

Editorial

As our readers have noticed already from our short history, some issues of this journal are open while others are dedicated to different subjects that concern different groups of scholars in the criminological field. The current issue is an open one and covers a large variety of subjects

The first two papers deal with some under-researched topics related to electronic monitoring. In their contribution, ‘Thinking about electronic monitoring in the context of pre-trial detention in Belgium: a solution to prison overcrowding?’, Eric Maes, Benjamin Mine, Caroline De Man and Rosamunde Van Brake look at the impact that electronic monitoring might have on the remand population. Although optimistic, their conclusion is that this measure could be introduced into the Belgian law though not necessarily as cost-reduction or decarceration strategies. The time-limit or the sentence feasibility is yet another important aspect of electronic monitoring. In ‘The six month limit to electronic monitoring and other equivalent measures: a myth?’, Martine Herzog-Evans explains from the professional’s perspective why the six month limit is an important turning point in electronic monitoring implementation.

The article ‘Inequality and punitivism in late modern societies: Scandinavian exceptionalism’ by Monica Barry and Dag Leonardsen touches on another important topic in the international criminology: punitivism. Using an interesting comparative design, the authors argue that punitivism in Norway is increasing but at a different rate. In order to understand this trend, the researchers should observe not only differences between countries but also the transformations within countries.

Related to the subject of inequality, the next paper – Are former inmates excluded from social life? by ... – explores the main difficulties encountered by ex-prisoners in the Romanian context using qualitative research methods. As in other countries, these difficulties belong to different social policy domains such as: housing, employment and so on, confirming what Wacquant (2010) labeled as ‘bureaucratic charade’ when referring to reintegration investments for ex-inmates.

James Byrne reviews the available literature on probation performance and effectiveness and suggests new directions in community supervision based on desistance literature and new dimensions such as high risk times, high risk offenders and high risk locations.

As usual, the journal provides two book reviews for the works that are likely to bring an important contribution to research or practice: Robinson, Anne (2011), *Foundations for Offender Management: theory law and policy for contemporary practice*. Bristol: Policy Press

As noted all these papers contribute to a better understanding the current practices and suggest new dimensions to be examined in the future.

The next issue of 2012 is dedicated to an important and timely subject: foreign nationals and community sanctions and measures. The main questions that will be addressed here are: what is the treatment of foreign nationals in different jurisdictions and how community sanctions are made available to them. Interested scholars are kindly asked to contact Miranda Boone, the Guest editor, at: M.M.Boone@uu.nl.

Ioan Durnescu
Editor

Reference

Wacquant, L. (2010) 'Prisoner reentry as myth and ceremony' in *Dialectical Anthropology*, 34:605–620.