INKERI ANTTILA (1916–2013)

Rikosoikeuden uudistajan ammatillinen ura ja vaikutus

Toimittanut Raimo Lahti

FORUM IURIS

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTON OIKEUSTIETEELLISEN TIEDEKUNNAN JULKAISUT

HELSINKI 2016

FORUM IURIS

Helsingin yliopiston oikeustieteellisen tiedekunnan julkaisut
Oikeustieteellinen tiedekunta, PL 4, 00014 Helsingin yliopisto

ISBN 978-951-51-2529-3 (nid.)
ISSN 1456-842X

Unigrafia
Helsinki 2016

INKERI ANTTILA'S INTERNATIONAL REACH

Matti Joutsen & Terhi Viljanen

1 Becoming an International Scholar: How Inkeri Anttila Entered the World Stage

Inkeri Anttila's academic career began in an environment that would not have seemed particularly international. She entered the Law Faculty of the University of Helsinki, a bastion of conservativeness, in 1933. At that time, it was rare for people to travel abroad, whether on study tours or even holidays. Typical law graduates went on to deal with local or national issues as judges or civil servants, immersing themselves in the daily routines of law or administration in Finland. Inkeri[1] seemed bound for this path, since soon after graduating from law school in 1936 (following completion of her licentiate degree in 1937), she served as an apprentice judge in the Imatra District Court.

She decided, however, to continue her studies. She received her doctorate in 1946, soon after the end of the war, and the following year she returned to the University as an assistant in criminal and procedural law. It was at this time that she made her first study tours abroad, to Sweden in 1947 and to Denmark in 1948. In 1949, her first article to be published abroad appeared, an article in the Nordisk Tidsskrift for Kriminalvidenskab (the Nordic Journal on the Criminal Sciences), on a physician's confidentiality obligation under Finnish law. She soon expanded this article to cover the legal protection of professional secrets in general in Finland, as a contribution to the III International Congress on Comparative Law, held in London in 1950. A steady flow of international publications followed.

In 1949, her career began to diverge from the traditional path of legal scholars, as she was appointed as a teacher in corrections at the School of Social Sciences. The same year, she attended a course on juvenile delinquency organized in London. The sociological aspect apparently interested her, and she entered the Faculty of Political Science at the University of Helsinki to study sociology, and in short order completed a Master's de-

[1] In Finland and more generally in Europe, scholars as distinguished as Professor Dr. Dr. (hon. causa; mult.) Inkeri Anttila would almost invariably be referred to with their titles. In the case of Inkeri, this simply seems inappropriate. To all who had the pleasure to work with her, "Inkeri" is the name by which she has always been known and admired.

gree and a Licentiate degree (both in 1954). In 1954, she also served for a short period as assistant in sociology at the University of Helsinki.[2]

The speed with which Inkeri's international orientation became evident is impressive, especially considering the situation at the time, both for Inkeri at home, and for Finland in general. Only two years after she graduated from law school, Finland was at war, and the war continued until 1945. During these early years, she gave birth to three children, and served her apprenticeship as a judge. Both during and after the war, the economic situation was very difficult, and few people could afford to travel abroad, even within the Nordic countries.[3] In general, there was little international orientation in academia.[4] And yet, Inkeri soon became active on the international conference circuit, and published articles in a number of languages.

Inkeri Anttila at the First United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, in Geneva in 1955.

[2] Jaakkola (p. 46) notes that at this time Veli Verkko held the chair in sociology at the University of Helsinki. Verkko was the first Finnish sociologist to achieve wide international recognition. Verkko was a pioneer in international criminal statistics, and one of the first experts in the UN crime prevention and criminal justice programme (Redo, p. 172).

[3] Inkeri remembers how during these years she often had to cover travel expenses from personal funds, "During the war and immediately after, it was not possible for Finns to travel abroad. We were isolated. International cooperation was important for us, because it affirmed Finland's position in Europe". Quoted in Hämäläinen; translated here.

[4] Pesonen, p. 24.

2 Inkeri's Participation in International Cooperation

Inkeri's international activity began close to home, in the Nordic countries. One of her first formal roles was as secretary and board member of the "Finnish Criminalists' Association" (Suomen kriminalistiyhdistys).[5] Corresponding associations had been established in the other Nordic countries, and they held joint meetings. Inkeri has recalled that, since the professors of criminal law at the time (and chairman and vice-chairman of the Association), Brynolf Honkasalo and Bruno Salmiala, were reluctant to attend Nordic meetings of the national associations, it was she who represented Finland at these meetings, often at her own expense.[6] She found the discussions enjoyable, far from the formal and authoritarian atmosphere in Helsinki.[7] Among those Nordics who influenced her thinking – and were in turn influenced by her – were Johannes Andenaes, Ulla Bondeson, Karl Otto Christiansen, Nils Christie, Torstein Eckhoff, Stephan Hurwitz, Alvar Nelson and Knut Sveri. From Finland, among others K.J. Lång, Klaus Mäkelä and Patrik Törnudd were also drawn – largely through Inkeri's encouragement – into close Nordic cooperation.

Inkeri Anttila and Nils Christie starting networking for their long-lasting Nordic cooperation within the Nordic Criminalistist' Associations, Nordic Summer University and the Scandinavian Research Council for Criminology, in the 1950's.

