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The Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody

The three-year Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (RCIADIC), established in 1987, investigated 99 Aboriginal deaths in police and prison custody during the period of 1980-1989, of which 11 were women. Generally speaking, the RCIADIC did not include specific references to problems faced by women (Payne 1992). Many of the deaths investigated were of people who had been institutionalised as children under paternalistic assimilationist policies, policies which have overtly and covertly maintained the colonial attempt at cultural genocide. The RCIADIC was only established after a four-year campaign by the National Committee to Defend Black Rights (NCDBR) and supporters. The NCDBR wanted to expose the racist attacks on our people and focus attention on the underlying causes for these deaths. The government wanted to keep the lid on the shocking reality of racist violence and neglect.

During the time of the RCIADIC Aboriginal people were 20 times more likely to be arrested than non-Aboriginal people. The first recommendation of the Interim Report released in December 1988, stated that: “Government ... [should] enforce the principle that imprisonment should be utilised only as a sanction of last resort.” This recommendation was repeated in the final National Report of the RCIADIC. To stop Aboriginal deaths in custody there needs to be a reduction in the massive number of our people being imprisoned.

Aboriginal Imprisonment Trends

The 1987 national prison census shows that Aboriginal people are overall 10 times more likely to be imprisoned than non-Aboriginal people. In some areas where the Aboriginal population is high the figure is as much as 90 times. In August 1988, 29 per cent of the 28,566 people held in police custody throughout Australia were Aboriginal, although our people comprise only 1.5 per cent of the national population (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission 1991).

The number of Aboriginal people imprisoned during the three-year period of the RCIADIC has increased overall by 25 per cent. In New South Wales, Western Australia and Victoria there have been dramatic increases in the number of Aboriginal prisoners: 80 per cent, 75 per cent and 24 per cent respectively (Cunneen 1992a).

This increase occurred during a period when authorities recognised that the over-representation of Aboriginal people in custody was a contributing factor to our deaths in custody. Overall, the imprisonment of Aboriginal people has far outstripped the general increases in imprisonment. For example, non-Aboriginal people in custody in New South Wales increased by 34 per cent whilst Aboriginal people in custody increased by 80 per cent. In Victoria, non-Aboriginal people in custody increased by 17 per cent, whilst Aboriginal people in custody increased by 75 per cent (Cunneen 1992a).

In the 26 months following the cut-off date set by the Royal Commission for investigations, at least 27 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people have died in custody. Aboriginal people are still dying in custody at the rate of one per month! If the non-Aboriginal population were dying in custody at the same rate as Aboriginal people, there would have been 66 non-Aboriginal people found dead in custody every month for the last eight years or an appalling total of 6,336 people.

Over-policing and over-sentencing of Aboriginal people

The ratio of police to civilians has increased substantially in Australia, particularly over the last decade. In New South Wales, the estimated ratio of police to civilians was 1:766 in 1945 and 1:432 in 1990 (Cunneen 1992a). A report compiled by the International Commission of Jurists stresses that this ratio is more concentrated in areas with Aboriginal communities; for example, Bourke 1:120, Wilcannia 1:77, and Brewarrina 1:100. This is sharply contrasted with Chatswood 1:926, a northern suburb of Sydney (Sydney Morning Herald 23 March 1992). Aboriginal people question why money is not redirected from this over-policing into community services and culturally appropriate Aboriginal services,
for example, alcohol rehabilitation programs, jobs, housing, health, education, and so on.

The RCIADIC recommends the utilisation of non-custodial community based options for punishment particularly as many offences charged against Aboriginal people are of a minor nature. The increase in charges laid against Aboriginal people for minor offences has been stimulated by the reintroduction of the Summary Offences Act (New South Wales) which gives the police powers to impose imprisonment for public order charges, for example, offensive language or behaviour.

Commonly, an Aboriginal person will find him/herself behind white bars for swearing and public drunkenness and resisting arrest (Cunneen 1992b). We also find that our sentences are harsher and longer than for non-Aboriginal people. In fact the RCIADIC Research Paper 8 states that most offences of drunkenness and against "good order" make up 63 per cent of the total offences Aboriginal people have been charged with. However, Aboriginal people are under-represented in the more serious offences of homicides, sexual offences, robbery, fraud and drug offences. When our people are in court facing charges there are never Aboriginal people present on the jury.

NCDBR response to the RCIADIC

The NCDBR and the Aboriginal community believe that the Royal Commission's findings failed to bring to justice those responsible for the deaths. We still firmly believe John Pat, kicked to death in the street, was murdered. We still believe Eddie Murray, Kingsley Dixon, Robert Walker, Barbara Yarrie, Bruce Leslie, and dozens of others were murdered. Further, the Commonwealth and State governments have still not fully implemented the urgent recommendations from the Muirhead Interim Report that were released four years ago. This illustrates the tokenistic attitude of the Australian government and its band-aid solution to human rights abuses against its indigenous population.

Position of Aboriginal girls and women outside the prison walls

Much has been written about the impact of the Australian criminal justice system on Aboriginal men. Few people have considered its impact on Aboriginal women. What is happening to Aboriginal women is an untold story and the situation is alarming.

Aboriginal women have survived over 200 years of violent colonial dispossession, alienation, poverty, rape, assault and murder. Aboriginal customary law was overthrown by the colonial, racist and patriarchal judicial system, based on a false legal framework (terra nullius or empty land) in 1788.

Conservative estimates show that today our death rate is four times higher than the rest of the community, life expectancy is up to 22 years shorter, infant mortality rates are up to three time higher and hospitalisation rates three to five times greater. Every indicator of social and economic status shows that our people continue to suffer a colonised existence in poverty.

In Australia it is very clear that the state legitimises violence against women. It has never been able to provide indigenous women and children with
basic human rights. It has not provided us with the standards of health, housing, education, nor employment that it has for non-Aboriginal Australians.

Aboriginal women have no faith in the criminal justice system; as clearly expressed by a Cape York woman: "If a white woman gets bashed or raped here, the police do something. When it's us they just laugh. The fellows keeps walking around, everybody knows but nothing is done." (Atkinson 1990).

Aboriginal women are often ashamed to report rapes and be subjected to the sneering interrogation of young white male policemen with their sexist and racist questions. And if Aboriginal women do take their cases to the judicial system they have to listen to sexist and racist arguments being condoned by the courts. Rape and assault of Aboriginal women is not seen to be as serious as rape of non-Aboriginal women. The following statement was in a report to the Queensland Office of Aboriginal Women:

I have found the the majority of sexual/physical assault against Aboriginal women are not reported. Most women are terrified of the police interrogation where anything from a woman's sexual history to whether she is a fit mother or not is brought out into the open. Reporting an assault sometimes seems to be just as traumatic as the actual assault (Atkinson 1990).

Many Aboriginal women experience violence. The Equal Opportunity Commission (WA) Report 1990 states: "It was claimed that police were slow and unwilling to attend violent situations, often refusing to acknowledge their seriousness."

Inside the prison walls

The prison system has itself been shown to be more dangerous and violent than the outside society. Aboriginal women make up a disproportionately large number of the prison population. In 1989, Aboriginal women composed almost 50 per cent of all women in custodial care although Aboriginal women represent less than 1.5 per cent of the national female population (McDonald 1990 cited in Reid et al. 1991).

The number of Aboriginal women in prison in all Australian jurisdictions rose from 78 in the 1987 prison census to 127 in the 1991 census. This represents a 63 per cent increase in the imprisonment of Aboriginal women during the climate of the RCIADIC (Cunneen 1992b). The rate of imprisonment of Aboriginal women in New South Wales has risen by 168 per cent and in Western Australia by 54 per cent.

The ratio of Aboriginal women going to prison compared to non-Aboriginal women is increasing.
serious police assault on her daughter who was pregnant and miscarried as a result of the violence. Besides being assaulted the girl was allegedly raped by police officers whilst in custody. According to her mother the young woman was too traumatised by the event to lodge a formal complaint. Aboriginal girls have been referred to as “black molly” and “black sluts” by the authorities (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission 1991).

These acts of violence are being perpetrated against Aboriginal girls and women by the upholders of law and order!

Aboriginal women are confronted by the dual barriers of racism and sexism. We are confronted by a historically and contemporary racist police force. Experiences of Aboriginal women in custody, and experiences of Aboriginal women using the law as their right to justice, clearly demonstrate the oppression and social control our people face daily.

Our Children

Aboriginal women as mothers have been placed in a disturbing position within Australian society. We are afraid of the consequences the current “law and order” regimes in Australia are going to have on our children and future generations.

A South Australian study found that while the number of all children admitted to institutions has decreased, the ratio of Aboriginal to non-Aboriginal children has increased. In some states the level of over-representation for Aboriginal girls in juvenile institutions is far greater than for adults (Gale et al. 1990).

A recent report released by the South Australian Office of Crime Statistics states that more than half the young Aboriginal people in South Australia have appeared before the justice system, 7:10 Aboriginal boys and 4:10 Aboriginal girls have been in trouble with the law (TTJ News 1992).

In 1989, the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission reported that in one state 77 per cent of the inmates in maximum security institutions for juvenile girls were Aboriginal (Atkinson 1990).

A large number of charges are for public order offences (hanging around the street) and offences against the police (not cooperating with the police). The visibility of Aboriginal girls on the street makes them an obvious target for police keen to make arrests. Many girls complain of sexual intimidation, ranging from snide remarks and insults to name calling and physical harassment by police. Such harassment allegedly includes strip searching as a regular feature of police practice (Payne 1990).

The New South Wales Summary Offences Act 1988, the New South Wales Sentencing Act 1989 and the Western Australia Juvenile Crimes Sentencing Act 1992 directly contradict the thrust of the recommendations of the RCIADIC. For example, the new Sentencing Act (1989) has increased the average length of juvenile detention sentences by 42 per cent increasing the number of Aboriginal people detained in corrective institutions and the likelihood of them being transferred to prison because of overcrowding (Carrington 1990). The New South Wales Summary Offences Act (1988) introduced new offences, such as “offensive behaviour” and “offensive language”, which provide the police with wider avenues for policing of Aboriginal communities.

