

What Are the Barriers to the Development of Convict Criminology in Australia?

Lukas Carey, Andreas Aresti and Sacha Darke

INTRODUCTION

Convict Criminology (CC) is a concept that has its roots in the USA in the mid-1990s and was created by a group of previously incarcerated academics (Ross and Richards, 2003). The movement has spread to other countries, with similar groups commencing in the UK and Canada with large numbers of active members (Richards and Ross, 2001; Aresti, 2012; Ross et al, 2014; Aresti and Darke, 2016; Newbold, 2017; Ross and Darke, 2018) with others such as New Zealand having smaller numbers of members (Newbold, 2017). Some countries are in the process of formalizing a CC group, but due to numerous barriers the progress is slow (Richards et al., 2008; Aresti, 2012; Hakeem et al., 2015; Aresti and Darke, 2016; Newbold, 2017; Earle, 2018; Ross and Vianello, 2020). This paper will discuss the barriers faced in developing convict criminology in Australia. It will provide context to the need for the lived experiences of previously incarcerated people to enhance criminological research in this country. In addition to this, the paper will provide a rationale as to the insider perspectives that previously incarcerated academics can provide to enhance the quality of criminological scholarship in Australia.

AN INSIDER PERSPECTIVE: FIRST AUTHOR'S BACKGROUND

Advocating bringing together a group of people with lived experience in the justice system is a bizarre thing to consider, without some background. The first author, Lukas has lived experience and after being released from custody in Australia, had a simple decision to make, lie on the couch and do nothing or try and do something to make a difference.

Lukas began to entrench himself in what could be done, as a person with a record, for both work and education and found the Convict Criminology (CC) website and commenced writing an email to co-founder Stephen Richards asking what could be done to get involved. Stephen's response was the prod needed, telling him to start studying criminology and use his Ph.D. and educational background in research. Due to the lack of formalized

CC representation in Australia, Stephen suggested Lukas speak to CC stalwart Greg Newbold in New Zealand. Once he did that, the ball began to roll with Greg also confirming that Lukas should study criminology and use his educational background to look into issues and experiences while ‘away’. It was here that his interest and passion for CC, lived experience and education of those inside and recently returned began and continues to flourish today. Lukas was inspired to research his prison experience and to explore the need for obvious radical reform in the criminal justice system.

WHAT IS CONVICT CRIMINOLOGY?

The CC movement is a ‘collection of individuals united by a general philosophy that the discipline of criminology benefits from the educated input of those with experience in the realities of crime and incarceration either as prisoners, prison workers or official visitors (Newbold, 2017). The members of the CC group conduct numerous activities such as research, publishing books and papers, presenting research at conferences, assisting with the development of policy and procedure, providing role modelling to previously incarcerated people, contributing to academic and career guidance and assisting others to find work in academic positions across the world (Ross and Richards, 2003; Richards et al., 2008; Richards et al., 2010; Newbold and Ross, 2013; Richards, 2013; Newbold et al., 2014; Ross et al., 2014; Richards, 2015; Ross and Darke, 2018). These activities encompass the primary goals of the CC movement (Ross and Richards, 2003) and fills the gap of the missing research accounts by academics who themselves served prison or jail time (Ross and Richards, 2003; Jones et al., 2009). The primary aims of CC are:

1. To transform the way research on prisons is conducted. More specifically, to share experiences and develop ideas that draw from the convergence of academic study of prison and experience of it as a prisoner.
2. To utilize our collective knowledge, experiences and expertise to influence policy change through our academic work and connections to advocacy/campaign groups. Moreover, to insist that our professional criminology and legal associations begin to

articulate policy reforms that will make the criminal justice system humane.

3. To develop critical perspectives on prisons and research with prisoners and former prisoners, and challenge managerial criminology and criminal justice.
4. To provide a balanced approach to criminological research utilizing those with lived experience, by providing support to prisoners and ex-prisoners in establishing themselves as academics in criminology and its cognate disciplines.

The majority of work done by members of the CC movement has occurred in the USA (Tietjen and Kavish, 2020; Richards and Ross, 2001; Ross and Richards, 2003; Richards et al., 2008; Richards et al., 2010; Richards, 2013; Newbold et al., 2014; Richards, 2015; Ross et al., 2016; Ross and Darke, 2018; Tewksbury and Ross, 2019; Tietjen, 2019; Tietjen et al., 2020), but a strong CC voice has also emerged in the UK since a British Convict Criminology group was established in the early 2010s (Aresti et al., 2010; Aresti, 2012; Honeywell, 2015; Aresti and Darke, 2016; Earle, 2018). Most recently, the CC movement has started to take root in parts of South America, especially in Brazil and Argentina (Ross et al., 2014; Ross and Darke, 2018; Ross and Vianello, 2020), as well as Italy (Vianello, 2020). The CC perspective has also been utilised by former incarcerated academics in other parts of the world including New Zealand (Newbold and Ivory, 1993; Weiss and South, 1998; Hakeem et al., 2015; Newbold, 2016; Ross and Vianello, 2020). One of the dreams of CC pioneer John Irwin was an international movement, this is happening, slowly, but challenges remain in Australia (Ross and Richards, 2003; Newbold, 2017).