[5] Later on, she served for a long period as vice president of this association.
[6] Hämäläinen.
[7] Koskinen et al, pp. 8–9.

Inkeri was appointed Professor of Criminal Law at the University of Helsinki in 1961 (as the first woman professor in the Law Faculty), and established the Institute of Criminology in 1963 as a governmental research institute, under the Ministry of Justice. She served as the Institute's Director from 1963 to 1974. The two positions, as professor and as director, provided her with platforms for expanding her international contacts. She has recalled that it was at this time that Nordic criminological cooperation strengthened, which had indeed led to the establishment of the new institute in Finland. The institute, with Inkeri as its Director, in practice became the Finnish secretariat for Nordic cooperation in criminology.[8] In 1974, the institute became the National Research Institute of Legal Policy, and she continued to serve as its Director.

In addition to the Criminalists' Associations, two other Nordic institutions influenced Inkeri, and in turn provided her with channels for reaching scholars abroad: the Nordic Summer University, and the Scandinavian Research Council for Criminology.

The Nordic Summer University (Nordiskt sommaruniversitet) was a cross-disciplinary forum for discussions, and for many years, Inkeri was the chairperson of the Helsinki division. She was very active in the meetings, and her colleagues recall fondly how, even at a time when the radical 1960s led to increasing tension between various factions, Inkeri's innate social skills and openness to different opinions were able to bring people together for discussions.[9]

In 1962, the respective Ministries of Justice of the Nordic countries established the Scandinavian Research Council for Criminology, which strengthened the shift in all the Nordic countries towards what later became a trademark of Inkeri's thought, rational and humane criminal policy, with a focus on equality and human rights.[10] Inkeri served as a member of the Council from the outset to 1983, and as its chairperson from 1968 to 1973.

Inkeri was among the first women students to attend the Faculty of Law, among the first women to join the law faculty as an assistant, and the first woman to receive a doctorate in law as well as be appointed as a professor in the Faculty of Law. This presumably made a strong impression on Inkeri, which was reflected in her increasing activity in women's professional organizations. This activity took on international dimensions. Already in 1950, as chairperson of the Finnish Association of Academic Women, she attended the Congress of the International Federation of University Women, and in 1954 the congress of the International Council of Women.

---

[8] Koskinen et al, pp. 9 and 12.
[9] See for example Tiisala.
[10] Hämäläinen. See also Törnudd, pp. 34–35.

Although these women's professional organizations provided Inkeri with some of her first international contacts beyond the Nordic countries, Inkeri found her niche in what are familiarly known as the "Big Four" international associations dealing with criminal law, criminology and criminal policy: the International Society of Social Defence, the International Penal and Penitentiary Foundation, the International Association of Penal Law, and the International Society for Criminology.[11]

In view of Inkeri's subsequent close involvement with the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme, it is perhaps a portent that the first international congress organized by any of the "Big Four" that Inkeri attended was the world congress organized by the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission in the Hague in 1950. The IPPC had been organizing such congresses every five years since the end of the 1800s. The congress in the Hague would turn out to be the last to be organized by the IPPC. At that time, the United Nations "crime programme" was being established. Part of this process led to the assumption by the United Nations of the responsibility for these quinquennial congresses as of 1955, and the IPPC reconstituted itself as the International Penal and Penitentiary Foundation. Inkeri became a member of the IPPF in 1962, the same year that she attended its congress in Brussels. She also attended the congresses in Ulm (1967), Bellagio (1973), Rotterdam (1977) and Syracuse (1982), and was elected first vice president for the terms covering 1970 to 1980.

Inkeri's first steps towards the International Society of Social Defence once again had a Nordic connection: she attended the Social Defence congress in Stockholm in 1958. She attended several of the society's subsequent congresses: Leche (1966), Paris (1971), and Thessalonica (1981). She was a corresponding member from 1962 to 1967, and was elected vice president for the terms covering 1981 to 1992.

The International Society of Criminology was next. She attended the ISC Congress in Hague (1960), followed by the congresses in Madrid (1970), Belgrade (1973) and Lisbon (1978). She served as a member of the scientific council from 1972 to 1977, and was elected a member of the board (1977–1990) and vice president (1979–1990).

As for the International Association of Penal Law, Inkeri attended the congresses in Rome (1969), Budapest (1974) and Hamburg (1979), as well as several preparatory colloquia. She was also elected to the board and served from 1969 to her retirement in 1986.

Both of the authors of the present article had the good fortune to accompany Inkeri to several of the Big Four congresses referred to above,

[11] The issues dealt with by these "Big Four" organizations had considerable overlap, although they each brought their own distinct approach to the issues. They also had considerable overlap in membership.

and see her in action. Her papers would be carefully prepared and thoughtful, and she would present them in the same clear and lively manner that had students flocking to her lectures back in Helsinki. And it was after the presentations that Inkeri was at her best: she was extremely sociable, and constantly expanded her network of acquaintances. Whichever table that had Inkeri sitting next to it was generally the most popular, and was the scene for long and lively discussions on topics ranging widely from the various papers that had been presented at the congress and recent developments in criminal policy around the world, to updates on the life of absent acquaintances and the arcana of the most recent episode of "Dallas" shown on television the previous evening. Her colleagues have recalled in particular how open Inkeri was to all views, whether those of senior academics or officials or of young students. She may have disagreed with some of the grounds and reasoning, but she was always ready to try to understand what other people were thinking.