The Western Australian Government’s response to the recent spate of tragic crimes involving juveniles was to introduce the Crimes (Serious and Repeat Offenders) Sentencing Act 1992. In effect juvenile repeat offenders will face mandatory prison sentences. This legislation breaches Australia’s commitment to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. It is directly targeting the Aboriginal community and will result in mass juvenile Aboriginal imprisonment. In Western Australia 75 per cent of all juveniles in detention are Aboriginal, the highest rate in the country and this legislation will send even more Nyungars to gaol (Koori Mail 24 March 1992). It is in complete contradiction to the recommendations of the RCIADIC which says imprisonment should be used as a last resort.

The effects of dispossession have fallen most heavily on Aboriginal women because we are often dependent on the state and have lost our traditional status. Aboriginal women face human rights abuses and deal with the consequences of discrimination against our children, husbands and sisters. There is a clear lack of custodial care and protection when we come into direct contact with the justice system. On the other side of the coin, we do not use the system because we do not want to send our own people to gaol, a racist institution, which could mean a death sentence for our people. Aboriginal women live in a society which offers them no legal care and protection, no basic human rights nor rights of citizenship. The social impact of the increased powers of the police needs urgent attention as they are inherently opposed to RCIADIC recommendations on policing Aboriginal communities. We fear the long-term effects of “white law and order” on our children, future generations and our culture.

Final Comments

Aboriginal women come into contact with the police, judiciary and prisons as individuals and as wives, mothers and sisters.

The findings of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (1991) and the Inquiry into Racist Violence (1991) clearly indicate that police attitudes towards Aboriginal people have not improved. In fact the evidence shows that they have deteriorated.

Police violence based on race remains a major area of concern and should be a priority on the political agenda. To date, no police officer has been charged in connection with any of the Aboriginal deaths in custody examined by the RCIADIC.

Aboriginal deaths in custody are a breach of the United Nations International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights of which Australia, as a signatory, is
legally obliged to observe; but Commonwealth and state governments have shown themselves to lack commitment in addressing the issue of Aboriginal deaths in custody. Under this covenant they are required to promote, protect and restore human rights at national, regional and international levels. However, by not actively opposing racism they are condoning it.

Traditionally, women in Aboriginal culture have a status comparable with and equal to men. We have our own ceremonies and sacred knowledge, as well as being custodians of family laws and secrets. Today, Aboriginal women are portrayed as passive victims of non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal men, and of colonial assimilationist policies (for example, institutionalised and forced adoption of Aboriginal children). The effect of colonisation and patriarchy has been to undermine the status of Aboriginal women. It has led to our disempowerment, to the downgrading of our role in society and it attempts to silence our cultural voice (Payne 1990).

Solutions do exist yet they have to come from the Aboriginal community. Aboriginal women need to be involved in the process of redefining and articulating customary law; that is, mechanisms of social organisation and social control which allowed Aboriginal society to function before invasion.

We can run and police our own lives in our own communities on our own lands using our resources and with compensation for the invasion of our nations. Aboriginal women have been significantly over-looked with the provision of services to assist with problems arising from alcoholism, domestic violence and lack of respite care. When the ideology of the welfare system retreats to residualism, marginalised groups are often invisible to service providers.

Royal Commissioner Elliot Johnson highlighted the unsatisfactory welfare service delivery to Aboriginal communities. The government is reducing services for women and there is a strong trend towards privatisation; the state is attempting to restructure its services towards more indirect forms of intervention (Bryson 1988). There is a low uptake of services provided by white professionals and bureaucrats, for both cultural reasons and experiences of racism. Clearly services to Aboriginal people need to be self-managed and self-determined.

Aboriginal sovereignty, land rights and a strong economic base incorporating Aboriginal community organisations (legal, medical/health, art and craft cooperatives, housing companies, education agencies, employment programs, sporting bodies, etc) need to be supported and encouraged. Community development and social justice options offer the best chance for Aboriginal self-determination.

Aboriginal-run “safe houses”, women trained and employed to investigate sexual offences, police aides trained not with an enforcement mentality but with implementing crime prevention programs, dispute resolution, crisis intervention, detoxification units are all alternative solutions to the enormous amount of money poured into policing Aboriginal communities and locking us up.

Aboriginal women need to be systematically included in decision making. Currently, all too often, only Aboriginal men are being consulted and this dispossesses Aboriginal women of our place in society, causing attitudes which promote social disruption and violence. Women need to be included in decision making processes otherwise further subjugation and dispossession of Aboriginal women and communities will continue (Payne 1990).

The increase in Aboriginal imprisonment is not the result of increasing criminal offences. Government policy has promoted the increase of imprisonment and this had a horrible effect on Aboriginal people.

International pressure has been successful in putting miscarriages of justice on the political agenda in Australia, but as this article illustrates, the level of human rights abuses in Australia is not improving. We demand our sovereignty, our rights to lands and compensation, and an end to racism and violence.
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6 CRIMINOLOGY AUSTRALIA
A conceptual model for integrating evaluation into operational policing

Bruce McTimmie

The evaluation of police performance has been the subject of considerable attention for some time. Much of the attention has been focussed on what information should be collected, that is, performance indicators. Less scrutiny appears to have been directed at how evaluation should be managed in large police organisations to optimise its benefit for decision makers.

The attention paid to evaluation can be attributed to at least two stimuli. Firstly, there is greater external scrutiny of police operations in the light of revelations of corruption. In some cases this scrutiny has been institutionalised through organisations such as the Criminal Justice Commission in Queensland and the Independent Commission Against Corruption in New South Wales. Secondly, there are coincidental public sector reforms such as program management which have requirements for evaluation and performance reporting. The clear implication is that police organisations must be more open, accountable and administratively professional. The pressure is on managers to improve their use of information to demonstrate better use of resources.

The use of information to monitor and improve performance has also been an issue in large non-government organisations. A number of models have been trialled in a variety of situations. And it is not surprising that different approaches are continuing to emerge. Even scientists are questioning their approach to measurement and the creation of appropriate information.

So how can police evaluate their operational performance in a way which:

- takes up the demand for increased external scrutiny;
- supports the need for police to more effectively deliver services and contribute to the legislative and policy agenda;
- complies with public sector requirements;
- reflects the lessons learned in large non-government organisations; and
- efficiently yields the appropriate information required for contemporary decision making?

Perhaps most crucially, how can police evaluate in a way which accounts for their existing skills and activities? Some of these issues must be explored more fully before an evaluation model for operational policing can be proposed.

Trends in policing

Most police organisations have advocated community based policing as the model for their service provision. The Queensland Police Service, for example, stated that community based policing was its principle philosophy, taking up the recommendations of the Fitzgerald Inquiry that policing once again becomes a neighbourhood affair. David Bayley (1988) suggested that community based policing includes: increased community involvement in police planning and operations; increased emphasis on communities preventing crime; the use of preemptive police tactics rather than simply reacting; and, devolved decision making. Recent reforms have also emphasised greater accountability for police.

Two aspects of the change process appear to have been consolidated. Firstly, the greater level of external scrutiny is part and parcel of contemporary policing, and one to which police are adapting. Secondly, the process of "democratising" which is implied by community based policing is occurring, with operational police and communities becoming more involved in decision making.

However, as David Bayley conceded in a recent forum in Brisbane, there are few examples of community based policing taking hold in an organisation. While its proponents may lament the difficulty operational managers have in fully integrating community based policing with their existing cultural understanding and operational styles, other explanations may give more credence to the misgivings of police about the model.

For example, the success of specific lighthouse projects may have as much to do with their resourcing and staff commitment as to the strategies themselves. Of perhaps greater concern from the point of view of evaluation is that community based policing implies that police are responsible for community safety and security—outcomes previously expected of the whole criminal justice system. With the causes of crime and disorder now more fully understood as being based in fundamental social structures, police may be well advised to resist accepting responsibility for social outcomes over which they have little or no control.

These concerns imply that police should move away from accountability indicators such as rates of reported offences to those which recognise, as...
Graboysky (1989) suggests, that the police role is as one of a number of cooperating agencies.

The trend for policing which offers promise, and which an evaluation process should support, embraces more democratic approaches to decision making and greater inter-agency cooperation at all organisational levels with police playing a defined role. Within this framework, evaluation of operational policing must be more vital for operational managers, providing a better link between information and their existing cultural understanding.

Trends in public sector management and evaluation

While corruption has not been absent as a motivator for management reforms elsewhere in the public sector, the greater concerns have been the efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery. Hence governments have implemented processes seeking greater accountability from their departments. Program management has provided the framework, with its three elements—planning, resource management and evaluation—being linked into the budget cycle.

However, program management has been expected to deliver more than simply better utilisation of resources. It has also been required to provide a framework for ongoing change. Hence, organisational goals have been linked through a hierarchy of objectives, strategies and actions, to the performance of each individual in the organisation. Evaluation under the model includes the collection and collation of performance information at ascending organisational levels. The visual image is that of a machine, with each component playing its pre-ordained role to ensure the overall success according to established criteria. Evaluation can occur externally to the "machine", with management applying appropriate remedial action once problems have been correctly identified.

According to many commentators, program evaluation has a poor record of impacting on organisational decision making. In part this may reflect insufficient resources allocated to the process. It also reflects the impact of political factors on decisions. What an increasing number of writers such as Stacey (1993) are arguing is that the assumptions of program management, grounded as they are in a rationalist philosophy, fail to recognise the way in which large organisations actually behave. Far from being machine-like, the suggestion is that organisations are highly chaotic structures operating in volatile environments. They might better be understood and managed by identifying their values, principles and culture in the context of changing criteria for success.

This has significant implications for organisational evaluation. It implies that information needs to be more closely linked with operations. Small changes in the environment may be insignificant for the organisation as a whole, but may be highly significant for local receivers of services. Hence, it is important that the service deliverers have the capacity to monitor changes in needs and evaluate their service delivery. Senior managers do not need detailed information about each organisational component. They need information about overall trends and instances where performance is exceptional (one way or the other).

Trends in planning and evaluation for large non-government organisations

In a recent article Allaire and Firsirou (1990) summarised trends in decision making in large corporations. They found two approaches in particular to be always inappropriate.

The first of these was referred to as the Numbers Driven approach. Its main features were the setting of clear objectives by senior managers who then monitored organisational performance via performance indicators. It was found that this numerical information gave managers the impression of increased understanding of their organisations. However, the reverse was often the case. Information is out of date by the time it is collected and collated, limiting its usefulness in changing environments. It was also found that operational areas quickly realised how their performance was being evaluated. While this may have resulted in modified behaviour, it more often resulted in subtle manipulations of information systems to throw the best light on performance. Managers also found that simple indicators provided simple explanations, failing to communicate the complexity of the operational situation. Moreover, the reliance on expensive information systems created havens for experts to gain disproportionate levels of power within organisations.

