Contemporary Comment: Using Financial Intelligence to Target Online Fraud Victimisation

Editor’s note: this piece is written by Dr Cassandra Cross, recipient of the ANZSOC 2017 New Scholar Prize and 2017 Adam Sutton Crime Prevention Award. Cassandra has kindly provided a contemporary comment showcasing some of her award winning research on fraud victimisation. Cassandra’s latest book on Cyber Fraud is now available.

Receiving the Adam Sutton Crime Prevention Award was a humbling moment for me at the conference in 2017. While I did not know Adam well, he played an important role in shaping my early work around crime prevention. Further, he was the source of great personal support and encouragement after a particularly difficult presentation experience at one of my earliest ANZSOC conferences. I am forever grateful for his kindness, and our interactions, however brief they were, have had an enduring impact on the scholar that I am today. Below is a contemporary comment on my article that was awarded the prize in his name.

Fraud is a global issue that devastates the lives of millions annually. Within Australia, the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission reported that over $340 million was lost by Australians to fraud in 2018. Given the known under-reporting of fraud, this is likely to be a small portion of actual losses. Further, these figures do not account for the non-financial harms incurred by victims, which include a deterioration in their physical and mental health and wellbeing; relationship breakdown; unemployment; homelessness and in extreme cases, suicide and suicide ideation.

There are genuine challenges to the successful policing of fraud, particularly in an online environment. There are barriers associated with jurisdiction, resources, knowledge and the lack of priority generally given to fraud. Each of these contributes to a current system that is marked by high levels of dissatisfaction and overwhelming negativity on the part of victims who attempt to navigate it and report their incident.

It has been ten years since I first started researching fraud. While the logistics of fraud may have changed, the impact on victims and the lack of an appropriate response to the support and prevention of fraud has not. Regrettably, I would also argue that Australia has lost its momentum in the targeting of fraud.

The article that I wrote on the use of financial intelligence to target fraud, was based on the proactive strategies being used by both police and consumer protection agencies back in 2015. The use of financial intelligence to proactively identify potential fraud victims was an approach that was arguably having positive impacts based on the (albeit limited) data that was available. It recognised fraud as a problem, and sought to remove some of the barriers that exist for victims in a) being able to identify themselves as a being part of a fraudulent scheme and b) being able to contact authorities who would respond to their circumstance in a non-judgemental and knowledgeable manner. Both are significant barriers to the reporting of fraud in a broader context.
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Secretary’s Report

Since the last newsletter the ANZSOC Secretary has been busy, with many things happening! We established a number of new prizes and awards including David Biles Correctional Research Award, Indigenous Justice Award, an Award for Excellence in Teaching and three Students awards. We have welcomed new members to the society. We provided funding of up to $1,000 for individual activities that support and promote criminology in Australia and New Zealand and this year we have supported over ten local events, many of which you can read about in this issue. As the Secretary I am also being part of developing a new look website for the society which will be launched early next New Year. The new website will offer a more useable and attractive internet presence and an enhanced navigation experience.

And its conference time again! I am very excited to see our members (and potential new members) in beautiful Melbourne at the ANZSOC conference, and also encourage all our members to come to the Annual General Meeting to be held at the conference on 6 December 2018 during lunch break. I hope that everyone enjoys the conference and also has a chance to enjoy some of beautiful Melbourne. We are also working towards our next conference in Perth in 2019. We are all excited to be able to present our members with this opportunity that will take us to Western Australia’s great sunshine and its sparkling Swan River.

ANZSOC has a team of dedicated Committee of Management (CoM) members with energy and commitment to developing ANZSOC membership. The CoM in conjunction with the conference meets on 4 December 2018 to review and develop new strategies for the year ahead.

We have also welcomed new members to the society and also received many new membership enquiries in the last few months. For those of you who are not yet members, I would encourage you to join. You can complete a membership application form online at any time or come and see me and we can sort it all out. If you haven’t renewed your membership, please do so to ensure you continue to receive your copy of the Journal. Please also keep your membership details up to date.

Lastly, I would like to congratulate all our award winners from this year, congratulations on your success. If you would like to nominate for an award next year, please look out for more information in the New Year.

The Secretary operates as a part time office on Thursdays only. I am happy to hear from you and help you with any enquiry you may have.

I look forward to seeing many of you in Melbourne in December.

With best wishes,

Katalina Bradley
Email: secretary@anzsoc.org
ANZSOC Secretary

Note from the Editor

Dear members, I am pleased to bring you this second issue of *PacifiCrim* for 2018. It is my last issue as Newsletter Editor. I have enjoyed the opportunity to edit this newsletter over the last two years and it has been a rewarding experience. I have learned a lot over this time and have been lucky to work with many members of the Society in this role. Thank you to all of you who provided me with submissions during this time. The newsletter only exists because of member contributions. I have been thrilled with the responses to the calls for content that went out this year, they have yielded some excellent submissions, many of which you will read in this issue. I’d like to thank the ANZSOC Committee of Management for all their help in the last two years. It has been wonderful to serve with such dedicated members and the Society is very lucky to have these people leading us.

This issue is full of news from around the region. We start the issue with a contemporary comment from last year’s New Scholar prize winner and Adam Sutton Crime Prevention prize winner, Cassandra Cross. We hear from our Secretary and wish our outgoing Treasurer well in her new adventure. Carolyn McKay reports on the artist/scholar collaboration of *justiceNxjustice* and in an interview with Asher Flynn we hear about the value of the Capstone Editing Prize. New collaborations and initiatives are afoot in criminology with the launch of the Adolescent Family Violence report from Monash University and the SVRPU launch at University of the Sunshine Coast. Chrissy Thompson provides a thoughtful and important comment on accessibility at academic conferences.

Our ANZSOC local sponsored events have been a highlight this year and we present pieces on these funded events to share with our members. Featured here are the ASSA Hancock Lecture, From Prison to Parole and Raising the Age of Criminal Responsibility events in WA, the From Nagle to Now event at CSU, Criminology Myth Busting at Griffith, Domestic Violence, Police Accountability and Women’s Criminalisation in Victoria and The Inaugural Tony Vinson Memorial Lecture at UNSW. If you are planning a local event, check out the ANZSOC website to see if you are eligible to apply for funding.

Last, sadly the Society and the discipline of criminology lost some scholars this year: Stanley Johnston, Sophie Body Gendrot and Noel Turner. We remember them and their contributions in these obituaries.

Thank you again for having me as your Editor for the last two years. Best wishes to the next Editor.

Emma Colvin
PacifiCrim Editor
ecolvin@csu.edu.au
Essentially, authorities were using transaction details of Australians who were sending money to identified hotspot countries in West Africa. While acknowledging that fraud is a global problem, West Africa is a known area for receiving fraudulent funds. Based on this financial intelligence, authorities would send a letter to the individual advising them that they were potentially a victim of fraud and requesting them to cease transactions. If they continued to send money, a further letter would be sent as well as details about support for fraud victimisation. Overall, this was a victim oriented, tertiary prevention strategy, which sought to reduce both the amount of money sent to offenders and the subsequent harm to victims.

Fraud is a crime where the likelihood of obtaining a successful arrest, prosecution and conviction are unlikely. In that way, the importance of prevention cannot be overstated. Sadly, the momentum gained through this approach has ceased. There are no longer resources dedicated to target fraud victims in this proactive manner, through the use of financial intelligence. Consequently, the number of fraud victims and the devastation caused through fraud has not reduced; rather it continues to increase substantially each year. In this way, the article today is sadly just a reminder of the lost potential to further refine and implement a strategy that could have tangible benefits to the reduction of fraud victimisation across Australia.

Cassandra Cross
Queensland University of Technology

Between 10 and 13 December 2019, the University of Western Australia Law School is hosting the 2019 Australia and New Zealand Society of Criminology (ANZSOC) Conference. The theme for the conference is Justice Re-imagined: the intersection between academia, government, industry and the community. This theme builds on the assumption that crime can most effectively be prevented when a combination of these elements intersect. UWA will invite presenters and participants to the conference who can contribute to this theme.

On Tuesday 10 December 2019, the post-graduate and early career researcher conference will be held on campus at the UWA and between 11 and 13 December the main ANZSOC conference will be held at the Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre.

To date, confirmed keynote speakers include the 2012 ANZSOC Distinguished Criminologist awardee, Distinguished Professor John Braithwaite of RegNet, Australian National University who seeks to design peacebuilding, crime prevention and regulation to reduce the amount of domination in the world; and Mr Rob Hulls, Director of the Centre for Innovative Justice at RMIT University who, among his many professional experiences, served as the Victorian Attorney General and Deputy Premier.