The Nordic associations and the "Big Four" circuits were not the only ones in which Inkeri participated. She was a member of the editorial board of several publications in the field, and as Director of the new Institute of Criminology, she attended the annual Council of Europe meetings of heads of such institutes. She maintained close relations with academia, as shown by the fact that she served as expert when the chairs of criminology at the University of Stockholm and the University of Copenhagen were filled. In 1979, she received an honorary doctoral degree from the University of Uppsala.

3 Inkeri and the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme

As mentioned, Inkeri attended the last congress organized by the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, in 1950. When the United Nations took over the organization of these congresses, Inkeri took note. She attended the very first United Nations Congress on the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders, in Geneva in 1955. She is one of the very few who attended all the subsequent congress, up to 1985: London (1960), Stockholm (1965), Kyoto (1970), Geneva (1975), Caracas (1980) and Milan (1985).[12]

The United Nations also established a small body of experts to advise it on crime and criminal justice issues. This ad hoc body, which originally consisted of seven experts, was later known as the United Nations

[12] Koskinen et al, p. 12.

Committee on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders.[13] Inkeri's professor of sociology at the University of Helsinki, Veli Verkko, was one of its first members (1950 to 1955). Inkeri's international activity contributed to her membership in this exclusive group, and she served as vice-chairperson from 1972 to 1974, evidence that Inkeri had established an international reputation as a thinker in crime prevention and criminal justice, and that she had the respect of her peers.

The fifth United Nations congress was held in Geneva in 1975. It was clear that Inkeri would attend, but a chain of events affected the capacity in which she would do so. The first was that the Secretary-General of the United Nations had designated that year as "International Women's Year". The second was that, at a very late stage, the congress was shifted from Canada to Geneva. By tradition, the President of the Congress would be the head of the delegation of the host country; this rule, however, does not apply when the congress is held at UN headquarters (as was the case with Geneva).

Inkeri Anttila as the President of the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, in Geneva in 1975. On Anttila's right side Gerhard Mueller, Executive Secretary of the congress.

The third event was that, as a result of a political crisis in Finland, the Government resigned and was replaced by a caretaker government. Inkeri,

[13] The Ad-Hoc Committee of Experts on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders. The Committee became a standing body in 1965, and the number of members was increased to 10, then in 1971 to 15 and in 1979 to 27. (Redo, p. 111, Lopez-Rey, p. 44 note 5, and Clark, pp.19–20.)

at that time Director of the Research Institute of Legal Policy, became the Minister of Justice of Finland. The Executive Secretary of the Congress, Professor Gerhard Mueller, has recalled the delicate negotiations that followed: under the circumstances, the Presidency of the Congress would presumably go to a woman of ministerial rank who was the head of her country's delegation to the Congress, and there were three such Ministers. To cut a long story short: the end result was that Minister Inkeri Anttila was elected by acclamation as President of the fifth United Nations Congress.[14]

Earlier UN congresses had been relatively refined affairs, with rather formal discussion among representatives from like-minded (and predominantly "first world") states. During the 1960s and the early 1970s, an increasing number of newly independent countries expanded the membership of the UN, and the various issues became politicized, also at UN Crime Congresses. Mueller has listed as some of the contentious issues on the agenda of the fifth Congress the draft Declaration Against Torture, the definition of terrorism, the new focus on the involvement of women in crime and criminal justice, and the creation of a code of ethics for law enforcement officials. He notes his admiration at Inkeri's stamina at not only presiding over the lengthy deliberations, but also playing a central role in meeting with individual heads of delegations in order to get their support for consensus. The result was that consensus was achieved on *all* the matters on the agenda.[15]

4 Inkeri and the Establishment of the European Institute

The United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme continued to figure prominently in Inkeri's career. It provided her with the opportunity to create yet another institute, this time a distinctly international one, with UN affiliations.

The UN "crime programme" had sought to expand its international reach by establishing regional institutes. The first such regional institute was established in 1962 in Tokyo, for Asia and the Pacific, the second in 1975 in San Jose, Costa Rica, for the Latin American countries and the Caribbean. The idea of establishing a regional institute for Europe was a logical extension.

Again, various factors came to play. At that time, Europe was politically divided into East and West. If an institute were to be established in the region, it should preferably go to a neutral country. A second factor was financing: not all governments even at that time would have been prepared

[14] Mueller, p. 21.
[15] Mueller, pp. 21–22; emphasis in the original,

to take on the financial responsibility of operating an international institute. And a third factor was reputation: in particular the director of the new institute would need to have credibility in the crime prevention and criminal justice community in order to make the institute operational.[16]

In 1972, Inkeri had just been appointed to the United Nations Committee on the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders, when she was returning via Geneva from a UN meeting in Egypt, with the director of the UN Secretariat unit responsible for the crime programme, Mr William Clifford. Although Spain and Poland had tentatively indicated their interest in hosting the institute, Finland's neutrality and above all Inkeri's readiness to take on this new task proved key. Together with her deputy director at the Research Institute, Patrik Törnudd, she was able to secure the support of Finland's Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and the European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United Nations (HEUNI), was established in 1982. She served as its Director until her retirement in 1986. In those short years, she set the mould for its work.

