog. He takes his dog for a run every morning ('do you run too?' I asked him, 'slowly' he replied, 'some people would call it walking'). Colleagues who live nearby have seen people walk past him whilst he is running (he comments these are probably athletes training for walking competitions!).

One of the less known facts about John is his dedication to his students. He often says that he regards his students as central to his job - and acts accordingly. The student dinners at the Braithwaites used to be an annual highlight when he was Head of RegNet, when PhD students in the program enjoyed his ravioli and Val's hospitality. John invests much of his time supporting his students' work: he reads drafts very quickly, and typically has constructive, detailed comments. How is it possible for someone who publishes a monograph every two years on average and is constantly writing and researching to be such an effective supervisor as well? One answer is that he is a workaholic. John rarely reads novels and does not appreciate popular entertainment (except rugby, of course). Professional literature is what he reads for pleasure, sometimes until 3am, and a colleague commented that while they were sitting in front of a beautiful bay in a distant country, after a long day of interviewing people for a research project, all John could talk about was the project.

John's next big project (on which he is planning to work for the next two decades or so - this is how he plans his agendas), is world peacebuilding. Based on field work in war-torn cultures he will develop his ideas on the application of restorative justice and responsive regulation at the macro level.

By Tali Gal. Tali is a postdoctoral fellow at RegNet, and was a doctoral student under John Braithwaite's supervision. Her thesis title was 'Victims to Partners: Child Victims and Restorative Justice'.



John and his dog Harry

The ANZSOC Newsletter profiles student research



Rebecca Wickes: Moving Beyond Social Capital? Collective Efficacy and the Relative Role of Social Ties in Urban Communities

I am a PhD student at the School of Criminology at Griffith University, under the supervision of Associate Professor Lorraine Mazerolle

(Principal Supervisor) and Professor Kathy Daly and Professor Ross Homel (Associate Supervisors). I am in the final stretch of my candidature and will be submitting my thesis in December 2006.

I attended the University of Queensland, graduating with a Bachelor of Arts with a double major in Psychology and a Bachelor of Social Science with 1st Class Honours. I was awarded the John Western TASA (The Australian Sociology Association) Sociology Prize for the Highest Fourth Year Result in Sociology and the University Medal for Outstanding Academic Achievements.

I joined Griffith University in 2003 under the tutelage of Lorraine Mazerolle. My research interests tied neatly into Mazerolle's ARC Linkage project that examines community capacity across 82 local areas in the Greater Brisbane Statistical Division. The project partners include the Department of Communities, the Queensland Police Service, the Office of Economic and Statistical Research, the University of Queensland and Harvard University. My PhD project is also supported by the Queensland Department of the Premier and Cabinet through the *Growing the Smart State* PhD Research Funding Program.

My research unpacks social processes that lead to collective responses to crime and social disorder in Brisbane communities. It comprises two main studies. The first study examines the relationship between social capital, collective efficacy and crime and examines the spatial dynamics of these constructs and their relationship to crime across the 82 Statistical Local Areas. The second study is about particular community processes that promote or constrain collective action. Central to this study has been an examination of the collective belief systems that affect a community's ability to generate and sustain effective responses to crime and disorder. My research asks whether feelings of trust and a belief in the ability of others to intervene for the common good are predominantly influenced by the community or if (and how) wider social, political and economic influences affect these perspectives.

My PhD student experience has been extremely positive. I have been given many opportunities to present my work nationally and internationally in New Zealand, Canada, the U.K. and the U.S. Most importantly, I have had an excellent supervisory team that has supported my development as an early career academic. Once the PhD is submitted, I want to continue my research into community dynamics and the spatial distribution of crime. I only hope the first job can live up to the PhD experience!



Sanja Milivojevic: Sex Trafficking in Serbia and Australia

I am a PhD candidate at Monash University in the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology, supervised by Dr Sharon Pickering and Dr Dean Wilson. I hold a BA and MA from Belgrade University Law School.

I have been a member of several human rights and women's rights non-governmental organisations, and one of the founders of the Victimology Society of Serbia, an NGO that established one of the first Victim Support Services in the Balkan region. In 2001-2002, I was a Public Interest Law Fellow at Columbia University Law School, USA. One of my interest areas is trafficking in women and, after contact with two amazing scholars, Dr Christine Adler and Dr Sharon Pickering, I came to Australia and applied at Monash.

