

# Notes

## Chapter 1 Criminal Trials, Foucault, Discourse

- 1 For a detailed discussion of the Foucauldian approach as it is applied to the discourses of adversarial justice, see Chapter 5, *Discourse Defined*.
- 2 See Chapter 6, *History, Discourse and Genealogy: Displacing Truth Claims*.
- 3 For an extended discussion of the issues, see Chapter 1, *Courts of Therapeutic Justice*, and Chapter 4, *Therapeutic Jurisprudence and Problem Solving Courts*.
- 4 See Chapter 3 for an extended discussion of control orders for domestic law and order.
- 5 The European Court of Justice (ECJ) is the highest court of the European Union (EU) on issues of community law. National law is left for the domestic courts. The national courts may refer issues of EU law to the ECJ. The national court will then apply the decision of the ECJ within its own domestic framework, including other cases that may share similar facts or points of law than that decided by the ECJ. This process enables all courts within a national hierarchy to refer questions of EU law. The ECJ is bound to apply EU law similarly throughout the EU, in the attempt to bring a measure of consistency between national courts.
- 6 The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) is an international court bound to interpret the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (ECHR). Litigants will complain to the ECtHR where they feel that their rights under the ECHR have been violated. However, a decision of the ECtHR does not become part of domestic law unless it is ratified by the government of the member state. In England and Wales, for instance, the courts may take the jurisprudence of the ECtHR into account when formulating future decisions pursuant to s2 of the *Human Rights Act 1998* (UK).
- 7 For an extended discussion of the cases flowing from art. 6 of the ECHR, see Chapter 4, *Human Rights under the ECHR*.
- 8 Horwitz (1981: 1058) considers such modes of analysis as anti-historical, regarding them with a fervent cynicism, thus 'History came to be subversive at just the moment when, for reasons that are difficult and obscure, the analytic tradition committed itself to the suppression of contradiction to the basic attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable by showing that X and not X can exist at the same time, which is essential to demonstrating that an unjust social order is capable of being rational. The interesting and difficult question, the really complicated question of historical explanation, is: Why did this particular form of rationalizing analytic scholarship come, by 1900, to represent the dominant apologetic mode of thought? Why, in turn, was history given up as a mode of apology?'
- 9 See Chapter 4, *Intervention Programs, Forum and Circle Sentencing*.
- 10 Other issues which have been cited as significantly modifying the criminal trial include the law and order debate and the need for greater expediency in criminal justice. Each of these issues is discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

- 11 Criminal law is used as a key reference here, however, whether the reforms introducing control orders or the establishing of alternative mechanisms for the hearing of evidence is seen to be a development in criminal law, or civil law, or the common law more generally, is open to debate. This issue is canvassed in Chapter 1 but is referred to throughout this book. Also see Chapter 3, *Control Orders – A Criminal Charge?*.
- 12 Indeed, this has led some to argue for a normative theory of the criminal trial. See Duff et al. (2007).
- 13 See Chapter 3, *Non-derogating Control Orders and the ECHR*, for an extended discussion of the relevant cases in English law. The House of Lords have addressed the use of preventative detention in *A v Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2005] 2 AC 68. In this case, the House of Lords declared s23 of the *Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001* (UK) is incompatible with articles 5 and 14 of the ECHR. The discussion in the book tends to focus on control orders, however, given that such orders have been said to usurp the criminal trial for an alternative means to justice and punishment (Fairall and Lacey, 2007: 1075).
- 14 The English authorities are discussed in Chapter 3.
- 15 See Chapter 3 for an extended discussion as to the extent to which non-derogative control orders under the English legislation may be considered a criminal charge.
- 16 For a further discussion of ASBOs and control orders for the restraint of domestic order see Chapter 3, *Control Orders, ASBOs and Domestic Order*.
- 17 See Chapter 4 for an extended discussion of victim rights under the ECHR.
- 18 The Act of Settlement 1701 (12 and 13 Will 3 c 2) provided for judicial tenure *quamdiu se bene gesserint*, or during good behaviour. Such standards reflect judicial tenure today, which requires a vote of both houses of parliament on the proven incapacity or misbehaviour of a judge.

## Chapter 2 A Genealogy of the Trial in Criminal Law

- 1 See the discussion of the Assize of Clarendon of 1166 and local governance, below.
- 2 Warren (1973: 283) describes the ordeal by water as a process whereby the hands of the accused were bound under their bent knees, who was then bound around the loins with a strong rope, such that the rope formed a knot at the distance of the length of his hair. The accused was then let down into the water without a splash. If the accused sank he was pulled up and saved, otherwise the accused would be adjudged a guilty man by the spectators.

## Chapter 3 Shifting Boundaries: Recent Changes to Criminal Justice Policy

- 1 See Chapter 2, *The Trial in Customary Law*.
- 2 As to other innovations involving the use of the jury, see Spigelman CJ's suggestion as to the expansion of the jury into the sentencing process, by

allowing the jury to make recommendations to the sentencing judge on the appropriate sentence that the offender should serve. This proposal was considered but ultimately rejected by the NSWLRC (2007) as inappropriate, as confidence in the justice system ought to be encouraged by further public education rather than direct participation. See Spigelman CJ, *A New Way to Sentence for Serious Crime*, Address for the Annual Opening of Law Term Dinner for the Law Society of New South Wales (31 January 2005).

- 3 Section 80 of the Australian Constitution 1900 provides that ‘The trial on indictment of any offence against any law of the Commonwealth shall be by jury, and every such trial shall be held in the State where the offence was committed, and if the offence was not committed within any State the trial shall be held at such place or places as the Parliament prescribes.’
- 4 See Chapter 3, *Infringements and Penalty Notices*.
- 5 See Chapter 7, *Substantive and Procedural Justice*, for a discussion of the rise of ASBOs in the context of human rights.
- 6 See *Gouriet v Union of Post Office Workers* [1978] AC 438 at 487, discussed in Chapter 3, *Charge Bargaining*.
- 7 See the discussion of *Thomas v Mowbray* (2007) 233 CLR 307 in Chapter 1.
- 8 Also see *Chu Kheng Lim v Minister for Immigration Local Government and Ethnic Affairs* (1992) 176 CLR 1 as to the power of the executive to detain without charge. In this case, it was held that the executive power to detain persons who arrive in Australia without an entry permit is a valid exercise of executive power. Brennan, Deane and Dawson JJ note, however, (at 27–28): ‘In exclusively entrusting to the courts designated by Ch. III the function of the adjudgement and punishment of criminal guilt under a law of the Commonwealth, the Constitution’s concern is with substance and not mere form. It would, for example, be beyond the legislative power of the Parliament to invest the Executive with an arbitrary power to detain citizens in custody notwithstanding that the power was conferred in terms which sought to divorce such detention in custody from both punishment and criminal guilt. The reason why that is so is that, putting to one side the exceptional cases to which reference is made below, the involuntary detention of a citizen in custody by the State is penal or punitive in character and, under our system of government, exists only as an incident of the exclusively judicial function of adjudging and punishing criminal guilt. Every citizen is “ruled by the law, and by the law alone” and may with us be punished for a breach of law, but he can be punished for nothing else’.
- 9 See Chapter 7, *Substantive and Procedural Justice*.

## Chapter 4 The Transformative Criminal Trial Emerges

- 1 See Chapter 1 for a discussion of the protective mechanism in place for rape victims in international law.
- 2 For an extended discussion of the statutory modification of victim rights in sexual assault and rape trials, see Chapter 4 *Human Rights and Statutory Reform*.
- 3 Art. 2 of the ECHR provides: (1) Everyone’s right to life shall be protected by law. No one shall be deprived of his life intentionally save in the execu-

tion of a sentence of a court following his conviction of a crime for which this penalty is provided by law. (2) Deprivation of life shall not be regarded as inflicted in contravention of this article when it results from the use of force which is no more than absolutely necessary: (a) in defence of any person from unlawful violence; (b) in order to effect a lawful arrest or to prevent the escape of a person lawfully detained; (c) in action lawfully taken for the purpose of quelling a riot or insurrection.

- 4 Art. 6 of the ECHR provides: (1) In the determination of his civil rights and obligations or of any criminal charge against him, everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law. Judgment shall be pronounced publicly but the press and public may be excluded from all or part of the trial in the interests of morals, public order or national security in a democratic society, where the interests of juveniles or the protection of the private life of the parties so require, or to the extent strictly necessary in the opinion of the court in special circumstances where publicity would prejudice the interests of justice. (2) Everyone charged with a criminal offence shall be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law. (3) Everyone charged with a criminal offence has the following minimum rights: (a) to be informed promptly, in a language which he understands and in detail, of the nature and cause of the accusation against him; (b) to have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his defence; (c) to defend himself in person or through legal assistance of his own choosing or, if he has not sufficient means to pay for legal assistance, to be given it free when the interests of justice so require; (d) to examine or have examined witnesses against him and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses on his behalf under the same conditions as witnesses against him; (e) to have the free assistance of an interpreter if he cannot understand or speak the language used in court.
- 5 Art. 8 of the ECHR provides: (1) Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence. (2) There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.
- 6 Also see the discussion of *Doorson v The Netherlands* (1996) 22 EHRR 330 in Chapter 1.
- 7 See Summers (2007) argument for the emergence of a criminal procedure that overcomes the normative boundaries of adversarial and inquisitorial processes, as discussed in Chapters 6 and 7.
- 8 Criminal Procedure Regulation 2005 (NSW) Sch 5, cl 7. For a list of offences for which intervention programs are appropriate, see *Criminal Procedure Act 1986* (NSW) s348.
- 9 Primary victims include persons or witnesses to an offence that have suffered personal injury as a result of an offence. Family victims include members of the primary victim's immediate family. See *Crimes (Sentencing Procedure) Act 1999* (NSW) s26.