There was no clear idea how the new institute would function. The agreement between Finland and the United Nations states that the institute is to promote the international exchange of information on crime prevention and control among European countries. This leaves considerable flexibility as to how such an exchange is to be promoted, and what type of information is involved.

At the time HEUNI was established, Western Europe did have extensive networks for the exchange of information. In particular the Council of Europe worked actively in this field. In Eastern Europe, on the other hand, only some countries (in particular Yugoslavia, but also Hungary, Poland and the USSR) had a criminological community. Their researchers, however, had to contend with considerable difficulties in access to data as well as to the international criminological literature. In many Eastern European countries, moreover, Marxist ideology was often too rigid to allow for true research and theory development.

Nonetheless, Inkeri emphasized the fact that all societies had to contend with basically the same problems, such as domestic violence, young people who steal from stores, the need to improve the operation of the police and the courts, and how to treat offenders. She decided that the new institute would start by identifying a few issues where an exchange among all European countries would seem productive: victim policy, effective, rational and humane criminal justice, non-prosecution, and non-custodial sanctions. The methodology would be to request national papers from each country, com-

[16] Joutsen and Viljanen, p. 70. The description of the first years of HEUNI provided below is based in part on Joutsen and Viljanen, pp. 71–75. The events are also recounted in Anttila 1996.

mission an expert to prepare a report, and then hold a "European Seminar" to discuss the issue, with all the authors of the national papers in attendance.

Such a model could not work unless the institute – and in this case, the Director – had a ready-made network of experts, so that regardless of the subject, it would be possible to identify a suitable person from each country to write the national reports and be prepared to engage in the discussions at the European Seminar. It also required that the Director, both during the sessions and during the informal discussions, could get people representing different political systems and different approaches to social and criminal justice issue to talk to one another in a sufficiently non-threatening atmosphere. Inkeri provided all of this. As has been noted in an earlier publication:

> "It was here that Inkeri Anttila's charisma came to the fore. Inkeri had always had the ability to bring together people who were interested in criminal policy and encourage them to take on great tasks. Her network of contacts throughout Europe and even beyond made it possible to find experts who deal with the issue at hand. In the case of large associations and other bureaucratic structures, one weakness is that contacts are usually made stiffly, through formal channels. The Director of small HEUNI had a different approach: she simply wrote directly to her good friend, who may happen to be a university professor, the president of the Supreme Court, the departmental head or permanent under-secretary in a governmental Ministry, or the Minister himself or herself. … At one of the first expert meetings, the head of the Division on Crime Problems of the Council of Europe and the Vice President of the Academy of Sciences of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics sat at the same table, and indeed these two friends of Inkeri were seen walking hand in hand through a nearby park in Helsinki. Any last doubts about HEUNI's possibilities of serving as a neutral forum for discussions disappeared, and the work could begin for real."[17]

Another example of the value of Inkeri's extensive network of contacts was provided in the run-up to the seventh UN Congress, held in Milan in 1985. One of the topics at the Congress would be "Youth, Crime and Justice", and for the first time at any UN crime congress, a research workshop was to be organized. In 1983, HEUNI received a long telegram from the UN Secretariat, asking the institute to prepare, in two months, a global overview of all research that had been conducted on juvenile crime. One of the authors of the present article recalls vividly presenting the telegram to Inkeri, along with a detailed list of why HEUNI should refuse the request:[18]

[17] Translated from Joutsen and Viljanen, p. 72.

[18] The request had first been made to the global UN research institute, the UN Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute, which had already said it was unable to perform the work.

juvenile delinquency was among the most heavily researched topics in criminology, and it was difficult to provide a meaningful overview in a short congress paper; there were huge differences between countries in the understanding of and approach to the topic (in particular, between the child welfare and the juvenile justice approach); the research tended to be closely tied to the idiosyncrasies of the jurisdiction in question, and it was difficult to draw conclusions that could be applicable elsewhere; much of the research was difficult to track down, and even if it was, it would be in a number of different languages; and so on. Inkeri's response was that a request from the UN Secretariat to its newest institute should be honoured, and that of course HEUNI would prepare the global overview. Her only request (which the UN Secretariat promptly granted) was that we would be allowed six months instead of two. Inkeri got out her list of contacts, and soon information was arriving from all over the world.[19]

A particularly significant example of Inkeri's influence may be revealed here, perhaps for the first time: the restructuring of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme in 1990–1991[20] owes a considerable debt to pizza and red wine served in the kitchen at HEUNI.

Towards the end of the 1980s, a number of countries became increasingly critical of the perceived inability of the United Nations to provide an effective response to growing problems in crime and criminal justice. There were a number of issues, and not all of the critics agreed on what the problems were. However, what were most commonly listed were that the Committee had little influence on national policy; the UN "crime programme" was producing standards and norms which, while noble in intent, had little practical impact without a vastly expanded technical assistance capacity (which the UN secretariat lacked), and the UN was not providing the tools needed for dealing with international and transnational crime.