Although identified as a growing problem in the mid-nineteenth century, trafficking in people garnered increased attention by the international community since the early 1990s. It has increasingly been referred to as 'modern slavery', and described within the rhetoric of evil and transnational organized crime (eg Hughes 2001, US Department of State 2004). Although estimates about the scope of trafficking and trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation vary, it seems that everyone agrees the phenomenon is growing. Yet the interest surrounding this issue is still running ahead of theoretical understanding and factual evidence. Trafficking has become "an increasing concern of various political, religious, and migration authorities" that "largely position women as victims who need the protection" (Long 2004, p. 7). As a result, anti-trafficking measures have been firmly located within law and order frameworks, while the voices of women have been rarely heard.

My research examines responses to sex trafficking in Serbia and Australia. While the differences between these countries are significant, my thesis is concerned with how they converge and diverge in responses to sex trafficking. This research seeks to identify the dominant discourses about women trafficked for sex in Serbian and Australian society and the criminal justice system, and to contrast them with women's experiences. I have adopted a feminist qualitative methodology utilising 30 in-depth interviews with trafficked women and professionals who assist them in Serbia and Australia.

This research is more than an academic pursuit. Its aim is to give voice to women - to consider women's narratives of trafficking in relation to dominant discourses about women trafficked for sex. The ultimate goal is to look for individual rather than universal truth; to bring to light women's hidden lives, histories, decisions and strategies for survival, and to deconstruct prevailing narratives and stereotypes identified in Serbian and Australian society and the criminal justice system. I believe this research may reveal a greater complexity to our understanding of sex trafficking, and could assist in constructing more informed strategies to address this phenomenon.

For full references for this article contact Sanja at smil17@student.monash.edu

Editor's Report: ANZ Journal of Criminology

This is a very busy time for the *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*. First, I am happy to report that the submission rate to the Journal has been increasing (by approximately 15%). While this is an important development, it has placed more pressure on the review process. Thankfully, many ANZSOC members and overseas scholars have been agreeing to support the journal by acting as reviewers. Secondly, as at July 3, the Journal has moved to Griffith University. I have recently taken up a new position at the Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance, and the Centre with assistance from the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice has agreed to provide support for hosting the Journal. Sincere appreciation and thanks are due to both Griffith University and my former employer, The University of Queensland, for their support for the Journal.

Upcoming Features

The final edition (39.3) of the Journal for 2006 will feature a special thematic volume, entitled *Pathways and Prevention*, which has been guest edited by Professor Alan France of Loughborough University in the United Kingdom and Professor Ross Homel of Griffith University. The volume includes a unique collection of papers from scholars in America, the United Kingdom and Australia.

Observations and Advice on the Review Process

I thought it would be useful to pass along some information about aspects of editorial and journal reviewing processes. In my experience as an Editor, and academic, I have developed a few observations about processes and procedures that may help smooth the editorial process for some authors work. These points are especially targeted toward junior scholars who may be feeling the publication pressure associated with becoming an academic criminologist.

1. Impression management

Impression management is important in the editorial and review process. Authors should ensure their paper is actually ready for review and that basic stylistic issues are properly addressed. Make sure your paper conforms to style requirements for the particular journal. Little things like not including page numbers or author contact details adds time to the review process. Make sure your writing is clear and unambiguous, your paper is appropriately structured, and that identifying references are removed. Attention to detail really counts. It is important for authors, especially new academics, not to leave an impression that they have not bothered to take the review process seriously. Make sure that your paper leaves a first impression that it is 'ready for review'.

2. The revise and resubmit strategy

Many of us have experienced a recommendation of 'revise and resubmit'. It is perhaps the most common editorial recommendation received by authors. Authors should have an explicit strategy for dealing with "RnRs". The following strategies are important:

- *Be timely in your response.* The revision process is often more difficult when authors sit on the paper for several months. It really pays to move quickly on revisions. It makes sense to spend time on the academic papers that are closest to appearing in

print. In deciding to work on finishing a new paper or the RnR, remember that the revised paper is, in all probability, going to be published first and represent a contribution to the field *and* your CV!

