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Four Police models in Europe

- Traditional models:
  1. Military Bureaucratic Model
  2. Lawful Policing Model
  3. Broad Scope Policing

- Modern models:
  3. Community (Oriented) Policing Model
  4. Variant: Problem (Oriented) Policing
  4. Theory: Broken Windows

- Postmodern models:
  4. Zero Tolerance Policing
  4. Public-private divide Policing Model
  4. Intelligence Led Policing
### Community Oriented Policing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretion</td>
<td>“Need for smart policing”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law as a means</td>
<td>Law enforcement is seen as a means among others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Strong emphasise on external accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation with public</td>
<td>Partnerships, tools in striving for higher quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalisation</td>
<td>Insight in societal mechanisms, tendency towards despecialisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Strongly linked with the concept of democracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>Reinforcement of informal social control, situational crime prevention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro/reactiveness</td>
<td>Strong emphasis on the need for proactive policing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intelligence Led Policing

ILP = is built around the assessment and management of risk
It is possible to distinguish different kinds of ILP, they all share the following qualities:

(1) oriented toward the victims and environments as well as offenders of crime and disorder;
(2) and to entire populations or ‘at risk’ groups as well as individuals already known to the authorities; and
(3) in ways that augment criminal justice and public order agendas with policing strategies aimed at managing the risks of victimisation and/or offending careers.

In turn, it is possible to distinguish different kinds of ILP in terms of their privileging of offender, victim or environmentally-oriented policing, of primary, secondary or tertiary interventions and of crime reduction and/or public order objectives.

PEMP : We think it is possible to identify three basic variants of ILP
### Table 1. Diagnosing Metropolitan Policing Dispositions: Orientations, Populations and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Rules of Meaning and Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGING THE RISKS OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR CRIME &amp; DISORDER</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGING THE RISKS OF OFFENDING CAREERS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) Offender-oriented tertiary strategies targeting prolific and priority offenders to expedite their desistance from criminal careers

This variant of ILP is exemplified in the Regional Safety Plans of Amsterdam (2010-2014, 2014-2018), Rotterdam (2010-2014, 2014-2018) and Antwerp (2003-2017), which are premised on the increasing research and policy interest in crime and the ‘life course’, in particular the idea that it is possible to identify common patterns in the onset and reproduction of offending behaviour amongst prolific ‘career’ criminals and, on the basis of this, to engineer desistance.

Belief that prolific criminals are responsible for the overwhelming majority of offences in a locality, the policing implication being that substantial reductions in crime and disorder can be accomplished quickly and can be sustained if these particular individual offenders can be identified and subject to intensive supervision, surveillance and rehabilitation.

See: the ‘Top 600’ programme that is the centrepiece of the Amsterdam, Rotterdam and the U-turn projects in the Antwerp Plans and which commits substantial resources to the involvement of a wide range of agencies in prolific offenders including their school or employers, their families, friends and extended kinship networks as well as a breadth of relevant municipal agencies including social workers, teachers, housing and health authorities as well as the police and probation services.
(2) Offender-oriented secondary strategies targeting ‘risky’ groups on the basis of suspect characteristics such as age, ethnicity or homelessness etc.

In stark contrast to the research-driven agenda of ILP concerned with the desistance of prolific offenders, another kind of developmental regime is premised on the punitive-populist concern with ‘outsider’, ‘suspect’, groups, in particular migrants and refugees, homeless street populations and, more generally, young street populations.

These regimes are oriented around offenders but employ secondary interventions against whole social groups, rather than particular individuals, whose members are thought to be ‘at risk’ of offending because of their demographic profiles. Although such (ethnic) ‘profiling’ is now proscribed by article 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights and the related case law of the European Court of Justice, it nonetheless persists, explicitly in some metropolitan policing agendas, notably the security pacts signed between the Italian Minister of the Interior and successive Mayors of Rome from (2008 onwards), and in the use of the administrative orders passed by these Mayors, targeting ‘nomad populations’ street vendors and unauthorised camps of ‘Roma’.

The policing implication of this targeting is to employ aggressive, militarised, street patrolling to disperse and ‘move on’ street populations, to disrupt street vice and narcotics markets and tackle ‘incivilities’ or ‘anti-social behaviour’. It is precisely through this shift from criminal justice to risk management that metropolitan policing in certain cities has witnessed an exponential increase in the innovative and highly discretionary use of administrative law.
(3) Victim-oriented and environment-oriented primary, secondary and tertiary strategies aimed at reducing the opportunities for crime and disorder

The key innovation here is to shift policing from a concern with the dispositions of offenders to the opportunities for victimisation, in particular those opportunities afforded by, and remediable through, highly situational factors. This approach has found particular favour in the UK, in some sense the ‘home’ of situational crime prevention given the amount of investment in the research and development of this agenda and more recently, can be discerned in the Police and Crime Plan for London.

This agenda seeks to facilitate ‘security for all’ by embedding the reduction of opportunities for crime and disorder into the routines of everyday life and accomplishes this, again, through innovative applications of administrative not just criminal law to increase the effort of commissioning offences, reduce the rewards and increase the risks of apprehension.

For example, improved surveillance, both natural and electronic, of particular victims. Of particular importance in the impetus behind the agenda of opportunity reduction has been the use of intelligence and data for analysing ‘crime patterns’ and the identification of concentrations of crime and disorder in ‘hot-spots’ and ‘hot-times’ which provide a logic for targeting policing.