The challenges faced by several countries such as Australia, New Zealand and other smaller populated countries are unique when compared to countries with higher populations and incarceration levels. The smaller prisoner numbers of Australia, when compared to countries like the USA and UK, where CC groups have been established, would suggest that the amount of previously incarcerated, educated people that could provide input into the area of CC, would be less. However, further challenges exist with the smaller amount of universities and Schools of Criminology in those universities that are prepared to include CC in their curriculum, and

a reluctance to hire previously incarcerated people as academics in their institutions. The amount of universities in places such as the USA and UK provide greater opportunity when compared to university numbers and teaching positions in Australia.

Literature reviews and a detailed review of Australian criminological libraries, online databases (Australian Education Directory, Australia and New Zealand Database, Health Issues in Criminal Justice [CINCH-Health], Directory of Open Access journals, Gale Virtual Reference Library, ProQuest One Academic), and phone conversations with heads of schools of the large majority of Australian universities, have not been able to uncover any concerted efforts to formalize CC in this country. Informal attempts have been made in some of the criminological institutes across the country but, to this point, no formal CC group has started in Australia. Although several individuals and groups, such as Brett Collins (Justice Action) Dr. Mindi Sotiri (Community Restorative Centre), Amelia Pickering (Prison Network Australia), Ian Neil (Pivot Support), Dr. Caroline Doyle (After Prison Network) and Dean Lloyd (Lloyd Consulting), work with previously and currently incarcerated people, it is done primarily on an individual basis and if united could increase the work of all groups in this area. The work of Newbold (2017) also indicates that the CC movement is still in its infancy and he identified several people in Australia that could be the future of the movement. Nothing formal has occurred in the space since this time with no records of CC existing in any of the Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology thematical groups that appear under its umbrella (ANZSOC, 2020).

CHALLENGES TO EXPANDING CONVICT CRIMINOLOGY INTO AUSTRALIA

Many challenges to the development of Convict Criminology exist and have been identified and explored in US and UK based research (Richards and Ross, 2001; Ross and Richards, 2003; Aresti, 2012; Newbold and Ross, 2013; Richards, 2013; Ross et al., 2014; Ross et al., 2016; Earle, 2018; Ross and Darke, 2018; Tietjen, 2019; Ross and Vianello, 2020).

Although technology continues to develop, making the world 'smaller' and increasing communication, some practical challenges are still encountered when bringing CC to Australia. The prime practical challenge

faced is that the ‘home’ of CC is the USA and many people see this movement as an ‘American thing’. Furthermore, in order to gain strength and career credibility it is almost implied that a CC academic ‘ply their trade’ and present at the American Society of Criminologists conference held annually. Academics in the area of criminology in Australia who have not been previously incarcerated are able to freely travel to this event, mix with other academics and return to Australia with an expanded network. Previously incarcerated academics do not have this freedom and are often crippled by parole requirements, visa restrictions and travel bans (Newbold, 2017; Tietjen, 2019). Currently, the USA has some of the most stringent travel bans for those with criminal records in the world (Ross et al., 2014), and this makes it challenging for any emerging voices in other countries to benefit from the breadth and relative strength of the movement in the USA. This exclusion from conventional academic networks makes it difficult for CC perspectives to have an impact in the Australian criminology landscape. This is amplified by the recently imposed travel ban measures taken by the UK, who following the US, have placed further limits on non-British citizens, with criminal convictions, entering the UK (UNLOCK, 2020). In contrast, most European countries, typically, appear to have a more relaxed approach in this respect, although of course, this will change post Brexit (UNLOCK, 2020).

It has been suggested by Singh (in Newbold, 2017) that a way to get past the issue of accessing such conferences and opportunities is through the use of webcams, teleconferencing and programs such as Zoom and Skype. One of the silver linings in the current pandemic is an increase of online conferences and ease of access for those with travel bans or parole challenges. The challenge with this type of conference is that not being able to participate in the ‘offline’ conversations, the casual interaction and the shared social time, taking away from the quality learning, networking and engagement between participants, that might occur (Newbold, 2017; Spilker et al., 2020).

An additional suggestion made by Newbold (2017) was the ability to have international academics attend Australian or New Zealand criminology conferences. In recent years, due to an increase in the toughness on international crime, and the existence of terrorism and immigration restrictions, this task is now almost as difficult as gaining access to the USA and UK. This realistically means that any internationally-based CC

academic with a criminal record would struggle to gain access to Australia, taking away the ability to promote such an event to get the word out about the CC movement (Aresti, 2012; Ross et al., 2014; Aresti and Darke, 2016; Ross and Darke, 2018).

In addition, the recent and continuing issue of the COVID-19 pandemic remains, and will possibly remain a restriction to all international travel and some domestic travel across the world, for a long period of time (Chinazzi et al., 2020). The ongoing fears of contamination and spread of the virus has seen the large majority of travel banned and conferences cancelled. This is a challenge that requires extensive and specific attention and consideration by groups hosting conferences as they balance academic benefits with the medical and, in some areas, legal challenges of bringing groups of people together in the current climate (Spilker et al., 2020). The development of online conferences and collaborations has been considered the ‘new normal’ under the current climate (Spilker et al., 2020). Although, the use of technology will potentially diminish some of the challenges travelling to a conference during COVID-19 could cause, further work in relation to the design of conferences and participant engagement before, during and after sessions is required (Chick et al., 2020).

However, whilst the use of technology can overcome some of the challenges faced in terms of conferences and international engagement, it is less useful in the realms of collaborative prison research and the development of co-produced knowledge. Restrictive access to prisons for researchers, especially for those of a critical persuasion (Aresti et al., 2016) and the added complication of COVID-19, has rendered it near impossible to conduct research with prisoners, and develop the CC network membership in prisons.