- *Be comprehensive in your response.* Most revisions require a reasonable amount of work. Make sure that every key point raised by reviewers and editors are addressed. If you have a good reason for not doing what was asked, a clear justification needs to be included in the response. In my experience, it often pays to over-serve the revision. It's especially important to include a covering memo describing the changes that were made or not made (and why) to the revised paper.
- *Seek clarification from editors.* The revision process works most efficiently if there is a shared understanding of expectations. Authors sometimes fail to address key things that are raised during the initial review process. If there is a concern about an issue, do not avoid it, seek clarification from the editor. As manager of the review process, he or she will be able to provide guidance about expectations from the earlier review.

3. Don't take it personally

Paper rejections are a common experience. Don't take it personally: try to salvage the suggestions offered by the reviewers to strengthen your paper. It is useful to remember that rejections form part of a larger professional process that is fundamental to our field and that journal editors are not out to settle old scores. Of course mistakes can be made, but in my experience, most editors are reasonable people who try to make the best decisions with the available information. Remember that reasonable people can honestly disagree about the merits of a paper.

4. Do unto others....

Authors should both expect useful reviews and provide them when asked. As key players in the editorial process, authors are dependent on effective reviews to improve upon their academic work. Of course the review process for any paper can present challenges, especially if conflicting insights about the merits of a paper arise during the review. Many of us have received reviewer comments that appear to be off the mark, incomplete, or generally unhelpful. As an author, the key is to try to extract as many useful messages from the reviews as possible. Remember that the academic peer review process is completely voluntary. It requires scholars to donate their time and expertise. Some reviews will be more or less helpful than others, but these experiences hopefully illustrate to authors the importance of providing useful reviews when asked. A review need not be lengthy to be helpful. Most good reviews can be communicated in 250-300 words. The fundamental point is to provide useful insights and suggestions, perhaps only four or five key points, in a timely way. Remember that the academic peer review process is fundamental to the strength of any journal, including the ANZJC.

I hope these suggestions are helpful. Remember that the quality of the *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* is a clear function of the many strong papers that are submitted and the useful reviews that are provided. So please remember to send along your best papers, and try to squeeze in a review when asked.

Paul Mazerolle, Griffith University

What is happening in Criminology in Australia and New Zealand?

The Newsletter keeps you up to date with information and news about Criminology across Australia and New Zealand. Please send us a contribution on your Department or School, agency, or events in your State or Territory for the next issue.

News from QUT

Tara McGee writes:

The School of Justice at the Queensland University of Technology (QUT) has been undergoing some changes. There has been a name change from the School of Justice Studies to the School of Justice. The School has recently been through an undergraduate curriculum review process. The Bachelor of Justice degree now has two majors: Investigations and Policing, and Criminology. The new curriculum has been implemented and will be taught in 2007. We have also appointed two new lecturers: Dr Samantha Jeffreies and Dr Sara Davies. The School will continue its Friday seminar series in semester one. Contact Tara McGee tr.mcgee@qut.edu.au if you would like to present a paper in this series or for further information.

Contact Tara McGee for further information:
tr.mcgee@qut.edu.au

News from Western Australia

David Indermaur writes:

Criminology in Western Australia is dominated by the staff and students from the three universities that provide undergraduate and post graduate courses in criminology: Edith Cowan, Murdoch and UWA. The biggest public employer is the former Department of Justice which has, this year, broken up into the Department of the Attorney General and the Department of Corrective Services. This split was one of the recommendations from the controversial Mahoney Inquiry set up in 2005 to investigate the management of offenders by the Department of Justice. The Parole Board has also been dissolved, and a 'Prisoner Review Board' re-established in its place. Public safety was the focus when the new Board was launched - in keeping with the flavour of the times.

The Office of Crime Prevention (OCP), established in 2001, has also experienced changes in 2006. The change in Premier earlier in the year resulted in a downsizing of the Premier's department, and OCP was shifted to Police. Outside of government the Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services (OICS), headed by Professor Richard Harding, provides a critical voice on the state of the prisons. The latest OICS report advocates that health services be provided by the Health Department and not by the prisons. Also outside government, the Prison Reform Group has recently launched its website (www.prisonreformwa.org).