- 10 Also see recommendation 3 of the New South Wales Law Reform Commission, *Sentencing*, Report No 79 (1996). Hunt J advocates the treatment of family impact statements in homicide cases along similar lines to those proposed by the NSWLRC.
- 11 The one exception recognised by Hunt CJ at CL may be where the primary victim dies a slow, lingering death. The circumstances of the offence would thus come to encompass family victims, who may come to care for the primary victim before death. See *R v Previtera* (1997) 94 A Crim R 76, 86.
- 12 Also see *Re Gangemi* [1971] QWN 19, *R v Allsop* [1972] QWN 34, *R v Johnson; Ex parte McLeod* [1973] Qd R 208.

## Chapter 5 The Criminal Trial as Social Discourse

- 1 See *Barton v The Queen* (1980) 147 CLR 75; *Dietrich v The Queen* (1992) 177 CLR 292 at 299–300. As to art. 6 of the ECHR, see *Khan v United Kingdom* (2001) 31 EHRR 45; *Rowe and Davis v United Kingdom* (2000) 30 EHRR 1; *Fitt v United Kingdom* (2000) 30 EHRR 480; *Windisch v Austria* (1990) (1990) 13 EHRR 281.
- 2 The Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States reads: ‘In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.’
- 3 Also see *Davis v Washington* (2006) 547 US 813. In *Davis v Washington*, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the transcript of an emergency 911 call was not testimony and so the sixth amendment did not require the caller to appear at trial and be cross-examined.
- 4 The blurring of the public/private dichotomy may be taken to the extent that one can question whether it is fair to conceptualise clear public and private spheres. The focus on discourse attempts to debunk such concepts as taken for granted assumptions, at least in criminal law. What is offered instead is an interrelated concept of public and private that seeks to problematise the legal convention that separates life into spheres, constituting the terrain of certain jurisdictions such as criminal law and civil law.

## Chapter 6 The Trial as Hermeneutic: A Critical Review

- 1 See Chapter 4. Non-derogating control orders have been characterised as non-criminal but this point is, arguably, debatable.
- 2 As to the centrality of the adversarial tradition in Canadian criminal law, see *R v Swain* [1991] 1 SCR 933.
- 3 Also see *Medellín v Texas* (2008) 552 US 491.
- 4 See Chapter 5, *Discourse Defined*.

- 5 Compare the *tribunal correctionnel* or *tribunal de police* in France and local or magistrates' court in common law jurisdictions in terms of the degree to which cases are dealt with by direction of the judicial officer over party representing the accused. See Hodgson (2006) and McBarnett (1981a, 1981b).

## **Chapter 7 Implications for Criminal Justice Policy**

- 1 See *Crimes (Criminal Organisation Control) Act 2009* (NSW) s32(1); *Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act 2008* (SA) s5(1).

# References

- Ashworth, A. (2004) 'Social Control and Antisocial Behaviour: The Subversion of Human Rights', *Law Quarterly Review*, 120, 263–291.
- Ashworth, A. (2009) 'Criminal Law, Human Rights and Preventative Justice', in McSherry, B., Norrie, A. and Bronitt, S. (eds) *Regulating Deviance: The Redirection of Criminalisation and the Futures of Criminal Law*, Hart Publishing: Oxford, pp. 87–108.
- Attorney-General's Department (2008) *Forum Sentencing: Facing up to Crime*, NSW Government.
- Baker, J.H. (1990) *An Introduction to English Legal History*, Butterworths: London.
- Berman, G. (2000) 'What is a Traditional Judge Anyway? Problem Solving in the State Courts', *Judicature*, 84, 2, 78–85.
- Berman, G. and Feinblatt, J. (2001) 'Problem-Solving Courts: A Brief Primer', *Law and Policy*, 23, 2, 125–140.
- Berman, G. and Feinblatt, J. (2005) *Good Courts: The Case for Problem-Solving Justice*, The New Press: New York.
- Berman, G. and Fox, A. (2001) 'From the Margins to the Mainstream: Community Justice at the Crossroads', *Justice System Journal*, 22, 2, 189–207.
- Blackstone, W. (1783) *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Strahan, W. and Cadell (eds) (1978), Oxford: London.
- Bloch, M. (1961) *Feudal Society*, Routledge: London.
- BOCSAR (2008) *New South Wales Criminal Courts Statistics 2007*, Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Attorney-General's Department: NSW.
- Booth, T. (2000) 'The Dead Victim, the Family Victim and Victim Impact Statements in New South Wales', *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 11, 3, 292–307.
- Booth, T. (2004) 'Homicide, Family Victims and Sentencing: Continuing the Debate about Victim Impact Statements', *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 15, 3, 253–257.
- Booth, T. (2007) 'Penalty, Harm and the Community: What Role Now for Victim Impact Statements in Sentencing Homicide Offenders in NSW?', *University of New South Wales Law Journal*, 30, 3, 664–685.
- Brienen, M.E.I. and Hoegen, E.H. (2000) *Victims of Crime in 22 European Criminal Justice Systems*, Wolf Legal Publishers: The Netherlands.
- Brown, H. (1999) 'Provocation as a Defence to Murder: To Abolish or Reform?', *Australian Feminist Law Journal*, 12, 137–141.
- Cam, H. (1960) *Hundred and the Hundred Rolls: An Outline of Local Government in Medieval England*, Burt Franklin.
- Carlen, P. (1976) 'The Staging of Magistrates' Justice', *British Journal of Criminology*, 16, 1, 48–55.
- Casey, L. (2008) *Engaging Communities in Fighting Crime*, Crime and Community Review, Prime Ministers Cabinet Office: United Kingdom.
- Christie, N. (1977) 'Conflicts as Property', *British Journal of Criminology*, 17, 1, 1–15.

- Clune, W.H. (1989) 'Legal Disintegration and a Theory of the State', in Joerges, C. and Trubek, D.M. (eds) *Critical Legal Thought: An American-German Debate*, Oxford University Press: Oxford, pp. 127–242.
- Corns, C. (2003) 'Retrial of Acquitted Persons: Time for Reform of the Double Jeopardy Rule?', *Criminal Law Journal*, 27, 2, 80–101.
- Corns, C. (2004) 'Videotaped Evidence in Victoria: Some Evidentiary Issues and Appellate Court Perspectives', *Criminal Law Journal*, 28, 1, 43–51.
- Cotterrell, R. (1992) *The Sociology of Law*, Butterworths: London.
- Cotterrell, R. (1995) *Law's Community*, Butterworths: London.
- Cross, R. (1979) *Cross on Evidence*, Butterworths: Sydney.
- Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) (2007) *Victim Focus Scheme Guidance on Enhanced CPS Service for Bereaved Families*, United Kingdom.
- Damaška, M.R. (1986) *The Faces of Justice and State Authority: A Comparative Approach to the Legal Process*, Yale University Press: London.
- Dean, M. (1994) *Critical and Effective Histories: Foucault's Methods and Historical Sociology*, Routledge: London.
- Dean, M. (1999) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, Sage: London.
- Department of Justice (Vic) (2009) *Reviewing Victims of Crime Compensation: Sentencing Order and State Funded Awards*, Discussion Paper, Department of Justice: Melbourne, Victoria.
- Doak, J. (2005a) 'Victims' Rights in Criminal Trials: Prospects for Participation', *Journal of Law and Society*, 32, 2, 294–316.
- Doak, J. (2005b) 'Child Witnesses: Do Special Measures Directions Prejudice the Accused's Right to a Fair Hearing? – *R v Camberwell Green Youth Court, ex p. D*; *R v Camberwell Green Youth Court, ex p. G*', *International Journal of Evidence and Proof*, 9, 4, 291–295.
- Doak, J. (2008) *Victims' Rights, Human Rights and Criminal Justice: Reconceiving the Role of Third Parties*, Hart Publishing: Oxford.
- Doak, J. and McGourlay, C. (2009) *Criminal Evidence in Context*, Routledge-Cavendish: New York.
- Dreyfus, H.L. and Rabinow, P. (1982) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- Duff, A., Farmer, L., Marshall, S. and Tadros, V. (2007) *The Trial on Trial Volume 3: Towards a Normative Theory of the Criminal Trial*, Hart Publishing: Oxford.
- Duff, P. (2001) 'The Limitations on Trial by Jury', *International Review of Penal Law*, 72, 1–2, 603–609.
- Dworkin, R. (1986) *Law's Empire*, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Edwards, I. (2002) 'The Place of Victims' Preferences in the Sentencing of "Their" Offenders', *Criminal Law Review*, September, 689–702.
- Edwards, I. (2003) 'Victim Participation in Sentencing: The Problems of Incoherence', *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40, 1, 39–54.
- Edwards, I. (2004) 'An Ambiguous Participant: The Crime Victim and Criminal Justice Decision-Making', *British Journal of Criminology*, 44, 6, 967–982.
- Edwards, I. (2009) 'The Evidential Quality of Victim Personal Statements and Family Impact Statements', *International Journal of Evidence and Proof*, 13, 4, 293–320.
- Elias, N. (1982a) *The Civilizing Process Vol. 1: The History of Manners*, Pantheon: New York.