THE CONNOTATIONS OF THE WORD CONVICT IN AUSTRALIA

A legitimate barrier to the development of CC as a genre of criminological study in Australia is the connotations derived from the word ‘convict’. The word has very differing connotations from the use of the word in the USA, UK and other countries that were not colonized by transportation of large numbers of convicts forcibly expelled from their country of origin. The simple existence of the word in an Australian context can generate negative

emotions for many and anger for others. Australia is an island colony that was created when a large amount of incarcerated people and offenders were labeled ‘convicts’ and were forcefully sent to a newly found country – the country we now know as Australia (Macintyre et al., 2000).

History has shown that the arrival of the boats from the ‘old country’ saw the indigenous habitants of the land forcefully displaced, abused, murdered and, in many instances, enslaved (Macintyre et al., 2000). The abuse that the Indigenous habitants were, and remain subjected to, produce daily social and health-related barriers that must be faced daily in the community (Muller, 2020; Selvanathan et al., 2020; Timperley, 2020). This treatment, historically at the hands of the ‘convicts’ and their captors, and the residual emotions and pain suffered by Australia’s Indigenous people, the loss of land, identity and ‘country’ (Atkinson, 2020; Habibis et al., 2020; Muller, 2020) and the fact that Indigenous Australians are the most over represented incarcerated group in Australia, makes any use of the term ‘convict’ as a positive academic identity extremely problematic, at best (Porter, 2019; Leigh, 2020; Prehn and Ezzy, 2020).

Times were also tough for many of the people arriving from Britain and Ireland as they experienced incarceration of a different type (Lydon, 2019; Sinclair and Slockee, 2019). This incarceration saw the setting up and establishment of a colony (new world), through hard labour in often-brutal conditions and the commencing of the start of the ‘whitening’ of Australia with some of the brutal punishments on offer phased out for white prisoners, but remaining active for many Indigenous ‘offenders’ (Macintyre et al., 2000; Cuneen, 2007; Lydon, 2019). This racial divide remains intact in some forms inside the Australian context and forms one of the most significant barriers toward gaining Indigenous support for any formalized CC movement. The conditions drove a divide between the newly arrived ‘convicts’, their custodians and the first owners and inhabitants of Australia (Macintyre et al., 2000; Lydon, 2019).

For many years this relationship continued to sour; the country of Australia slowly grew and developed as more and more of the new arrivals finished their sentences and started up their own lives in the new world (Macintyre et al., 2000; Lydon, 2019; Sinclair and Slockee, 2019). The same feeling of disdain and hatred continued to be harbored between the convicts, law enforcement and Indigenous peoples in Australia, but the negative connotation of the word ‘convict’ continued to grow.

Hundreds of years have passed and the origins of Australia and the blood, sweat and tears of the many convicts that created the country remain pertinent and at the front of cultural relevance (Lydon, 2019; Prehn and Ezzy, 2020). Government officials, conference organizers and presenters, in the most part, commence speeches recognizing the land in which they stand and thank the original owners. This structural change is only a small step forward, but continues a slow movement toward the recognition of Australia's land-owners that was fast tracked by the Mabo land rights case in the early 1990s (Bartlett, 1993; Meyers and Mugambwa, 1993; Stephenson, 1995).

The word convict, still to this day, has a much different meaning than in other countries due to its origin (White, 2019). These connotations make it near impossible to use the word convict in the title of this group. In order to setup a group representing the same position as American and British Convict Criminology, a different name is required that does not possess these negatives connotations and can culturally include and have input from the most highly incarcerated group in the country, indigenous people (Ley, 2019). This is an argument considered previously when setting up the US and UK groups (Earle, 2014), but the connotations remains somewhat unique when referring to the Australian setting.

The challenge of this position is that along with a new name, comes a possibility of disconnection from the roots of the idea and the ideals Convict Criminologist mainstays John Irwin, Stephen Richards, Jeffrey Ian Ross and Greg Newbold (among others) suffered and worked so hard to create, but something I believe they would not begrudge due to the complexities of the Australian setting. The new group, regardless of name will emphasize the CC perspective and will encourage currently and previously incarcerated people to become involved. The work of these founding members and the many others in the USA that have and continue to strive to research and develop opportunities for previously incarcerated people, may be diminished somewhat if the name of an Australian group does not link somewhat to the original group. The years of work and the battles fought by the pioneers of the movement were undertaken for a reason and a new name not recognizing the work may devalue it. Breaking away from these roots and origins presents huge practical challenges to those of us steering the movement here in Australia. Keeping the word convict in the name could detract from the movement and could dissuade people from becoming involved. The same problem could exist with taking the name

away, as another word may not have the same quick and descriptive power and response that the word ‘convict’ has. This is a similar problem that has been experienced and explored by CC groups in the USA and UK in the past and will no doubt raise questions and comments about the work being more important than the name. CC is not a brand but a group of people working toward a set of goals, all valid and poignant points for consideration and further discussions moving forward (Ross and Richards, 2003; Aresti, 2012; Aresti and Darke, 2016; Newbold, 2017; Earle, 2018).

WHAT CAN THE CC MOVEMENT BRING TO AUSTRALIAN CRIMINOLOGY?