Enter Inkeri, who in 1986 brought together a small, select group of her close friends – friends who happened to include, among others, top criminal justice officials from Germany (Erich Corves and Konrad Hobe), Italy (Giocchino Polimeni), the Netherlands (Julian Schutte), Sweden (Bo Svensson), the United Kingdom (David Faulkner), the United States (Ronald Gainer) and Yugoslavia (Dušan Cotić). This group, sitting comfortably around a table nibbling on pizza and drinking red wine, put together what may be considered the first outline for a total restructuring of the UN crime prevention and criminal justice programme. In 1991, a second group, with Polimeni and Schutte augmented by General Vasily Ignatov (the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Professor Roger Clark (the United States)

[19] The report was submitted to the UN Crime Committee in 1984 and was finalized at an ad hoc working group. See A/CONF.121/11, para 3.
[20] General Assembly resolution 46/152.

continued the work and produced a "Plan for the Restructuring of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice System", which was reflected in many ways in the final product that was subsequently approved under the chandeliers of Versailles at a grand ministerial conference, and formally adopted by the General Assembly at the end of 1991.

5 Inkeri's International Publications

The mantra of "publish or perish" is well known in academia. Scholars and researchers live for the exchange of ideas, and much of their time is spent writing for various publications. Usually, however, the intended audience is in one's own country, and – for understandable reasons – academics tend to use their own native language.

It is striking that almost from the outset Inkeri looked beyond the borders of Finland. She had learned Swedish at school,[21] and thus the obvious first step was towards the other Nordic countries, as shown by her first internationally published article mentioned above. Although she continued to publish in Finnish, she clearly wanted to reach an international audience. She soon had publications not only in Swedish, but also in Danish, English, French and German. Indeed, during some years in her career, the majority of her publications appeared in other languages. (In addition to the languages mentioned, later on translations would appear also in Dutch, Hungarian, Italian, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish.) By the year 1996, she had notched up 300 publications, 45 % of which appeared in languages other than Finnish. Among these were some 60 in various Nordic languages, over 50 in English, and some 20 in French.[22] Without a doubt, Inkeri was making her mark internationally.

As impressive as the sheer volume of articles published by Inkeri in foreign languages is the expanding scope of their subject matter. It has already been mentioned that her first two foreign language publications were on traditional legal issues, those related to professional secrecy (a topic undoubtedly fostered by the fact that her husband was a physician, and their home at that time was in connection with a tuberculosis sanatorium). Later on, she wrote a few other articles that dealt primarily with criminal and procedural law, such as on defamation (1962), the role of the court in sentencing (1970 and 1976), and trends in criminal law (1986). However,

[21] Swedish is a national language in Finland.

[22] Lena Andersson has compiled a bibliography of Inkeri Anttila's publications; Andersson 1986. This bibliography was updated in a Festschrift which appeared ten years later: Lahti (1996), pp. 323–326. These two bibliographies were consolidated in an annex published in Lahti and Törnudd (2001), pp. 223–238; in doing so, some 50 of Inkeri's lesser Finnish language articles (such as shorter book reviews) were left out.

her experience in teaching correctional officers generated an interest in corrections, and more broadly in the treatment of offenders. Among her earliest international articles was one on the advanced training of correctional officers in Finland (1951), which was followed in 1953 by three separate articles on different aspects of the treatment of offenders. She would return to this general theme many times over the years, covering for example indeterminate sentences (1953, 1971 and 1974), pre-sentencing reports (1953), a study on the grounds for measuring sentences (1961 and 1962), the reintegration of offenders (1963), the treatment of intoxicant abusers (1964), pardons for persons serving a life sentence (1965), the death penalty (1966), punishment versus treatment (1972), probation and parole (1973 and 1974), long-time incarceration (1977), prisons past and future (1978), corrections in Finland (1979), criminal records and rehabilitation (1982), community service in Finland (1990), and the general goals of corrections in Finland (1992).[23]

Closely related to these articles were her articles on the legal, administrative and social consequences of sentencing (1956), the training of lawyers and criminal law (1957), young offenders (1961, 1975, 1976, 1979, 1985 and 1995), and diversion (1982 and 1985).[24]

She was clearly becoming more interested in how the criminal justice system worked. This is reflected in the fact that from the 1960s on, the bulk of her international articles (and her Finnish language publications as well) dealt with criminology, with criminal justice, and with the importance of a humane and rational criminal policy. It is these last publications – on humane and rational criminal policy – that established her international reputation.

Criminology. Inkeri was a pioneer in criminology, and together with her colleague wrote the first Finnish-language textbook on the subject.[25] The textbook was soon translated into Swedish and was long used throughout the Nordic countries.[26] She continued to produce articles on criminology, and they were published in a steady stream: causes of crime (1964), recorded and unrecorded crime (1966), crime in Scandinavia (1972), European cooperation in criminological research (1974), theories of crime prevention (1976), terrorism and skyjacking (1976), comparative research on the use of discretion in criminal justice (1978), research and criminal justice (1978), clinical criminology (two separate articles in 1979), urban crime (1983), criminology in Finland (1983), the death penalty and criminology (1987), and the scope and organization of criminology in Scandinavia (1987).[27]

---

[23] For bibliographical references, see Lahti and Törnudd 2001.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Anttila and Törnudd 1970. This appeared in a thoroughly revised edition as Anttila – Törnudd 1983.
[26] Anttila and Törnudd 1973.
[27] For bibliographical references, see Lahti and Törnudd 2001.