- Elias, N. (1982b) *The Civilizing Process Vol. 2: Power & Civility*, Pantheon: New York.
- Elias, N. (1988) 'Violence and Civilisation: The State Monopoly of Physical Violence and its Infringement', in Keane, J. (ed.) *Civil Society and the State: New European Perspectives*, Verso: London, pp. 177–198.
- Ellison, L. (2002) *The Adversarial Process and the Vulnerable Witness*, Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Emsley, C. (1983) *Policing and its Context, 1750–1870*, Schocken Books: New York.
- Emsley, C. (1987) *Crime and Society in England 1750–1900*, 2nd edn, Longman: London, New York.
- Erez, E. (2004) 'Victim Voice, Impact Statements and Sentencing: Integrating Restorative Justice and Therapeutic Jurisprudence Principles in Adversarial Proceedings', *Criminal Law Bulletin*, 40, 5, 483–500.
- Evans, E.P. (1987) *The Criminal Prosecution and Capital Punishment of Animals*, Farber and Farber: London.
- Fairall, P. and Lacey, W. (2007) 'Preventative Detention and Control Orders Under Federal Law: The Case for a Bill of Rights', *Melbourne University Law Review*, 31, 3, 1072–1089.
- Feld, B. (1994) 'Juvenile Justice Swedish Style: A Rose by Another Name?', *Justice Quarterly*, 11, 4, 625–650.
- Feldthusen, B. (1993) 'The Civil Action for Sexual Battery: Therapeutic Jurisprudence', *Ottawa Law Review*, 25, 2, 205–234.
- Field, S. (2009) 'Fair Trials and Procedural Tradition in Europe', *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 29, 2, 365–387.
- Findlay, M. and Henham, R. (2010) *Beyond Punishment: Achieving International Criminal Justice*, Palgrave Macmillan: Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire.
- Findlay, M. and Henham, R. (2005) *Transforming International Criminal Justice: Retributive and Restorative Justice in the Trial Process*, Willan Publishing: London.
- Flynn, T. (1994) 'Foucault's Mapping of History', in Cutting, G. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, pp. 28–46.
- Foucault, M. (1969) *Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, Pantheon Books: New York.
- Foucault, M. (1971) 'Truth and Power', in Gordon, C. (ed.) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, Pantheon Books: New York, pp. 109–133.
- Foucault, M. (1976) *The History of Sexuality Vol 1: An Introduction*, Penguin Books: Sydney.
- Foucault, M. (1982) 'The Subject and Power', in Dreufus, H.L. and Rabinow, P. (eds) *Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, University of Chicago Press: Chicago, pp. 208–226.
- Foucault, M. (1984) 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History', in Rabinow, P. (ed.) *The Foucault Reader*, Pantheon Books: New York, pp. 76–100.
- Foucault, M. (1994) *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, The New Press: New York.
- Fox, R.G. (1994) 'The Meaning of Proportionality in Sentencing', *Melbourne University Law Review*, 19, 489–511.

- Friedman, N. and Jones, M. (2005) 'Children Giving Evidence of Sexual Offences in Criminal Proceedings: Special Measures in Australian States and Territories', *Journal of Judicial Administration*, 14, 3, 157–170.
- Friedman, R.D. (2004) 'Adjusting to *Crawford*: High Court Restores Confrontation Clause Protection', *Criminal Justice*, 19, 2, 4–13.
- Garkawe, S. (2006) 'Victim Impact Statements and Sentencing', *Monash University Law Review*, 31, 1, 90–114.
- Gil, D.G. (2008) 'Toward a "Radical" Paradigm of Restorative Justice', in Sullivan, D. and Tift, L. (eds) *Handbook of Restorative Justice*, Routledge: London, pp. 499–511.
- Girgen, J. (2003) 'The Historical and Contemporary Prosecution and Punishment of Animals', *Animal Law Review*, 9, 97–133.
- Goldstein, A. (1982) 'Defining the Role of the Victim in Criminal Prosecution', *Mississippi Law Journal*, 52, 3, 515–561.
- Goldstein, H. (1987) 'Toward Community-Oriented Policing: Potential, Basic Requirements, and Threshold Questions', *Crime and Delinquency*, 33, 1, 6–30.
- Goodey, J. (2005) *Victims and Victimology: Research, Policy and Practice*, Pearson Education Limited: United Kingdom.
- Goodrich, P. (1992) 'Ars Bablativa: Ramism, Rhetoric, and the Genealogy of English Jurisprudence', in Leyh, G. (ed.) *Legal Hermeneutics: History, Theory and Practice*, University of California Press: California, USA, pp. 43–82.
- Gordon, C. (1991) 'Governmental Rationality: An Introduction', in Burchell, G., Gordon, C. and Miller, P. (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, University of Chicago Press: Chicago, pp. 1–51.
- Hay, D. (1975) 'Property, Authority and the Criminal Law', in Hay, D., Linebaugh, P., Rule, J.G., Thompson, E.P. and Winslow, C. (eds) *Albion's Fatal Tree: Crime and Society in Eighteenth-Century England*, Allen Lane: London, pp. 33–63.
- Haydock, R. and Sonsteng, J. (1991) *Trial: Theories, Tactics, Techniques*, West Group: USA.
- Herman, K. (2006) 'Sex Offence Courts: The Next Step in Community Management?', *Sexual Assault Report*, 9, 5, 65–80.
- Herrmann, J. (1996) 'Models for the Reform of the Criminal Trial in Eastern Europe: A Comparative Perspective', *Saint Louis-Warsaw Transatlantic Law Journal*, 127–51.
- Hodgson, J. (2006) 'Conceptions of the Trial in Inquisitorial and Adversarial Procedure', in Duff, A., Farmer, L., Marshall, S. and Tadros, V. (eds) *The Trial on Trial Volume 2: Judgement and Calling to Account*, Hart Publishing: Oxford, pp. 223–242.
- Holdsworth, W. (1903–38) *A History of English Law*, Vols. 1–17, Methuen & Co.: London.
- Horwitz, M.J. (1981) 'The Historical Contingency of the Role of History', *Yale Law Journal*, 90, 1057–1059.
- Hoy, D.C. (1992) 'Intentions and the Law: Defining Hermeneutics', in Leyh, G. (ed.) *Legal Hermeneutics: History, Theory and Practice*, University of California Press: California, USA, pp. 173–186.
- Hyams, P. (1981) 'Trial by Ordeal: The Key to Proof in Early Common Law', in Arnold, M.S., Green, T.A., Scully, S.A. and White, S.D. (eds) *On the Laws and*

- Customs of England: Essays in Honor of Sameul E Thorne*, University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, pp. 90–126.
- Jacoby, S. (1976) *Wild Justice: The Evolution of Revenge*, Harper and Row: New York.
- Joutsen, M. (1987) 'Listening to the Victim: The Victim's Role in European Criminal Justice Systems', *Wayne Law Review*, 34, 95–124.
- Kamenka, E. and Tay, A. (1978) 'Socialism, Anarchism and Law', in Kamenka, E., Brown, R. and Tay, A. (eds) *Law and Society: The Crisis in Legal Ideals*, Edward Arnold: London, pp. 48–80.
- Kaye, J.S. (2004) 'Delivering Justice Today: A Problem-Solving Approach', *Yale Law and Policy Review*, 22, 1, 125–151.
- Keyzer, P. and Blay, S. (2006) 'Double Punishment? Preventive Detention Schemes Under Australian Legislation and their Consistency with International Law: The Fardon Communication', *Melbourne Journal of International Law*, 7, 2, 407–242.
- Kimball, E.G. (1978) *A Cambridgeshire Gaol Delivery Roll 1332–1334*, Cambridge Antiquarian Records Society: Cambridge.
- King, M., Freiberg, A., Batagol, B. and Hyams, R. (2009) *Non-Adversarial Justice*, The Federation Press: Sydney.
- King, M.S. (2006a) 'Therapeutic Jurisprudence in Australia: New Directions in Courts, Legal Practice, Research and Legal Education', *Journal of Judicial Administration*, 15, 3, 129–141.
- King, M.S. (2006b) 'The Therapeutic Dimensions of Judging: The Example of Sentencing', *Journal of Judicial Administration*, 16, 2, 92–105.
- King-Ries, A. (2005) 'Crawford v Washington: The End of Victimless Prosecution?', *Seattle University Law Review*, 28, 2, 301–327.
- Kiralfry, A.K.R. (1958) *Historical Introduction to the English Law and its Institutions*, Sweet and Maxwell: London.
- Kirchengast, T. (2005) 'Victim Impact Statements and the *Previterra* Rule: Delimiting the Voice and Representation of Family Victims in NSW Homicide Cases', *University of Tasmania Law Review*, 24, 2, 127–154.
- Kirchengast, T. (2006) *The Victim in Criminal Law and Justice*, Palgrave Macmillan: Houndmills, Basingstoke: Hampshire.
- Kirchengast, T. (2009) 'Criminal Injuries Compensation, Victim Assistance and Restoration in Australian Sentencing Law', *International Journal of Punishment and Sentencing*, 5, 3, 96–119.
- Klerman, D. (2001) 'Settlement and the Decline of Private Prosecution in Thirteenth Century England', *Law and History Review*, Spring, 1–66.
- Knipps, S.K. and Berman, G. (2000) 'New York's Problem-Solving Courts Provide Meaningful Alternatives to Traditional Remedies', *New York State Bar Association Journal*, 72, 8–10.
- Knoops, G.J. (2007) *Theory and Practice of International and Internationalized Criminal Proceedings*, Kluwer Law International: The Netherlands.
- Langbein, J.H. (2003) *The Origins of the Adversary Criminal Trial*, Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Law Commission of England and Wales (LCEW) (2004) *Partial Defences to Murder: Final Report*, UK Government.
- Lee, M. and Herborn, P. (2003) 'The Role of Place Management in Crime Prevention: Some Reflections on Governmentality and Government Strategy', *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 15, 1, 26–39.