This last concern was taken up by Allaire and Firsirou as typical of the Staff Driven approach through which planning and evaluation specialists define and measure organisational performance.
Invariably these “experts” drive the planning and decision making processes, short-circuiting the roles of executive and line managers.

If these approaches (still evident in many police organisations) are inappropriate, what clues can the non-government sector provide about better evaluation processes? A number of concepts are evident. Firstly line managers, including operational managers, must have some control over their planning and evaluation. Terms such as “empowerment” and “ownership” are among those used to reinforce this concept. Secondly, organisational performance should be defined more in terms of agreed principles, values and standards of quality rather than through requiring consistency with centrally determined strategies. Thirdly, cooperative teams should be the basic work unit and hence should be the basis for evaluating performance.

This implies a significant shift in responsibility for senior managers. They must be prepared to at least partially relinquish their dependence on information as a tool for external, autocratic control. Information must be treated as having a more intrinsic value, primarily within the operational environment.

Trends in the understanding of measurement

The forms of measurement used in evaluation have tended to be defined within the scientific paradigm. Inherent in this approach are assumptions about the independence of the observer (evaluator), the objectivity of the methodology and the predictability in the behaviour of the system.

However, challenges to these assumptions have emerged from within science. For example, the results of quantum theory research imply that there is an unpredictable interdependence between the observer and the system. More recently, chaos theory has further challenged rationalistic paradigms of knowledge and measurement giving rise to more fuzzy, relativist and holistic approaches which acknowledge the biases of the observer and the unpredictability of certain systems.

It is difficult (and perhaps dangerous) to analogise these new approaches for organisational evaluation. However, it might be argued that specialist evaluators and “arm’s length” methodologies are not essential to the generation of useful knowledge. As Eelden and Levin (1991) suggest, “insiders” are experts in terms of understanding how things work. While their knowledge may be constructed around social and cultural biases, it may nevertheless be highly relevant to the internal decision making process.

Methodologies may also need to be broadened. Relying on experts, according to Eelden and Levin, creates “model monopoly”, vesting power with researchers and de-democratising the learning process.

An alternative to the scientific research paradigm is the participative action research model (White 1991) which claims the capacity to “create new knowledge in active collaboration with the people who live in that situation. They are not ‘subjects’, or ‘clients’ or ‘data sources’, they are ‘colearners’” (Eelden & Levin 1991, p 128). Participative action research is designed to support greater workplace democracy, empowerment and self-management.

The features of the method include:

• the development of theories which allow people to take more appropriate control of their lives;
• the creation of information-rich work environments using continuous mutual learning strategies which build team approaches;
• tapping the existing expertise among workers,
building on the way they make sense of their situation; and
• using work-experience as the foundation for genuine participation (Elden & Levin 1991).

Participatory action research provides scope for methodologies which are consistent with the skills and activities of participants to emerge from within work-groups. The claimed result of successful participatory action research is that insiders take the lead in creating new knowledge. Paradigm shifts in understanding occur in conjunction with changes in activities and values. Moreover, participants find the opportunity to communicate the rich cognitive map which they have of the work environment in a way which contributes to the understanding of managers (Elden & Levin 1991).

A number of concerns should be raised about the model. There is a danger that program participants may be overly focussed on presenting needs, rather than actual needs, with the result that misleading information may be reported. There is also a concern that participants have a narrow view of the overall program which hampers their ability to evaluate its performance. Clearly the objectivity of participants as evaluators will often come into question. There may also be a suggestion that operators take too much control of organisational direction, at times crossing the boundaries of discretionary behaviour.

Notwithstanding these concerns, participatory action research does provide a framework for performance evaluation which supports organisations seeking alternative approaches to management and decision making.

A model for evaluating operational policing
The participative action research model provides a basic direction for the evaluation of police operations because it:
• meets the need for evaluation to have a better cultural fit with policing and police decision making;
• gives strategic status to existing operational police skills (interviewing, observing, investigating) and police activities (patrolling, consulting) while providing a mechanism for the development of new evaluative skills;
• can be managed cheaply by linking evaluation with operations;
• clearly takes up new directions in management which emphasise empowerment, through which operational teams can respond directly and creatively to new problems as they arise, rather than being constrained by centralised strategy; and
• is also consistent with the direction for policing which emphasises more democratic relationships with communities.

It avoids known pitfalls associated with the Numbers Driven and Staff Driven approaches to planning and evaluation.

Figure 1 represents how the participative action research approach fits within a police organisation. It attempts to draw together the main issues of this discussion by linking the information needs of operational police, senior management and research projects.

Operational policing
Operational police receive a variety of information critical to their operations. They are informed of organisational priorities. They must understand their local communities and its agencies. They must also be aware of contemporary research into policing strategies.

The participative action research provides a framework for deciding on the operational issues to investigate. The model assumes that local police have considerable discretion in defining their outcomes and performance criteria, within the framework of the organisational mission and goals.

Senior management
Senior police managers have many sources of information which they must attempt to manage simultaneously. There are external data including government expectations, media concerns and broad community needs. They also receive information about
general trends in finance, reported offences, calls for service from administrative systems.

The model implies that it is also critical for senior managers to receive the qualifying, enriching information which indicates how organisational values and principles are being practised. It is suggested that this is partly achieved by periodic reporting of operational performance according to operational evaluations.

Consistent with the participative action research paradigm, it is critical that senior managers also use informal methods of information collection to help them make the cognitive link between the political and community considerations. Regular visits to police operations is an important method of gathering information and communicating the organisation's direction by reinforcing values and principles.

The model does not seek to devalue the role of formal inspection and audit. However, it does suggest their role will focus more on processes than on specified outputs and outcomes (although some broad parameters clearly must apply).

Democratic projects

There will be particular initiatives which senior management and operational policing want to trial. These will require more formal evaluation processes to validate perceptions of success or failure.

Opportunistic

Like their counterparts in private corporations, operational police need to seize on the few, small strategic opportunities which emerge if they are going to make the difference within their communities. This implies that operational managers have significant levels of authority in decision making and information management. Police need to integrate operational tasks with the collection, analysis and reporting of strategic information if the necessary complex learnings are to be achieved. Hence, evaluative processes must exploit existing skills and activities while creating the conditions under which new approaches emerge.

Participative action research provides a model with the potential to meet these needs of operational police. However, there are other constraints on police decision making at all organisational levels which must be accounted for. Organisational performance is a complex integration of political, organisational and special strategic outcomes.

To build and maintain the momentum for positive change, managers at all levels must access a variety of information, including symbols of success which fit within their current cultural map of policing. This provides an opportunity for change to emerge from within the work environment rather than simply being imposed.

The participative action research paradigm supports a management style which emphasises empowerment, local responsiveness and the development of teams working closely with communities to solve problems. It gives status to police skills and activities as methods appropriate for creating relevant knowledge about police effectiveness and efficiency. The proposed model acknowledges the complexity of the policing environment and builds in the essential political and organisational accountability mechanisms such as internal audit.

Like any new initiative this process demands training and support for operational police. In particular, middle managers need to understand their role more as facilitators than controllers.

This approach has the potential to create a vibrant information environment in which police at all levels exchange what often appears to be conflicting ideas. This creative instability may, in the short term, frustrate participants' views of the policing world. However, in the long term it is likely to increase police understanding of the complexity of the social environment in which they operate. The alternative of pursuing a highly structured information environment is likely to promote belief in a finite set of certainties and maintain management's frustration with operational police inability to achieve the simple outcomes which appear so obvious to central planners.
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why do parents kill their children?

A "loving father" shoots dead his two-year-old twin daughters and then turns the gun on himself. He had recently separated from the children's mother, and abducted and killed the children during an access visit. A six-year-old Nowra boy dies in hospital, allegedly following a "horrible and systematic" beating over a two-hour period. His mother Gunn-Britt Ashfield and step-father Austin Hughes are charged with his murder, after initially alleging that the child had been attacked by four youths in a park. The body of a four-week-old baby boy is found decomposing beside a Gold Coast road, and the boy's mother is charged with murder.

Such cases of child-killing have received a blaze of publicity, and produced emotive and shocked reactions from the public. When Gunn-Britt Ashfield and Austin Hughes appeared at Nowra Local Court in August 1993, over 200 protesters were reported to have yelled abuse, and several brandished placards calling for the death penalty. The media coverage of such cases is also often very sensational: child-killers tend to be portrayed as evil or mad. When the victim has been under the surveillance of child protection agencies, social workers are pilloried and blamed for their ineptitude and naivety.

Such reactions reflect increasing public awareness of, and horror at, child abuse, and a fear that we as a society seem powerless to prevent these tragedies occurring time after time. It also reflects our desire to separate the child-killer from the rest of society, and portray him or her as a bizarre aberration with no connection with "us" or with general social attitudes, practices or conditions.

However, in order to prevent these deaths occurring, we need to move beyond our feelings of horror and anger, and place such crimes in their social context. Whilst we still know relatively little about the motivations and circumstances behind child-kilings by parents (filicide), a recently completed English study (Wilczynski 1993) carried out at the Institute of Criminology in Cambridge sheds some light on this. It was found that filicidal parents usually suffer from numerous difficulties, such as financial and psychiatric problems, social isolation, marital conflict and lack of preparation for parenthood. Parents who kill also tend to perceive their situations negatively, and lack personal and social resources with which to cope with their problems.

Whilst filicide is a rare and extreme act, there are strong connections between filicide and both non-fatal abuse and so-called "normal" parenting. For example, numerous studies have shown widespread support for and use of corporal punishment for children (Graziano et al. 1992; see review in Newell 1989, pp.58-65). Some would argue that this does no harm to the child and that there is a big difference between corporal punishment and "abuse". Yet a common form of child-killing occurs during the course of discipline which has "gone too far". For example, one man who killed his three-month-old daughter after a history of severe violence was asked by police how often he hit the baby. He replied "When she's naughty and cries". When the police officer pointed out that young babies cry all the time, the man replied "They've still got to be taught".