Planning is well underway for the Perth ANZSOC conference and we look forward to welcoming ANZSOC members and friends to UWA in 2019.

Jade Lindley
University of Western Australia

In July this year, the ANZSOC Committee of Management bid farewell to our treasurer, Dr Li Eriksson. Dr Eriksson is currently on maternity leave and in July 2018 she welcomed Erik into her family.

Dr Eriksson is a Lecturer in Criminology and Criminal Justice at Griffith University and was in the treasurer role since December 2016. Prior to this, she was a member of the Committee of Management in her roles as Queensland Representative (2014-2016) and Editor of PacifiCrim (2011-2013 and 2016). Given her longstanding involvement in the Committee and contributions to ANZSOC, she has a great deal of organisational memory and we were sad to see her leave.

During her time in the office of treasurer Dr Eriksson made great strides in ensuring all the appropriate authorities and access was in place with the Society’s accounts, establishing policies for payment approval processes, internet and other banking processes, accounting software, Australian Business Register records. Dr Eriksson also engaged in the usual day-to-day activities of a treasurer such as preparing the financial statements for the AGM, making payments and reimbursements, and maintaining the financial records.

The Committee of Management on behalf of ANZSOC minuted their thanks for her service. Members can be rest assured that the finances of the Society are still in safe hands. Dr Eriksson was replaced by the highly capable Dr Lara Christensen who is a Lecturer in Criminology and Justice at the University of the Sunshine Coast Law School.

Tara McGee
ANZSOC President

Thank you to Li Eriksson

Li Eriksson
justiceINjustice was a collaboration between criminal lawyers (Ray Watterson, Robert Cavanaugh and Karen Wells), The Lock-Up’s director, Jessi England and seven visual artists (Corinne Brittain, Rob Cleworth, Blak Douglas, John A Douglas, Leah Emery, Richard Lewer and Lezlie Tilley). Given my interdisciplinary education and research in visual arts and criminal law/criminology, I was invited to curate the exhibition, select and work with the artists, and write a curatorial catalogue essay.

By way of exhibition and public program, justiceINjustice aimed to scrutinise public interest cases of injustice (deaths in custody, police shootings, wrongful convictions, investigative failure and wrongful detention) in a manner that would transcend official police, judicial or coronial narratives, immerse viewers in a forensic aesthetic and amplify the inadequacies of the criminal justice system. The curatorial directive was for artists to revisit official legal archives by working with the lawyers and, in some instances, family members, to represent the cases anew and highlight the structural inequalities that framed these high profile cases.

Two bodies of work responded to the deaths in custody of young Aboriginal men. Richard Lewer’s Never Shall be Forgotten – A Mother’s Story, 2017 was an animation regarding the death in custody of 16-year-old John Pat in 1983. This was an extant work, not the product of the collaborative process, yet it so clearly spoke to injustice that its inclusion in the exhibition was desired. John Pat’s death, as a juvenile in police custody, was a catalyst for the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (1987-91). Unfortunately, deaths in custody continued as exemplified by John A Douglas’ installation No System to Fail, 2018. This site-specific video installation regarding the death in custody of Edward (Eddie) Russell in 1999 was consciously unforgiving in its execution, immersing viewers in the stark reality of carceral space and demanding reflection on an uncaring and futile system. The theme of systemic failure in detention and the dereliction of the duty of care continued with Corinne Brittain’s installation. STRANDED (I have done nothing wrong) critiqued the treatment of Cornelia Rau during 2004-05. Brittain’s work of rusted wire bedsprings and dangling red cotton twill highlighted the existential violence of this incident and our ongoing treatment of those in immigration detention. Cracks in the criminal justice system were made apparent in the infamous series of legal proceedings against Lindy and Michael Chamberlain. Blak Douglas’ painting A Dog’s Breakfast, 2018 examined the flawed investigations into the disappearance of Azaria Chamberlain at Uluru, 1980. In particular, Douglas has drawn attention to the non-recognition and marginalisation of the knowledge of the Aboriginal trackers involved in Azaria’s search. Investigative failure was at the heart of Leah Emery’s installation Vigil, 2018, regarding the unsolved disappearances of three young females from the Newcastle area, 1978-79. Twenty years after their disappearance, Strike Force Fenwick was formed to investigate why police had not treated these cases as suspected homicides and Emery’s installation has appropriated text from the findings to conjure a metaphor for the inadequate investigations and the families left holding vigil. Text was also critical to the installation created by Lezlie Tilley in relation to the Kathleen Folbigg Diaries. Folbigg’s convictions of three counts of murder and one count of manslaughter in relation to the deaths of her four babies, were secured on the basis of circumstantial and forensic evidence, and selected extracts from Folbigg’s personal diaries seemingly sealed her fate. Interestingly, the NSW Attorney General has recently announced that Folbigg’s convictions will be reviewed. Finally, Rob Cleworth’s body of work, Taharah, True Blue and Dear Roni responded to the 1997 death of Roni Levi at the hands of police officers on Bondi Beach. Roni Levi, who was suffering from mental illness at the time, was shot and killed as he emerged from the surf. Two police officers were later investigated by a Police Integrity Commission.

The resulting artworks were transformative of their original textual legal sources, tangibly immersing viewers in harsh, experiential installations, all within the carceral and historic site of The Lock-Up. The project contributed to understandings of injustice, the impacts on victims and grieving families, and the failures of the criminal justice system. By engaging with a broad audience through the exhibition and related public programs (Newcastle Writers’ Festival, ‘Songs for Justice’ and ‘Art & Law: Putting Justice into Practice’ Symposium), the project contributed
to general debate concerning how regimes of prosecution, punishment and law enforcement have impacted marginalised communities and people with mental health issues.

The project was supported/funded by Create NSW, NSW Trade & Investment Crown Lands, Headjam, Hunter TAFE, The Herald, The City of Newcastle, The University of Newcastle, Sydney Institute of Criminology and Merridy Elphick Lawyers.

For more information interested readers can follow this link:

http://www.thelockup.org.au/whats-on/justiceinjustice

Carolyn McKay
The University of Sydney

---

Asher, congratulations on winning this award, can you tell our readers a bit about this award?

Thanks Emma! I am honoured to be the recipient of this national award and very grateful to Capstone Editing for creating this important initiative. As a full-time academic and primary carer of my (absolutely gorgeous!) two-year old son, Henry, I have encountered a range of new difficulties in finding the necessary resources (both time and money) to continue to pursue my academic career. I find it impossible to engage in any significant periods of travel (interstate or overseas) without Henry, which means many of the opportunities I have, end up substantially increasing personal travel costs, and require quite a bit of negotiation and planning.

International travel opportunities are vital for network development, career-enhancing collaborations and impact – opportunities that are less available for primary carers, among whom women continue to be over-represented. Capstone Editing recognise that a major requirement of academia is undertaking research-related travel and that women continue to feel the effects of missing out on these opportunities due to the difficulties in arranging (and funding) childcare, or in funding the expenses of having your child/children and a carer accompany you. For these reasons, the Capstone Editing Carer’s Travel Grant for Academic Women was created several years ago to assist academic women who are primary carers in continuing to achieve their career goals (and requirements!).

You can find out more about the award on the Capstone Editing Website: https://www.capstoneediting.com.au/travel-grant.

Tell us about the research that is being supported by this award and how the award will help you to achieve this.

I am using the funding provided by the award to cover some of the costs associated with having my family accompany me to Spain in 2019, where I am running and presenting at a workshop on Youth Violence with 18 international scholars at the Oñati Institute.

What advice do you have for academic women who are primary care givers?

It is challenging! For me, the main issue has been more about managing (usually unreal) self-expectations, and the feeling that sometimes you cannot stretch yourself to be meeting the needs of your family, your employer and yourself. Managing and recognising guilt – particularly the unfair guilt we place on ourselves – is important, as is developing strategies and a support network. In addressing this, I found it really useful to identify my priorities in relation to work. This involved asking myself, what do I want to achieve? When do I want to achieve it? What do I need to do to get there? Once I had some idea of this, I felt more confident in my abilities to say yes to what I needed/should/wanted to be doing, and when it was alright, and in fact necessary, to say no. This isn’t an easy task, but one I strongly recommend.
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Transforming Criminology?
On Access and Inclusion at Criminology Conferences

I was invited to write this short piece after my difficulties in accessing the British Society of Criminology conference in the UK were aired on Twitter in June of this year. With the power of social media, my frustration with the exclusionary practices and inaccessibility of academic conferences had finally garnered the attention of those beyond my immediate social network. I’d like to share my own observations, not only about where things have gone wrong, but how criminology as a discipline can move forward to be a more inclusive and accessible community for all researchers.