- Leyh, G. (1992) 'Legal Education and the Public Life', in Leyh, G. (ed.) *Legal Hermeneutics: History, Theory and Practice*, University of California Press: California, USA, pp. 269–294.
- Lininger, T. (2005) 'Prosecuting Batterers After *Crawford*', *Virginia Law Review*, 91, 3, 747–822.
- Lorenzmeier, S. (2006) 'The Legal Effect of Framework Decisions – A Case-Note on the Pupino Decision of the European Court of Justice', *Zeitschrift für Internationale Strafrechtsdogmatik*, 12, 583–588.
- Luhmann, N. (1993) *Law as a Social System*, Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Matthews, K., Easton, H., Briggs, D. and Pease, K. (2007) *Assessing the Use and Impact of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders*, Policy Press: Bristol.
- Maturana, H. (1982) *Erkennen: Die Organisation und Verkorperung von Wirklichkeit*, Braunschweig: Vieweg.
- Mauet, T.A. (2007) *Trial Techniques*, 7th (ed.) Aspen Publishers: USA.
- Mawby, R. (2007) 'Public Sector Services and the Victim of Crime', in Walklate, S. (ed.) *Handbook of Victims and Victimology*, Willan Publishing: London, pp. 209–239.
- McBarnet, D. (1981a) *Conviction: Law, the State and the Construction of Justice*, Palgrave Macmillan: UK.
- McBarnet, D. (1981b) 'Magistrates' Courts and the Ideology of Justice', *British Journal of Law and Society*, 8, 2, 181–197.
- McConville, M. (1984) 'Prosecuting Criminal Cases in England and Wales: Reflections on an Inquisitorial Adversary', *Liverpool Law Review*, 4, 1, 15–32.
- Mercado, C.C. and Ogloff, J.R.P. (2007) 'Risk and the Preventive Detention of Sex Offenders in Australia and the United States', *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 30, 1, 49–59.
- Ministry of Justice (2005) *Making a Difference: Taking Forward Our Priorities*, United Kingdom.
- Ministry of Justice (2009) *Engaging Communities in Criminal Justice – Green Paper*, UK Government.
- Mosteller, R.P. (2005) '*Crawford v Washington*: Encouraging and Ensuring the Confrontation of Witnesses', *University of Richmond Law Review*, 39, 2, 511–625.
- Nerhot, P. (1992) *Law, Writing, Meaning: An Essay in Legal Hermeneutics*, Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh.
- New South Wales Law Reform Commission (NSWLRC) (1997) *Partial Defences to Murder: Provocation and Infanticide*, Report No. 83, NSW Government.
- New South Wales Law Reform Commission (NSWLRC) (2007) *Role of Juries in Sentencing*, Report No. 118, NSW Government.
- New Zealand Law Commission (NZLC) (2001) *Acquittal Following Perversion of the Course of Justice*, New Zealand Government.
- Nobles, R. and Schiff, D. (2001) 'Criminal Justice: Autopoietic Insights', in Priban, J. and Nelken, D. (eds) *Law's New Boundaries: The Consequences of Legal Autopoiesis*, Ashgate: Aldershot, Hampshire, England, pp. 197–217.
- Nonet, P. and Selznick, P. (1978) *Law and Society in Transition: Toward Responsive Law*, Transaction Publishers: London.
- Norrie, A. (2001) *Crime, Reason and History: A Critical Introduction to Criminal Law*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Office for Criminal Justice Reform (2007) *Working Together to Cut Crime and Deliver Justice: A Strategic Plan for 2008–2011*, United Kingdom.

- Ortwein, B.M. (2003) 'The Swedish Legal System: An Introduction', *Indiana International and Comparative Law Review*, 13, 2, 405–455.
- Packer, H. (1968) *The Limits of the Criminal Sanction*, Stanford University Press: California.
- Pollock, F. and Maitland, F.W. (1968) *The History of English Law before the Time of Edward I*, 2nd edn, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Powell, M., Roberts, K. and Guadagno, B. (2007) 'Particularisation of Child Abuse Offences: Common Problems when Questioning Child Witnesses', *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 19, 1, 64–74.
- Powers, E. (1966) *Crime and Punishment in Early Massachusetts 1620–1692: A Documentary History*, Beacon Press: Boston.
- President of the Queen's Bench Division (2006) *A Protocol Issued by the President of the Queen's Bench Division Setting Out the Procedure to be Followed in the Victims' Advocate Pilot Areas*.
- Roberts, P. (2002) 'Double Jeopardy Law Reform: A Criminal Justice Commentary', *Modern Law Review*, 65, 3, 393–424.
- Roxon, N. (2005) 'Prevention or Punishment: Terrorisms Challenge to Criminal Law', *Human Rights Defender*, Special Issue, 12–14.
- Sanders, A. (2002) 'Victim Participation in an Exclusionary Criminal Justice System', in Hoyle, C. and Young, R. (eds) *New Visions of Crime Control*, Hart Publishing: Oxford, pp. 197–222.
- Schwikkard, P.J. (2007) 'Convergence, Appropriate Fit and Values in Criminal Process', in Roberts, P. and Redmayne, M. (eds) *Innovations in Evidence and Proof: Integrating Theory, Research and Teaching*, Hart Publishing: Oxford, pp. 331–346.
- Schwikkard, P.J. (2008) *Possibilities of Convergence: An Outside Perspective on the Convergence of Criminal Procedures in Europe*, Kluwer.
- Sebba, L. (2009) 'Victim-Driven Criminalisation', in McSherry, B., Norrie, A. and Bronitt, S. (eds) *Regulating Deviance: the Redirection of Criminalisation and the Futures of Criminal Law*, Hart Publishing: Oxford, pp. 59–84.
- Secretary of State for Constitutional Affairs and Lord Chancellor (2006) *Hearing the Relatives of Murder and Manslaughter Victims: The Government's Plans to Give the Bereaved Relatives of Murder and Manslaughter Victims a Say in Criminal Proceeding – Summary of Responses to the Consultation Paper*, United Kingdom.
- Shapiro, B.J. (1991) *Beyond Reasonable Doubt and Probable Cause: Historical Perspectives on the Anglo-American Law of Evidence*, University of California Press: California, USA.
- Simon, W.H. (1978) 'Ideology of Advocacy: Procedural Justice and Professional Ethics', *Wisconsin Law Review*, 31, 1, 29–144.
- Sklansky, D.A. (2009) 'Anti-Inquisitorialism', *Harvard Law Review*, 122, 1634–1704.
- Smallbone, S. and Ransley, J. (2005) 'Legal and Psychological Controversies in the Preventive Incapacitation of Sexual Offenders', *University of New South Wales Law Journal*, 28, 1, 299–305.
- Stephen, J.F. (1883) *History of the Criminal Law and England*, William S. Hein and Company.
- Stone, J. (1991) *Evidence: Its History and Policies*, Butterworths: Sydney.
- Summers, S. (2007) *Fair Trials: The European Procedural Tradition and the European Court of Human Rights*, Hart Publishing: Oxford.

- Tadros, V. (2007) 'Justice and Terrorism', *New Criminal Law Review*, 10, 4, 658–689.
- Tanford, J.A. (2009) *The Trial Process: Law, Tactics and Ethics*, 4th edn, LexisNexis.
- Teubner, G. (1993) *Law as an Autopoietic System*, Blackwell: Oxford.
- Tobias, J.J. (1979) *Crime and Police in England 1700–1900*, Gill and Macmillan: London.
- Tolmie, J. (2005) 'Is the Partial Defence and Endangered Defence: Recent Proposals to Abolish Provocation', *New Zealand Law Review*, 1, 25–52.
- Unger, R. (1976) *Law in Modern Society: Toward a Criticism of Social Theory*, Free Press: New York.
- Victorian Law Reform Commission (VLRF) (2004) *Partial Defences to Murder: Final Report*, Victorian Government.
- von Hirsch, A. and Ashworth, A. (2005) *Proportionate Sentencing: Exploring the Principles*, Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Walters, M. (2006) 'Victim Impact Statement in Homicide Cases: Should 'Recognising the Harm Done... To the Community' Signify a New Direction?', *International Journal of Punishment and Sentencing*, 2, 2, 53–71.
- Walton, M. (2005) 'The Anti-Terrorism Bill (No. 2) 2005: An Overview', *Human Rights Defender*, Special Issue, 3–5.
- Warner, K. (2004) 'Gang Rape in Sydney: Crime, the Media, Politics, Race and Sentencing', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 37, 3, 344–362.
- Warren, W.L. (1973) *Henry II*, Yale University Press: New Haven and London.
- Weisstub, D. (1986) 'Crime Victims in the Criminal Justice System', in Fattah, E.A. (ed.) *From Crime Policy to Victim Policy: Reorienting the Justice System*, St Martin's Press: New York, pp. 191–209.
- Wemmers, J. (2009) 'Where Do They Belong? Giving Victims a Place in the Criminal Justice System', *Criminal Law Forum*, 20, 4, 395–416.
- Wexler, D.B. (1999) 'Therapeutic Jurisprudence and the Culture of Critique', *Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues*, 10, 263–277.
- Wolhunter, L., Olley, N. and Denham, D. (2009) *Victimology: Victimisation and Victims' Rights*, Routledge Cavendish: Oxon.
- Zedner, L. (2006) 'Neither Safe Nor Sound: The Perils and Possibilities of Risk', *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 48, 3, 423–434.
- Zedner, L. (2007) 'Pre-Crime and Post-Criminology?', *Theoretical Criminology*, 11, 2, 261–281.
- Zila, J. (2006) 'The Prosecution Service within the Swedish Criminal Justice System', in Jehle, J.M. and Wade, M. (eds) *Coping with Overloaded Criminal Justice Systems: The Rise of Prosecutorial Power Across Europe*, Springer: Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 285–311.