The field of criminology continues to develop in Australia and across the world (Germov and McGee, 2005; Bartels et al., 2015). Criminology is a fast-growing university industry in this country, with careers in the field becoming more diverse (Bates et al., 2020). These changes offer a greater focus on a wider variety of criminology and have resulted in a more diverse set of theories being developed for discussion and debate (Richards and Ross, 2001).

As the number of people who are incarcerated in Australia continues to rise (ABS, 2018a, 2018b), so too does the amount of people who have completed their sentences, and thereby return to the community (ABS, 2018b). Research suggests that many previously incarcerated people will enter formal education upon their release, with many of them studying subjects related to corrections, criminology or services that assist other incarcerated people (Richards and Ross, 2001; Brown, 2015). Some of these potential future convict criminologists will already have started or completed social science degrees before their release from prison (Darke et al., 2020).

The challenge Australian criminology is facing, and will continue to face, is the amount of ‘classroom and textbook’ trained criminologists who have little, to no, face-to-face experience with people convicted of a crime. This challenge has been shown to be shared worldwide, with a concern that research in the field is missing a voice; the voice of those that have experienced incarceration (Gordon, 1990; Richards and Ross, 2001). An Australian CC has the potential to provide a vehicle for many previously and currently incarcerated undergraduate and postgraduate students, and

early-career criminologists, to articulate their perspectives and experiences, and to have their stories heard. Their voices should be nurtured in two different ways, both of which will rely on the support and participation of established criminologists with and without prison experience.

First, as in the USA (Tewkesbury and Ross, 2019; Tietjen et al., 2020) and UK (Darke et al., 2020), it will be important for an Australian CC to provide these people with educational support and academic mentoring. The UK group starts this process before convicted students leave prison. At the University of Westminster, undergraduate criminology students participate in reading and writing groups with prison-based students at three prisons in and around London. A number of postgraduate Westminster students – most of whom are not former prisoners – also took on the role of mentors.

Second, the hesitancy and/or refusal of some Australian universities to recruit and work with academics and students that have been incarcerated are also impeding the quality of research in the criminology field. Work as to the attitudes and reasons behind this stance by many institutions requires further work in an Australian setting, similar to the work of Ross and colleagues (2011). Research in the USA and UK has shown that pairing the lived experiences of current and previously incarcerated people with the work of the current crop of criminologists has increased the quality of research and the outcomes for not only the justice system, but the people experiencing it (Ross et al., 2011; Aresti and Darke, 2016; Tietjen et al., 2020). The CC perspective, in other words, is not restricted to research completed by former incarcerated academics. It also encompasses participatory research between people with and without prison experience.

Richards and Ross (2001) suggest that the incarcerated voice was missing early on in the USA and that criminological study and theory was lacking the articulated stories of those with lived experience. It can be suggested, in the current academic environment, that this problem also exists in Australia. What a better way to deal with this gap in literature and to increase the validity and quality of Australian criminological research than by incorporating the lived experience and theoretical principles through the promotion and encouragement of CC and the active hiring of its proponents into Australian academic circles. Colleges and universities in the USA and UK have been, and continue to be, leaders in this space through not only the hiring of academics with previous incarceration experience. It is also the case that the publication of literature by those who have been or are still

incarcerated is particularly strong in the USA because of the efforts of their CC groups (Richards and Ross, 2001; Richards et al., 2008; Richards et al., 2010; Ross et al., 2011; Aresti, 2012; Ross et al., 2014; Aresti and Darke, 2016; Ross and Vianello, 2020; Tietjen et al., 2020).

THE ADVANTAGE OF WEIGHED POSITIONS AND ARGUMENTS WITHIN RESEARCH

Human bias and opinions are commonplace in academic activity, even when it is disavowed. This is an identified issue in some criminological work where a distinct emotive ‘voice’ is important (Jewkes, 2012; Newbold et al., 2014; Newbold, 2017). With the voice of the previously incarcerated missing, in the main part, from Australian criminological research, an unbalanced weighting may occur toward the opinion and position of management and corrections staff. The work of critical scholars both inside and outside of Australia has worked hard to attend to this balance through their own research and study design. The inclusion of lived experience academics in this space may provide a balancing mechanism to the words of the management of staff in the correctional setting in this country, as has occurred in other countries throughout the world (Richards et al., 2008; Jones et al., 2009; Ross et al., 2011; Tewksbury and Ross, 2019; Tietjen, 2019; Tietjen et al., 2020).

The provision of academics with lived experience with the opportunity to share the lived experiences of other previously incarcerated people would enhance academic accounts and would provide for a more informed development of policy and procedure. It is essential that this mix of academics involved in the CC movement represent the socioeconomic mix of people inside Australian prisons, with Indigenous, females and other minorities granted the opportunity to share their own lived experiences. This is particularly important given the absence of ‘marginalized voices’ in the criminological literature, specifically, criminalized women and criminalized ethnic minorities (Belknap, 2015; Aresti and Darke, 2016; Bozkurt et al., 2020). Despite the unjustified criticisms of CC, and its neglect of ‘marginalized’ voices, it is critical that these marginalized cohorts, including the absent Indigenous voices, are provided with a platform to articulate their experiences. This has always been and remains a critical concern of CC (Aresti and Darke, 2016; Bozkurt et al., 2020; Ross et al., 2016).