As a disabled PhD student nearing completion, this recent conference marked the 6th I’d attended in the last four years. Because I acquired my disability part way through my candidature, my experience as a conference delegate from 2015 onwards has always been from the perspective of a person with a lived experience of disability. However, having attended one conference as an able-bodied person prior to my first surgery, I have a point of comparison which marks a clear distinction in how I experienced academic criminology conferences BC – before chair, and A.D.- after acquiring my disability.

Perhaps the most obvious place to begin this discussion, is in thinking about who an academic conference is for. If you don’t have to spend four weeks writing 1500 words over three emails, two twitter threads and expending countless wasted hours trying to ascertain how, and whether you physically can access a conference, then you’re probably the target demographic.

Providing clear information at all points of contact with your delegates about venue access, refusing to lease venues that do not have accessible premises or lavatories, having an allocated accessibility officer who will respond to delegates enquires and allocating funding for accessibility requirements like interpreters and captioning are some of the ways we will start to create a more disability confident criminology community. However, these issues of access and inclusion transcends disability. These considerations will help people with similar needs to my own, but this is not the solution – the issue runs deeper than this.

Ken Robinson once described academics as rather curious because they “typically live in their heads. They live up there, and slightly to one side. They're disembodied, you know, in a kind of literal way. They look upon their body as a form of transport for their heads”. I feel that this understanding of academics is reflected in the way conferences are organised, and how conference delegates are imagined. It is as though conferences are seen as a coming together of minds, forgetting that they are attached to bodies with different needs, from different walks (or rolls) of life. These bodies and people are more than just vehicles for delivering our heads to a conference, and we need to stop pretending that this is the case. As will come as no surprise to anyone, the bodies of conference delegates have, and still are assumed to be, white, wealthy male academics who do not live with a disability or chronic health condition.
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Capstone Editing Prize cont’d

A key piece of advice I have is to not be afraid to raise these issues within your institution/organisation or with people you admire/trust in your institution/organisation, particularly in terms of getting guidance on what avenues of support are available. I am very lucky to work in an area which is led by inspiring, passionate and successful women. My head of discipline is our amazing ANZSOC Vice President, Associate Professor Rebecca Wickes, and the Dean of my Faculty is the inspirational, Professor Sharon Pickering, so I appreciate I am coming at this with a very strong backing. But in general discussions within my discipline, we raised concerns to the Faculty about the absence of financial support available for academics who are primary carers, which was restricting our ability for both international research and teaching opportunities. The Faculty, through the efforts of Professor Sharon Pickering, responded by creating a funding scheme for academics with primary carer responsibility of a child or children up to 18 years, who can apply for a specified amount to assist in covering the costs of childcare or for the child/children to accompany the academic.

While this is a highly competitive pilot initiative and only a small pool of funding is available, this is a big start and we are hoping the institution may be able to roll out similar initiatives more broadly across Monash.

My institution also has a range of internal schemes available for primary carers returning to work, including financial assistance for projects, and opportunities for mentorship and coaching, which can be really useful in helping people identify key goals and time management. There are likely to be similar initiatives at your institution, but you may have to do a bit of research to find them. And if there aren’t these initiatives or opportunities, it’s time to start asking why? If you don’t feel comfortable doing this on your own, talk to other primary carers who have returned to work, or your mentors and other senior women. It is in your institution’s interest to provide you with the support and resources you need to achieve. I also strongly encourage others to apply for this grant in 2019!

Asher Flynn
Monash University
Transforming Criminology? Con’t

As someone who thinks about my body and its mobility more than others, I am in a privileged position to point out what is glaringly obvious to me, but what continues to be overlooked within criminology, and academia more broadly. My body for example, is the body of a doctoral student who requires accessibility information to be considered and communicated at all points of a conference event. There are other bodies that belong to parents with young children who have scrambled to make child care arrangements and mothers who are breast feeding who couldn’t bring their child with them. These bodies belong to trans delegates who don’t have safe lavatory spaces and LGBTIQA+ folk who don’t feel safe going out at night for a drink. These bodies belong to people of colour who are consistently confused with the only other delegate who isn’t white and whose name is constantly mispronounced. These bodies belong to delegates who have mental ill health who need a quiet space to decompress and who are too tired to make all the sessions or social events. And most of all, these bodies belong to the women who are wary of predatory advances and unwanted sexual comments from other male delegates, and who are emotionally exhausted after a panel session detailing graphic victim narratives of sexual violence because #MeToo.

An official blogpost from the conference website claimed that: “The conference itself was well organised and it ran in a way which provided opportunities to… consider future applications of critical theory”. This experience was not universally shared and risks drowning out the counter narrative that was silenced in the lead up to and during the conference. But what about after? With an opportunity here in the aftermath of a conference that left myself, and many others feeling unheard, silenced and unacknowledged, I’d like to think about the future applications of a critical criminology we desperately need by concluding with the following.

The conference in question, that provided no accessibility information to a disabled delegate for several weeks also had six male keynote speakers and only one female keynote speaker. At the close of the conference Professor Francis Heidensohn delivered a very pointed comment in her acceptance speech for the outstanding achievement award for her work in feminist criminology about this very issue, questioning whether criminology had truly been transformed. At the close of the dinner, the conference organisers refused to acknowledge or engage with any of the critical feedback and instead congratulated themselves on a job well done, a theme repeated both on social media and on the official blog posts. Upon searching for the direct quote from Professor Heidensohn from the transcript, curiously this statement critiquing the lack of diversity in relation to gendered keynote speakers was omitted from the official transcript on the website.

A similar trend of silencing marginal voices happened within the context of my own accessibility issues. A statement from a prominent criminologist congratulating the university responsible for hosting the conference noted that he was pleased the problem has been “speedily” addressed after a colleague of theirs publicly reported that the issue had been addressed after a phone call with me. This statement from the professor not only ignored the many weeks and countless attempts I had made to gain access to the information I required, but carried a finality that punctuated the experience by marking its closure. It re-wrote the narrative of what had happened to me in the same way the critical comments from Professor Heidensohn were omitted from the official transcript of events at the closing dinner, erasing the critique from frustrated feminist criminologists who had been re-iterating these very issues all throughout the conference.

The message received was loud and clear – we want a critical criminology but not one that is critical of criminology and the criminologists dominating the discipline. As long as the voices of the academics who do not fit neatly into mainstream criminology continue to be erased, ignored and silenced, our voices will go hoarse as we continue to voice our dissent from the margins. Our bodies and needs will not be catered for at conferences so long as they are run by people who neither listen nor care. But with the power of social media and an ever-growing community of criminologists on the margins, that may not always be the case. At the conference I attended, a subversive online movement was started by some brave criminologists who were disappointed with the lack of diversity of the keynote speakers. This #virtualpanel was a way of calling out the on-going lack of representation, and consideration for the role of diversity in our discipline. It is movements like this that will transform our discipline into a criminology that is accessible and inclusive for all bodies and for all criminologists.

Chrissy Thompson
The University of Melbourne
Investigating Adolescent Family Violence

Investigating adolescent family violence in Victoria is a recent project recently completed by Dr Kate Fitz-Gibbon, Dr Karla Elliott and Professor JaneMaree Maher from the Monash Gender and Family Violence Prevention Centre. The project’s Final Report was launched in August 2018 by the Victorian Commissioner for Children and Young People, Liana Buchanan.

The project draws on the insights of 120 people who have experienced adolescent family violence gathered through an online anonymous survey and 45 Victorian experts, service providers, general practitioners and health service providers who participated in interviews and focus groups. The research aims to provide new insights into the nature and impact of adolescent family violence, the adequacy of current criminal justice, service and therapeutic responses, and the needs for future practice and policy reform. While primarily Victorian focused, the findings are relevant to all Australian jurisdictions and comparative countries.

Adolescent family violence describes the use of violence by young people against family members, including parents, siblings, carers and other members of the family. Adolescents who use violence in the home engage in a range of different strategies to control, coerce and threaten family members that create harm. Participants involved had experienced a combination of physical violence, property damage, verbal abuse, coercive and controlling behaviours, and financial abuse. In some cases, physical violence was used to achieve broader goals, such as to change the household rules, to avoid household tasks, to frighten and achieve control over members of the household, or to extract money from a parent. Verbal abuse and coercive behaviours were used in many incidents to establish power and control over a parent and/or sibling. For many affected parents the early stages of victimisation were fraught with concerns over what distinguishes ‘normal’ adolescent tantrums from behaviours that constitute abuse. While for some parents the incidents of abuse were isolated and occurred infrequently, for other the violence became part of their everyday lives.