# Index

- A v Secretary of State for the Home Department* 26, 111, 112, 118, 227
- Act of Settlement 44, 227
- Adhesive Prosecution 140–141
- Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1933* (UK) 68
- Adversarialism
- anti-inquisitorialism 194–200
    - centrepiece of modern criminal law and justice 7, 15, 19–21
    - characteristics of adversarialism 2, 6, 14, 41–42, 120, 153, 166–178, 189–194, 219, 221
    - due process 17–21, 25, 118, 125, 127–128, 172, 212–213
    - emergence/development of 3, 60–64
    - evidence, development of 5, 15
    - fair trial 6–11, 32, 63, 69, 98, 109, 125, 126, 137, 172–174, 174, 212–218
    - institutional capacity of the Crown 54
    - judicial independence 34, 227
    - nationalism and 202, 206
    - rise of counsel 3, 5–6, 8, 16–17, 63
    - rise of the state 4–5, 14–15
    - role of counsel 6–8, 20, 119, 178–180, 195–201
    - self-representation 21, 125
    - ultimate state of perfection 175
- Adversarial and Inquisitorial Hybrid
- defendants and fair trial 11, 31, 133, 137–138, 165, 207, 217
  - ECtHR 203, 216, 219
  - European civil tradition 137–143
  - hybrid process 14, 133, 168, 202–206, 213, 216–218
  - Sweden 139–143
  - victims and 139–143, 203, 213
- Agency 24, 34, 41, 61, 212
- Altercation Trial 63
- Animals, Trial of
- ecclesiastical trials 48–49
  - secular trials 49–51
- Anonymous Witness Evidence
- Doorson v The Netherlands* 32, 126, 130, 132, 203, 213–214, 229
  - PS v Germany* 32
  - SN v Sweden* 32, 133
- Anti-inquisitorialism 38, 194–200, 206
- Anti-Terrorism Act (No. 2) 2005* (Cth) 26, 28, 112–113
- Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001* (UK) 113, 227
- Antrobus, In re* 103–107
- Appeal
- EWCA 83, 111, 159
  - NSWCCA 157–158
  - right to 17–18
- Appeal of Felony 51, 53, 73
- Apprendi v New Jersey* 197
- Archaeology 1, 167, 170–171, 184
- Archive 166–170, 184, 186, 187, 193, 202–205, 212, 217
- Arrest 8, 54, 59, 68, 72, 76, 82–84, 117, 138
- ASBO
- civil order 91–92
  - criminal law 92
  - generally 30, 36, 66, 82, 87, 91
  - R (on the application of McCann and others) v Crown Court at Manchester; Clingham v Kensington and Chelsea Royal London Borough Council* 91, 213–214, 222
  - standard of proof 91–92
  - Ashford v Thornton* 73–74

- Assize of Clarendon 47, 51, 53–56, 66
- Assize of Eyre  
 appeal of felony 51, 53, 57  
 gaol delivery 56, 58–62  
 local governance 51–61, 62–63  
 offences 53–54, 55–56  
 punishment 42–48  
 role of victim 40–47  
 royal justice 54–56, 57, 59–60
- Assize of Northampton 51, 53, 55–58
- Australian Constitution  
*see* Constitution
- Autonomy of law  
 criminal justice and 207–209  
 hypercycle 16  
 Maturana 207  
 normative perspectives 208–209  
 self-referentiality 16, 209  
 Teubner 16, 207
- Autopoiesis 16, 208–209
- Auxiliary prosecution 113, 133, 138, 139–142
- Baegen v The Netherlands* 128–129
- Bail  
*Bail Act 1978* (NSW) 85–87, 155  
 changes to bail law 33, 82  
 control orders and 27–29  
 early committal process 68–69  
 law and order 85–87  
*R v Hammill* 86–87  
*s22A Bail Act 1978* (NSW) 86–87  
*Barton v The Queen* 134, 230
- Battle, trial by 57, 60, 62, 72–74, 193
- Becket, Thomas 57
- Benefit of Clergy 57
- Blackstone, Sir William 18, 28, 29, 61, 200
- Blakely v Washington* 196–197
- Bill of Rights  
 Australia, lack of 10–11, 124  
 New Zealand 96  
 United States 77
- Bill of Rights Act 1990* (NZ) 96
- Blood Feud  
*see also* Customary Justice
- first trial 44  
 generally 40, 43–47
- Bocos-Cuesta v The Netherlands* 129–131
- BOCSAR 20
- Brooks v Police* 162–163
- Brown v Walker* 198
- Butera v Director of Public Prosecutions (Vic)* 176–178
- Casey Review 148
- CCP 109, 150
- Charge Bargaining  
 district attorney 105–108  
*GAS v The Queen; SJK v The Queen* 79–81  
*Gouriet v Union of Post Office Workers* 78  
 police 78–79  
*R v Andrew Foster Brown* 79  
 sentencing and 80–81  
 victims and 100–178  
*Wright v McQualter* 79
- Cheatle v The Queen* 74–76
- Cheung v The Queen* 134
- Circle Sentencing 2, 124, 152–154
- Common Law  
 discourse and 184  
 doctrine 194  
 growth of 184
- Commonwealth Criminal Code 26, 28
- Community Justice 147–151
- Compensation  
 domestic law and 11, 97, 108, 124, 125, 151–153, 160–164, 224  
 framework decisions 11  
 ICC 110  
 victim lawyers 97, 108
- Confrontation  
 confrontation and customary justice 42  
 confrontation clause 118, 137, 179, 181, 182, 195, 196, 203, 216  
 confrontation under the ECHR 13, 130, 132



- Constitution  
*see also* Bill of Rights  
 Australian constitution 28,  
 77–78, 228  
 Sixth Amendment to the US  
 Constitution 179, 182, 195,  
 197, 230  
 United States constitution 118,  
 137, 170, 179, 199
- Control Order  
*A v Secretary of State for the  
 Home Department* 26, 28,  
 112–113  
*Anti-Terrorism Act (No. 2) 2005*  
 (Cth) 26, 28, 112–113  
*Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security  
 Act 2001* (UK) 113, 227  
 ASBOs 30, 36, 66, 82, 87, 91  
 Australia generally 26–30, 82,  
 214  
 contested hearings and 28,  
 113–118  
*Crimes (Criminal Organisation  
 Control) Act 2009* (NSW)  
 89–91, 231  
 criminal law and 91, 110–113  
*Criminal Organisations Legislation  
 Amendment Act 2009* (NSW)  
 89–91  
*Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual  
 Offenders) Act 2003* (Qld) 10  
 derogative and non-derogative  
 control orders 26, 113–118,  
 227  
 England and Wales generally  
 26–30, 113–118, 223  
 fair hearings 117  
 freedom of movement and  
 association and 10, 26, 30,  
 82, 87, 214  
 organised motorcycle clubs 9, 29,  
 214  
*Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005*  
 (UK) 26, 112–118  
 proof 213–214, 26–27  
 secrecy of trial 26–27, 114–118  
*Secretary of State for the Home  
 Department v AF (No. 3)* 26,  
 116–118  
*Secretary of State for the Home  
 Department v MB and AF* 26,  
 110, 114, 116  
 sentencing options 26–27, 89–91  
*Serious and Organised Crime (Control)  
 Act 2008* (SA) 30, 87, 231  
*Thomas v Mowbray* 28, 111, 113,  
 228  
*Totani and Anor. v The State of  
 South Australia* 30, 82, 87  
 Council of Europe 11, 139  
 CPS 34, 78, 99–100, 149–150  
*Crawford v Washington* 38, 174,  
 179–183, 187, 193, 194–196, 206  
*Crime and Disorder Act 1998* (UK) 91,  
 222  
 Crime Control Model 202  
*Crimes (Criminal Organisation Control)  
 Act 2009* (NSW) 89–91, 206  
*Crimes (Sentencing Procedure) Act 1999*  
 (NSW) 153, 155, 156, 157, 229  
*Crimes Act 1900* (NSW) 68, 85, 109,  
 161  
*Criminal Code 1913* (WA) 95  
*Criminal Code Act 1924* (Tas) 95  
*Criminal Injuries Compensation Act  
 1967* (NSW) 161  
*Criminal Justice Act 1988* (UK) 135  
*Criminal Justice Act 2003* (UK) 96,  
 135, 136  
*Criminal Justice and Public Order Act  
 1994* (UK) 81, 83  
*Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*  
 (SA) 162  
*Criminal Procedure Act 1986* (NSW)  
 70, 109, 125, 133–134, 229
- Cross-Examination  
 direct confrontation 115, 119,  
 125, 128, 132, 134, 136, 137,  
 142, 174, 176, 179, 187, 230  
 rape trials 134  
 statements 31–32, 102, 129–132,  
 135–136, 137  
 truth 183  
*curia regis* 57
- Customary Justice  
 appeal of felony 51, 53, 73  
 blood feud 40, 43–47  
 dispute settlement 42–47