ANZSOC and ANZAPPL (Australian and New Zealand Association of Psychiatry, Psychology and Law) are the main professional organizations active in the West, with the latter regularly providing interesting seminars. The biggest conference event in 2006 was the International Conference on Therapeutic Jurisprudence held in June. This conference reflected the substantial changes in the magistrates' courts as they move towards embracing the 'problem solving' approach. A one-day Justice Research conference, hosted by the Crime Research Centre and the Department of Justice and designed to bring government and university research sectors together, was held late in 2005 and proved very popular. The conference will be held again in November 2006, this time hosted by Murdoch University and OCP. See the website:

www.law.murdoch.edu.au/news/justice_conferece_2006.html

News from New Zealand

John Pratt writes:

Scandals undermine Penal Populism in New Zealand

New Zealand's high rate of imprisonment - 189 per 100,000 of population - at a time when recorded crime has declined by about 25% in the last ten years has been largely the product of penal populism. Indeed, the Labour party in its election manifestos of 2002 and 2005 even repeated Tony Blair's 'tough on crime, tough on the causes of crime' dictum, with similar electoral success and rises in the prison population as a result. However, during the last year, as a series of chickens have come home to roost, Labour is now attempting to rein in the populist forces it was previously happy to unleash. There have been scandals about the cost of four new prisons (\$NZ1 billion and way over initial estimates) and revelations in authoritative reports by the Ombudsman and the Salvation Army that most prisoners in New Zealand prisons spend most of their time doing precisely nothing. The high rate of imprisonment has become an inscribed feature of political and public debate, since it so clearly challenges the reputation for egalitarianism and social justice that is also associated with this country.

There have also been regular news stories on prisons and penal policy in the press, and on leading radio and television current affairs programmes. A major and well publicized conference organized by the Prison Reform Trust, as well as high profile seminars sponsored by the Ministry of Justice and given by visiting academics, have drawn attention to the nuanced nature of public opinion on punishment: it does not uncritically support an ever-expanding prison estate.

At the same time, particular incidents have highlighted the unsustainability of current policies. There have been reports in the media, for example, of prisoners having to sleep in a prison van in the street outside the gaol they had been sent to because it was full; of prisoners being taken to rugby clubs to shower because of the strain on prison facilities due to overcrowding; of young offenders being held in remand in police cells for days on end because there was no prison accommodation for them; and of the brutal murder of a 17 year old by one of his peers, while in transit from court to prison after he had been remanded in custody for stealing his mother's car.

As this series of scandals has been unravelling, the government began to make it increasingly clear that it wanted to take a new direction in this area. The extent of the change was then revealed in a high profile launch in August 2006, presided over by the Prime Minister, of the Law Commission's report to government advocating the establishment of a Sentencing Council. The Council will be designed to restrict disproportionate and inconsistent sentencing by developing guidelines, while relieving some of the political pressures on judges to pass longer sentences. It is hoped that sentence length will be reduced by 25% in conjunction with delaying parole eligibility until two thirds of the sentence had been served. It will thus provide 'truth in sentencing' as well as lowering the rate of imprisonment.

At the launch, the Prime Minister made comment that 'prison levels are too high ... the goal must be to get the prison rate back to something more consistent with our peers ... The criminal justice system cannot go on as it is [with] the unacceptably high rate of imprisonment.' What these changes will lead to remains to be seen. Penal populism has to date been much easier to let loose than to rein in. It does, though, point to the beginning of a fresh chapter in penal developments in this country.

John Pratt

ANZSOC Awards 2006

Student Paper Prize

The Student Paper Prize is awarded each year for the best paper in criminology or a related area written by an Australian or New Zealand citizen or resident (or by any student member of the Society regardless of their citizenship or place of residence), who is a student (undergraduate, honours, or masters by coursework candidate, with eligibility limited to those upon whom the degree has yet to be conferred) at the time of writing. Papers submitted for the Student Paper Prize are to be written by the applicant as sole author and must be under 8,000 words (including references). Honours and Masters research theses are ineligible.

The 2006 winner was Amber McLean (Institute of Criminology, Victoria University of Wellington) for her paper, 'The Legality of Humanitarian Intervention in Cases of Genocide: The Right or the Wrong Side of the Thin Red Line?', under the supervision of Elizabeth Stanley.