The findings of this project support previous research that concludes that adolescent males more commonly use violence in the home than their adolescent female counterparts, and mothers are more likely to be victimised than male adults within the home. This is not to overlook the experiences that were shared through the survey of males who had experienced adolescent family violence as victims and parents who had been victimised by their adolescent daughter but rather to highlight the importance of gendered understandings in this area. A number of service providers who participated in this research noted that the types of violence committed were influenced by gender, with girls more commonly using verbal violence and property damage as mechanisms for control, while male adolescents were more commonly reported using physical violence.

This research found that adolescent family violence has long term health and wellbeing implications for those affected. The study documents a range of impacts, including negative educational outcomes for the adolescent as well as affected siblings, affected parental work patterns, relationship breakdown including parental separation and family estrangement, health impacts for families that live in fear, social isolation, as well as the economic, physical and emotional impacts associated with experiencing violence. For many cases for the 120 persons who responded to the survey, these impacts were not alleviated through any help-seeking behaviour in either therapeutic, service or criminal justice contexts.

The research reveals the barriers that women experience when seeking help for adolescent family violence particularly as they work to maintain their care relationship with their child, experiences of shame and fear of stigma, and a reluctance to engage police as primary responders.

This research reiterates the finding by the Victorian Royal Commission into Family Violence that specialised service responses and programs for this unique form of family violence are needed. Criminal justice system responses are typically viewed as inadequate and inappropriate given the acknowledged risks associated with criminalisation, the lack of specialised police training, and the unwillingness of parents victimised to support an intervention order being taken out against their child. For those families that did report to police it was often framed as a ‘last resort’ decision, one made only when safety risks presented to other children in the home reached a critical level.
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Investigating Adolescent Family Violence Cont’d

In Victoria specifically but also Australia more broadly the current dearth of specialist responses to adolescent family violence means that many parents are left on their own to manage and maintain their families’ safety and security. There are no clear avenues for accessing effective support or responses, particularly in cases where the child using violence is under 12 years of age. This research identifies the critical role that schools and other education institutions can play in operating as an interface between families and services, and providing support for families experiencing adolescent family violence.

The research highlights why further attention to AFV is warranted and overdue, and needs to be underpinned by:

- systematic and comprehensive data collection on AFV in a range of service contexts beyond criminal justice, including health, educational and family services,
- the development of nuanced understandings of AFV, which attend to age and gendered patterns and ongoing relationships of care and dependency as they impact young people, their parents and other family members, and
- effective links between service responses and early interventions that recognise the ongoing need for care for young people alongside the efforts and resilience of families.

The full report can be accessed via the Monash Gender and Family Prevention Centre website, at: https://arts.monash.edu/gender-and-family-violence/projects/adolescent-family-violence/

Kate Fitz-Gibbon
Monash University

Sexual Violence Research and Prevention Unit

Sexual violence and abuse is a global public health concern that seriously impacts individuals, families and whole communities. This makes prevention research and innovation a national and international priority. The Sexual Violence Research and Prevention Unit (SVRPU) was launched in October 2018 at the University of the Sunshine Coast (USC Australia).

The SVRPU brings together a community of academics, government and non-government industry partners, and students with a shared interest in sexual violence and abuse practice and research. Collectively, the work of this Unit aims to reduce victimisation and address perpetration through innovative and evidence-based knowledge and practice. The SVRPU will disseminate research to industry professionals and to the broader community, bridging the gap between research and practice. In doing so, it will cater to the needs of professional groups, through timely access to facts sheets, training events and videos in addition to contributing to the broader academic literature.

The Unit aims to understand, prevent and respond to sexual violence and abuse at a local, national and international level.

First, understanding sexual violence and abuse enhances the capacity to prevent and respond effectively to this issue. Understanding causal pathways, and individual ecological and situational risk factors, for example, provides important information to guide the development of effective primary and secondary prevention initiatives. Likewise, understanding reoffending pathways, recidivism and re-victimisation risks, can inform tertiary responses to sexual violence and abuse. For these reasons, the SVRPU focuses on research that promotes and enhances understanding of this phenomenon.

Second, researchers within the SVRPU are dedicated to preventing sexual violence and abuse. The SVRPU research therefore aims to prevent abuse before it occurs in the first place. Research projects and publications focus on primary and secondary prevention; examining theoretical frameworks underpinning prevention practice, investigating prevention across diverse settings and evaluating discrete prevention initiatives.
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Creating Pathways to Child Wellbeing in Disadvantaged Communities - ASSA Hancock Lecture 2018

The Academy of the Social Sciences promotes excellence in the social sciences in Australia and highlights the contribution of social science to public policy. Together with ANZSOC, ASSA was an active contributor to events during the recent inaugural Social Sciences Week (September 10-14).

As a long-standing Fellow of the Academy, I was invited to present the 2018 Hancock Lecture, first in Brisbane in March and most recently at the University of Melbourne. The Hancock Lecture is named in honour of Professor Keith Hancock AM, a distinguished labour market economist who is a former Vice Chancellor of Flinders University and who also served for some years as President of ASSA. I was honoured that Keith was able to attend the Melbourne lecture this year. He was accompanied by his wife Professor Sue Richardson, who is also a well-known labour force economist and was one of the small band of social and health scientists led by Fiona Stanley who in the early 2000s founded the Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth.

I was myself part of the movement to create ARACY as a way of building bridges between the worlds of research, policy and practice in order to accelerate the translation of new research findings into government thinking and into the routine practices of health, education, justice, and social service organisations. I was particularly animated in those days by the insights my colleagues and I had gained in preparing a report in 1999 for the Commonwealth Department of the Attorney General called Pathways to Prevention: Developmental and Early Intervention Approaches to Crime in Australia.

I began the Melbourne lecture by drawing attention to the fact that while the Pathways report has had a substantial impact on public policy in many fields including substance abuse prevention, mental health, and child protection, it appears to have had little or no impact in the ensuing 20 years on youth justice policies and practices. I used a photograph of Dylan Voller tied to a chair with a ‘spit hood’ over his head in the Don Dale Correctional Centre in the Northern Territory to highlight the enormous gulf between both the clear conclusions of criminological research and Australia’s human rights obligations under the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.

I argued that it is unacceptable in 21st century Australia that children living in economically deprived areas, especially First Nations children, are still more likely than those from more affluent communities to drop out of school, become trapped in inter-generational cycles of poverty and welfare dependence, or get caught up in the child protection or youth justice systems. Despite the explosion in scientific knowledge about human development and crime prevention, and despite the best efforts of governments and caring organisations and the expenditure of billions of dollars over several generations, the gap is not narrowing.

I characterised the challenge facing Australia in the following terms: to build developmental and prevention science methods and insights into large scale, sustainable, economically efficient, early prevention delivery systems. To this end I argued the need for government and philanthropic investment in a small number of ‘intermediate organisations’ that provide safe environments for researchers, policy people, and front-line professionals to build respectful partnerships. In these safe places new ways to achieve both system transformation and community empowerment can be developed, tested, discarded, or taken to scale.

The transformation of the youth justice system (not to mention the community services and education systems!) should be one immediate priority of the kinds of research-policy-practice partnerships I argued for in the lecture. I observed that criminological research, most recently in an authoritative Campbell Systematic Review (Petrosino et al., 2010: Formal System Processing of Juveniles: Effects on Delinquency), is quite clear in demonstrating that on average youth detention and the whole paraphernalia of the criminal justice system increase the crime rate and makes the community less safe. We urgently need alternative approaches based on prevention science and community development research that dismantle youth detention and replace it with data-driven and evidence-based preventive practices that put control back in the hands of the communities most affected by crime and violence, notably Indigenous communities.