- familial justice 42–45  
 frankpledge 52, 61  
 hue and cry 59  
 local institutions and  
     custom 42–60  
 oath of felty 52  
 origins 42  
 restoration in 43  
 rise of presentment 51–52  
 rule of law and 45  
 tythings 51–52  
 Unger, R. 42  
 wergild 47  
 CVRA 100–108
- Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003* (Qld) 10  
*Dean, In re* 105–107  
 Decentralised Justice  
     discourse 1, 37, 218  
     governance 61–62  
     mode of trial 33, 36, 66, 92–95  
     social change 119, 121  
 Defences  
     *see* Provocation  
 Defendant Rights  
     appeal 134, 157, 162  
     counsel and 6, 7, 62, 179  
     fair trial and 6–8  
     proportionality requirement  
         under art. 6 ECHR 31, 126, 131, 133  
         *Trials for Felony Act 1836* (Imp) 63  
*Demski v Poland* 13  
*Dietrich v The Queen* 6, 7, 8, 23, 63, 230  
*Director of Public Prosecution Act 1986* (NSW) 109  
 Discourse  
     *Archaeology of Knowledge* 168  
     communicative process 18  
     competing discourses 26, 65, 168, 192, 193, 224  
     decentralised justice 36–37, 61–62, 119–121, 166, 186–188, 218, 224  
     Discipline and 15, 184, 208–210, 222  
     enunciative field 167, 224  
     Foucault and 14–17, 167–171  
     genealogy and 9, 14–17, 123–124, 189, 200–205, 218  
     hermeneutics and 14–17  
     law and society 165–167  
     rhetoric 15, 19–24, 122, 123, 199, 205, 225  
     social change 220–225  
     statement 38, 167–171  
     truth and power 171–174, 217–220  
 Discretion  
     courts/judicial 21, 30–31, 79  
     executive 10–11, 79  
     in institutions 21  
     normative positioning of 79  
     police 34, 36, 72  
     prosecution and 41, 78–81  
     subjects and 34  
 Discursive Formation 1, 166–169, 171, 186–188, 211, 219  
*Doorson v The Netherlands* 32, 126, 130, 132, 203, 213, 214, 229  
 Double Jeopardy  
     *Crimes (Appeal and Review) Amendment (Double Jeopardy) Act 2006* (NSW) 96  
     *Criminal Justice Act 2003* (UK) 96  
     *Daniels v Thompson* 96  
     *Franz Fischer v Austria* 96  
     *The Queen v Carroll* 96  
 Due Process  
     *see* Fair Trial
- Ecclesiastical Law 48–49, 50, 57  
 Effective History  
     *see* Discourse  
     *see* Hermeneutics  
*Enhorn v Sweden* 215  
 European Convention on Human Rights  
     accusatorial trinity 202–203, 217  
     art. 2 ECHR 126, 228  
     art. 5 ECHR 32  
     art. 6 ECHR 31–32, 111, 117, 124, 126–135, 172, 174, 229  
     art. 8 ECHR 11, 32, 129, 229  
     art. 14 ECHR 113

- European Convention on Human Rights – *continued*  
 control orders 113  
 equity of arms 172  
 victim rights and the fair trial 31–32, 126–133
- European Civil Law  
*see* Inquisitorial Justice  
*see* Sweden, Criminal Process in  
 influence on ECtHR 202–206, 206–217, 222  
 private prosecutions in 139, 141
- European Court of Human Rights 13, 31, 116, 126, 128, 131, 133, 135, 203, 216, 219
- European Court of Justice  
*Pupino, Criminal Proceedings Against* 12, 31
- European Union 226
- Evidence  
*see also* Procedural Justice  
 anonymous witnesses 13, 31–32, 128–132, 173  
*Crawford v Washington* 38, 174, 179–183, 187, 193, 194–196, 206  
*Doorson v The Netherlands* 32, 126, 130, 132, 203, 213, 214, 229  
 frightened witness 135–137  
*Gately v The Queen* 171, 174, 175–179, 187, 193–194  
 orality, tradition of 175  
 out of court or hearsay evidence 31, 37, 118, 149, 151, 170, 183, 186–188, 194, 217–223  
*R v Camberwell Green Youth Court* 119, 131, 135, 173–175, 193–194  
 scientific evidence 64  
*Evidence Act 1977 (Qld)* 176–177  
*ex officio* indictment 69  
 Experimental Justice 36  
 Eyre  
*see* Assize of Eyre  
*see also* Judicial Commissions
- Fair Trial  
*see also* Cross-Examination  
 accusatorial trinity 202–203, 217  
 art. 6 ECHR 31–32, 111, 117, 124, 126–135, 172, 174, 229  
 art. 8 ECHR 11, 32, 129, 229  
*Barton v The Queen* 134, 230  
 confrontation and customary justice 42  
 confrontation clause 118, 137, 179, 181, 182, 195, 196, 203, 216  
 confrontation under the ECHR 13, 130, 132  
 control order, contested hearing 28  
 cross-examination and ‘truth’ 183  
*Dietrich v The Queen* 6, 7, 8, 23, 63, 230  
 direct examination of witness 125–134  
 due process 17–21, 25, 118, 125, 127–128, 172, 212–213  
 equity of arms 172  
*Jago v District Court of NSW* 94, 194  
 procedural fairness 20, 25, 41, 109, 111, 116, 128, 132, 138, 183, 189, 203, 213, 223  
 proportionality requirement (art. 6 ECHR) 31, 126, 133, 131  
 public hearing 173, 174  
 victim rights 31–32, 126–133, 133–137  
*Fardon v Attorney-General (Qld)* 10, 82, 112  
*Finkensieper v The Netherlands* 129  
*Forge v Australian Securities and Investments Commission* 88  
 Forum Sentencing 2, 124, 152–156  
*Foster, Re Applications for* 161  
 Foucault  
 discipline 15, 183–186, 208  
 effective history 3–4, 6, 15–17, 192–193, 200–205, 212, 217–218, 223–225  
 essential fact 15  
 genealogy 14–17, 123–124, 200–205  
 governmentality 6  
 hermeneutics 14–17, 189–200, 217–220

- knowledge and power 14–17,  
 205–207, 217–220  
 statement 38, 167–171,  
 186–188  
 truth and doctrine 14–17,  
 200–205
- Framework Decision on the  
 Standing of Victims in Criminal  
 Proceedings 11
- Frankpledge 52
- Gately v The Queen* 171, 174,  
 175–179, 187, 193–194
- Genealogy  
*see also* Hermeneutics  
 discourse and 9, 14–17, 123–124,  
 189, 200–205, 218  
 Foucault and 14–17
- Gouriet v Union of Post Office  
 Workers* 72, 228
- Governmentality  
 discourse and 6  
 Power and 192–194
- Grand Jury  
*see also* Jury  
*Administration of Justice  
 (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act  
 1933 (UK)* 68  
*Grassby v The Queen* 68
- Guilty Plea 20–21, 22, 40, 70–71,  
 72, 79, 80, 102, 103, 105, 143,  
 144  
*see also* *R v Thomson and  
 Houlton*
- Gypsy Jokers Motorcycle Club Inc v  
 Commissioner of Police* 88
- H (Minors) (Sexual Abuse: Standard  
 of Proof), In re* 92
- Hermeneutics  
*see also* Genealogy  
 defined 16–17  
 discourse and 5–6, 14–17, 218  
 Foucault and 167–171, 218  
 method 14–17
- Hill v Chief Constable of West  
 Yorkshire Police* 126
- Holdsworth, Sir William 14, 39,  
 52, 201
- Huff Asset Management Co.,  
 In re* 104, 107
- Human Rights  
*see* Defendant Rights  
*see* ECHR  
*see* ECtHR  
*see* ICC  
*see* Fair Trial  
*see* Victims
- Human Rights Act 1998  
 (UK)* 226
- Hundred Court 51–57
- Hundred Eolder 51–52
- ICTR 138
- ICTY 138
- Indictable Offences Act 1848  
 (UK)* 68
- Indictment  
 appeal of felony 51, 53, 73  
 assize of eyre 51, 53  
 presentment 53–59  
 victim challenges to 109
- Infringement  
*see* Penalty Notice
- Inquisitorial and Adversarial  
 Hybrid  
*see* Adversarial and Inquisitorial  
 Hybrid
- Inquisitorial Justice  
*see also* Adversarial and  
 Inquisitorial Hybrid  
 anti-inquisitorialism 194–200  
 European tradition 204–205  
 judicial independence 143, 201,  
 204  
 role of counsel 141, 204  
 victims and 139–143
- International Criminal Court  
 Office of Public Counsel for  
 Victims 110  
 Regulations of the ICC 110  
 Rome Statute 109–110  
 Rules of Procedure and  
 Evidence 138
- Intervention Program  
*see* Restorative Justice
- Italian Code of Criminal  
 Procedure 12