As well, sex differences in the amount of child-care performed by filicidal parents reflect more general social attitudes, and contribute to the occurrence of child-killing. Whilst there have been numerous media images presented of the "New Man" who changes nappies and delights in bathing babies, research shows that women still perform the sole or primary child-care role. Cases of filicide reflect a similar pattern. Most women who kill their children have had the sole or primary care of the child, and expect to do so for the foreseeable future. They are also subject to the very high social expectations made of women to be "perfect" mothers on the basis of supposedly instinctive ability and with little support. Filicidal men, however, have usually only performed some or no child-care responsibilities before they kill. Typically they have been left looking after the child for a short period whilst the mother goes out. Since they have usually spent comparatively little time with the child, they are often rather ignorant about child behaviour. Therefore it could be argued that mothers kill their children because they have too much responsibility for them, whilst men kill because they do not have enough.

The connections between child-killing and more general social attitudes can also be seen from the sex differences in child-killer's motivations. Male filicide commonly occurs during the course of discipline. Men also quite frequently kill because of jealousy of, or rejection by, the victim. These homicides may occur, for example, because the man suspects or knows he is not the child's biological parent, or resents the attention the child receives from the
mother. Another common motivation is "retaliation" against the man's female partner, often because of sexual jealousy or possessiveness. An example is the case of Malcolm Baker, who in August 1993 pleaded guilty to six counts of murder and one of wounding with intent. In October 1992 he went on a shooting rampage on the Central Coast north of Sydney, and killed his son, his former de facto wife Kerryann Gannan, her pregnant sister, their father, a man who owed him money and the man's girlfriend. He also shot and wounded Gannan's new boyfriend. It was alleged that Baker could not accept the breakdown of his relationship with Gannan and blamed her family for it.

On the other hand, women generally tend to kill for different reasons. A common reason is because the child is unwanted. These cases often involve newborn babies, who are killed by young, single women who are somewhat passive and immature, and deny and conceal their unplanned pregnancies. Another common motivation is altruism, such as the woman suffering post-natal depression, who sees herself as a "bad" mother, and hence thinks the child is better off dead. Female child-killers who suffer from psychosis are a third common group.

These patterns of motivation reflect traditional norms of appropriate male and female behaviour. Whilst men are encouraged to be unemotional, aggressive and sexually possessive, women are taught to be passive, nurturing and self-sacrificing. Thus male child-killings tend to be related to sexual possessiveness, jealousy and discipline, whereas female child-killings typically occur in the context of passivity, altruism and mental disorder. Thus child-killing appears to represent in extreme form the playing out of traditional gender roles. Rather than representing a complete rejection of the norms of the traditional nuclear family, child-killing may in fact partly result from those very values.


The Youth and Community Combined Action Program (YACCA) is a new initiative of the Queensland Government which seeks to develop constructive alternatives for young people who may be at risk of becoming involved in offending. It constitutes the juvenile crime prevention component of a comprehensive juvenile crime strategy, which also includes legislative reform of the juvenile justice system through the Juvenile Justice and Children's Court Acts.

The article by Hil and Seaton "Policy or Orthodoxy? Queensland's Response to Juvenile Crime" (Criminology Australia, April/May 1993) confuses these two elements of the Juvenile Crime Strategy, and presents an inaccurate and misleading impression of the YACCA Program in particular.

YACCA is a $2 million, recurrently funded primary prevention strategy coordinated by the Department of Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs, targeting disadvantaged young people rather than young offenders. Interstate and overseas research in the area of juvenile crime prevention suggests that programs which have proved to be effective in reducing levels of youth crime have succeeded in reconnecting disaffected young people with sources of support in their community. YACCA employs a community development approach to help prevent these young people from becoming involved in the juvenile justice system by providing them with opportunities to play a valued role in community life.

In Queensland, rapid urban development, high unemployment and high residential mobility contribute to undermining family, school and community cohesiveness—the principal sources of support for young people. When these sources of support are weakened, the potential for offending increases. YACCA therefore targets those most marginalised from these social support structures and networks.

YACCA seeks to bring all sectors of the community together—parents, schools, churches, community organisations, government agencies, businesses and young people to identify their needs, to develop their own strategies to meet those needs and to build a spirit of cooperation, collaboration and communication. This response is based on a positive evaluation of the role of young people as valued members of the community, who have the knowledge, vision and desire to participate as active partners in community life and have a right and the opportunities to do so.

The Program has built on extensive consultations with the government and non-government sector, and on the result of five pilot juvenile crime prevention action research projects. These projects indicated strong support for the proposed initiative and, in particular, for the promotion of local community participation in project design and implementation.

Twenty locations throughout Queensland have been targeted under YACCA on the basis of a number of indicators of need, including Children's Court statistics, size of the 10 to 16-year-old Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non-Aboriginal population and availability of services and programs for young people. The aim of the Program is to enhance the capacity of these targeted communities to engage disadvantaged young people in community life by building links with young people on four fronts.

**Three types of community-based projects**

Sixteen Community Activity Projects (CAPS) have been funded to provide attractive and productive alternatives to offending for young people. They encompass such responses as development of employment initiatives, skills development programs and recreational activities.

Four Neighbourhood Youth Projects (NYPs) have been established in a smaller number of communities where no infrastructure or support for young people exists. They provide activities and direct services to assist young people gain access to health, housing and labour market programs as well as income security, legal services, family counselling, education, transport and recreation.

Both types of community-based projects are following a two-phase process involving planning (consulting with young people and a broad constituency of government and non-government agencies, community groups, schools and youth clubs) and implementation of creative and innovative responses to the needs and concerns identified in the community. It is expected that the projects will target disadvantaged young people, and actively involve the participation of young women, young people with disabilities, young people from non-English speaking backgrounds and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander...
young people.

In addition, community organisations in seven targeted areas have been funded under YACCA to provide intensive support services to young people engaging in opportunistic prostitution or at risk of entering the formal sex industry. These young people tend to be homeless or itinerant unemployed and disconnected from family, school and community support and tend not to access the health, information, advocacy and referral services available to sex industry workers.

These projects are also following a two-phase process of planning and implementation. Targeted communities have been encouraged to adopt a coordinated approach, bringing together key youth, health, legal and welfare organisations to inform the planning phase and ensure a comprehensive response.

School-based projects

The Department of Education has been funded under YACCA to develop school-based projects aimed at enhancing the capacity of schools and parents to assist young people experiencing difficulties with mainstream education. These projects will link with and complement the community-based YACCA projects, enhancing their capacity to engage with and respond to young people at the margins of school life.

Involvement of the major statewide voluntary youth organisations

A Mainstream Youth Organisation Task Force has been established to bring together major voluntary youth organisations such as the Scouts, the Girl Guides, and the Sports Federation of Queensland, which have statewide coverage and a long history of commitment and involvement with young people in their communities. These organisations are being encouraged to pool their resources and to extend their skills, services and facilities to young people in the target areas, thereby providing vital opportunities for these young people to participate in positive alternatives to crime. They are also being encouraged to link with the community-based YACCA projects, enhancing the involvement of the various components of the YACCA program and the development of an effective partnership between the community and government sectors.

These four elements together constitute a broad and comprehensive strategy which recognises collective responsibility for juvenile crime and emphasises a community-owned response. It is a new and innovative approach, and from the outset there has been a commitment to the provision of training, and to evaluating the program fully.

Queensland Youth Sector Training Council has been funded to undertake the first phase of the YACCA training program, which will comprise the delivery of core training to funded project participants, and a comprehensive training needs analysis. This training will be vital in ensuring the implementation of quality and effective local projects.

Independent evaluation consultants will produce a report which evaluates both the process and impact of YACCA at the local and statewide level. It will analyse, evaluate and document the extent to which YACCA has reduced juvenile offending in target areas, implemented activities and projects in which young people have had a key role in planning and organising, and enhanced linkages between young people and key stakeholders at a local level. The evaluation will be crucial in informing the review of the Program to be conducted in 1995 and will assist in future program development.

Over the next 10 years, the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Services will monitor the YACCA program to ensure its continuation and success.
package recognising that the phenomenon of youth crime is complex and requires a range of individual, family, community and structural responses.

Whilst purporting to be an analysis of the juvenile crime strategy, the article by Hil and Seaton comments on the new legislation in a few brief words and in doing so presents an inaccurate and simplistic account of the purpose and philosophy of the legislation and its key objectives.

Contrary to the views expressed by Hil and Seaton, the legislation is not based on "law and order populism" nor does it reflect a shift to "reactive principles of punishment and retribution." Rather the legislation is founded on the dual concepts of young people being held accountable for their actions whilst being provided with opportunities to reorientate successfully into the community.

The criticisms of YACCA raised by Hil and Seaton are based on a misunderstanding of the nature of the Program and its target group. Young offenders are not targeted under YACCA as the article suggests, and any links between the YACCA projects and the juvenile justice system are voluntary rather than formalised. There can be no referral of young people under community service orders to YACCA projects for example. Furthermore, the role of the Queensland Police Service is falsely represented by the article, which suggests that the police have been funded to undertake a central coordination and implementation role in YACCA, including the establishment of camps and programs for young people. Whilst the police put forward a proposal for such a role in the early development stages of the program, they received no funding under YACCA. Nevertheless, the police have an important part to play in an attempt to address the question of juvenile crime, and are involved in local community-based projects and at the state level through representation on the cross-government group overseeing the Program.

Rather than widening the net of state control as suggested by Hil and Seaton the Program seeks to divert young people from the criminal justice system by improving the linkages between young people and family, school and community networks. As described by Coventry, Muncie and Walters (1992), such a preventive focus "rests on the principle of integration, rather than ... exclusion and separation". This approach recognises the structural causes of juvenile crime and the limited capacity of the criminal justice system to prevent juvenile crime. It has built on existing research into juvenile crime prevention but while the lessons of interstate and overseas programs have been considered, YACCA is not simply modelled on any specific program such as the French Bonnemaison scheme. Rather, it emphasises the development of local responses to the specific and individual needs of Queensland communities, an approach commended by the Criminal Justice Commission in its report "Youth, Crime and Justice in Queensland" (1992). YACCA seeks to encourage and support these communities to bring about real social change, not only by improving young people's access to employment, education, training, housing and health services, but by strengthening the structures of family and social support that are fundamental to the growth and development of young people.
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Queensland’s approach to crime prevention revisited

In the recent history of Queensland’s approach to crime prevention the Youth and Community Combined Action (YACCA) program is perhaps “new” in the sense that it advocates a large-scale, interdepartmental response to juvenile crime. Indeed, the State government has invested a considerable sum of money in this initiative and its outcomes are eagerly awaited by officials at the Department of Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs (DFSAIA), politicians and a host of other interested parties. In order to evaluate the program the DFSAIA has recently granted a consultancy to researchers from the Centre for Crime Policy and Public Safety at Griffith University in Brisbane to report towards the end of 1994.