This is a big call. To make the challenge a little less daunting, I spent the last few minutes of the lecture demonstrating some of the new methods, tools and resources that my colleagues and I have been building as part of the Creating Pathways to Child Wellbeing Project, a long-term research collaboration in disadvantaged communities funded by the Australian Research Council and 15 partner organisations. CREATE is an acronym that stands for our principles of preventative action: C-collaboration; R-relationships; E-early in the pathway; A-accountability through shared, measurable goals; T-training of front-line professionals; E-evidence-based practice. I showed a short video that we have produced to explain these ideas and to motivate school principals, community workers, and others to form collaborations and implement the CREATE principles: (www.creatingpathways.org.au).
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The other new tool I briefly demonstrated was the *Rumble’s Quest* system for understanding, measuring and acting on valid and reliable data about the wellbeing of primary-aged children ([www.realwell.org.au](http://www.realwell.org.au)). Rumble’s Quest gives children a voice in the school system to talk about their own lives – how they feel about themselves, about school and about friends, whether they have supportive home relations, and whether they find it easy to concentrate and to think before acting.

Our aim in the CREATE Project is simple but, we believe, potentially revolutionary: to place powerful tools directly into the hands of trusted front-line professionals who are in the best position to effect change at community, school, family or individual child levels. In concluding the Hancock Lecture, I proposed that this is what needs to happen on a larger scale and at a national level across a variety of problems and sectors, with youth crime prevention a top priority.

*Ross Homel*  
*Griffith University*

---

**SVRPU Cont’d**

Third, when sexual abuse does occur, it is crucial that responses are timely and effective, reducing harms to victims of abuse, including risk of re-victimisation, and reducing the likelihood of re-offending by perpetrators of abuse. The SVRPU research, therefore, also targets responses to sexual violence and abuse. This includes justice system responses and treatment program evaluation.

The SVRPU is co-led by three Criminology and Justice academics in the USC Law School, Dr Nadine McKillop, Dr Susan Rayment-McHugh and Dr Lara Christensen, under the mentorship of Professor Christian Jones. Nadine, Susan and Lara are experts in sexual violence and abuse research and prevention and have made significant contributions through research, consultation and practice leadership in the area of evidence-informed sexual violence and abuse prevention. With his international reputation and expertise in interactive media, Christian has co-developed a mobile game app to educate children aged 8 – 10 years about sexual abuse prevention (Orbit), as well as a sexual abuse prevention game for Indigenous communities.

Parties interested in becoming members of the SVRPU are encouraged to contact the co-leaders via email for more information ([SVRPU@usc.edu.au](mailto:SVRPU@usc.edu.au)). Professional groups interested in facts sheets, training events and videos are also encouraged to contact the co-leaders. Please be sure to introduce yourself to Nadine, Susan and Lara at the ANZSOC Conference, where they will be presenting a panel session on how tertiary prevention of sexual violence and abuse can inform primary and secondary prevention. You can learn more about the SVRPU by visiting: [www.usc.edu.au/SVRPU](http://www.usc.edu.au/SVRPU)

*Lara Christensen*  
*University of the Sunshine Coast*

---

**Raising the Age of Criminal Responsibility**

The UWA and WA ANZSOC organisers would like to thank Professor Cunneen for delivering his public lecture ‘Arguments for Raising the Minimum Age of Criminal Responsibility’. The lecture was very interesting and generated much discussion afterwards. We would also like to acknowledge and thank all ANZSOC members and those members of the public for attending the successful event. Professor Cunneen’s lecture argued that the minimum age of criminal responsibility should be raised from the current minimum age of 10 years. By international standards Australia has a low minimum age of criminal responsibility. Even more problematic is the fact the majority of children under the age of 14 years who come before youth courts in Australia and are sentenced to either youth detention or a community-based sanction are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children.

*Jade Lindley*  
*University of Western Australia*

---

*Follow us on Twitter*  
[@anzsoc]
Domestic Violence, Police Accountability and Women’s Criminalisation’

On Friday 22 June 2018, at the conclusion of the annual Victorian Postgraduate Criminology Conference ((VPCC) the brainchild of academic mastermind, Dr Mark Wood), the ‘Domestic Violence, Police Accountability and Women’s Criminalisation’ public panel event was held at RMIT University before a full house of over 200 researchers, students, industry stakeholders, members of various domestic violence prevention services, legal practitioners, police, and members of the wider public. The event sold out in less than four days and a waiting list had to be created to deal with the unanticipated demand.

The event was organised and chaired by Monash Criminology doctoral candidate and ANZSOC PG/ECR representative Madeleine Ulbrick, alongside the VPCC organising committee. It was facilitated by The Honourable Marcia Neave AO, and brought together leading experts on police accountability and domestic violence: Professor Jude McCulloch (convener Monash University Family Violence Prevention Centre), Marianne Jago (Senior Policy Advisor, Women’s Legal Service Victoria), legal practitioner (now the first Indigenous ACT magistrate, formerly Deputy CEO Legal Aid ACT) Louise Taylor, and survivor-activist Aunty Vickie Roach (a Yuin woman, member of the Stolen Generation, writer, poet, and former prisoner). We were also extremely fortunate to have national treasure, Uncle Jack Charles perform the Welcome to Country. We were inundated with positive feedback both directly after the event and via our follow-up survey.

The event was sponsored generously by ANZSOC as well as Monash University, the University of Melbourne, and Deakin University. This funding provided the graduate organising committee an opportunity to engage the broader public in the work that we do, which is such a vital part of academia – and impossible for graduate students to achieve without funding. Members of the committee were thus able to build important skills and work collaboratively on something we all felt incredibly passionate about. It was widely felt by all involved that organising the VPCC and the public panel event was an affirming, collegial, and inspiring experience that we will never forget. We are so grateful for the funding sponsorship provided by ANZSOC and the Victorian universities, and we hope it will be the beginning of many future public events organised and convened solely by graduate student committees.

The VPCC is held in Victoria annually, but is open to all Australian (and international graduate students). This year we had more abstracts than ever, including interstate and international graduate students. We strongly encourage all Australian graduate students to participate in the 2019 VPCC (see official twitter for details @VicCrimCon). This year’s VPCC conference was a soaring success, which comes as no surprise, given the energising and inspiring Tully O’Neill (RMIT) was at the helm (special thanks as well to committee members: Will Arpke-Wales (University of Melbourne), Philippa Jai-Hermann (RMIT), Sally Kennedy (Deakin University), Joe MacFarlane (RMIT University), Matthew Mitchell (University of Melbourne), Monique Moffa (RMIT), Shaez Mortimer (RMIT), Katherine Schofield (Monash), Alyssa Sigamoney (RMIT), Catherine Treloar (University of Melbourne), and Madeleine Ulbrick (Monash).
Local and international research indicates that parolees recidivate less frequently, less seriously, and take longer to reoffend than non-parolees. Therefore best practice suggests that prisoners who are released on parole generally do better than those released without a period of conditional release. However, recent research conducted via surveys and interviews in Western Australia by Natalie Gately and her team at Edith Cowan University suggests that public awareness is low, their perceptions are inaccurate and overall they did not support parole. Nearly all participants of interviews mentioned the case of Jill Maher in their responses. Furthermore, many believed that if you deny a prisoner parole, then they do not get released. They failed to comprehend that once a prison sentence had finished the prisoner gets released anyway. However, when presented with factual information, the participants felt they understood parole and their support levels increased. The outcome of the research was a recommendation to better inform the public. The Prisoners Review Board (PRB) in Western Australia agreed to proposition by the lead researcher to hold a Public Forum to coincide with ECU’s Research Week and Social Science Week. Whilst wary at first, the Chair of the PRB supported the initiative and gave permission for the members to be involved if they chose to. This is the first time the PRB have participated in a public forum. The panel consisted of those listed below. Approximately 200 people attended the event, and asked questions about the role of the Board, how decisions are made, which types of prisoners are granted parole, whether prisoners deny their own parole, whether they believe it was successful, what happened to those who did not get parole and the success rates of parolees in complying with the conditions imposed. The session went for about 80 minutes, but could have gone much longer as the discussion was impressive. Attendees were sent a survey prior to the event to ask about their levels of knowledge and support before the forum, and have been emailed another post event to measure changes in attitude due to the event. That will be fed back to ANZSOC who supported the event.