- Jago v District Court of NSW* 69, 194
- Judicial Commissions  
*ad omnia placita* 58  
 gaol delivery 56, 58, 59–60, 62  
 general assize 51, 57–59  
*mort d'ancestor* 55, 56  
*nisi prius* 58  
*novel disseisin* 55, 56  
 oyer and terminer 56, 58, 59, 62, 200
- Jury  
*Cheatle v The Queen* 74–76  
 Grand jury 20, 33–34, 56, 67–69, 195, 200  
*Jury Act 1977 (NSW)* 74  
*Kingswell v The Queen* 76–78  
 majority verdicts 74–76  
 petit/petty jury 15, 59, 67, 75  
 reforms to 68–69, 72–78  
 s80 Australian Constitution 74–78  
 sentencing and 227–228
- Justice For All Act 2004 (US)*  
 see CVRA
- Justice of the Peace 52, 59
- K-Generation Pty Ltd v Liquor Licensing Court* 88
- Kable v Director of Public Prosecutions for the State of New South Wales* 88
- Kenna v US District Court* 102, 107
- Khan v United Kingdom* 230
- King  
 see also King Henry II  
 Henry I 53  
 Henry II 51, 53, 56, 57, 61  
 Stephen (and Empress Matilda) 53, 58
- King Henry II  
 Assize of Clarendon 53, 56, 61  
 Assize of Northampton 56, 61  
 law reform and 53
- King's Bench 73, 180
- Kingswell v The Queen* 76–78
- Kostovski v The Netherlands* 131, 133
- Langbein, John H. 3, 5, 8, 14, 15, 17, 35, 63
- Law and Order  
 ASBO 30, 36, 66, 82, 87, 91  
 bail 85–87  
*Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 (UK)* 81, 83  
*Criminal Procedures and Investigation Act 1996 (UK)* 82  
 Cronulla riots 85  
 infringement and penalty notices 36, 71–72  
*Law Enforcement (Powers and Responsibilities) Act 2002 (NSW)* 81–85  
 Organised Motorcycle Clubs 87  
 Police 82–85  
*Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (UK)* 81–83  
 pre-emptive crime control 84  
*Law Enforcement (Powers and Responsibilities) Act 2002 (NSW)*  
 see Law and Order
- LCEW 93
- Lippl v Haines* 84
- Local Court  
 CPS 34, 78, 99–100, 149–150  
 defendant rights and 20–21, 70–72  
 guilty pleas 20–21, 70–72  
 litigants in person 20–21, 70–72  
 police prosecution and 20–75  
 private prosecution 108–109  
 rhetoric of justice and 20–21  
 statistics in NSW 20–21  
 summary process 70–72
- M v Director of Public Prosecutions* 92
- McCann and Ors v United Kingdom* 126
- McClintock v Jones* 161
- McNeil v Wisconsin* 195, 196, 198, 199
- Magistrates' Court  
 see Local Court
- Magna Carta 56, 76
- Medellín v Texas* 230
- Mile v Police* 163
- Miranda v Arizona* 195
- Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 (UK)* 84

- National Security  
 control orders generally 26–31  
 court processes and 26–29  
 terrorism 25–31  
 terrorist organisations 26, 27
- Non-adversarial Justice 146  
*see also* Problem Solving Courts  
*see also* Therapeutic Justice
- Norman Conquest 7, 46–47
- Normative Perspectives  
 adversarialism 192, 200  
 autonomy of law 38, 183–186, 211, 221–225  
 discourse 4, 9, 14–19, 25, 42, 63, 120, 125, 133, 151, 166, 185, 189, 205–210, 211–225  
 doctrine 4, 9, 17, 21, 25, 188, 192, 194, 200, 211, 214  
 future of law and justice 220–225  
 genealogy 3, 9, 14–17, 120, 123–124, 189, 200–205, 218  
 hermeneutics 5–6, 14–17, 218  
 normative theory of the trial 17–19
- NSWLRC 93, 228, 230
- NZLC 96
- O’Loughlin v Chief Constable of Essex* 83
- ODPP 34, 63, 69, 78, 108, 109, 124
- Ohio v Roberts* 179, 181, 182
- Ordeal  
 abolition of 57, 61–62  
 generally 52, 56–57, 61–62  
 mode of proof 52, 56
- Organised Motorcycle Clubs  
*Crimes (Criminal Organisation Control) Act 2009* (NSW) 231  
*Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act 2008* (SA) 30, 87, 231  
*Totani and Anor. v The State of South Australia* 30, 82, 87
- Osman v Southwark Crown Court* 83
- Osman v United Kingdom* 126–128
- Packer, Herbert 202
- Participation 4, 14, 20, 24, 34, 98, 126, 128, 151, 211, 216, 220
- Peace  
 borh, in 52  
 oath of fealty 52
- Penalty Notice  
*Crimes Legislation Amendment (Penalty Notices Offences) Act 2002* (NSW) 72  
 infringements 34, 36, 66, 67, 71–72, 81, 151
- Plea Bargaining  
*see* Charge Bargaining
- Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984* (UK)  
*see* Law and Order
- Policing  
*see also* Law and Order  
 arrest 82–83  
 cautions 151  
 charge 79–80, 83  
 hue and cry 59  
 law and order 82–85  
 over-charging 71, 79  
 prosecutors 34
- Politics  
 law and order 2, 18, 128  
 reactionist 214  
 restraining 14, 122  
 sectarian 224
- Powers of Criminal Courts (Sentencing) Act 2000* (UK) 162
- Pre-Trial Process  
*see also* Bail  
*see also* Charge Bargaining  
 adhesion proceedings 142  
 auxiliary prosecution 139  
 discovery 143  
 division of trial 41  
 generally 15, 24, 25, 33, 41, 87, 98, 99, 101, 104, 120, 131, 138, 139, 142–143, 146, 173, 189, 205, 219  
 human rights issues 25  
 ICC 138  
 inquisitorial process 205, 219  
 management/monitoring of accused 87, 146  
 plea-hearing 105  
 police 24  
 procedural justice 15

- Pre-Trial Process – *continued*  
 statute and 33  
 victims' lawyer 98–104  
 witness statements 173
- Presentment  
 appeal of felony 51, 53, 73  
 assize of eyre 57–59
- Preventative Law  
*see also* Control Orders  
*see also* Organised Motorcycle Clubs
- A v Secretary of State for the Home Department* 26, 111, 113, 118, 227
- apprehended violence orders 28, 29, 111–112
- bail 27, 28, 29, 111–112
- keeping the peace 27–29, 111–112
- recidivism 25, 29, 33, 82  
*Thomas v Mowbray* 28, 111, 113
- Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005* (UK) 26, 112, 117
- Private Prosecution 53, 108, 124  
 in civil systems 139, 141
- Private Settlement 44
- Problem Solving Courts  
*see also* Therapeutic Justice
- Community Court 2, 22, 33, 143, 144, 146, 147–151
- Domestic Violence Court 9, 22, 23
- Drug Court 9, 22, 33, 143, 144, 172, 218
- England and Wales 147–151
- interdisciplinarity 143–144, 145–147
- Lee v State Parole Authority of New South Wales* 145
- Mental Health Court 22
- New York State 9, 22, 23, 143, 145, 218
- origins of 144
- processes 145–147
- role of 143–147
- Sex Offence Court 22, 23, 145
- social services and 145–146
- victim-centred approach 145–146
- Youth Court 22
- Procedural Justice  
 accusatorial trinity 202–203, 217  
 art. 6 ECHR 31–32, 111, 117, 124, 126–133, 134–135, 172–174  
 fair trial and 200–205
- Proof  
 ASBO 82, 91–92, 213, 222  
 blood feud 40, 43–47  
 civil standard 31, 36, 82, 91–92, 112, 153, 160–161, 213, 222  
 control order (anti-terrorism) 28  
 criminal standard 28, 204  
 grand jury 67–69  
 modified criminal standard 91–92  
 ordeal 52–57, 60–62, 72, 227  
 petit/petty jury 15, 59, 67, 75  
 trial by battle 57, 60, 62, 72–74, 193
- Prosecution  
*see also* Adhesive Prosecution  
*see also* Auxiliary Prosecution
- assize of eyre 53–59
- CPS 34, 78, 99–100, 149–150
- ODPP 34, 63, 69, 78, 108, 109, 124
- police 79–80
- presentation 53–54
- problem solving courts 145–147
- Provocation  
 abolition of 92–93, 94–95  
*Crimes (Homicide) Act 2005* (Vic) 94–95  
*Crimes (Provocation Repeal) Amendment Act 2009* (NZ) 93  
*Criminal Code Amendment (Abolition of Defence of Provocation) Act 2003* (Tas) 93  
*Green v The Queen* 95  
 history of 94  
*R v Smith* 93–94  
 reform of 95
- Public Hearing 173, 174
- Public Prosecution 34, 35, 68–69, 78–79, 92, 109, 176–177  
*nolle prosequi* 78  
*s9 Director of Public Prosecution Act 1986* (NSW) 109
- Public vs Private 121–125

