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Changing Times = Changing Theories of Urban Policing?

*A very special welcome by*

*Bruce Springsteen*

*and*

*Bob Dylan*
Come gather around people...

Come gather around people, wherever you roam
And admit that the waters around you have grown
And accept it that soon you’ll be drenched to the bone
If your time to you is worth savin’
Then you better start swimmin’ or you’ll sink like a stone
For the times they are a-changin’

As the present now will later be past
The order is rapidly fadin’

Bob Dylan, 1964

Yes, that is, what we are doing here in Muenster: we gather around. But do we admit, that the waters around us have grown? Do we accept, that Europe will be drenched to the bone, if we do not take action? Do we accept, that our academic standing is worth saving? Then we better start swimming, or we will sink like a stone. We as scientists, should keep our eyes wide as the old theories are rapidly aging, as society is changing.

What does Bruce Springsteens words of an open and just society have to do with us as Criminologists? We as academics have to accept, that science has a social responsibility, and so do we, because we are representing science. # What is the difference between yesterday’s policing and today’s? What needs to be done by criminologists in the field of Policing Inner Cities and Urban Communities?
The History of Policing – just „Ordinary Men“?

The history of policing is a history of scandals, violence, abuse of power and misconduct.
As Hannah Arendt said: „The dead of human empathy is one of the earliest ... signs of a culture about to fall into barbarism“.
What does this mean against the background of refugees, who die at the borders of Europe everyday? Have we lost our moral compass?

Policing Inner Cities - Paris 2016 haine anti-flics

Policing is a diverse and pluralistic set of social acts.
Police is part of society. Police stems from society.
Police officers and their work reflect historical and current societal standards in terms of moral belief.
If we look at the most recent situations in France and the U.S., we are confronted with extraordinary violence against and by the police.
What are the reasons, what are the consequences for policing in the future?
Policing inner cities is not a new topic, but one which is more important than ever.
Police violence destroys trust in police and trust in democracy and leads to more aggression, to a vicious circle of violence, aggression, prejudice and mutual rejection. Under these circumstances, policing inner cities looks like a mission impossible.
But is it? Are there any solutions to break that vicious circle?
A new (?) philosophy of solving problems.
Not only in France.

Latest since the youth riots in Paris (2005) and London (2011), but also after the terror acts in Paris and Nizza, we are facing the question of how to deal with social problems and the people our society leaves behind. But not only does the „wiping out“ idea not work; it also comes with many risks and side effects.

Isn’t it obvious that “nothing works” in policing?

Policing is much more than maintaining law and order and crime fighting. In our study in five European countries some years ago, penal law related activities counted (in average) for 20% of all police activities. Many colleagues have argued, that nothing works in policing. Police do not prevent crime, although they claim to “fight crime”.

• But nothing is “obvious” in science. Some recent studies have shown that police can make a difference.

“The police do not prevent crime. This is one of the best-kept secrets of modern life. Experts know it, the police know it, but the public does not know it. Yet the police pretend that they are society’s best defense against crime. This is a myth.” (Bayley 1994:3)

“…no evidence exists that augmentation of police forces or equipment, differential patrol strategies, or differential intensities of surveillance have an effect on crime rates.” (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990:270)
More of the same (Police)?

Let's start with a common misunderstanding: Politicians say, that there is one police officer per 300-400 citizens. But effectively available is one officer for every 10,000 citizens - if we take into account the shift system, training and education, illness, holidays and so on.

Just “more of the same” can not work! Crime rates and clearing rates are determined by other factors such as the size of the city, social composition, poverty rate, and NOT the size and density of the police. Crime and clearing rates are determined by other factors than the size and density of the police. There is no verifiable correlation between the size and strength of the police and the actual level of crime perceived by the public, too.

Paul Watzlawick
...the game of “more of the same, is one of the most effective recipes for disaster that has gradually evolved on our planet.”

Crime, Police and Place – a new approach?

Since some years, research is focusing on the distribution of crime at lower levels of geography. The focus on micro geography is called the 'criminology of place'. What are the advantages and disadvantages of this approach, and what are the consequences for policing urban communities.

Increased interest in the distribution of crime and other antisocial behavior at lower levels of geography.