Panel
Host, Mr Gareth Parker – Radio 6PR and Channel 7 Reporter
Mr Allan Fenbury, Chairman, PRB
Mr Craig Somerville, Deputy Chair, PRB Advisor on Aboriginal Affairs to previous Labour Government; Previous Director of the Aboriginal Legal Service
Ms Georgia Prideaux-Cera, Community Member Prisoners Release Review Board, Victims Representative Supervised Release Board
Kati Kraszlan, Acting Commissioner for Victims of Crime
Astrid Kalders, Assistant Commissioner, Adult Community Corrections, Corrective Services
Dr James McCue, ECU Clinical Psychologist and Forensic Psychologist (Registrar)
Dr Michael Coole, Member PRB

Natalie Gately
Edith Cowan University

The Christine M Alder Book Prize

The Christine M Alder Book Prize is awarded biennially for an outstanding monograph or book which, in the opinion of the judges, has made a valuable and outstanding contribution to criminology. The Prize is awarded in honour of Dr Alder who has made a leading contribution to the development of Australian and New Zealand criminology through her pioneering research on gender, crime and justice, drawing international recognition to Australian criminological research in the 1980s and 1990s, her collaboration with practitioners in criminal justice reform and through her work in mentoring future generations of criminologists. Sole or multi-authored monographs or books may be nominated for the Christine M Alder Book Prize but only one prize will be given every two years to be shared amongst all authors. Recipients must be residents of either Australia or New Zealand and be financial members of the Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology at the time the Prize is awarded. Nominated monographs or books must have been published by a commercial publisher in the preceding two years prior to January 1 of the current year.

Nominations are open for the 2019 prize

Check the ANZSOC website (www.anzsoc.org) for further information!
Is the widespread use of imprisonment in the current age an outdated policy response, at least for the vast majority of offenders who find themselves behind the prison bars in Australian prisons?

It is not likely that the owners and shareholders of the thousands of private prison beds in Australian prisons would agree. Nevertheless, it was this question which simply came to my consciousness, as I prepared the public lecture held at the University of New South Wales in acknowledgement of the extraordinary professional career of Professor Tony Vinson AM.

Tony had been both a colleague and close friend for almost 40 years and during that time he never appeared fatigued from his ceaseless endeavour to find a better way to respond to criminality. Throughout his career as a criminal justice reformer and public policy advocate he never wavered from his deep conviction that it was simply unreasonable and unjust to impose a period of imprisonment on those who came before the criminal courts largely because of their disability or their heritage at birth: being born into a postcode area distinguished by locational disadvantage.

Tony began his criminal justice career as a parole officer in the 1950s with the then New South Wales Department of Prisons. While his initial qualifications were in Arts and Social Work from the University of Sydney, he proceeded to obtain a Doctorate from the University of New South Wales, examining the social determinants of low birth weight babies.

In 1971, he was appointed the Foundation Director of the New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research and in 1976 was appointed the Foundation Professor of Behavioural Science in Medicine at the University of Newcastle. The 1970s were marked by considerable unrest in the New South Wales prison system, as prison activists highlighted the problems within the regimented prison regimes, particularly in high security prisons such as Bathurst and Katingal. Prisoners rioted in Bathurst and effectively destroyed the prison by fire. The prison staff took their vengeance, as the prisoners were transferred to a range of prisons across the State.

By 1977, the conflict had been so marked and the media coverage so widespread that the New South Wales government was forced to act and established a Royal Commission to investigate the allegations of prison brutality and demands for penal reform. Mr Justice Nagle, who had been appointed a Judge of the NSW Supreme Court in 1960, was appointed in 1977 to head the Royal Commission, which made many recommendations for reform. It was in 1979, as a response to those recommendations that Premier Neville Wran appointed Tony Vinson to Chair the New South Wales Corrective Services Commission. (As Tony would later refer to it over a glass of wine: he was appointed the Chief Screw of New South Wales).

Prison reform has always been a difficult thing to achieve, particularly in Australia with our heritage of European settlement being formed on the foundations of being a British penal colony. Tony Vinson remained in the position for just over two years, and his efforts to bring about reform were consistently resisted by the efforts of the New South Wales prison officers union. The story was told in his publication: Wilful Obstruction: the frustration of prison reform (1982).

For the next two decades Tony Vinson dedicated himself to academic roles, firstly Professor of Social Work then as Head of School of Social Work at UNSW (1983-1988 and 1996-1997). During this time he was a Visiting Professor at the University of Stockholm in 1985 and 1988 and the Research Centre at the Ministry of Justice in the Netherlands in 1985.

Tony Vinson never fatigued in trying to find a solution to the overuse of imprisonment, despite the fact that during these decades he witnessed the rapid expansion of the prison estate throughout all States and Territories of Australia, in ways that
Tony Vinson Lecture cont’d

could never have been imagined during his years as Head of the New South Wales Corrective Services Commission.

One of the many contributions that Tony Vinson made, among his many publications, was the social research he completed mapping social disadvantage by postcode. His first two studies: Unequal in Life (1999) and Community Adversity and Resilience (2004) were focused on New South Wales and Victoria. The later two studies: Dropping Off The Edge (2007) and DOTE: persistent communal disadvantage in Australia (2015) were national. These studies clearly established the growing entrenchment of social disadvantage that occurred in Australian society over the last two decades, and established the correlation existing between more than twenty social disadvantage factors.

Of interest to criminologists and those concerned with crime prevention were the unchallenged relationships which he established between court convictions and imprisonment with a wide range of demographic measures, ranging from low birth weight through to mortality rates.

It was the experience of working closely with Tony Vinson, managing these ongoing social research projects over more than a decade, that led me to the conclusion that the Australian criminal justice system, and the prison systems in particular, had lost their primary focus on responding to and preventing the occurrence of serious criminal activity.

With the rate of prison growth more than trebling the rate of population growth across Australia over the last twenty years, despite anything like an equivalent increase in serious crime during this period, it had become clear to my mind that something was seriously wrong. It became clear to me that it was now time to challenge the overuse of imprisonment in Australia and to monitor carefully those forces at play that had led to this extraordinary expansion of the penal estate.

It was for this reason that I devised, as part of the Tony Vinson Memorial Lecture, a 10 step pathway towards the reduction by 5% per year of the national prison population, a plan that requires implementation over the next 20 years.

It was David Garland who in 2001 foresaw the developments taking place in the western world in his publication: Mass Imprisonment: social causes and consequences. “Imprisonment ceases to be the incarceration of individual offenders and becomes the systematic imprisonment of whole groups of the population”.

It is my belief that it is now time for criminologists and policy makers to demand a radical change in the use of imprisonment in Australia, a change which rejects the incarceration of the marginalised, the disabled and those who pose no physical threat. We can only hope that future generations of Australians will look back at the foundations of our rapidly growing penal estate with great regret that we imprisoned so many marginalised peoples.

Peter Norden
Deakin University

Criminology Myth-busting

On Wednesday 12 September 2018 the Griffith University School of Criminology and Criminal Justice (CCJ) and the Griffith Criminology Student Society (CSS) hosted a Community Poster Evening as part of Social Science Week. This event was sponsored by ANZSOC, which provided financial support for promoting the event through a Facebook campaign, as well as producing the posters.

The aim of the event was to raise awareness among members of the Brisbane community about criminology, what it is and what criminologists do. The theme of the event was “criminology myth busting”, and the format was very much like a poster session at a criminology conference. The event organisers produced a series of posters “shattering” a range of myths about criminology. Examples include: “Criminology is like CSI”; “Criminologists spend a lot of time collecting DNA and fingerprint evidence”; “Many criminologists work as forensic pathologists on police murder investigations”; “The work of criminologists is mainly theoretical”.

The Facebook campaign ran for three days and more than 70 members of the Brisbane community registered and attended the free event, which ran from 6pm to 7:30pm and included canapés and refreshments. A number of CCJ academic staff and CSS Committee members attended to discuss the posters with community members. The feedback from attendees was very positive and there was a high level of interest in all of the posters. The event was an overall success and the School hopes to run a similar event for the 2019 Social Science Week. The posters from the event are now on display in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice offices.

Hennessey Hayes
Griffith University
In late August this year, approximately 250 people braved a wintry Bathurst evening to attend a free public lecture and expert Q&A Panel on penal reform. With sponsorship from ANZSOC, the Centre for Law and Justice at Charles Sturt University brought together a variety of academics, practitioners and advocates to discuss the rapidly increasing prison population, increasing sentence length and the ongoing expansion of prisons across NSW.

The event coincided with the 40th Anniversary of the release of the report of the Nagle Royal Commission into NSW Prisons, which was initiated to investigate the brutal reprisals that followed riots at Bathurst Gaol in the mid-1970s. Featuring a Welcome to Country by local Wiradyuri Elders, the panel session was a keystone event of the Centre for Law and Justice’s law degree residential school program. Students, members of the legal profession and community members came traveled from Sydney, Melbourne and Orange to attend.