A broader criticism focuses on the authenticity of accounts produced by current and previously incarcerated academics. It has been suggested that work done by previously incarcerated researchers who may have their own emotive bias regarding opinions of the system, guards and wardens, or others that may have treated them badly, or in some instances in a positive way. Many previously incarcerated people leave jail with negative feelings, beliefs and feelings that can often bias any subsequent research they undertake. Not only does research allow for these feelings to be explored further to better the policy and procedures to be followed in the corrections setting, but research can also play a part in the participant sorting through their own feelings and experiences, assisting with breaking the recidivism cycle (Jewkes, 2012; Newbold et al., 2014; Tewksbury and Ross, 2019). The reality of all research is that some bias exists regardless of the position of the researcher, with overall objectivity being an ideal and not a reality. Regardless of the type of research being undertaken, bias exists and must be considered and explored.

Newbold and colleagues (2014, p. 439) highlight the challenges of prison guards and management in dealing with “rude, recalcitrant, deceitful and abusive” prisoners and how this damages their mental health. They also highlight the influence that “petty, vindictive, autocratic, antipathetic, and unreasonable” prison guards can have over the mental wellbeing of prisoners while incarcerated (Newbold et al., 2014, p. 439). Finding a balance between the voice of the criminological researcher/academic and the voice of the previously incarcerated academic is a mix that will go a long way in steadying this balance and to providing a new level of rigorous and important research that can steer criminology in Australia into the future. The promotion and fostering of CC in Australia will assist this challenge.

Criticism of CC includes the suggestion that some previously incarcerated academics see themselves as ‘the be all and end all’ of criminology due to their lived experience, believing it trumps the work of academics without it (Bosworth, 2004). Additionally, questions have been raised regarding previously incarcerated academics desire to publish and discuss realities of others who have served time (Lilly, 2009). These criticisms have been discussed and debated by CC and non-CC academics alike from across the globe, and will remain active discussion points moving forward. This type of spirited debate can only increase the authenticity of research involving lived

experience and the rigour by which the research is undertaken, a positive result for those studying, involved with or experiencing the Australian justice system.

ACCESS TO PRISONS AND INCARCERATED PEOPLE THROUGH AN INSIDER-PERSPECTIVE

The ability to gain access to prisons and incarcerated people is often a challenging thing for researchers (Newbold & Ross, 2013; Newbold et al., 2014). This can often be less challenging for researchers who don't have criminal records due to administrative red tape. However, it has been shown that the information gathered by previously incarcerated academics from incarcerated or previously incarcerated people is often richer and contains information often out of reach to many researchers (Richards et al., 2008; Richards et al., 2010; Aresti et al., 2012; Richards, 2013; Earle, 2014; Newbold et al., 2014; Richards, 2015; Tietjen, 2019).

The term 'insider-perspective' has been developed and is now used as part of the criminological vernacular to describe the position a researcher with lived experience takes when undertaking research with others with criminal records (Aresti et al., 2012; Earle, 2014; Aresti and Darke, 2018; Tietjen, 2019).

It has been shown that a researcher with a criminal record, that has served time in prison, has a unique understanding of prison politics and criminal culture (Bint et al., 2018; Darke et al., 2020), which places them in a different position of acceptance than other researchers (McLellan et al., 1996). Newbold (2014: 443) argues that "criminals are more likely to be open and candid with an investigator they can identify with, and who will recognize misleading information".

With the lack of previously incarcerated researchers in Australia, the field of criminology is likely missing out on some honest and important information from currently and previously incarcerated people. If a CC group were instituted in Australia the opportunity to increase the quality of criminological data being produced in this country would rise substantially. The work of current researchers is excellent, but a new frontier of opportunity exists. This opportunity requires a link with previously incarcerated researchers and academics, current criminologists, correction departments and Australian universities.

CONCLUSION

Convict Criminology has continued to develop its presence in the USA and has provided a unique voice for previously incarcerated academics to share their lived experiences. The CC group has developed in size in the USA and produces numerous articles, research pieces, books, book chapters, and conference presentations challenging traditional criminology positions and practices. These studies are primarily focused on the US criminal justice system, with limited similarities to our 'different' system.

Although CC has emerged in the UK, and is developing in Italy, Brazil and Argentina, the CC movement has shown minimal, to no, structured and planned growth in Australia. The existence of previously incarcerated academics in Australia is unknown, but suspected, with several doing work in the area, but in an isolated and, almost soloist, manner. Combining the work of some of the best criminologists in the world in Australia, with the lived experiences and skills of previously incarcerated academics will have great benefit. These benefits will come in the form of enriched research, balanced decision making and policy development, but more importantly, can improve life-course outcomes for the people we entered this field to assist; the men and women impacted by the justice system in Australia.

Taking this all into consideration the way forward will be arduous but inevitably rewarding for all involved. Initially, the steps to contact the heads of criminology at all universities across Australia are essential to inform them of the movement and of the willingness to formalize and grow. While building the Australian network, it is essential to link with the US and UK CC groups and if successfully developed, Italian and Latin American CC groups, and individual scholars to build the movements backing from across the globe. Additionally, this development of a network will allow for lessons to be learnt and for mistakes made overseas to be managed more efficiently in the setup of the Australian CC group. This link with the US- and UK-based groups will allow for programs being run by them to possibly be mirrored or developed further for implementation in Australia. The two primary programs of interest will be the in-prison education program in the UK and the teaching of CC as a subject in both the UK and US.