Members of the Award Committee were Julie Stubbs (Chair), John Pratt and Jennifer Wood

Amber McLean has written a review of the 2006 ANZSOC Conference in this issue of the Newsletter.

The Allen Austin Bartholomew Award

This Award is awarded each year for the best article published in *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*.

The 2006 winner was Professor Kate Warner (Faculty of Law, University of Tasmania) for her article, 'Gang Rape in Sydney: Crime, the Media, Politics, Race and Sentencing,' *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 37(3): 344-61.

Members of the Award Committee were Frank Morgan (Chair), John Braithwaite and Janet Chan

New Scholar Prize

The New Scholar Prize is awarded each year for the best publication in criminology or a related area written by an Australian or New Zealand citizen or resident, or by any member of the Society regardless of their citizenship or place of residence. Candidates for the New Scholar Prize must be within five years of their appointment to their first full-time academic or other research-related position. There was no prize awarded in 2006.

Entries for 2007: See the Society's website at www.anzsoc.org for details of eligibility and entry.

Government Reports

A number of reports have been released recently on responses to sexual assault. See:

- The Northern Territory's *Protocol: A Coordinated Approach to Better Respond to Drug-Facilitated Sexual Assault in Darwin* (2004)
- The Victorian Ombudsman's *Improving Responses to Allegations Involving Sexual Assault* (2006) www.ombudsman.vic.gov.au
- The NSW Attorney General's *Responding to Sexual Assault: The Way Forward* (2006) <http://elib/pubs/271746.pdf>
- Queensland's *Response to Sexual Assault: Interagency Guidelines for Responding to Adult Victims of Sexual Assault* (2006) <http://www.health.qld.gov.au/violence/sexual/16005.pdf>
- South Australia Attorney-General's Dept: [Review of South Australian rape and sexual assault law](#) (2006)
- NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, (2006) [The attrition of sexual offences from the New South Wales criminal justice system](#)

Other recent reports include:

- [The family law violence strategy](#)
Australia. Attorney-General's Department; 2006)
- [Juvenile justice in Australia : 2000-01 to 2003-04](#)
Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2006) and Welfare, (2006)
- [Community based sentencing options for rural and remote areas and disadvantaged populations](#)
New South Wales Standing Committee on Law and Justice (2006)
- [How much crime does prison stop? : The incapacitation effect of prison on burglary](#)
NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, (2006)
- [Risk of re-offending among parolees](#)
NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, (2006)
- [Christchurch Youth Drug Court pilot : one year follow-up study](#)
Searle, Wendy; Spier, Philip; New Zealand. Ministry of Justice (2006)
- [Review of family violence laws : report](#)
Victorian Law Reform Commission (2006)
- [Review of South Australian rape and sexual assault law](#)
Chapman, Liesl; South Australia. Attorney-General's Dept (2006)
- [Long-term trends in property and violent crime in New South Wales : 1990-2004](#)
NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, (2006)
- [Preventing violence : the state community violence prevention strategy 2005 : a green paper policy framework for development](#)
Western Australia. Dept. of the Premier and Cabinet (2006)
- [A national approach to mental health : from crisis to community](#)
Senate. Select Committee on Mental Health (2006)

- [Australia : phase 2 : report on the application of the convention on combating bribery of foreign public officials in international business transactions and the 1997 recommendation on combating bribery in international business transactions](#)
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Directorate for Financial and Enterprise Affairs (2006)
- [Aboriginal customary laws : discussion paper](#)
Law Reform Commission of Western Australia (2006)

Thanks to Janet Smith, Manager, Information Services at the Australian Institute of Criminology for this listing. See www.anzsoc.org for the full list and related links.

Announcements & Calls for Papers

The NYPD Model of Policing in Australia: Dream or Nightmare?

2 day workshop with Professor Eli Silverman, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, New York (CUNY)
21-22 November 2006

The Social Justice Social Change Research Centre, School of Social Sciences at the University of Western Sydney

Contact: Alyce McGovern

Phone: + 61 2 9772 6411

Email: a.mcgovern@uws.edu.au

Australian Consortium for Social and Political Research, Inc (ACSPRI) Social Science Methodology Conference 2006

December 10-13, 2006

University of Sydney

Email: conf.acspri.org.au

Web: www.conference2006.acspri.org.au

Conference on Confidence in the Courts

National Judicial College of Australia and the ANU College of Law

February 9-11, 2007

National Museum, Canberra

Papers are sought on the following general themes related to Confidence in the Courts: legitimacy, accountability, fairness, efficiency, accessibility, reform, and limits on responsibility of the courts for the justice system.