CSU Barrister-in-Residence Bill Walsh opened proceedings with a dramatic and captivating narrative, recounting the terrifying hours when, as off-duty police officer with just 7 years experience, he responded to the 1974 Bathurst Gaol riot. Outlined against a moody backdrop of projected black and white photographs of the burning prison, he told an enthralled audience: “I have never been to war. The afternoon of Sunday, 3 February 1974 was as close as I want to get to war”. He remembered that ‘there was screaming and yelling, the gaol was burning. Police on the outside were powerless to prevent the lawlessness and arson that was taking place. On the outside, we really didn’t know who was winning – the prisoners or the prison officers. But we had the real sense that things were completely and utterly out of control”.

Facilitated by Dr Kath McFarlane, CSU Senior Lecturer and former Chief of Staff to the NSW Minister for Justice, the expert panel then considered whether the establishment of the Nagle Royal Commission following the Bathurst Gaol riot had achieved lasting reform of the prison system. NSW Assistant Commissioner Corrections Strategy & Policy Luke Grant’s robust explanation of the agency’s role in rehabilitation, education and community supervision of prisoners, provided a sober opening note to proceedings. ‘There is no evidence that prison serves as a deterrent’, he stated, but there is considerable evidence ‘that it acts as a form of retribution and incapacitation’. The former NSW Inspector of Prisons and CSU Adjunct Dr John Paget used the recently-announced expansion of Bathurst Gaol to illustrate the economic arguments used to justify prison ‘investment’. To audible gasps of concern from the audience, he pointed out that the multi-millions spent on prisons could instead be used to reduce hospital waiting lists, improve public housing and increase access to education. ‘What we spend on prisons nationally would send 100,000 students to university’, Dr Paget observed.

Australian Human Rights Award winner Debbie Kilroy OAM, the first Australian female prisoner to go on to practice law, was a striking and passionate speaker as she presented the audience with an abolitionist perspective on prisons. Her message was clear and simple: prisons do not fix people, they do not rehabilitate, and they cause incalculable social harm. Uncle Vic Simms, Bidigal Elder, Deadly Award recipient and former prisoner, who recorded the ‘great, lost classic album of black protest music’, The Loner, in Bathurst Gaol a year before the 1974 riot, agreed. Reflecting on the ‘cruel’ treatment of prisoners before and after the Bathurst Gaol riot, he told the audience that he had been used by prison authorities as ‘the poster boy for rehabilitation’, but had succeeded in spite of his prison experiences, rather than because of them. Responding to an audience member’s concern about inadequate sentences imposed for white-collar crime, Uncle Vic also provided an entertaining yet pointed riposte, asking dryly: ‘White-collar crime? You must mean white fella crime. Because I don’t know any black fella whose done crime like that’.

The proceedings closed to tumultuous applause as Uncle Vic and his band took to the stage with rousing renditions of classic songs from The Loner and a string of fabulous Fifties hits.

To find out more check out the CSU Facebook page

Kath McFarlane
Charles Sturt University
Stanley William Johnston, BA, LLB, FACE, Barrister-at-Law, was one of a handful of people who was involved in promoting criminology as an academic discipline at the University of Melbourne in the 1950s.

Around that time, people with an academic interest in crime and justice in Australia generally tended to be lawyers, medical practitioners or people in the prison system who sought to administer and reform laws, improve the conditions of prisoners and understand the reasons why people broke the law – with a view to preventing crime and reducing recidivism. In Melbourne, they took a forensic and psychiatric approach to the problem of crime which followed in the steps of some of the earliest criminologists who had worked in European Universities in the nineteenth century.

Stan was one of those people, trained in the law, who took an interest in law reform, sentencing, punishment and some of the challenging contemporary medico-legal issues of the time. He worked alongside Sir John Barry, Justice of the Supreme Court, Professor Oscar Oeser, Head of Psychology, Sir George Paton, Vice-Chancellor, Professor Zelman Cowan, Dean of Law, Professor Ruth Hoban, Head of Social Studies, and Professor Norval Morris to create a Department that would be truly interdisciplinary. Little did he know how difficult the process would be to satisfy all these competing interests.

The 1950s was also a time at which the global consequences of the Second World War were being examined and addressed, including the need to ensure that the genocide and war crimes committed during the war were adjudicated upon and punished. Efforts were also undertaken to create global responses to crime through the establishment of United Nations agencies such as the Office on Drugs and Crime. Stan took the view that any new criminological curriculum to be created in Melbourne should include subjects that would allow students to learn about contemporary global crime problems such as genocide, maritime piracy, war crimes and cross-border trafficking, and to examine the need for, and operation of, entities designed to police, investigate, prosecute and adjudicate such crimes, including the International Criminal Court. Throughout his career, he maintained a keen interest in the work of the United Nations, and was an early member of the United Nations Association of Australia.

However, at the University of Melbourne in the 1950s, the closest existing departments came to dealing with these issues was in the law school’s international law and criminal law courses, some subjects that dealt with forensic psychiatry, and some aspects of the theory of psychology that Dr Frank Knopfelmacher taught in the Department of Psychology. Unlike in the United States, sociology wasn’t taught in Melbourne – apart from a subject called “Social Organisation” in the Department of Social Studies. Stan’s ideas, thus faced an uphill battle.

Serious arguments developed within the University bureaucracy about where criminology should be located – in law, arts, medicine, psychology or social studies. There were also arguments about whether criminology should be a theoretical academic discipline or whether it should aim to provide training for criminal justice personnel. Cross-disciplinary study was also something quite new and academics fought hard to protect their own territory. Stan remained committed, and, along with others such as Norval Morris, Sir John Barry and Deidre Greig, managed to convince the University to establish a Board of Studies in Criminology that would offer a Diploma – that included a number of Stan’s favourite areas of interest – United Nations Law Enforcement, Human Rights, Sentencing, Corrections and Victimology.

In 1957, Sir John Barry encouraged Stan to leave the Bar and take up a position as Senior Lecturer in Charge of Criminology at the University. At the time, Stan was described by Professor Albert Morris (who was visiting Melbourne from the University of Boston in 1960), in the following words: “Johnston seems to me to be an able young man (then aged 28), who with proper support and experience should be able to do an entirely creditable job in developing a program of studies and research in criminology”.

I was one of Stan’s students in the 1970s who took a number of subjects he taught which fitted in well with my cross-disciplinary background in Law and Psychology. I think Stan would have been pleased that I have since made use of these studies by working at the Australian Institute of Criminology which has included attending meetings of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. This year’s meeting, that I attended in Vienna in May, was on the theme “global responses to cybercrime” that I am sure Stan would have had quite definite views on. In 1963, for example, Stan wrote an article on the role of technology in crime prevention, and he was the founding patron of the Australian Institute of Computer Ethics – making him well ahead of his time.
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I can remember Stan’s Seminars in the first floor room of the Departmental Terrace House at 23 Royal Parade in Parkville where he would start by offering up some highly contentious policy position or theoretical argument that at least one student in the class would violently object to. This then set the stage for a couple of hours of fiery argument that Stan generally seemed to enjoy – until he invariably got quite cross by the end of the class. Just imagine what the debate would have been like in his Criminology B class in 1960 when those attending included Allen Bartholomew and Brian Cook (from the Mental Health Authority), David Hundley (a Probation Officer) and Richard Fox (then Stan’s Research Assistant)!

Another of Stan’s activities concerned the establishment of a professional association for criminology. Stan supported Sir John Barry’s efforts in creating the Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology in 1967 that comprised 49 members drawn from the law, psychiatry, judiciary and prison administration. ANZSOC has just celebrated its 50th anniversary and now has over 1,600 members on its books.

During the 1960s, Stan became passionate about a number of contemporary crime and justice issues and political debates, including the place of capital punishment (just before its abolition following Ronald Ryan’s execution) and abortion law reform (about the time of Dr Bertram Wainer’s activities). Around that time there was also extensive and heated discussion of allegations that the University of Melbourne (and the Criminology and Social Studies Departments in particular) had been infiltrated by communists. ASIO was notified and defamation writs were on the verge of being issued following an exposé article in the Bulletin in April 1961). As far as I can see, there was only one academic working in these Departments who could have been described as a communist. Stan was closely involved in these other debates and was unwavering in his often contentious views.

To conclude, Stanley Johnston’s legacy to criminology is varied and enduring:

- he was involved in the establishment of Victoria’s first University Department that provided academic teaching and research in criminology as a separate discipline;
- he helped to get the Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology off the ground, later becoming one of its Presidents;
- he encouraged Australians to become involved in the work of the United Nations, working at UNESCO in Paris, advising the Australian Mission to the UN in New York, and being involved in the United Nations Association of Australia; and
- he encouraged his students to pursue research in cross-disciplinary, international criminology that might not have been on the curriculum were it not for Stan’s insistence that this was an essential element of a rounded criminological education.