Pandora’s Panacea

Although the architects of YACCA claim repeatedly that it is “new”, the program shares many of the problems and shortcomings associated with countless other well intentioned “crime prevention” initiatives. As the turbulent history of crime control in Western industrialised states demonstrates, rather than solving the original problem of offending, prevention programs often tend to generate new, unexpected and undesirable outcomes (Cohen 1985, Scull 1983). The results of such programs have been described as “less a panacea than a Pandora’s Box” (Cullen & Gilbert 1982, p.152).

For many criminal justice policy makers the effectiveness of programs is often less important than simply being seen to be doing something about the “juvenile crime problem”. And one of the common ways of gaining widespread support, as well as considerable amounts of funding, is to evoke references to “community”, “community alternative”, “community diversion”, “community development” or “community prevention”. Indeed, for some policy makers it appears that the mere mention of “community” is sufficient to ensure a program’s support, funding and ultimate success. The fact that programs established in the “community” to deal with juvenile crime may turn out to be equally or even more repressive than more formalised systems of crime management is conveniently forgotten (Cohen 1983; Scull 1977; Van Krieken 1991).

Protecting the New

It is against the background of such considerations that this article attempts to respond briefly to the critique of Hil and Seaton’s article (“Policy or Orthodoxy?”, Criminology Australia, April/May 1993) by Erica McLuckie (see previous article). Like other articles and papers written by representatives of DFSAIA, McLuckie’s article slips into a rather descriptive and promotional account of the YACCA program—indeed, the key “critique” of the Hil and Seaton’s article is reduced to a few sentences at the end.

Since the publication of “Policy or Orthodoxy?” my co-author and I have received a number of interesting comments and observations, including the accusations that the article was “airy-fairy”, inaccurate and overly “negative”. “What about the good bits of YACCA?” was a familiar inquiry. The most terse and occasionally caustic criticisms came from representatives of the DFSAIA. It is apparent that criticism of YACCA tends to generate a somewhat defensive reaction on the part of the Department, and in its eagerness to protect the ideology of “community development” and the alleged newness of the program it has avoided the discomfort of open criticism. However, there are signs that such a debate is beginning to emerge beyond the bureaucratic constraints of the DFSAIA, and it is to be welcomed (Lincoln & Wilson 1993; Hil 1993; O’Connor 1993, see also Youth Advocacy Centre 1993).

Given the recent emergence of the program the absence of critical discussion from within the ranks of the DFSAIA is perhaps to be expected. The YACCA initiative is regarded rather like a newborn baby, and, as most proud parents would insist, the offspring is not less than beautiful.

Taking Issue

I wish here to address a number of points raised in McLuckie’s article and to restate briefly some of the major concerns surrounding the implementation of the YACCA program.

Firstly, the claim that “Policy or Orthodoxy?” contains inaccuracies is of particular interest. McLuckie, however, fails to articulate clearly the nature of the alleged inaccuracies. It would seem appropriate for the misrepresentation or distortions to be mentioned in some detail, particularly as this is central to the critique.

The accusation of inaccuracy raises a number of general points in relation to the way in which information is disseminated by the DFSAIA. Complaints from researchers about the delays and obstacles in accessing even the most basic items of information in
the Department are not uncommon.

Obtaining accurate information in relation to the development of YACCA has proven frustrating given the Department’s tendency to release select and partial data while labelling other documents as “confidential”. It is often difficult to discern on what basis the Department chooses to release or suppress information. This, of course, has implications for researchers attempting to gather material from the Department.

Secondly, McLuckie states that “Policy or Orthodoxy?”, dealt with the Juvenile Justice Act in a “few brief words”. This indeed was the case but the article focussed on the YACCA program and not on the new legislation. The Act was mentioned only to illustrate some of the contradictory aspects of the Queensland Government’s response to juvenile crime (O’Connor 1993). The substantive point made by McLuckie in relation to the legislation is that the Act is “founded on the dual concept of young people being held accountable for their actions whilst being provided with opportunities to reorientate successfully into the community”. In fact the Act makes no detailed reference to the latter principle. However, the principle of making young people “accountable for their actions” is worth commenting on. In essence this principle constitutes a distinct shift in emphasis from the welfarism of the Children’s Services Act 1963 to a re-worked version of the justice model. As Barbara Hudson (1987) points out in an eloquent critique of the justice model, such an approach is predicated on a highly individualistic theory of offending behaviour that is essentially abstracted from broader structural considerations. Thus, according to advocates of the justice model, such an approach is predicated on a highly individualistic theory of offending behaviours that is essentially abstracted from broader structural considerations. Thus according to advocates of the justice model, offending behaviour is viewed primarily as the outcome of individual action rather than as a result of particular social, economic and political conditions. Such an abstraction is of course a useful mechanism for a state wishing to shift the blame for its own mismanagement onto the shoulders of “young offenders”. Thus, for a state faced with the threat of “problem populations” (Box 1988) the objective of the criminal justice system is to punish and punish “harder” (Cohen 1983). On the other hand when it comes to that grey area known as “crime prevention” the State appears suddenly able to make the theoretical connection between disadvantage and crime. Talk of individual responsibility and accountability is replaced by reference to community development.

In order to understand fully the emergence of what are essentially contradictory responses to juvenile crime, it is necessary to locate such developments in some sort of historical “space”. For a state faced with problems of youth unemployment, homelessness, marginalisation and dissatisfaction, the Act is a means of punishing offenders without having to acknowledge the impact of social and economic forces on disadvantaged populations. In short, the Act is a way of speeding through the process of justice without the fetters of “mitigating circumstance” associated with the welfare model. Like Western Australia, Queensland has opted for a legislative brand of justice which at its very centre embraces notions of individual responsibility and punishment. Given the results of a similar response to juvenile crime in England during the 1970s, the likely outcome in Queensland will be an increase in the juvenile custodial population (Giller & Morris 1983).

Thirdly, contrary to the claims made in “Policy or Orthodoxy?”, McLuckie states that “young offenders are not targeted under YACCA as the article suggests ...” This is confusing. The major DFSAIA policy statements on crime prevention, including the Juvenile Crime Prevention Initiative (JCPI), the Juvenile Crime Prevention Program (JCPP) and the Youth and Community Combined Action (YACCA), have set out proposals for a comprehensive approach that targets particular “high crime” areas in Queensland. While such a policy may endeavour to cast a wide net over those juveniles deemed “at risk” in such communities it is probable that those already engaged in criminal or “delinquent” activity will come in for special attention.

Interestingly, the DFSAIA has recently changed emphasis in that prevention of crime is now viewed as a by-product of “community development”. The implication is that the goal of crime prevention is now secondary to the aim of improving the quality of life for young people in disadvantaged areas. This, however, has not prevented the program’s managers from referring to YACCA as a “community based crime prevention programme” (Tansky 1993). The point here is that it is disingenuous for the DFSAIA to suggest that the prevention of crime is no longer the primary aim of the program. Indeed, in political terms, the reduction of juvenile crime is the raison d’être of the program and without some evidence to “prove” this outcome the State is likely to reconsider its funding. This has enormous implications for the way in which programs are designed and implemented at a local level. Indeed, from my conversations with a number of YACCA practitioners it is apparent that considerable efforts are being put into targeting those young people responsible for repeat offending, while the “real” business of the program is seen as “community development”. Clearly YACCA workers are more than aware of the political imperatives governing the program.

Fourthly, McLuckie’s article sidesteps a number of assumptions underpinning the YACCA program. DFSAIA information papers, articles and conference proceedings are littered with references to “high crime areas”, youth “at risk” and “targeting”. To date, no attempt has been made by the Department to address the implications of such terms. For example, what is meant precisely by “at risk” — according
to whom? What is a “high crime area”? And can crime data be accepted so uncritically? Further, if the statistical assumption of “high crime” is questionable (Hil 1993), why “target” such areas? Indeed a policy of targeting may operate to the detriment of other areas experiencing similar levels of socio-economic disadvantage. Reluctantly, targeting implies the penetration of more agencies and officials into disadvantaged communities, many of which are already subject to significant amounts of control and surveillance.

Fifthly, McLuckie makes a number of comments on the role of the Queensland Police Service in the YACCA program. She writes “Police have an important role to play in an attempt to address the question of juvenile crime...” Quite so. However, the precise nature of police involvement is left unstated. In “Policy or Orthodoxy?” we raised some concerns about DFSAIA proposals for police involvement in community education, youth camps and other activities. Attention was drawn to issues of accountability and confidentiality and to whether the police were really best placed to carry out such educational and supervisory duties. These are legitimate public concerns and it is a pity the Department has avoided addressing them.

McLuckie’s observation that “the phenomenon of youth crime is complex and requires a range of individual, community and structural responses” is accurate. However, like most aspects of legal “reform” in the field of juvenile justice, good intentions often turn out to be undesirable outcomes. Interestingly, although the DFSAIA recognises the need to address “structural” factors the main focus of the YACCA initiatives is on individuals in targeted “high crime” communities. As a result of its failure to address the underlying assumptions of the program, the DFSAIA has, perhaps unwittingly, contributed to the State’s crackdown on “problem populations”. In this sense “community development” may be used by the State as the pretext for increased control of particular communities.

Having outlined a response to McLuckie’s article it is important to note that many aspects of the YACCA program are positive and progressive and should therefore be commended. Indeed, the program may lead to a range of real improvements in the quality of life for young people in disadvantaged communities. However, until the Department begins to engage openly some of the hard critical questions raised in recent papers on YACCA, the program runs the very real risk of merely slotting into the State’s jigsaw of community control. Certainly there are large numbers of young people in Queensland communities who suffer various forms of abuse and neglect and one reaction to this may be criminal activity. However, the policy of targeting areas on the basis of alleged “high crime” is more likely to succeed in placating public opinion than in assisting children in need.
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The Processes in Forecasting

The usual impression one has of the processes involved in forecasting prisoner numbers is that it is more akin to alchemy than to policy-related research. One has visions of the forecaster gazing intently at a crystal ball or even sweating over a bubbling cauldron before triumphantly handing down the prophecies to a sceptical but grateful audience. Perhaps the results are all that's necessary, and it doesn't matter if the process is shrouded in mystery. Politicians and prison administrators who quote forecasts to justify new prison construction plans or the introduction of some new form of non-custodial sentencing quite properly need some figures to hang their hats on, but they probably never ever look back later to see if the forecasts were correct or if the assumptions built into them were sensible. By the time questions are asked, politics will have moved on, and few but the historians have time to consider such questions. On the other hand, it is somewhat disturbing to think that the decision-making users of prisoner forecasts don't really understand how they are derived, or participate in generating the assumptions that are built into them.