• Focus on micro geography; the 'criminology of place'.
• Focus on small geographic areas within cities, often as small as addresses or street segments.
Crime and Place: Studying streets or blocks instead of communities or districts

Weisburd, Groff and Yang (2014, Oxford University Press). The Criminology of Place: Street Segments and Our Understanding of the Crime Problem

Shaw and McKay’s Conclusion

- Place matters!
- Crime was NOT due to welfare biology or crime pathology
- The cause of crime are in the place

Crime is not distributed equally. That itself is nothing new. Place matters sounds familiar since Shaw and McKay, nearly 75 years ago

Let’s have a look at an example from Germany. This chart equals many others and it shows the unequal distribution of crimes in Bremen. But what happens if we look closer into the data
If we look at microlevels like street segments or blocks, we realize "hot spots of crime".

But the interesting question is: What lies behind these places? In fact, there are "melting pots": Different social problems melt there and provide a melange that is usually discussed as a crime problem.
The “Law of Crime Concentration”

From studies by David Weisburd and others we know, that about 5% of the city segments are responsible for up to 50% of all crimes. If we try to explain these crime concentrations, we find socioeconomic disadvantages: poor education (at home, and in schools), unemployment, poor physical and mental health, drugs, poor housing, bad nutrition, discrimination. These aspects are interdependend.

![Graph showing the law of crime concentration in large cities](image)

Place Based Prevention Identifies **Where.** Not **Why,** not **How,** not **Who!**

Place Matters! But for whom? Identifying where, does not answer why problems exist and how they can solved and by whom. And: The relation between police and the public is an important point. Order maintenance focused policing strategies have negative implications, because they damage citizens’ views of procedural justice.

We need a shift from the shortsighted focus of crisis response to an open approach that allows space for community-building efforts at hot spots

1. **Informal social control and collective efficacy** are important for crime prevention.
2. **Order maintenance** focused policing strategies have negative implications for police legitimacy and crime control efforts because they can damage citizens’ views of procedural justice.
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“Police frontierism and “othering” by “Hot Spot Policing”?

Hot spot policing can result in police frontierism and othering, if members of the respective communities are seen as causes of problems, as objects of police interventions needed to be „whipped off “ by using the Police Kärcher...

‘police frontierism’ delineates perceived safe spaces from dangerous ones.

- This is done in order restrict, subdue or eliminate those individuals, that have deemed to be a threat to order and peace.
- “The police engage in ‘othering’, where the communities of interest are viewed negatively, and almost alien, and predominantly seen as ‘objects’ of disorder and law breaking”.

(Lamb 2016/17, p. 4)

Can police conquer areas?

Police often is forced by public opinion and politics to recover so called „lawless areas “ like streets or districts, where police is accused of retreating instead of being „brave enough“ to intervene. But police can not conquer areas.
Fifty-fifty and two-third. The new society.

Let’s turn back again to the beginning of my lecture and the recent situation in Europe. If we measure the cohesion within a society (which is the most important aspect of crime prevention) …

If we measure against the voter participation, as David Weisburd does, what does it mean that one third of the society permanently refrains from voting or votes, as we have seen now in elections in Germany (and we will see in France, Netherlands, Austria…), right-wing-parties?

What is happening in our societies? Are we facing a „clash of attitudes“? Are basic moral believes fading? And if so, why? Which consequences have to be drawn accordingly for policing urban communities? Nowadays we chose between yes or no, like or dislike. We are living in a biased society. How is the police dealing with that? On which side are the police on?

One third of the society permanently refrains from voting.

(participation in Brexit 72%, presidential election in Austria 73%, elections for the German parliament 72%; Berlin 67%; Meck-Pomm 61%)

What we need is more social cohesion and a police, that is supporting this idea, and not distroying trust in democracy.

Police must speak out loud about the social problems they realize by analyzing the relation between place and crime.

A New Theory of Policing?

Long-term prevention is impossible if we cannot address the social crime problems. Only changing the social situation may (!) result in less crime.

• Police can and should act as a “litmus test” for crime and social problems.

We must see police as Catalytic Converter of Social Problems

1. Police is (only) one of many actors in the field of security.
2. Police is (only) one of the institutions responsible for causes of crime.
3. Police work has to reflect this:
   ➢ Scandalizing social problems which are behind hot spots of crime.
   ➢ Refuse to be the „Kärcher“ of our nations. Policing means collecting information on the real background of crime.
   ➢ To fight alongside with those, who suffer and who have no voice to cry out loud.
   ➢ New image: instead of „crime fighters“ the „voice of the left behindes“.
   ➢ Nobody else is closer to the real crime factors. It is the mission of the police to name these problems.