Criminal policy and criminal justice. Inkeri's arguably most important mark in international scholarship came through her many articles on the importance of humane and rational criminal justice. She was one of the privileged few anywhere in the world who was able to combine academic work with work in government, culminating in her brief stint as Minister of Justice, but reflected more clearly in her extensive contribution to various governmental committees, and her service as expert advisor to Parliament. In all the Nordic countries, academic expertise is used very closely in governmental decision-making. What was innovative in Inkeri's role was that she was ready to question the dominant academic theories, and through this the dominant governmental policies, whether they involved harsh sentences, coercive treatment, or indeed excessive reliance on the criminal justice system in controlling behaviour.

These threads appeared early in Inkeri's Finnish-language publications. For example, in 1960 she criticized as costly and ineffective the widespread use of lengthy imprisonment terms for drunken driving,[28] and the same year she criticized the extensive use of imprisonment for unpaid fines.[29] She soon reached out to the broader Nordic community, with two articles appearing in 1962 that examined measures used for young offenders.[30] One of her most influential articles appeared a few years later in Swedish (1967) and then in English (1971), in which she provided an overview of what she called radical and conservative criminal policy in the Nordic countries.[31] (She continued to write about Nordic developments in criminal policy, with articles appearing in international journals almost yearly, to the end of her career.) In her international articles, she also dealt with specific issues, such as due process in administrative detention (1963), the criteria for sentencing (1970), crime problems in Scandinavia (1970), indoctrination of norms in criminal law (1971), individual security and international relations (1972), approaches to controlling traffic crime (1978), imprisonment in the criminal justice system (1982), decriminalization (1983), "new perspectives on justice" in the criminal justice system (1984), assessing and allocating the harm caused by crime (1985), and the use of conditional imprisonment in Finland (1993).[32]

Victims. When Inkeri started her academic career, criminal law and criminology (which at that time was almost unknown in the Nordic countries) focused almost exclusively on the offender. In 1962, she had a key role in launching the first study of self-reported criminality ever carried out in Finland, and indeed one of the first such studies to be conducted any-

[28] Anttila 1960(a).
[29] Anttila 1961(b).
[30] Anttila 1962(a) and 1962(b).
[31] Anttila 1967 and Anttila 1971.
[32] For bibliographical references, see Lahti and Törnudd 2001.

where in the world. In an article published two years later, "The Criminological Significance of Unreported Criminality",[33] in 1964, she raised the intriguing possibility of using a survey of victims to find out about unreported crime. Fattah says that it was this article that resulted in the very first victimization survey, which was carried out in the United States.[34] She continued to write on victims for the rest of her career, with articles for example on the victim as the forgotten party in criminal justice (1969), on compensation for victims (1973 and 1992), on victimology as a field of inquiry (1974), on the need for developing victim policy (1986), and on the responsibility of the victim (1991).[35]

Women and criminal justice. Inkeri achieved many firsts for women in criminal law, in research and in government. She was able to achieve national and international recognition in what was (and to a large extent still is) a male-dominated field despite being a woman. One woman who has similarly achieved wide international recognition, Professor Freda Adler, has emphasized the clear respect commanded by Inkeri at international meetings, where Inkeri was often one of the few women in the room.[36] Inkeri rarely if ever drew attention to herself as a woman, much less used it as an argument for her advancement. Nonetheless, Inkeri has also written about women and criminal justice. She has published one of the first papers to examine the role of women as professionals in the criminal justice system (1979), and also an examination of women as offenders in Finland (1980).[37]

6 What Made Inkeri Run? The Secret to Inkeri's International Reach

Inkeri was a pioneer in many ways, in Finland and in the world. As a very popular professor of criminal law at the University of Helsinki, and as the director of a criminological research institute and, later, of a UN-affiliated regional institute, she inspired many persons to follow her in bridging the divide between criminal law, sociology and the practical organization of the criminal justice system. Her achievements received due recognition: she has, for example, been honoured with the Sellin-Gluck Award of the American Society of Criminology (1983), and the European Criminology Award of the European Society of Criminology (2011). She was perhaps proudest of the

[33] Anttila 1964.
[34] Fattah, p. 108. Fattah also emphaasizes how Anttila was one of the earliest persons to note the partial overlap in the roles of victim and offender, and in speaking on behalf of restorative justice. Ibid., pp 108–109. See also Lahti 2013.
[35] For bibliographical references, see Lahti and Törnudd 2001.
[36] Freda Adler, personal interview, 7 January 2016.
[37] Anttila 1979 and Anttila 1980.

Testimonial awarded to her by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in recognition of her dedicated service on behalf of the United Nations programme on crime prevention and criminal justice (1992).

What led to Inkeri's considerable international influence? How was she able to quickly move from the conservative and somewhat insular academic environment prevailing in Finland at the end of the Second World War to become an internationally recognized and influential scholar and thinker?

One factor that presumably led to this was Inkeri's linguistic skills. Although she went to a Finnish-speaking school (Finnish and Swedish are both national languages of Finland), she learned Swedish as well as German in school. On graduating from the University, she soon participated in Nordic meetings. Not only did she become quite fluent in Swedish, she was also able to get by in Norwegian and Danish. One of her first study tours abroad was to England, and she quickly picked up English as well.