Forecasting Models

Disturbing as it might be, there is definitely some truth in these images of sorcery. At a conference organised by the UK Home Office in 1991 the diversity of the methods used was quite striking. They included some simple and some quite complex statistical extrapolations of trends in prisoner counts (often purely numerical extrapolations without any reference to possible causative factors), and some elegant but extremely data-hungry simulation models which purported to forecast individually for each of the many different categories of prisoner and then aggregated these extrapolated trends. But these models all had one thing in common—they were all extremely good examples of the “Black Box” technique—that is, the results emerged from an impenetrable maze of assumptions buried somewhere in a computer, and accessible only to the “computer expert”. The very complexity of the model, either in terms of the theoretical statistics which had to be used to perform the extrapolations or the complex mechanisms needed to simulate the workings of the criminal justice system, precluded the participation of the decision-makers themselves. And those models which relied upon statistical evidence of emerging trends, from past data, appeared to me not only to impose unwarranted data collection burdens on the user, even where trend information is routinely collected and accessible to correctional staff, but also to miss the point that the history of the criminal justice system is full to the brim of examples where, because of deliberate changes to the way the system operates, data from past years are no indication at all of the way the trends will run in the future. What can such models forecast, except continuity from the recent past? As shown by Figure 1, trends in imprisonment result from deliberate policy changes rather than some theoretically based statistical trend extrapolation.

The 1983 Australian Forecasting Model

In presenting my own forecasting model at that conference, developed in 1983 for the Victorian Corrections Master Plan, I described my approach as more of a computer-assisted Delphi technique than a statistical projection or simulation model. The term “Delphi” is used to describe a technique whereby one begins with a picture of the present situation, and then each of the “experts” likely to have a knowledgeable opinion about future trends relevant to a particular issue are asked to describe how they see the trends emerging, and why. The results of this “survey” are compiled and circulated back to the original experts, so that each might reconsider their own position in the light of what the others have said. The process might be repeated several times and, in theory at least, the experts’ opinions should tend to converge. Whether they do converge or not, the decision-maker, relying on the results of the process for policy advice, has the satisfaction of knowing that he or she cannot be criticised later for failing to consult, and can hardly be personally blamed if policy-wrecking changes later occur which were not anticipated by repeated consultation of the experts. The process also has the merit of assisting the compilation of a comprehensive list of factors which might be expected to affect the emerging trends, which can itself be used as a set of monitoring indicators for early identification of divergence from the anticipated trendline.

When applied to the problem of forecasting prisoner numbers, this means that a whole range of experts need to be consulted. Firstly, the demographers, because we know that offending is a very age-specific thing and we need to know if there is any demographic change in our forecasting horizon which may act to change rates of offending— for example,
the large increase in the teenage population that has occurred in the last decade or the decrease that is expected to occur in the next. Then we need to consult the police, firstly because we regard them as in the front line of the fight against crime, and therefore most likely to have detected emerging trends, and secondly because we know that changes in policing practices can have a profound effect on the numbers of persons appearing at court and being sentenced. (Consider, for example, the radically new approaches the police have adopted over the last few years in regard to drink driving, domestic violence, prostitution and fraud, and the changes in numbers of prosecutions for these offences.) Then there are the courts, who in trying to reflect the prevailing community attitudes often seem to alternate between periods of relatively punitive sentencing and periods in which offender education and rehabilitation are seen as paramount. And, of course, there are the legislators, part of whose job is to change the bounds of legality and of sentencing, to reflect community attitudes, as they see them. They may be aware of intended changes to legislation or to such provisions as remission rates on prison terms, and any other form of early release which may affect the relationship between the sentence handed down in court and the time a prisoner actually spends under sentence. It certainly doesn’t even end there, because the sociologists and the technologists often also have insights which others may not have considered (for example, think of the tremendous but unintended effect car ownership has had on patterns of offending since the 1950s, and the possible future effects of the equally ubiquitous credit card or computer links). Only when we have all these issues covered can we be in a reasonable position to start forecasting prisoner numbers. Once we have these ideas assembled, however, the greatest problem for the forecaster is in combining them into a manageable number of overall scenarios, for the actual range of possibilities is endless. This is what the Walker model aims to achieve.

A User-Friendly Computer Model

Ideally, policymakers should be able to sit with the statisticians in front of a user-friendly computer terminal and, with a simple and speedy menu-driven model, test the effects of the widest possible range of crime trend futures and societal and justice system policy responses. This in fact requires us to be able to construct not one, but many different forecasts, and compare their results to discover which possible future events are likely to be significant determinants of prisoner numbers. If we could build a model which actually enabled us to do that, then the whole level of debate over sentencing, rates of imprisonment, and the costs of corrections, could be raised significantly. Party policy platforms on both sides of politics could be developed with realistic and explicit assumptions taking the place of unsubstantiated and unstated political dogma. Ministers should be able to sit with administrators and see the likely results of their decisions, with the priceless luxury of being able to change their minds before it was too late. Unfortunately, at that time neither the computer technology nor my programming skills were capable of setting up such a user-friendly system. The system I then offered produced a voluminous printout which, with computing skills, could be turned into crude graphics—if you had the right software! It worked, though, and most jurisdictions in Australia have used it—some several times now—as well as a number of researchers overseas.

Things have changed, however, with the latest computer models and the almost universal availability of sophisticated packages such as Windows and Excel. The ACT Corrective Services staff recently asked for help in identifying likely trends in prisoner numbers, including examining the possibility of the Territory building a new prison to house the anticipated increases, I suggested that, even where the numbers are small, as they are in the ACT, the use of a computer model has advantages. It forces the user to think systematically of the elements of a forecast — the catalogue of "expert opinions" listed above. It enables forecasters to run a range of possibilities, including the worst possible scenario, the best possible scenario, and a number of in-between, and having a standard model to fit them into assists the interpretation of the results. The approach and the basic simplicity of the Walker model appealed to the ACT correctional officers, so, after a hour’s instruction, they went away with a floppy disk, convinced they would be able to assemble the data and run the model effectively.

While doing some Excel graphics work for another project, however, I began to realise the potential for a user-friendly interface for the forecasting

Figure 1. Trends in Prisoner Numbers, Australia, 1945-90

Trends depend on political decisions reflecting electoral choices. If we plot the rates of imprisonment in Australia over the past fifty years, we find that coalition governments in the major States (N=New South Wales, V=Victoria, Q=Queensland) and in federal power in Canberra (C, given a weight of two reflecting its national influence) are strongly associated with high prison populations while Labor governments are associated with lower rates. (My thanks to Bill Farr, of Time Australia magazine, for the form of presentation of this chart.)
model: one which would present the user with a set of easily understood graphs describing the key trends, and showing up the differences resulting from one set of assumptions and another. A few hours experimentation and a very rapid learning curve with Excel macros resulted in a model which, was successfully demonstrated at the ACT Corrections offices in Woden later in the week.

Essentially, the model uses Excel spreadsheets, macros to switch back and forth between the original forecasting model, the standard DOS Editor available in Windows, and in addition to offering the standard printout, it also produces a set of Excel charts showing projected trends in commencements and in 30 June musters for prisoners, those under supervision and those sentenced to community work (See Figure 2). Once you have set up the basic data files, using the DOS editor or your word processing package, only four keystroke combinations are necessary to "drive" the model:

- Ctrl/A allows the user to edit a “scenario” file, which describes the changes in rates of offending, sentencing patterns, remissions etc, you have anticipated over the period of the forecast;
- Ctrl/B runs the model and assembles the results of the forecasts in detail;
- Ctrl/C momentarily presents graphical summaries of the results of the previous run before overwriting them with updated graphs, allowing a visual impression of the extent of the changes; and
- Ctrl/D allows the user to browse, edit and/or print the detailed results in full.

The whole process takes only a minute or two, and even beginners and non-computer-users will find it simplicity itself. If you wish to try a new set of options after viewing your results, you simply type Ctrl/A again, enter your new assumptions, and repeat the whole process. The model now appears to have potential not only in policy formulation and testing, but also in the educational field, where it may be a useful tool to allow students to examine for themselves the possible correctional consequences of a wide range of societal, legal and penal issues.

A Fictional Example

The graphical presentation of the model results for an entirely fictional jurisdiction are shown in Figure 2. The somewhat bizarre input scenario suggested, amongst other changes, a substantial increase in the actual time served by minor offenders commencing sentences in or after 1993-94. Note that prison receptions barely changed at that point, yet the prison population is projected to more than double in the space of one year, and to stay high in spite of 1998-99 diversionary efforts increasing probation and CSO placements. Other turning points in the graphs are the results of assumptions regarding changes in the rates of offending and the treatment of young offenders in various offence categories. These are all imposed on a rising demographic trend, which is seen in the steady increases in all categories of corrections after 1999.
Over a number of years, various papers have been published about inmate work. In most cases they have focused upon the dynamics of Correctional Industry Programs in their relevance to inmate development and correctional management.

It is unfortunate that rarely in embracing this important subject, has the broader role and importance of work to the individual and to society been embraced. I was particularly taken by a recent edition of the television program "Four Corners" which profiled the human life cycle as birth...school...work...death. Whilst this might profile our life cycle in a rather stark way it does nevertheless focus upon the dimension of work upon our lives.

It is unfortunate that Australian culture tends to underscore and undervalue the role work plays in satisfying our needs and our development. The "Four Corners" program continued:

From birth to death it's work that shapes us. It is a simple equation. Work equals income, opportunity, security. It gives us purpose. With work we belong. Work in this society is identity.