This logic is currently being developed further through ‘Policing 2.0’ or the presumed insights into patterns of crime and disorder that so called ‘Big Data’ arising out of the rise in digital communications (social media, social networks) and the digital archiving of administrative data sets.
The debate between advocates of the “contagion thesis” and the “immunisation thesis”

**The contagion thesis**
Contagion understands and seeks to predict, the distribution of crime and disorder in terms of its frequency in particular places (hot-spots) and times (hot-times).
However, critics of this approach argue that a preoccupation with the frequency of crime and disorder ignores the relationship to the distribution of non-victims.

For example, the analysis of non-victimisation to victimisation for high volume personal and property crime in the UK (Hope, 20013) identifies a 80:20 distribution in which it is estimated that 80 percent of the residential population experience only 20 percent of crime (and most of the population experience no crime at all), 20 percent of this population are chronically victimised experiencing 80 percent of all personal and property crime registered through self-report studies such as the Crime Survey for England and Wales.

**The Immunisation thesis**
Moreover, there is an interrelationship between populations of non-victims, able to better ‘immunise’ themselves against victimisation through access to private security goods (especially mobility in the housing market to exit high crime neighbourhoods), and chronically victimised populations whose vulnerability to victimisation is increased precisely by their lack of access to private security and their dependence on limited, episodic, public policing provision. This ‘immunisation thesis’ implies a very different policing agenda, one that self-consciously uses social and economic policies to redistribute access to security particularly for chronically victimised and vulnerable populations, thereby addressing the concern with of ‘High Impact Crimes’.
The risks of risk management (1)

These ILP agendas share a concern with anticipating various ‘risks’ or ‘risky groups’ for the purposes of ‘early intervention’ to reduce, if not completely prevent, the actual occurrence of these risks and their associated harms. In turn, this generates a key strategic dilemma for metropolitan policing agendas and that is **how to reconcile the criminal justice of due process**, prosecuting particular suspects on the basis of predicate offences on the ‘facts’ of the case to establish guilt ‘beyond all reasonable doubt’ prior to any executive action to punish or ‘correct’ this behaviour, **with the anticipatory and extra-judicial logic of risk management**.

A further dilemma generated by ILP is their alleged **displacement effects** in which targeted, extra-judicial, action on particular individuals, groups or places **increases the vulnerability of the non-targeted individuals, groups or places**. The dilemma here is that focussing intervention on prolific or priority offenders or ‘high crime neighbourhoods’ or multiple and repeat victims necessarily removes security from those who offend, are victimised or live in areas of significant if not ‘high’ rates of crime and disorder.

In terms of the strategic dilemmas risk management may enhance security but at **certain costs to freedom of movement and/or equality** before the law, including the right to **equal protection** by state authorities, a problem exacerbated by the enrolment of commercial security agencies into risk management regimes whose primary duty is to their clients not to the broader citizenry.
Within this shared governing rationality, however, an important distinction exists between risk management agendas that are oriented towards reducing the opportunities for victimisation and those oriented towards desistance amongst prolific and priority offenders.

This distinction can be registered in the contrasting practices found in London, which has invested a significant amount in opportunity reduction, for example pervasive surveillance of the residential population through CCTV as well as target hardening households against burglary etc], and Amsterdam and Rotterdam, which have prioritised investment in managing the ‘Top 600’ prolific career offenders.

In turn this reflects another strategic dilemma and focus for political competition around metropolitan policing and that is whether to pursue a highly targeted, tertiary, policing strategy in the belief that managing the Top 600 offenders will produce a much greater impact on a metropolises volume and concentration of crime and disorder problems, given increasingly austere constraints on policing resources, or whether to pursue at least secondary policing strategies aimed at those groups ‘at risk’ of embarking upon prolific offending careers or victims at risk of multiple and repeat victimisation, much less a primary policing strategy that seeks to address offending and victimisation amongst the breadth of the population. This dilemma is represented most clearly in the use of administrative orders and security pacts in Rome, since 2008, to manage the perceived risks associated with ‘nomad settlements’ and ‘mobile populations’, in particular robbery, inter-personal violence, drug use and trafficking and prostitution.
A key impetus behind the rise of ILP since the 1980s and since the explicit invitation of a plurality of governmental actors to participate in plural policing strategies at the sub-national level, is the increasing recognition amongst municipal authorities of their ability to formulate policing agendas in their own municipalities through the use of administrative law and sanctions which they control. This, as contrasted with the use of criminal law in maintenance regimes, which is restricted to state police and to prosecutorial authorities.

We might identify a number of possible drivers behind the rise of ILP agenda’s including the saturation and increasing incapacity of criminal justice systems to cope with demands being placed upon them, evidence questioning the efficacy of criminal justice sanctioning for accomplishing sustainable reductions in volume crimes, the political and economic appeal of risk management policies promising substantial, sustainable and cost-effective reductions in crime and disorder either through reducing the situational opportunities for their commission and/or the intensive supervision, surveillance and reintegration of prolific offenders and the increasing interest of municipal authorities in using their powers in pursuit of this promise. The promise of risk management becomes even more attractive to those municipal authorities under particular pressure from the ‘perfect storm’ of severe reductions in public expenditure for policing combined with an exponential increase in the demand for policing as a consequence of mass migration and allied problems of social cohesion.