After developing the network it will be important that individuals identified with an interest in CC in Australia can present and publish work

discussing and promoting the importance of CC. These sessions could be seminars, guest lectures or webinars and will all go toward the promotion and awareness of CC. This wider spread knowledge of the movement will then allow for a formal application to become a thematic group of the Australia and New Zealand Society of Criminology (ANZSOC) to be submitted. Acceptance to this will allow for a formalized approach and an ongoing existence at ANZSOC conferences and inside research and publications. The work is expansive, but the results for those inside, yet to go inside or having previously served time, will be door opening and will hopefully drive change and the betterment of conditions across the justice system.

REFERENCES

- ANZSOC (2020) *About Us*. Retrieved from: <https://anzsoc.org/about/>
- Aresti, Andreas (2012) "Developing a Convict Criminology Group in the UK", *Journal of Prisoners on Prisons*, 21(1&2): 148-165.
- Aresti, Andreas and Sacha Darke (2018) "Developing Insider Perspectives in Research Activism", *Journal of Prisoners on Prisons*, 27(2): 3-16.
- Aresti, Andreas and Sacha Darke (2016) "Practicing Convict Criminology: Lessons Learned from British Academic Activism", *Critical Criminology*, 24(4): 533-547.
- Aresti, Andreas, Sacha Darke and David Manlow (2016) "Bridging the Gap: Giving Public Voice to Prisoners and Former Prisoners through Research Activism", *Prison Service Journal*, 224: 3-13.
- Aresti, Andreas, Sacha Darke and Rod Earle (2012) "British Convict Criminology: Developing Critical Insider Perspectives on Prison", *Inside Time* – August. Retrieved from: <https://insidetime.org/british-convict-criminologydeveloping-critical-insider-perspectives-on-prison/>
- Aresti, Andreas, Virginia Eatough and Belinda Brooks-Gordon (2010) "Doing Time After Time: An Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis of Reformed Ex-prisoners' Experiences of Self-change, Identity and Career Opportunities", *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 16(3): 169-190.
- Atkinson, Judy (2020) "Symptom as History, Culture as Healing: Incarcerated Aboriginal Women's Journeys Through Historic Trauma and Recovery Processes", in Kim Wale, Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela and Jeffrey Prager (eds.), *Post-Conflict Hauntings: Transforming Memories of Historical Trauma*, London: Palgrave, pp. 287-314.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS] (2018a) *Media Release: Prisoner Numbers up 4 percent from 2017*.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS] (2018b) *Prisoners in Australia*.
- Bartels, Lorana, Alyce McGovern and Kelly Richards (2015) "Degrees of Difference? A Preliminary Study of Criminology Degrees at Australian Universities", *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 48(1): 119-146.

- Bartlett, Richard (1993) "Political and Legislative Responses to Mabo", *UW Austl. L. Rev.*, 23: 352-361.
- Bates, Lyndel, Stacey Walker, Kate Marchesi and Hennessey Hayes (2020) "Scaffolding Employability throughout Undergraduate Degrees: A Case Study in Criminology", presentation at the ACEN 2016 Conference.
- Belknap, Joanne (2015) "Activist Criminology: Criminologists' Responsibility to Advocate for Social and Legal Justice", *Criminology*, 53(1): 1-22.
- Bint Faisal, Aisha, Molly Dean, Mustafa Demirtas, Sahana Dharmarajah, David Hinde, Moses Mathias, George Milner, Megan Raynor, Muzzaker Shah, Ashley Stanford and Gary Taylor (2018) "Insider Perspectives in Higher Education Within the British Prison System", *Journal of Prisoners on Prisons*, 27(2): 75-90.
- Bosworth, Mary (2004) "Book Review of *Convict Criminology*", *British Journal of Criminology*, 44(6): 988-990.
- Bozkurt, Sinem, Marisa Merico, Andreas Aresti and Sacha Darke (2020) "Crossing Borders, Pushing Boundaries and Privileging 'Marginalised' Voices", in Jeffrey Ian Ross and Francesca Vianello (eds.), *Convict Criminology for the Future*, London: Routledge, pp. 21-34.
- Brown, Christian (2015) "Returns to Postincarceration Education for Former Prisoners", *Social Science Quarterly*, 96(1): 161-175.
- Chick, Robert, Guy Clifton, Kaitlin Peace, Brandon Propper, Diane Hale, Adnan Alseidi, and Timothy Vreeland (2020) "Using Technology to Maintain the Education of Residents During the COVID-19 Pandemic", *Journal of Surgical Education*, 77(4): 729-732.
- Chinazzi, Matteo, Jessica Davis, Marco Ajelli, Corrado Gioannini, Maria Litvinova, Stefano Merler, Ana Pastore y Piontti, Kunpeng Mu, Luca Rossi, Kaiyan Sun, Cécile Viboud, Xinyue Xiong, Hongjie Yu, Elizabeth Halloran, Ira Longini and Alessandro Vespignani (2020) "The Effect of Travel Restrictions on the Spread of the 2019 Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) Outbreak", *Science*, 368(6489): 395-400.
- Cuneen, Chris (2007) "The Criminalization of Indigenous People", in Tania Das Gupta, Carl E. James, Chris Andersen, Grace-Edward Galabuzi and Roger C. A. Maaka (eds.), *Race and Racialization: Essential Readings*, Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, pp. 266-274.
- Darke, Sacha, Andreas Aresti, Aisha Faisal and Natalie Ellis (2020) *Prisoner University Partnerships at Westminster*, London: University of Westminster.
- Earle, Rod (2018) "Convict Criminology in England: Developments and Dilemmas", *British Journal of Criminology*, 58(6): 1499-1516.
- Earle, Rod (2014) "Insider and Out: Making Sense of a Prison Experience and a Research Experience", *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(4): 429-438.
- Germov, John and Tara McGee (2005) "Australian Sociology: Recent Trends and Prospects", in John Germov (ed.), *Histories of Australian Sociology*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Gordon, Diana (1990) *The Justice Juggernaut: Fighting Street Crime, Controlling Citizens*, New Brunswick (NJ): Rutgers University Press.
- Habibis, Daphne, Penny Taylor and Bruna Ragaini (2020) "White People Have No Face: Aboriginal Perspectives on White Culture and the Costs of Neoliberalism", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 43(7): 1149-1168.