- Punishment  
 see also Sentencing  
 feudal law and 42–47, 51–60  
 rationales of 27  
 victims and 42–47  
*Pupino, Criminal Proceedings Against*  
 12, 31  
 Purposive Law 183–184
- Quarter Sessions 59
- R v Akbar* 159–160  
*R v Babic* 161  
*R v Berg* 157–158  
*R v Bowen* 160  
*R v Braham* 161  
*R v C* 161  
*R v Camberwell Green Youth Court*  
 119, 131, 135, 173, 174–175, 193,  
 194  
*R v Cheppell* 160  
*R v Cook* 190–192  
*R v Daley* 161  
*R v Field* 161  
*R v Forsythe* 161  
*R v Longman* 83  
*R v Martin* 136  
*R v McDonald* 161  
*R (on the application of McCann and*  
*others) v Crown Court at*  
*Manchester; Clingham v Kensington*  
*and Chelsea Royal London Borough*  
*Council* 91–92, 213–214  
 see also ASBO  
*R v P* 122, 154  
*R v Pitchfolk* 159  
*R v Previtera* 156–157  
*R v Sellick and Sellick* 135, 137  
*R v Swain* 190, 230  
*R v Thomson and Houlton* 70–71  
*R v Tzanis* 157–158
- Rape  
 ECHR cases 13, 128  
 NSW law and procedure 96, 125,  
 133–134  
 offence 2, 12, 97  
 victim impact statements 159
- Rehabilitation 27, 110, 114, 146,  
 147, 153, 154, 162
- Responsive Law 184
- Restorative Justice  
 see Sentencing  
 circle sentencing 152–154  
 compensation 160–164  
 forum sentencing 153–156  
 restitution 101, 110, 153,  
 160–164  
*Sentencing Act 1995 (WA)* 147
- Rhetoric, Trial as 19–24  
 see also Discourse
- Royal Justices 54–57, 59, 60, 61, 62  
*Rowe and Davis v United Kingdom*  
 230
- Sanchez-Llamas v Oregon* 197  
*SBF v R* 158–159  
*Secretary of State for the Home*  
*Department v AF (No. 3)* 26,  
 116–118  
*Secretary of State for the Home*  
*Department v MB and AF* 26,  
 110, 114, 116  
*Seneviratne v R* 191–192
- Sentencing  
 see also Rehabilitation  
 see also Victim Impact Statements  
 circle sentencing 152–154  
 contrition 154  
*Crimes (Sentencing Procedure) Act*  
*1999 (NSW)* 153, 155–157,  
 229  
*Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*  
 (SA) 162  
 forum sentencing 153–156  
 proportionality 152, 157  
 punishment and 151–164  
 restorative justice 110, 124,  
 153–156  
 revenge 43–45  
*Sentencing Act 1995 (WA)* 147  
*Veen, R v (No. 1); Veen, R v (No. 2)*  
 152  
 victim impact/personal statements  
 156–160  
*Serious and Organised Crime (Control)*  
*Act 2008 (SA)* 30, 87, 231  
*Serious Organised Crime and Police*  
*Act 2005 (UK)* 82–83



- Sex Offenders  
*Fardon v Attorney-General (Qld)* 10  
 preventative detention 10  
 trial process 29, 33, 82  
*Skaf v The Queen* 134  
*SN v Sweden* 23, 133  
 Social Systems 207–210  
 Sociological Power 9  
 Sociology of Law 122, 183–186,  
 209, 221  
 Stakeholders of Justice 2–15, 17, 19,  
 38, 125, 135, 138, 146–148,  
 211–212, 223  
 State, The  
*see also* State Power  
 criminal law and 123  
 defendants and 164  
 duty to protect life (art. 2  
 ECHR) 126  
 fear of state power 220  
 individual rights and 109  
 monopolising justice 151  
 threats to 110  
 State Funded Counsel 20  
 State Power 1, 14, 17, 18, 34, 35,  
 87, 110, 183, 197, 205, 220  
 Statements  
*see also* Victim Impact Statement  
 community impact statement 150  
 discursive formation and  
 167–170, 187, 205, 219,  
 224–225  
 ECHR 129–132, 173, 174–183  
 evidence 31–32, 99–100, 102,  
 103, 108, 135–137  
 Stephen, Sir James Fitzjames 39  
*Summary Offences Act 1988*  
 (NSW) 70  
 Summary Process  
*see* Local Court  
 history of 70  
 infringement and penalty  
 notices 3, 34, 36, 66, 67,  
 71–72, 85  
 Sweden, Criminal Process in  
*see also* Adhesive Prosecution  
*see also* Auxiliary Prosecution  
 adversarial process 137–142  
 brottsoffer 140–141  
 Code of Judicial Procedure 141  
 courts and 140  
 inquisitorial process 139  
 målsägande 140  
 målsägandebitråde 141–142  
 private prosecutions in 139, 141  
 stödperson 141  
 victims and 140–141  
 Therapeutic Justice  
*see also* Problem Solving Courts  
 England and Wales 147–151  
 New York State 9, 22, 23, 143,  
 145, 147, 218  
 problem solving courts 22–24,  
 143–151  
 victims generally 22, 31–32,  
 97–110, 138–139, 145–147,  
 155–158  
*Thomas v Mowbray* 28, 111, 113, 228  
*Totani and Anor. v The State of South*  
*Australia* 30, 82, 87  
 Treaty on European Union  
*see also* *Pupino, Criminal Proceedings*  
*Against*  
 Trial  
 antiquity of the trial 39–40, 42–47  
 blood feud 43–47  
 customary justice 42–47  
 double jeopardy 66, 92–93, 95–97  
 forensic process 64  
 local government 51–60  
 of animals 48–51  
 process *see* Trial Process  
 provocation 93–95  
 reconstructive trial 64  
 rhetoric 19–24  
 transgressive 3, 33, 65, 120, 206,  
 211, 223  
 Trial Process  
*see also* Pre-trial Process  
 appeal of felony 51, 53, 73  
 committal 67–69  
 compensation 164  
 ECHR 129–132, 172–173  
 evidence 174–183  
 fair hearing 117  
 grand jury 20, 33, 34, 56, 67–69,  
 195, 200

- hearing 28, 31, 33, 34, 70–71, 104, 106, 114
- independent tribunal 2, 18, 31, 34, 35
- judge 2, 5, 7–8, 17, 20, 88, 191
- petit/petty jury 15, 59, 67, 75
- plea-hearing 105
- prosecution 34
- public hearing 173, 174
- rape trials in NSW 96, 125, 133–134
- right of appeal 10, 17, 114
- sentencing 98–100, 103, 154, 157
- Trials for Felony Act 1836* (Imp) 63
- Truth
  - adversarial process and 41, 63, 121, 171–174, 217–220
  - combat effect 8, 17, 40, 122
  - doctrine and 183–186
  - Foucault and 4–5, 14–17, 166–171
  - inquisitorial process and 201, 204
- Tything 51–52
- Tything Man 51
- United States Constitution *see* Constitution
- United States v BP Product North America* 105–106
- V v United Kingdom* 172–173
- Van Mechelen and Ors v The Netherlands* 132
- Veen, R v* (No. 1); *Veen, R v* (No. 2) 152
- Vendetta
  - collective 44
  - judicial intervention and 47
  - restrained 43
  - unrestrained 42
- Vengeance *see* Customary Justice
- Victim
  - antiquity 42–44
  - Assize of Clarendon 53–54
  - Assize of Northampton 55–56
  - Compensation 160–164
  - ECJ 13, 31–32, 126–133, 135, 203
  - ECtHR 13, 31–32, 126–133, 135, 203
  - feudal justice 44–47, 51–60
  - forum sentencing 153–156
  - human rights generally 31–32, 125–137
  - ICC 110, 124, 138, 219
  - problem solving courts 145–147
  - Pupino, Criminal Proceedings Against* 12, 31
  - victim impact statements 98–100, 108, 156–160
  - victim lawyers
    - see* Victims' Lawyers
    - Victims' Advocate Pilot 98–100
  - Victim Impact Statements
    - Australia 156–158
    - benefits of 156
    - England and Wales 98–100, 159–160
    - homicide cases 98–100, 156–160
    - s3A *Crimes Act 1900* (NSW) 157
    - United States 102, 103
    - victims' lawyers 98–100, 102, 103, 108
  - Victim Rights Act 1996* (NSW) 156
  - Victims' Lawyers
    - Antrobus, In re* 103–107
    - Australia 108–109
    - Crime Victims' Rights Act 101–108
    - Dean, In re* 105–107
    - England and Wales 98–100
    - In re Huff Asset Management Co.* 104–107
    - Kenna v US District Court* 102, 107
    - Maxwell v The Queen* 109
    - plea bargaining 100–108, 109
    - R v DPP, Ex parte C* 109
    - United States 100–108
    - United States v BP Product North America* 105–106
    - Victims' Advocates 98–100
    - writ of mandamus 103–107
- Violence
  - Bloch, M. 46–47
  - customary 42–47
  - Elias, N. 45–46
  - human existence and 46
  - Jacoby, S. 43–44
  - personal 42–44
  - state 46–47

VLRC 95

Voice and Participation

*see* Participation

*see also* Agency

*Watts v Indiana* 199

*Windisch v Austria* 173, 230

*Witold Litwa v Poland* 215

*Woolmington v DPP* 28, 204

*Wright v McQualter* 79

*Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence*

*Act 1999 (UK)* 131, 135