It is with the realisation of the role and value of work to the individual and to society in mind that the current program of Correctional Industry expansion and commercialisation in New South Wales evolved. On 27 April 1989 the former Premier of NSW, the Hon. Nick Greiner, committed the new Government to this program in a profound way:

One of the clear-cut goals in my administration is to ensure that the long-term run down in Prison Industries is reversed and that within the first term of Government (if at all possible) each and every prisoner in the system is given the obligation and opportunity to do real and meaningful work.

On the same day the former Minister for Corrective Services, the Hon. Michael Yabsley profiled the Government's philosophical commitment in a very direct manner:

It is not work for the sake of work ... It is very deliberately a program directed at rehabilitation ... That is, making prisoners come out of the system better people than when they went in ready to resume a law abiding life with skills that they did not have when first they entered the prison system.

What was important, however, was that the policy commitment of the incoming Government was not merely political rhetoric. It was backed up by a level of structural and organisational commitment previously unknown to Correctional Industry programs. The handbrake which for so long had hampered the role of Correctional Industries to fulfil their potential and to serve the community had been released.

The new policy included:

* A clear policy commitment to provide an optimised implementation of the so-called competing commercialisation of Correctional Industry programs, which I refer to inmate development, Correctional Centre management and economic performance expectations.
* The progressive commercialisation of Corrective Services Industries (CSI) work programs, to enable those programs to reflect and maintain real world "work environments". This also meshed with enhanced expectations over the general performance of Government Trading Enterprises.
* The ability of Corrective Services Industries, often against hostile reaction from some business groups, to source and negotiate market opportunities to generate work for inmates.
* Overdue structural reform to enable CSI to operate on a commercialised basis to facilitate long-term business planning; to generate income to self-finance program development; and to resource capital development and replacement initiatives.

What has occurred in New South Wales over the last five years in terms of Correctional Industry expansion and commercialisation is unprecedented. This has had a profound and visual impact upon Correctional Centre populations.

Throughout the NSW Correctional systems new industry facilities have been opened; existing facilities have been revitalised and extended and facilities previously closed reopened. No longer are Correctional Centres typified by groups of inmates laying idle in yards with all of the inherent destructive influences of human boredom. In such a situa-
tion little hope existed for either the inmate or the community.

What will be found is a large part of the inmate population engaged in a balance of education, vocational development and work program activity (see Figure 1). This is facilitated through a positive and productive rapport between staff and inmates which in turn has had a positive and overwhelming influence over the stability of the NSW Correctional system.

Figure 1.
Inmate employment

The structural outcomes of this program of Correctional Industry revitalisation have been impressive by any yardstick. An additional 2,122 inmate work positions have been created representing an increase of 70 per cent.

Importantly 1,489 of these positions, an increase of 125 per cent, have been created within CSI commercial based business units. In this period more commercial based inmate work positions have been created in five years than existed after 200 years of corrections in New South Wales.

This expansion has of course taken place in an era where the NSW Correctional Centre population has significantly increased. Nevertheless, inmate work positions within NSW are provided to 80 per cent of the Correctional Centre population.

Creating new work positions represents only a small part of the overall program of revitalisation. Greatest attention has been to ensure that the positions created are part of a work environment which reflects the rigours, disciplines and satisfaction of a community workplace.

This is commercialisation. It represents the most misunderstood element of Correctional Industry endeavour. Unfortunately there exists a common, but false view that commercialisation simply represents a hell bent desire to achieve “profit”. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Commercialisation is really about replicating community based work environments. This is fundamental to provide inmates with development opportunities to enhance their opportunity to understand and value the work ethic and to gain and retain employment upon release. It is about linking education and work in the workplace; of establishing regular working hours of attendance; of establishing productivity and quality assurance targets; and of having a customer focus.

Having a customer focus recognises that without customers to generate sales, Correctional Industries
programs do not exist. In NSW, as with all correctional industry programs, this has provided one of our greatest challenges. Just ten years ago the central marketing strategy for CSI revolved around providing “cheap products”. On-time deliveries, quality products and services, and customer service were almost non-existent.

Thus great attention has been given to the transformation of CSI into a professional and respected commercial organisation. This has incorporated a strong commitment to business planning and the adoption of a marketing strategy which recognises the constraints and limitations of a correctional setting and of our work force. We have developed and implemented a “Customer Service Guarantee” which is reinforced by an enlightened customer service program.

CSI is both delighted and encouraged by the many customer testimonials we now receive. They act as an inspiration and encouragement to both staff and inmates. Our diverse customer base comprising private and public sector companies will provide record sales of SI5m in the current financial year—an increase of 86 per cent.

The achievement of this sales development has not been without representations from some sections of the business community about the legitimacy of Correctional Industries to operate within the marketplace. Notwithstanding that CSI is committed to adopting a sensitive and restrained presence within the marketplace, community concerns unfortunately and predictably represent a general phenomena of Correctional Industry operation.

It is, however, important to note that CSI has enjoyed a good rapport with the Trade Union movement. Indeed, the Secretary of the NSW Trades and Labor Council, Michael Easson, carried out a far-reaching review of CSI operations during 1992. Comments made in the review report bear mention:

The concept of Corrective Services Industries and the path it is currently taking is in the broad sense to be congratulated and promoted. It is certainly something which I believe should be supported and encouraged.

To this end, it is important that CSI continue to operate in the market at large and does not simply rely as has been the case some years before on public sector contracts. This enables diversification, skills enhancement and greater industry significance for the skills taught and goods produced.

Whilst there will be successes as well as losses, it is nonetheless important to continue to focus on and commit resources to the process of rehabilitation. Corrective Services Industries has a vital role to play in this process. There is a good story to tell about the work CSI has done to date in the rehabilitation and training of prisoners.

(Review and Recommendations on Relation to the Role and Function of CSI 13 November 1992)

The diversity of CSI functional commercial endeavours reflects our commitment to operating sensitively and sensibly within the marketplace. We are fortunate to have in place the Corrective Services Industries Consultative Council which comprises representatives of the Chamber of Manufactures, the Metal Trades Industries Association, and the Labor Council. A community representative monitors the development and operation of CSI to ensure other businesses are not unreasonably impacted upon.

A primary influence on our achievements has been the development of private sector involvement in the management and operation of Correctional Industries. From complete management and opera-
Figure 2.
Commercial performance analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980/81</td>
<td>-1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983/84</td>
<td>300,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987/88</td>
<td>561,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/93</td>
<td>2,464,225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We do not hold unreal expectations about our ability to link technical skill training with direct community work placement. In large part this evolves from our restricted market access and commitment to not impact unreasonably on other businesses. It also reflects the implications of a correctional setting on the realistic dimension of our technical endeavours.

This commitment is illustrated by the diversity of CSI functional endeavours. A manufacturer of metal and furniture products; an operator of a dairy or a sawmill; a provider of upholstery services to a major textile product supplier; provision of skilled services to a range of agricultural services; printed products and electronics.

CSI work programs, whilst primarily catering for those inmates with educational and work skill deficiencies, also cater for those inmates who possess sound to superior educational and work capabilities.

To those inmates CSI offers a unique range of opportunities to ensure their creative talents can be utilised in a constructive and useful manner.

CSI is committed to continue with an important 1991 research study entitled “Offender and Post-Release Employment” which found that Corrective Services Industries work programs had positive implications for both inmates and the correctional system. The study will be continued during 1994 with a view to identifying the influence of CSI work programs in reducing recidivism levels and to provide inputs which will influence the future direction and operation of CSI work programs in NSW.

Our direction for the immediate future is to create further inmate work positions in the areas where there is a deficiency. We will be further refining our commercial infrastructure and performance to ensure the future of CSI as a viable and professional commercial entity.

Correctional Industry programs recognise that work is a cornerstone of our society and aim to provide hope and confidence to both inmates and the community. Nevertheless, managing Correctional Industry programs in the 1990s is complex and encompasses setting and achieving social and commercial objectives. It involves balancing the constraints and opportunities of operating within a public sector and correctional environment. Finally, it includes setting and achieving commercial goals within a restricted, customer focused and highly expectant marketplace.

The cynics, pessimist and visionless would suggest that optimising all these considerations represents an impossible task. In New South Wales, through a team of highly dedicated staff, we think otherwise and have the results to prove it.
The Aboriginal Justice Issues Conference provided a forum for the discussion of Aboriginal rights and welfare. The success of the conference is reflected in the final chapter of this book, which contains 113 recommendations.

Aboriginal Justice Issues includes topics on Aboriginal rights and welfare; the efforts of Aboriginal communities to prevent crime within settlements and the types of strategies used; mediation within communities and the use of alternative dispute resolutions; police and Aboriginal people; juvenile programs; and the issues of judicial and media racism.

Conference Proceedings No. 22
National Conference on Juvenile Justice
eds Lynn Atkinson & Sally-Anne Gerull

The administration of juvenile justice is going through rapid change. Over recent decades the philosophy underpinning Australia's juvenile justice system responses has shifted from welfare/rehabilitation, to due process, to more multi-dimensional responses. The National Conference on Juvenile Justice provided the forum for debate on a number of issues relating to young people.

The book, National Conference on Juvenile Justice is a timely contribution to the ongoing juvenile justice debate.

Facts and Figures in Crime and Criminal Justice
General Editor, John Walker
(Subscription A$20.00 per annum)

Australian Prison Trends
ISSN 1037-6925
No. 207 August 1993, No. 208 September 1993
Compiled by Sue Salloom

Australian Criminology Information Bulletin
ISSN 1034-6627
Vol. 4, No. 6, December 1993
Subscription A$20.00 p.a. (6 issues per annum)

Deaths in Custody, Australia
ISSN 1038-667X
General Editor: David McDonald
Free of charge to subscribers to Trends and Issues - contact Australian Institute of Criminology

No. 6 Australian Deaths in Custody 1992-93
Christine Howlett & David McDonald
Publications by the Crime Research Centre, The University of Western Australia available from the Australian Institute of Criminology:

Repeat Juvenile Offenders: The Failure of Selective Incapacitation in Western Australia Research Report No. 10
Richard W. Harding (ed.)

The Law Book Company Ltd
44-50 Waterloo Road
North Ryde NSW 2113

Criminal Law
Peter Gillies

Criminal Law examines the criminal law in NSW, Victoria, SA and the ACT. It progresses through the substantive criminal law in Australian common law jurisdictions and explores other related issues, such as offences against justice and fraud in the criminal law. This edition incorporates the case law and legislative changes since 1989.