- Hakeem, Farrukh, Manish Madan, Mahesh Nalla, Hanif Qureshi, Prabha Unnithan and Arvind Verma (2015) "Criminology Around the World", *The Criminologist*, 40(3), 30.
- Honeywell, David (2015) "Doing Hard Time in the United Kingdom", in Stephen C. Richards (ed.), *The Marion Experiment: Long-term Solitary Confinement and the Supermax Movement*, Carbondale: South Illinois University Press.
- Jewkes, Yvonne (2012) "Autoethnography and Emotion as Intellectual Resources: Doing Prison Research Differently", *Qualitative Inquiry*, 18(1): 63-75.
- Jones, Richard, Jeffrey Ian Ross, Stephen C. Richards and Daniel Murphy (2009) "The First Dime: A Decade of Convict Criminology", *The Prison Journal*, 89(2): 151-171.
- Leigh, Andrew (2020) "The Second Convict Age: Explaining the Return of Mass Imprisonment in Australia", *Economic Record*, 96(313): 187-208.
- Ley, Lyndall (2019) "Truth Integrity Knowledge: Indigenous Knowledge", *Incite*, 40(7/8): 8.
- Lilly, Robert (2009) "Book Review: Carceral, K. C. (2006). *Prison, Inc.: A Convict Exposes Life Inside a Private Prison*. Edited by T. J. Bernard. New York: New York University Press. 246 pp.", *Criminal Justice Review*, 34(3): 460-462.
- Lydon, Jane (2019) "British Slavery and Australian Colonisation", in Immanuel Ness and Zak Cope (eds.), *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Imperialism and Anti-Imperialism*, London: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Macintyre, Stuart, Alan Atkinson, Marilyn Lake, Xavier Pons and Stuart Macintyre (2000) *A Concise History of Australia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McLellan, Velma, Kay Saville-Smith and Greg Newbold (1996) *Escape Pressures: Inside Views of the Reasons for Prison Escapes*, Wellington: Department of Corrections.
- Meyers, Gary and John Mugambwa (1993) "The Mabo Decision: Australian Aboriginal Land Rights in Transition", *Envtl. L.*, 23: 1203.
- Muller, Lorraine (2020) *A Theory for Indigenous Australian Health and Human Service Work: Connecting Indigenous Knowledge and Practice*, London: Routledge.
- Newbold, Greg (2017) "Convict Criminology", in Antje Deckert and Rick Sarre (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Australian and New Zealand Criminology, Crime and Justice*, London: Palgrave-Macmillan, pp. 603-615.
- Newbold, Greg (2016) *Crime, Law and Justice in New Zealand*, London: Routledge.
- Newbold, Greg and Robert Ivory (1993) "Policing Serious Fraud in New Zealand", *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 20(3): 233-248.
- Newbold, Greg and Jeffrey Ian Ross (2013) "Convict Criminology at the Crossroads: Research Note", *The Prison Journal*, 93(11): 3-10.
- Newbold, Greg, Jeffrey Ian Ross, Richard Jones, Stephen C. Richards and Michael Lenza (2014) "Prison Research from the Inside: The Role of Convict Autoethnography", *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(4): 439-448.
- Porter, Amanda (2019) "Aboriginal Sovereignty, 'Crime' and Criminology", *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 31(1): 122-142.
- Prehn, Jacob and Douglas Ezzy (2020) "Decolonising the Health and Well-being of Aboriginal Men in Australia", *Journal of Sociology*, 56(2): 151-166.
- Richards, Stephen (2013) "The New School of Convict Criminology Thrives and Matures", *Critical Criminology*, 21(3): 375-387.
- Richards, Stephen (2015) "USP Marion: A Few Prisoners Summon the Courage to Speak", *Laws*, 4(1): 91-106.