Related to her linguistic skills were her skills at communication. One of the reasons that she was a popular professor was that she was able to render even difficult concepts comprehensible, and tended to use relatively simple language and examples. These same skills came out in her publications. She enjoyed lecturing and writing, and would generally have several articles under preparation, articles that she would keep refining until she was satisfied that her points came across.[38]

A third factor was her social skills. She was very sociable. At international conferences and meetings, she was anything but the archetypical shy, introverted Finn who would present a paper and then sit quietly in the back of the room, to rush back to the hotel after the sessions were over. She enjoyed having a constantly expanding group of colleagues and friends around her. When international meetings would be held in Helsinki, they would usually involve evenings hosted by Inkeri at her home. When the meetings would be held elsewhere, Inkeri would be with company at restaurants until late in the evening, after which the discussions would quite often continue in the hotel bar or in her room, over glasses of wine (red, preferably). Her colleagues have often recalled how she was able to create a warm, hospitable atmosphere, where all present, from young students to

[38] One of the authors of the present paper has extensive experience with this aspect of Inkeri. At a time when articles were written on manual typewriters, slight revisions of a paragraph here and a line there often meant long rewrites of draft articles.

government Ministers and chief justices of the Supreme Court, participated equally in the discussions.[39]

A fourth factor was her analytical skills, her cross-disciplinary approach, and her readiness to question prevailing theories, dogma and policy, a characteristic already noted above. Inkeri combined criminal law and sociology, and eagerly embraced new scientific approaches, such as criminology and victimology. She was an expert, and an expert with a constantly growing area of knowledge. Moreover, beginning from her early years as a teacher she was able to make the leap from academia to the practical day-to-day operation of the criminal justice system. For example Törnudd has emphasized that Inkeri's ability to combine cross-disciplinary research (law, sociology and criminology) with her work on governmental committees, as expert appearing before Parliament, and as Minister of Justice, was instrumental in ensuring that criminological expertise in Finland influenced criminal policy in a rational and humane direction.[40] Lahti, in turn, emphasizes Inkeri's role in challenging criminologists to be critical and constructive; criminologists have a duty to disseminate their insights and arguments to decision-makers, other experts and the general public.[41]

One of Inkeri's seminal articles dealt with conservative and radical criminal policy. Inkeri began her career in a small country where conservative values contributed to harsh punishments, coercive treatment and almost unquestioning respect for established authorities, whether academic or governmental. She lived through the radical 1960s and 1970s, when authorities were being questioned simply for the sake of questioning them, and new solutions were offered with little testing of their suitability or of their impact in practice. She herself was neither conservative nor radical, and was able to maintain a healthy common-sense approach to criminal law, criminology and criminal justice. Perhaps largely because of this, she was able to outline a just, rationale and humane criminal policy, a policy which changed the way the operation of the criminal justice system was perceived in Finland and more broadly in the Nordic countries. Towards the end of her career, especially through the National Research Institute of Legal Policy and HEUNI, she was increasingly able to work for these same

[39] In this context it should be noted that it had not been quite self-evident that Inkeri would devote her career to jurisprudence. She could just as easily have turned to music full-time. She was an excellent pianist and singer who on several occasions entertained her guests at home and colleagues on the road. She once (in 1964) gave a presentation for students at the University of Helsinki on "the sociologist in music", noting that music as such is not political nor nationalistic, and it does not have boundaries that confine it to a certain race or religion. Music has been a forerunner: before the world ever knew anything about the Leagues of Nations, or the UN Charter, music had been one form of international cooperation in which everyone had the same right to participate. – Her many trips to congresses and meetings in Geneva, for instance, inspired her to write music and lyrics to a song that has charmed her many friends: the "Flower Bell of Geneva".

[40] Törnudd (1996), pp. 36–37.

[41] Lahti (2013).

values regionally and globally. Most important, she was able to inspire new generations to examine received wisdom regarding crime and criminal justice, and search for new approaches together. That is a legacy that would have made her proud.

The meeting of the International Advisory Board of HEUNI in 1991. In the front row, from the left Raimo Pekkanen, Inkeri Anttila, Bo Svensson, Simone Rozès and David Faulkner, in the back row Patrik Törnudd, Eduardo Vetere, Matti Joutsen, Vladimir Kudrjavtsev, Dušan Cotić, Kudrjavtsev's secretary and Seppo Leppä.

Bibliography

Andersson, Lena (1986), Bibliography of Inkeri Anttila's publications, Rikosoikeudellisia kirjoitelmia V Sylvi Inkeri Anttilalle 29.11.1986 omistettu (Papers on Criminal Law V in Honour of Sylvi Inkeri Anttila 29 November 1986), Vammala 1986, pp. 405–423.

Anttila, Inkeri (1970), Conservative and Radical Criminal Policy in the Nordic Countries, Scandinavian Studies in Criminology, Vol. 3, Oslo, pp. 9–21.

Anttila, Inkeri (1981), Female Criminality in Finland. What Do the Statistics Show?, in Freda Adler (ed.), The Incidence of Female Criminality in the Contemporary World, New York, pp. 64–84.

Anttila, Inkeri (1996), Finland and the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme, in Kimmo Kiljunen (ed.), Finns in the United Nations, The Finnish UN Association, Jyväskylä 1996, pp. 256–269.

Anttila, Inkeri (1960a), Juopumussakot – kallis ja tehoton järjestelmä (Drunkenness Fines – An Expensive and Ineffective System), Alkoholipolitiikka, pp. 156–157.