Allen & Unwin
PO Box 8500
St Leonards NSW 2065

Studies in Society
Offending Girls
Kerry Carrington

Offending Girls explores the vulnerability of young girls who come from Aboriginal communities and housing commission areas to come in contact with justice authorities. Using feminist and post-structuralist concepts, it analyses how female delinquency is manufactured by the juvenile justice system, through the application of specific forms of knowledge and power.

The author lectures in sociology at the University of Newcastle, NSW.

The Federation Press
PO Box 45
Annandale NSW 2038

Mabo: What the High Court Said

This book sets out in plain English the High Court decision in Mabo. It has no commentary or point of view, but simply gives everyone the opportunity to read the case for themselves and make up their own minds. It gathers the judgment into chapters and themes. It enables all Australians to understand what the High Court has ruled in the Mabo case and why.

Justice in Error
Clive Alker & Keir Starmer (eds)

Recent years have seen the release from prison of the Guildford Four, the Birmingham Six and the Tottenham Three. The Maguire Seven has now been cleared of all charges, and the discredited West Midlands Crime Squad has been disbanded. Each of these events has highlighted serious failures in the UK criminal justice system. This book examines the various steps within the criminal justice system which have resulted in the conviction of the innocent. Remedies as to how miscarriages might be avoided in the future are suggested.

The Institute of Criminology
Faculty of Law
The University of Sydney
Sydney NSW 2006

The Man in White is Always Right: When Cricket Meets Law
David Fraser

David Fraser is a lecturer in the Faculty of Law, University of Sydney. His book, The Man in White is Always Right: Cricket and the Law, looks at the interconnections between cricket and law, and tries to show the complex ways in which we construct "communities of understanding". Topics discussed include the controversies of underarm bowling, allegations of racism, and ethics. It will appeal to lawyers or academics with an interest in the legal and ethical issues posed in cricket, as well as to those interested in the game of cricket.

Psychiatry in Court
Peter Shea

Psychiatry in Court is written in clear, non-technical language and explores the use and usefulness of psychiatric evidence in court. The book explores the "language of psychiatry" and through a methodical examination of the way psychiatric disorders are classified, the major theoretical schools of psychiatry and three of the principal diagnostic groups — schizophrenia, depression and psychopathy. There are also chapters on the assessment process and those involved in it, the connection between mental disorder and criminal behaviour, and the concept of dangerousness, its relationship to mental disorder and its predictability.

Dr Shea lectures in forensic psychiatry at the University of Sydney's Faculty of Law.
Australian Institute of Criminology
(Please note that Conference information is subject to change. Check conference details with the Conference Program at the address below)

1994
11-13 May 9th Conference for Librarians in the Criminal Justice System, Canberra
14-17 Jun Aboriginal Justice Issues II, Townsville
20-22 July Access to Justice, Sydney
21-26 August 8th International Symposium on Victimology, Adelaide (held by the World Society of Victimology in association with the Australasian Society of Victimology. The AIC is a co-sponsor)

The Conference Program of the Institute is always keen to hear from people interested in participating in, or speaking at, Institute Conferences. If you would like to be involved in any of the above events, kept informed of planning for them, or have any suggestions for Institute Conferences that would address issues of national importance in the criminal justice or related areas, please contact the:

Conference Program
The Australian Institute of Criminology
GPO Box 2944
Canberra ACT 2601
Tel: (06) 274 0223/0230
Fax: (06) 274 0223

International Forum of Education in Penal Systems (Melbourne)
Employment, Education and Training of Offenders: Focussing on National Agendas
27-29 March 1994, Radisson President Hotel, Melbourne.

For further information, please contact:
Dr Bob Semmens
Institute of Education

Australian and New Zealand Association of Psychiatry, Psychology and Law
1994 14th Annual Congress
The Thin Blue Line: law, order and mental health
7-10 April 1994, Esplanade Hotel, Fremantle, Western Australia

Access to Justice, Sydney
8th International Symposium on Victimology, Adelaide (held by the World Society of Victimology in association with the Australasian Society of Victimology. The AIC is a co-sponsor)

Australian Institute of Judicial Administration
3rd Biennial Higher Courts' Conference
26-27 May 1994, Sydney

The Conference Program of the Institute is always keen to hear from people interested in participating in, or speaking at, Institute Conferences. If you would like to be involved in any of the above events, kept informed of planning for them, or have any suggestions for Institute Conferences that would address issues of national importance in the criminal justice or related areas, please contact the:

Conference Program
The Australian Institute of Criminology
GPO Box 2944
Canberra ACT 2601
Tel: (06) 274 0223/0230
Fax: (06) 274 0223

International Forum of Education in Penal Systems (Melbourne)
Employment, Education and Training of Offenders: Focussing on National Agendas
27-29 March 1994, Radisson President Hotel, Melbourne.

For further information, please contact:
Dr Bob Semmens
Institute of Education
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2nd International Conference on Deaths in Custody, Caring for People at Risk®
5-7 April 1994, Cambridge, England

Speakers will include:
Sir Louis Blom-Cooper QC (Chair of the UK Mental Health Act Commission), Ian Dunbar (Director of Inmate Administration, HM Prison Service) David McDonald (Australian Institute of Criminology), and Joseph Rowan (Criminal and Juvenile Justice International, USA)

For further information, please contact:
Ms Julia Braggins
Director
Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency
King’s College London
Strand
London WC2R 2LS
Tel: (44) (71) 873 2822
Fax: (44) (71) 873 2823

Centre for the Study of Public Order
University of Leicester
Prisons 2000 - An international conference on the present state and future of the prison system®
8-10 April 1994, University of Leicester, England

Topics to be covered will include: Comparative Penal Policies; Riots and Disturbances; Women in Prison; Privatisation of Penal Services; HIV/AIDS and Imprisonment; Alternatives to Custody; Human Rights; and much more. Guest speakers will include: His Honor Judge Stephen Tumin, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, UK; Professor Norval Morris, University of Chicago, USA; Professor Monika Platek, University of Warsaw, Poland; and Professor Thomas Mathiesen, University of Oslo, Norway.

For further information, please contact:
Ms Julie Trickey
Centre for the Study of Public Order
University of Leicester
The Friars
154 Upper New Walk
Leicester LE1 7QA England
Tel: (44) (533) 52 5707
Fax: (44) (533) 52 3944

International Academy of Legal Medicine and Social Medicine
16th Conference
31 May-2 June 1994, Strasbourg, France

*Transport between these two UK conferences can be arranged and discounts to participants wishing to book for both conferences may be available.

For further information, please contact:
Prof. P. Mangen
President of the Organising Committee
Institut de Médecine Légale
11 Rue Humann,
F-67085 Strasbourg, France

3rd World Congress on Penitentiary Health Care and Treatment of Offenders
6-9 June 1994, Tokyo, Japan

The main theme of the conference will be the philosophical and cultural approach of penitentiary medicine and rehabilitation aid. Topics will include treatment and health care of adult and juvenile offenders with emphasis on narcotic addiction, mental disorders, sexual deviation, AIDS, forensic science, and prevention of juvenile delinquency. Discussions will draw upon international experts, clinical studies, and practical experiences of prison authorities from around the world.

The official languages will be English and Japanese with simultaneous translation.

For further information, please contact:

Secretariat for ICPMS'94 Japan,
c/o Japan International Cultural Exchange Foundation
2-15-5-207 Shoto, shibuya-ku,
Tokyo, Japan
Tel: 81-3-3467-7316
Fax: 81-3-3467-7317
Chair of AIC Board appointed to the Family Court of Australia

Mrs Sally Brown, Chair of the Australian Institute of Criminology's Board of Management and former Chief Magistrate of Victoria, has been appointed as a Judge of the Family Court of Australia. Justice Brown's appointment will fill the vacancy created in the Court by the retirement of Justice Steven Strauss.

Environmental Law (1)

Professor Ben Boer, Director of the Australian Centre for Environmental Law based at the Faculty of Law, University of Sydney, and Ms Donna Craig, Senior Lecturer in Law at Macquarie University, have received Australian Research Council grants totalling $180,000 over three years for their research into “Legal frameworks for sustainable development in Australia, Asia and the Pacific Region”. The project will provide a comparative analysis of Australia and a range of countries in the Asian and Pacific region, focusing on the implementation of sustainability by means of legal and policy mechanisms.

Environmental Law (2)

A research project being undertaken by Neil Gunningham, Professor of Law at the Australian National University and Director of the Australian Centre for Environmental Law, and Dr Peter Grabosky*, a political scientist at the ANU's Urban Research Program specialising in government regulation, aims to provide a blueprint for environmental regulation which will not only improve the environmental performance of government and industry, but reduce the cost burdens regulation traditionally imposes on the taxpayer and private sector. The project will also look at ways in which governments can provide incentives for companies to become good environmental citizens and promote green markets.

Dr Grabosky advises: “we are striving to envisage an optimum mix of public sector, private sector, and other public interest and commercial institutions in furtherance of environmental protection.”

*Dr Grabosky is currently on secondment to the Australian National University from the Australian Institute of Criminology.

Justice Appointment

Professor David Weisbrot, Dean of the Faculty of Law, University of Sydney, has been appointed a member of the Access to Justice Advisory Committee, an expert group responsible for proposals to make the justice system cheaper, fairer and more accessible. The Committee is due to report to the Attorney-General and the Minister for Justice during 1994.

New Law Newsletter

The Centre for National Corporate Law Research in the Faculty of Management at the University of Canberra has launched a new fortnightly publication, Update, which details news and developments from the corporate and taxation world. It includes news and information from industry; cases, draft rulings and determinations; new legislation; recent journal articles; and news on the Centre's activities. For further information contact Ms Emma Davis on 06 201 2731.

Occasional Seminars at the Australian Institute of Criminology


On 9 November 1993, Dr Hans-Jurgen Kerner, Professor of Criminology and Director of the Institute of Criminality in the Law Faculty of the University of Tuebingen, Germany, and Dr Elmar Weitekamp, Senior Research Association at the Institute of Criminality, University of Tuebingen, spoke about “Social Change and Fear of Crime and Attitudes towards Foreigners in Germany: a Comparison between the Old and New States”.

On 20 December 1993, Mr Barry Weisberg, President of Civic Consultants, a legal and political consulting company in Chicago, spoke about “How the Public and Private Sector can work together to reduce and prevent Violence, Substance Abuse and Crime”.
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