- Richards, Stephen, Donald Faggian, Jed Roffers, Richard Hendricksen and Jerrick Krueger (2008) "Convict Criminology: Voices from Prison", *Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Contexts*, 2(1): 121-136.
- Richards, Stephen, Michael Lenza, Greg Newbold, Richard Jones, Daniel Murphy and Robert Grisby (2010) "Prison as Seen by Convict Criminologists", in Martine Herzog-Evans (ed.), *Transnational Criminology Manual* (volume 3), Nijmegen: Wolf Publishers, pp. 343-360.
- Richards, Stephen C. and Jeffrey Ian Ross (2001) "Introducing the New School of Convict Criminology", *Social Justice*, 28: 177-190.
- Ross, Jeffrey and Sacha Darke (2018) "Interpreting the Development and Growth of Convict Criminology in South America", *Journal of Prisoners on Prisons*, 27(2): 108-117.
- Ross, Jeffrey Ian, Sacha Darke, Andreas Aresti, Greg Newbold and Rod Earle (2014) "Developing Convict Criminology beyond North America", *International Criminal Justice Review*, 24(2): 121-133.
- Ross, Jeffrey Ian, Richard Jones, Michael Lenza and Stephen C. Richards (2016) "Convict Criminology and the Struggle for Inclusion", *Critical Criminology*, 24(4): 489-501.
- Ross, Jeffrey Ian and Stephen C. Richards (2003) *Convict Criminology*, Belmont (CA): Wadsworth.
- Ross, Jeffrey Ian, Stephen C. Richards, Greg Newbold, Richard Jones, Michael Lenza, Daniel Murphy, Richard Hogan and David Curry (2011) "Knocking on the Ivory Tower's Door: The Experience of Ex-convicts Applying for Tenure-track University Positions", *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 22(2): 267-285.
- Ross, Jeffrey Ian and Francesca Vianello (eds.) (2020) *Convict Criminology for the Future*, London: Routledge.
- Selvanathan, Eliyathamby, Saroja Selvanathan and Maneka Jayasinghe (2020) "Nexus between Drinking Patterns, Gender and Life Satisfaction: Some Evidence from Indigenous Australians", *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 55(4): 396-417.
- Sinclair, Kim and Tom Slokee (2019) "Colonisation: Australia's Dark Side", *Parity*, 32(10): 44.
- Spilker, Maria, Fleur Prinsen and Marco Kalz (2020) "Valuing Technology-enhanced Academic Conferences for Continuing Professional Development: A Systematic Literature Review", *Professional Development in Education*, 46(3): 482-499.
- Stephenson, Margaret (1995) *Mabo: The Native Title Legislation*, St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.
- Tewksbury, Richard and Jeffrey Ian Ross (2019) "Instructing and Mentoring Ex-con University Students in Departments of Criminology and Criminal Justice", *Corrections*, 4(2): 79-88.
- Tietjen, Grant (2019) "Convict Criminology: Learning from the Past, Confronting the Present, Expanding for the Future", *Critical Criminology*, 27(1): 101-114.
- Tietjen, Grant, James Burnett and Bernadette Jessie (2020) "Onward and Upward: The Significance of Mentorship for Formerly Incarcerated Students and Academics", *Critical Criminology*, 29(3): 633-647.
- Tietjen, Grant and Daniel Kavish (2020) "In the Pool without a Life Jacket: Status Fragility and Convict Criminology in the Current Criminological Era", in Jeffrey Ian

- Ross and Francesca Vianello (eds.), *Convict Criminology for the Future*, London: Routledge, pp. 66-81.
- Timperley, Claire (2020) "Justice in Indigenous Land Claims: A Typology of Problems", *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, 8(1): 1-23.
- UNLOCK (2020) *Travelling Abroad*, London. Retrieved from: <https://unlock.org.uk/guide/travelling-abroad/>
- Vianello, Francesca (2020) "Developing Convict Criminology: Notes from Italy", in Jeffrey Ian Ross and Francesca Vianello (eds.), *Convict Criminology for the Future*, London: Routledge, pp. 98-111.
- Weiss, Robert and Nigel South (1998) *Comparing Prison Systems: Toward a Comparative and International Penology* (volume 8), London: Taylor & Francis.
- White, Rachael (2019) "Australia as Underworld: Convict Classics in the Nineteenth Century", *Antipodean Antiquities: Classical Reception Down Under*, 29-39.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Dr. Lukas Carey completed his doctorate in education and has worked in the field for most of his career as a coach, teacher, trainer and educator. While filling a role in local government, he was charged with, and convicted of, receiving secret commissions and served time in prison. During and since his incarceration, Lukas developed a strong interest in the role that previously incarcerated people have in the development of policy and procedure in the justice system concerned with education and post-release employment. He is a strong advocate for the importance of Convict Criminology and lived experience in shaping the direction of these policies and practices. He can be reached by email at Careyss@westnet.com.au or at the following address:

Lukas Carey
44 Minderoo Crescent
Golden Bay, Western Australia, 6174

Dr. Andreas Aresti is a Senior Lecturer in Criminology at the University of Westminster and has first-hand experience of the criminal justice system and prison. Andreas is committed to penal reform and is actively involved in several projects which aim to improve the lives of those currently incarcerated by emphasizing the importance of education in prisons and the role it can play in facilitating desistance from crime (the process through which people cease and refrain from offending). He is a founding member of British Convict Criminology, a relatively new

critical perspective (consisting of ‘ex-con’ and non-ex-con academics) that challenges traditional understandings of crime, the penal system, prisoners/former prisoners, and how matters of criminalization and punishment are conceptualized, represented, and discussed.

Dr. Sacha Darke is a Senior Lecturer in Criminology at the University of Westminster and is a Visiting Lecturer at the University of São Paulo. His teaching and research focuses on Convict Criminology, prisons, state crime, as well as comparative and transnational criminal justice. He is currently involved in research projects on the use and experience of imprisonment in Brazil, and the internationalization of Convict Criminology (with Andreas Aresti and Jeffrey Ian Ross). With Andreas Aresti, he delivers academic mentoring for prisoners and criminology programs at HMP Pentonville, HMP Grendon, and HMP Coldingley in the United Kingdom.