Although it is very sad that Stan is no longer with us, memories of his rounded criminological education.

Russell Smith
Australian Institute of Criminology

Obituary: Sophie Body-Gendrot

The fields of criminology and political science have lost one of their most prolific French international scholars.

We would like to pay our respects to Professor Sophie Body-Gendrot, who passed away on Friday 21 September 2018 in Paris, France.

Sophie Body-Gendrot

Sophie was a specialist of urban disorder, comparative public policy and criminology. She was the director of the Centre d’Etudes Urbaines dans le Monde Anglophone, in La Sorbonne-Paris IV. Her theoretical and empirical work led her to become a researcher at the Groupe Européen de Recherches sur les Normativités, and later the Centre d’Etude sur le Droit et les Institutions Pénales. She was the president of the European Society of Criminology between 2009 and 2010 and served on its boards for several years. She is the author of more than 20 books, the most notable being Ville et Violence (PUF, 1993), Les villes face à l’insécurité (Bayard, 1998), The Social Control of Cities (Willey-Blackwell, 2000), Les villes: La fin de la violence? (Presses de Sciences Po, 2001), La peur détruit-elle la ville? (Bourin, 2008), and Globalization, Fear and Insecurity: The Challenges for Cities North and South (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012). She co-edited the Routledge Handbook of European Criminology (2013). She sat on many scientific journal boards and authored hundreds of articles, most of which focused on urban riots and public policy.

I will always remember my first encounter with Sophie. It was my last year as an undergraduate at La Sorbonne in Paris. She was unlike any of my other lecturers. I was studying a topic called ‘The American City’. The moment she started talking about fieldwork was the moment I became convinced that it was what I wanted to do: study society, and specialise in security issues. She spoke with passion and conviction, and she presented facts that she had always carefully checked and then contextualised. She had an extraordinary capacity to think on her feet, bringing politicians down to earth and answering journalists’ questions simply and clearly. She went to interviews and government inquiries.
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thoroughly prepared, briefing notes in her hand. She was different in the way that she wanted to check everything herself, by ‘going there’. You would often find her talking to police, politicians and community members and visiting the ‘banlieues’ in France and elsewhere. Travelling was an integral part of her work. To her, it was all about getting the facts right and people’s views of events. A year later, I knocked on her door and declared boldly: ‘I want to do my master’s with you, and then I want to do a PhD’. She welcomed me with her beaming signature smile, and said ‘Come in, let’s have a chat’. I became her first doctoral student.

We were in a supervision meeting when the World Trade Center fell. She received a phone call. We thought it was a joke until sobering confirmation came. These moments one never forgets.

Sophie indelibly punctuated my academic life. The transition from HDR student to colleague was a natural one. We always kept in touch. She came as a visiting scholar to Australia in 2010, where she gave talks in Brisbane, Sydney, Goulburn, Wollongong, Melbourne and Hobart.

For many of us in Australia and the world over, Sophie was a mentor, always ready to provide advice and support about teaching, research and publications. She was a fierce advocate for her HDR students and gave thorough, thoughtful advice whenever that advice was sought. She will be sorely missed.

Isabelle Bartkowiak-Théron
University of Tasmania

---

**Obituary: Noel Turner**

Shortly before going to press, PacifiCrim was notified of the recent passing of Dr Noel William Turner (9 August 1948 to 9 July 2018). Noel was a former Treasurer of ANZSOC who brought to the position a wealth of experience having worked at the ANZ Bank for nine years and then as a secondary teacher for many years. He also managed his own lottery businesses for a number of years, that led to him becoming Secretary and then Treasurer of the Lottery Agents’ Association of Victoria between 2001 and 2007. Noel had a Bachelor of Education (SCV Rusden), Master of Educational Studies (Monash) and Master of Arts in Publishing (Monash) and completed a PhD on domestic homicide victims at Monash, graduating only a short time before he died suddenly at his home.

His thesis, entitled ‘Murder and the Australian Dream’ examined media representations of four high profile Victorian cases of murders committed in victims’ homes. The study investigated what it is about a ‘home’ that makes it a site for homicide. His research was supervised by Dr Thomas Heenan and Dr David Dunstan of Monash University. Noel was an intelligent, kind-hearted and caring person who is sorely missed. The Society gratefully acknowledges the service Noel gave to the Society during his time as Treasurer and as a member of ANZSOC.

---

**Contributions to PacifiCrim**

PacifiCrim is a vehicle for communicating with members, and for keeping people informed of developments in the Society and in criminology, both in Australia, New Zealand, and internationally.

Among other items, the Editor looks for content in these areas:

- news of activities and achievements among the members and departments
- coverage of ANZSOC meetings
- announcements of forthcoming conferences and other activities
- feature stories or profiles of members
- awards received and given
- listing of new members of the Society
- president’s report
- research snapshots of members’ current projects and findings
- HDR graduations (ANZSOC student members and students of ANZSOC members)

There are two issues of PacifiCrim annually. For it to be informative and interesting, the editor needs to receive stories and news, including pictures, from the members.

**Advertising rates for PacifiCrim**

Full page (colour) $160 (excl. GST)
Half page (colour) 100 (excl. GST)

Please contact the Editor* for specifications and deadlines.

*A new Editor will be appointed in December 2018. Please go to the ANZSOC website (http://www.anzsoc.org/cms-publications/anzsoc-newsletter.phps) for details of the new Editor after December 2018.
ANZSOC Officers and Committee of Management

Management of the Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology Inc. is comprised of Officers and a Committee of Management which include representatives from New Zealand and all the states and territories of Australia. The Officers and the Committee of Management are elected at the Society AGM, held to coincide with the annual conference.

**Office bearers**

**President**  
Tara McGee (Griffith University)

**Australian Vice-President**  
Rebecca Wickes (Monash University)

**New Zealand Vice-President**  
James Oleson (The University of Auckland)

**Secretary**  
Katalina Bradley (Australian Institute of Criminology)

**Treasurer**  
Lara Christensen (University of the Sunshine Coast)

**Committee members**

**New South Wales**  
Alyce McGovern (University of New South Wales)

**Northern Territory**  
Karen Heenan (Swinburne University)

**Queensland**  
Adrian Cherney (University of Queensland)

**South Australia**  
Katherine McLachlan (University of South Australia)

**Tasmania**  
Jeremy Prichard (University of Tasmania)

**Victoria**  
Asher Flynn (Monash University)

**Western Australia**  
Jade Lindley (University of Western Australia)

**Australia Capital Territory**  
Jason Payne (Australian National University)

**New Zealand**  
Trevor Bradley (Victoria University of Wellington)  
James Rodgers (The University of Auckland)

**Postgraduate and Early Career Researcher Representative**  
Maddy Ulbrick (Monash University)

**Journal Editors**  
Andrew Goldsmith (Flinders University)  
Mark Halsey (Flinders University)

**Newsletter Editor**  
Emma Colvin (Charles Sturt University)

**Conference Convenor 2018**  
Fiona Haines (The University of Melbourne)

**Sub-committees**

**Communications**  
Katherine McLachlan (Chair), Tara McGee, Katalina Bradley, Andrew Goldsmith, Mark Halsey, Alyce McGovern, Emma Colvin

**Student and Early Career Researchers**  
Maddy Ulbrick (Chair)

---

**Becoming a Member of ANZSOC**

**Types of Memberships**

**Full membership**  
(residing in Australia, New Zealand or the South Pacific)  
AUD 155 (annual) AUD 265 (biennial)

**Student membership**  
(only available to full-time students residing in Australia, New Zealand or the South Pacific)  
AUD 85 (annual) AUD 150 (biennial)

**Electronic journal access membership**  
(online journal access only; all other membership benefits apply)  
AUD 85 (annual) AUD 150 (biennial)

**International member**  
(residing outside of Australia, New Zealand or the South Pacific)  
AUD 165 (annual) AUD 285 (biennial)

**Benefits of Membership**

⇒ Reduced conference fees
⇒ Free online / paper copies of the Journal and Newsletter
⇒ 25% discount on SAGE publications
⇒ Access to members' website
⇒ Eligibility for ANZSOC Awards
⇒ Networking opportunities

**How to Apply**

Application for membership can be completed online at [www.anzsoc.org](http://www.anzsoc.org). If you have any queries regarding membership, please contact the ANZSOC Secretary:

Email: secretary@anzsoc.org

ABN: 66 972 302 862