Anttila, Inkeri (1967), Konservativ och radikal kriminalpolitik i Norden (Conservative and Radical Criminal Policy in the Nordic Countries), Nordisk Tidskrift for Kriminalvidenskab, pp. 237–251.

Anttila, Inkeri (1962a), Om rättskyddet och likställigheten I det påföljdssystem, som angår rättsstridiga gärningar begångna av barn (Issues of Due Process and Equality in the Sanction System for Illegal Acts Committed by Children), Tidskrift, utgiven av Juridiska Föreningen i Finland, pp. 48–55.

Anttila, Inkeri (1966), Recorded and Unrecorded Criminality. Unrecorded criminality in Finland. Institute of Criminology, Series A:2, Helsinki, pp. 5–22.

Anttila, Inkeri (1960b). Sakon muuntorangaistus kriminaalipoliittisena ongelmana (Fine Conversion Imprisonment as a Problem of Crime Control Policy), Lakimies, pp. 473–483.

Anttila, Inkeri (1964), The Criminogical Significance of Unregistered Criminality, Excerpta criminologica, Vol. 4, pp. 411–414.

Anttila, Inkeri (1962b), Åtgärder mot ungdomskriminalitetn sedda mot bakgrunden av kriminalitetens allmänna utveckling i de nordiska länderna under de senaste åren (Measures Against Juvenile Delinquency in the Nordic Countries in the Perspective of Recent Crime Trends), Nordisk Tidskrift for Kriminalvidenskab, pp. 5–30.

Anttila, Inkeri (1979), Women in the Criminal Justice System, Publications of the National Research Institute of Legal Policy, Helsinki.

Anttila, Inkeri and Patrik Törnudd (1973), Kriminologi i kriminalpolitiskt perspektiv (Criminology in the Perspective of Criminal Policy), Stockholm.

Anttila, Inkeri and Patrik Törnudd (1970), Kriminologia (Criminology), Porvoo

Anttila, Inkeri and Patrik Törnudd (1983), Kriminologia ja kriminaalipolitiikka (Criminology and Criminal Policy), Juva 1983.

Aromaa, Kauko (1996), Inkeri Anttila ja minä: eräitä varhaisia muistoja (Inkeri Anttila and I: Some Early Recollections), in Lahti (ed), pp. 64–66.

Clark, Roger (1994), The United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Program. Formulation of Standards and Efforts at Their Implementation, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Fattah, A. Ezzat (1996), A Fine Thinker, an Innovative Scholar, and a Humane Policy-Maker, in Lahti (ed), pp. 107–110.

Halikainen, Pertti (1996), Ihminen Inkeri (Inkeri the Person), in Lahti (ed), pp. 31–33.

Hämäläinen, Mariitta (undated), Humaani kriminalisti (A Humane Criminalist), available at https://skr.fi/fi/humaani-kriminalisti.

Joutsen, Matti and Terhi Viljanen (1996), Meidän Inkeri maailmalla (Our Inkeri Abroad), in Lahti (ed), pp. 69–76.

Koskinen, Pekka, Raimo Lahti and Patrik Törnudd (1996), Inkeri Anttila haastateltavana (Interview with Inkeri Anttila), in Lahti (ed.), pp. 3–20.

Lahti, Raimo (2013), Inkeri Anttila 1996 – 2013 In Memorium *Revue internationale de droit pénal* 1/2013 (Vol. 84), pp. 13–15, available at: www.cairn.info/revue-internationale-de-droit-penal-2013-1-page-13.htm.

Lahti, Raimo (ed.) (1996), Kohti rationaalista ja humaania kriminaalipolitiikkaa. Omistettu Inkeri Anttilalle 29.11.1996 (Towards A Rational and Humane Criminal Policy. Dedicated to Inkeri Anttila, 29 November 1996), Helsinki 1996.

Lahti, Raimo and Patrik Törnudd (ed.) (2001), Inkeri Anttila, Ad Ius Criminale Humanius. Essays in Criminology, Criminal Justice and Criminal Policy, Helsinki, 2001.

Lopez-Rey, Manuel (1985), A Guide to United Nations Criminal Policy, Cambridge Studies in Criminology LIV, Gower.

Mueller, Gerhard O.W. (1996), "Thank you, Madame President", in Lahti (ed), pp. 21–23.

Nordenstreng, Kaarle (1996), Inkeri ja minä 1960-luvun henkisessä maastossa (Inkeri and I in the Ethos of the 1960s), in Lahti (ed), pp. 38–45.

Pesonen, Pertti (1996), Vuosikymmenten Nainen (The Women of the Decades), in Lahti (ed), pp. 24–26.

Redo, Slawomir (2012), Blue Criminology: The power of United Nations ideas to counter crime globally – A monographic study, Helsinki: HEUNI Report series no. 72.

Tiisala, Seija (1996), Inkerin monet kasvot (The Many Sides of Inkeri), in Lahti (ed), pp. 27–30.

Törnudd, Patrik (1996), 1960-luvun kontrollipolitiikkaa: pienryhmät virikkeitä välittämässä (Control Policy during the 1960s: Small Groups Providing Influence), in Lahti (ed), pp. 34–37.

Unrecorded archives of the National Research Institute of Legal Policy.