Email: confidencecourts@law.monash.edu.au

Web:

www.njca.com.au/programs/confidencecourts.asp

International Journal of Cyber Crimes and Criminal Justice

Email: cybercrimejournal@gmail.com

Web: www.cybercrimejournal.co.nr

International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences

Web: www.ijcjs.co.nr

New Journal

Asian Journal of Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Crime, Law and Deviance in Asia

Published by Springer: first issues July and November 2006

Web: www.springer.com/sgw/cda/frontpage

ANZSOC Officers

Following the ANZSOC Annual General Meeting on 13 September 2006 the Society's Officers are:

President

Kathleen Daly (Griffith University)

First Vice-President

Russell Smith (Australian Institute of Criminology)

Second Vice-President

John Pratt (Victoria University of Wellington)

Secretary

Damon Muller (Australian Institute of Criminology)

Treasurer

Matthew Willis (Commonwealth Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs)

Journal Editor

Paul Mazerolle (Griffith University)

Conference Convenor

Rick Sarre (University of South Australia)

Committee Members

Jennifer Wood (ACT) Australian National University
Brendan Thomas (NSW) NSW Attorney-General's Department

Jan Jordan (NZ) Victoria University of Wellington
Allan Van Zyl (NT) Department of Justice, Northern Territory

Christine Bond (Qld) University of Queensland

Rick Sarre (SA) University of South Australia

Julia Davis (Tas) University of Tasmania

Dean Wilson (Vic) Monash University

Frank Morgan (WA) University of Western Australia

Sub-committees

Long-Term Planning

Kathleen Daly (Chair), Paul Mazerolle, Russell Smith and Allan Van Zyl.

Communications

Bronwyn Naylor (Chair), Christine Bond, David Indermaur, Peter Levan, Tara McGee and Dean Wilson.

Professional Affairs and Ethics

Russell Smith (Chair), Gary Allen, Eileen Baldry, Sally Doran, Hennessey Hayes, Mark Israel, Bronwyn Naylor and Anna Stewart.

Contact ANZSOC

The Secretary, ANZSOC
Damon Muller
Australian Institute of Criminology
GPO Box 2944
Canberra ACT 2601
Phone: + 612 6260 9235
Fax: + 612 6260 9201
Email: Damon.Muller@aic.gov.au

Website: www.anzsoc.org

Deadline for next edition: 15 January 2007

Editor, ANZSOC Newsletter
Bronwyn Naylor
Faculty of Law
Monash University
Victoria 3800
Phone: + 613 9905 3319
Fax: + 613 9905 5305
Email: bronwyn.naylor@law.monash.edu.au

Note from the Editor

Members are invited to submit stories or notices for inclusion in the *ANZSOC Newsletter*. Every effort will be made to include contributions, but space is limited. Please understand that items may be edited or not included.

The views included in this newsletter are those of contributors and do not necessarily represent the views of The Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology Inc.

The Editor would like to thank all contributors to this newsletter and the members of the Communications Sub-Committee, and acknowledges the publication assistance of Charlotte Holden from the Monash University Faculty of Law.

20th Annual ANZSOC Conference



Criminology: Building Bridges

*Keynote speaker
Stockholm Prize co-winner
Professor John Braithwaite*

Plenary themes:

Peace Building and Security
Persistence and Desistance
Interdisciplinarity and Theory
Criminological developments in the Asia-Pacific Region
Evidence-based policy-making
Learning from the past; looking to the future
Capacity building in communities

**Adelaide Convention Centre
Sept 23-26, 2007**

For more information, please contact
Rick Sarre, University of South Australia
Rick.sarre@unisa.edu.au or
Andrew Goldsmith, Flinders University
Andrew.goldsmith@flinders.edu.au

Or visit one of our websites: www.anzsoc.org/conferences/
www.aomevents.com/conferences/anzsoc

Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology