Thomas Feltes

Community Policing in Germany

Introduction

The discussion of the role and function of the police in society moves between seeing them as an "instrument of state power" and as a "provider of services to the community". In recent years, the latter understanding of the work of the police, according to which they should primarily focus on the needs of the citizens, has become increasingly predominant. According to this view, the police and the citizens work together to generate the security that is seen by the citizens of a modern state – and particularly a state undergoing transformation – as an extremely important good with a major influence on their quality of life. Under the heading of "community policing",[1] preventive approaches that aim to improve the population's feeling of security have been under discussion in Germany since the late 1980s. The start was a conference at the University of Heidelberg, where US proponents of community policing presented their ideas, and efforts to put them into practice were discussed.[2] Community policing is not to be understood as a new policing *method*, but rather as a philosophy of how policing should be carried out: a guiding vision for the police that needs to encompass the entire police service. Hence, the establishment of a separate community-policing department is only sensible to the extent that the entire working philosophy of the police is simultaneously adapted to this core idea. The objective is as follows: The police are responsible for upholding public security and public order, preventing crime, and catching criminals. At the same time, they also need to deal with the fears and concerns of citizens.

Community Policing as a New Philosophy

Community policing requires not only organizational change, but also a fundamental shift in the administration of police work and in management philosophy. One may therefore speak of a "paradigm shift in German criminal

---

1   The term most commonly used in Germany is *bürgernahe Polizeiarbeit*, literally "citizen-oriented policing".
2   Cf. Thomas Feltes/Erich Rebscher (eds), *Polizei und Bevölkerung. Beiträge zum Verhältnis zwischen Polizei und Bevölkerung und zur gemeindebezogenen Polizeiarbeit ("Community Policing")* [The Police and the People. Essays on the Relationship between the Police and the People and on Community Policing], Holzkirchen 1990. Cf. also Dieter Dölling/Thomas Feltes (eds), *Community Policing. Comparative Aspects of Community Oriented Police Work*, Holzkirchen 1993.

policy"[3] that requires citizens to be treated as partners and not merely the objects of policework. The decentralization of power is a precondition for this, as is support for grassroots initiatives. Job satisfaction, motivation, and co-operative leadership are closely interlinked. The conventional yardsticks used to evaluate police work (crime rates, clear-up rates, etc.) are based on the desires of politicians rather than the requirements that citizens make of the police. Community policing therefore requires a change of mindset on the part of politicians, too, though the "zero-tolerance" concept, imported to Germany from New York, and often mentioned in this context, has nothing in common with this approach.[4]

Community Policing and Community Crime Prevention

A precondition for this kind of citizen-focused policing is a local situation report, drawn up to answer the following questions: What problems exist in a given community (not just those that are directly related to policing)? Who defines them? Who can influence them? The aim of community crime prevention, which goes hand in hand with community policing yet is often erroneously thought of as an alternative to it, is, taking into account local differences, to strengthen citizens' subjective sense of security and to give them a sense that their problems, fears, and difficulties are being taken seriously. They need to be involved in efforts to find solutions to local problems.[5]

Community policing also assumes that the police service is the only public agency that provides citizens with aid and other services around the clock. It should also be noted that the demand for police services, including proactive conflict resolution, is increasing, and not only in Germany. However, the means that are available to fight crime are limited, and the view that crime is primarily a community problem and that prevention is a task for the whole of society is becoming ever more widely accepted. Both community crime prevention and community policing involve working more closely with

---

3   Wiebke Steffen, Bürgernähe und gemeinwesenorientierte Polizeiarbeit in Deutschland [Public Responsiveness and community-oriented police work in Germany], in: Manfred Berg/Stefan Kapsch/Franz Streng (eds), *Criminal Justice in the United States and Germany – Strafrecht in den Vereinigten Staaten und Deutschland*, Heidelberg 2006, pp. 117-128, here: p. 119.

4   See Hans-Dieter Schwind, *Kriminologie. Eine praxisorientierte Einführung mit Beispielen* [Criminology. A Practical Introduction with Case Studies], Heidelberg 2011, p. 338; Thomas Feltes, Das Zero-Tolerance-Konzept: Gartenzwerge aus New York. Oder: Was fangen wir mit der US-amerikanischen Polizeistrategie an? [The Zero-Tolerance Concept. Garden Gnomes of New York. Or: What Are We Doing with US Policing Strategy?] In: *Kriminalistik* 2/2001, pp. 85-89; Gunter Dreher/Thomas Feltes (eds), *Das Modell New York. Kriminalprävention durch "Zero Tolerance"? Beiträge zur aktuellen kriminalpolitischen Diskussion* [The New York Model. Crime Prevention through "Zero Tolerance"? Contributions to a Current Discussion in the Field of Criminal Policy], Holzkirchen 1998.

5   Cf. Schwind, cited above (Note 4), pp. 369ff.; Dölling/Feltes (eds), cited above (Note 2); Thomas Feltes, New Philosophies in Policing, in: *Police Studies* 2/1994, pp. 29-48.

citizens to place crime in the context of other social problems in a community and to deal with it accordingly. The aim is to prioritize prevention over law enforcement, with the police sharing responsibility for upholding public security and public order. In this way, the police acknowledge the "impossible mandate" that gives them sole responsibility for security and order in society.[6] Community policing draws other state agencies, private organizations, NGOs, business owners, householders, and private individuals into the production of security.

The role of the police in this is to provide advice and, where law enforcement measures do prove necessary, to execute these with due regard for the rule of law. Despite many differences in implementation, all the models of community policing that have been put into practice so far have two things in common: They create better links between the police, communities, and citizens, enabling law enforcement to be augmented or, where possible, replaced by other public and private services that can raise the quality of life of the citizens. They also enhance the police's ability to systematically identify and analyse problems in the community and to decide who is able or required to deal with them and how. One consequence of this approach is that this cannot – and should not – always be the police. Experience has so far shown that this strategy can improve relations between the population and the police, while raising levels of citizen satisfaction with the latter's work, lowering the fear of crime, and raising the quality of life in affected areas. Wesley Skogan considers community policing to have three defining characteristics: decentralization, citizen involvement, and problem-solving.[7] The problem has always been that, while engagement is relatively easy to achieve in middle-class areas, residents in socially disadvantaged neighbourhoods, which are generally more affected by crime, have to suffer far more before becoming involved.

At the same time, community crime prevention also attempts to determine the individual and social causes of deviant behaviour in a local context in order to develop, implement, and evaluate viable methods of crime prevention. The key question here is whether efforts to "combat crime" can ever be decisive, or whether the social peace might not be disturbed by other factors having little to do with crime. If it becomes apparent that it is difficult or impossible to achieve a significant reduction in crime by means of prevention or law enforcement, it becomes necessary to learn to live with crime to a certain extent and to strengthen the sense of security of the citizens, which usually bears no relation to actual levels of crime.

---

6   Peter K. Manning, *Police Work: The Social Organization of Policing*, Cambridge, MA, 1977, p. 155. Manning's book was a groundbreaking contribution to the sociology of policing.

7   Cf. Wesley Skogan, Probleme gemeinwesenorientierter Polizeiarbeit am Beispiel des Houston-Projektes [Problems of Community-oriented Policing with Reference to the Houston Project], in: Feltes/Rebscher (eds), cited above (Note 2), pp. 117-130; Wesley Skogan, *Community Policing. Can it work?* Belmont 2004.

The switch to a preventive model of community policing usually takes place via the creation of a working group, whose tasks include analysing the social structure and the crime situation in a community, and conducting a survey of attitudes. This can also provide an insight into people's sense of security and fear of crime as well as the likelihood that they will report a crime.

After the analysis is complete, specific problems can be addressed via measures tailored to the individual situation. The goal of these measures may be the quantitative and qualitative reduction in crime. However, they must seek to reduce the fear of crime, strengthen individuals' sense of security, and to remove the causes of fear.

At the same time, direct contact between institutions is encouraged, to enable the development of common solutions. Minorities and so-called "problem groups" need to be included in the problem-solving process so that their issues and viewpoints can be taken into account. This strategy does not generally show results quickly, but only in the medium to long term. Yet the intensive co-operation between police, citizens, and other institutions does lead to the growth of mutual understanding and trust in the short term and to citizens feeling more at ease in their home towns and cities.

Experience shows that community crime prevention needs to extend beyond co-operation between the police and the population if problems relating to public security and public order are to be alleviated in the long-term. The police alone cannot create jobs, improve schools, or ensure that refuse collection and street-cleaning services function effectively. In most cases, public-order problems arising from or in connection with such failures of public services can only be solved with the assistance of other public agencies or institutions. In the realm of crime fighting and crime prevention, effective police work is also a function of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of co-operation and co-ordination with other institutions of the criminal justice system. This requires the development of strategies that encompass multiple agencies. Consequently, there have been attempts not only to place policing on a community-oriented footing but also to decentralize the work of public prosecutors and the courts and achieve neighbourhood-level co-operation between these institutions, particularly on problem topics.

Structural Questions

Community crime prevention and community policing need to go hand in hand with changes in police organizational and management structures. If the concept of community policing assumes that the role of the police in the community needs to be expanded, this is not primarily a matter of politics or operational tactics but rather because, as communities become more diverse and social solidarity declines, the institution that assumes responsibility for

managing the various everyday conflicts and problems of public order increasingly takes centre stage, namely the police.

Community policing demands a decisive shift in the philosophy and culture of policing. It entails greater openness and democracy, as well as a redefinition and expansion of the role of the police. This can only be based on an organic organizational design (non-authoritarian) and participatory management (delegation of responsibility). The bulk of the work must consist in defining local problems and finding creative ways to solve them.

In Germany, in recent years, many forms of co-operation between the police and local populations have emerged, based on the assumption that crime needs to be solved in a local context. In terms of their concrete application, they have a wide variety of approaches, and it is rarely possible to draw a clear boundary between community crime prevention and community policing.[8]

Starting in 1990, Germany began to establish "crime prevention councils" (*kriminalpräventive Räte)*. As well as crime prevention bodies such as the councils, a number of German states also possess additional networks. For instance, in the state of North Rhine-Westphalia, some 700 "partnerships for public order" (*Ordnungspartnerschaften*) have been established in 179 towns and cities.[9] Participants in partnerships for public order may include the police and other local government departments with responsibility for public order (*Ordnungsbehörden*), schools, universities, and local public transport providers. These and other networks that integrate the police with local authorities and their departments of public order, social services, and youth, have the goal of bringing all the stakeholders in a given city or community to the table so that their grievances can be addressed. The issues they deal with range from the sponsorship and supervision of playgrounds, via the provision of support to young immigrants, to co-operation between local authorities, the police, and the federal police (*Bundespolizei*) with regard to public order problems in railway station forecourts. While crime prevention bodies deal with a wide range of issues, they tend to focus on children and young people. More than 2,000 crime prevention networks now exist in Germany at local and regional level, with the busiest phase of new foundations falling in the second half of the 1990s.[10]

---

8   Cf. Thomas Feltes, Bürgernahe Polizeiarbeit – neuer Wein in alten Schläuchen? [Community Policing – New Wine in Old Wineskins?] In: *Jahrbuch für Rechts- und Kriminalsoziologie 1995* [Yearbook for the Sociology of Law and Crime], Baden-Baden 1996, pp. 125-148.

9   Cf. Bernhard Frevel (ed.), *Kooperative Sicherheitspolitik in Mittelstädten – Studien zu Ordnungspartnerschaften und Kriminalpräventiven Räten* [Co-operative Security Policy in Medium-sized Towns – Studies on Partnerships for Order and Crime Prevention Councils], Frankfurt 2007.

10   The searchable "Infopool" of the German Federal Criminal Police Office (*Bundeskriminalamt, BKA*) can be accessed at: http://www.infopool-polizeikonzepte.bka.de/index_internet.php; a (somewhat older) overview of projects can be found in: Bundeskriminalamt (ed.), *Kriminalprävention in Deutschland* [Crime Prevention in Germany], Munich 2004, at: http://www.bka.de/nn_205998/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/ThemenABisZ/

Internal Security and Quality of Life

Security and a sense of security are key aspects of quality of life. In many communities, the enhanced focus on the needs of citizens has led to the issues of "security" or "crime" being included in local authority planning. Until the mid-1990s, local authorities did not have access to materials that could support them in this undertaking. This led the Community Crime Prevention Research Group of the German state of Baden-Württemberg (*Forschungsgruppe Kommunale Kriminalprävention in Baden-Württemberg*) to carry out studies of victimization and fear of crime in towns and communities in Baden-Württemberg and produce a handbook and standard questionnaire for use in conducting further surveys.[11] The standard questionnaire[12] supports the planning of community crime prevention measures and provides assistance in implementation. It was based on the studies undertaken by the Research Group, which, since 1993, had been performing research to support the "Community Crime Prevention" pilot project initiated by the Ministry of the Interior of Baden-Württemberg.[13] The citizen surveys of victimization, fear of crime, specific local problems and their possible solutions together with the attitudes of citizens to bodies charged with maintaining social order were also compared with data from the whole of Germany.[14]

Citizen surveys provide an indispensable basis for the provision of community policing and citizen-oriented public security services. They serve to determine how citizens view the public security situation and, above all, to what degree they are affected by crime and where and why they experience fear or insecurity. They also catalogue which problems citizens consider to be the most urgent and troubling ones in their communities and how much they are considered "security issues". Surveys help local governments to better understand security problems and the concerns of the population, not only in terms of the community as a whole but also for specific neighbourhoods. The results need to be used as a basis for planning and measuring progress in

---

Kriminalpraevention/bundLaenderProjektsammlung2003,templateId=raw,property=public
ationFile.pdf/bundLaenderProjektsammlung2003.pdf.

11 Cf. Forschungsgruppe Kommunale Kriminalprävention in Baden-Württemberg, Viktimisierungen, Kriminalitätsfurcht und Bewertung der Polizei in Deutschland [Victimization, Fear of Crime, and Assessment of the Police in Germany], in: *Monatsschrift für Kriminologie und Strafrechtsreform* 2/1998, pp. 67-82.

12 Cf. Landeskriminalamt Baden-Württemberg (ed.), *Handbuch zur Planung und Durchführung von Bevölkerungsbefragungen im Rahmen der Kommunalen Kriminalprävention* [Handbook for the Planning and Execution of Population Surveys in the Framework of Community Crime Prevention], Stuttgart 2000, at: http://www.polizei-bw.de/praevention/ Documents/kkp/BROSCH%C3%9CRE%20-%20Handbuch%20zur%20Bev%C3% B6lkerungsbefragung.pdf.

13 Cf. the contributions in: Thomas Feltes (ed.), *Kommunale Kriminalprävention in Baden-Württemberg* [Community Crime Prevention in Baden-Württemberg], Holzkirchen 1995.

14 Cf. Forschungsgruppe Kommunale Kriminalprävention in Baden-Württemberg, cited above (Note 11).

local authorities.[15] In the meantime, comparable surveys on fear of crime, views on appropriate punishments, and the perception of crime trends have been carried on a national scale.[16] There is still a dearth of methodologically sound evaluations of community crime prevention projects and community policing initiatives.[17]

The criticisms sometimes made of community policing and community crime prevention should be taken seriously. These include being associated with practices that exclude certain groups from society, being the continuation of "neoliberal criminal policy",[18] and serving the "colonization of social policy by criminal policy".[19] The police have been accused of imposing themselves on local self government; their community policing activities are said to disguise the truth about power relations between citizens and the state and cover up or even exacerbate problematic police attitudes and behaviour towards minorities. The approach is also accused of stigmatizing certain population groups without addressing the underlying problems of social deprivation.[20] Against this, it can be argued that the description and analysis of problems at the neighbourhood level is necessary if appropriate solutions are to be found. One task for the police (among other actors) is to ensure that these solutions are not reduced to law enforcement or a combination of law enforcement and prevention, but rather that structural issues are identified and addressed. To this extent, the role of the police in community policing is catalytic: They can and must set processes of societal change in motion to achieve social changes that can reduce crime in the medium term. Short-term solutions largely serve political interests. A democratic police service should refuse to participate in this.

---

15 Cf. Christoph Hohage, "Incivilities" und Kriminalitätsfurcht ["Incivilities" and Fear of Crime], in: *Zeitschrift für soziale Probleme und soziale Kontrolle* 1/2004, pp. 77-95.

16 Cf. Dirk Baier/Stefanie Kemme/Michael Hanslmaier/Bettina Doering/Florian Rehbein/Christian Pfeiffer, *Kriminalitätsfurcht, Strafbedürfnisse und wahrgenommene Kriminalitätsentwicklung. Ergebnisse von bevölkerungsrepräsentativen Befragungen aus den Jahren 2004, 2006 und 2010*, [Fear of Crime, Views on Punishment, and Perceived Crime Trends. Results of Representative Surveys from 2004, 2006, and 2010] Hanover 2011, available at: www.kfn.de/versions/kfn/assets/fob117.pdf.

17 Cf. Joachim Obergfell-Fuchs, Wirkung und Effizienz Kommunaler Kriminalprävention [The Effectiveness and Efficiency of Community Crime Prevention], in: Hans-Jürgen Kerner/Erich Marks (eds), *Internetdokumentation Deutscher Präventionstag* [Online Archive of the German Congress on Crime Prevention], Hanover 2004, at: http://www.praeventionstag.de/nano.cms/dokumentation/details/61.

18 Verena Schreiber, *Fraktale Sicherheiten. Eine Kritik der Kommunalen Kriminalprävention* [Fractal Security. A Critique of Community Crime Prevention], Bielefeld 2013, p. 13.

19 Reinhard Kreissl, Die präventive Polizei. Auf dem Weg zur gläsernen Gesellschaft? [The Preventive Police. On the Way to a Transparent Society?] In: *Kritische Justiz* 2/1981, pp. 128-139, here: p. 133.

20 Cf. Schreiber, cited above (Note 18).

Starting with the Neighbourhood

The work of community crime prevention starts with the neighbourhood. Considering this arena holistically in terms of its infrastructure, architecture, public utilities, social integration, gentrification processes, and crime statistics makes it possible to identify and localize the causes of crime. Neighbourhood-based community development seeks to empower inhabitants to exercise pressure on political and administrative authorities to bring about change. The question of the usefulness of publicly financed measures, which is being asked with increasing frequency in the current economic crisis, means that their effectiveness, cost-benefit ratio, and efficiency need to be evaluated objectively. Experience shows that performing such analyses frequently increases the acceptance of community crime prevention. Alongside the crime situation, three levels of analysis are relevant for both community crime prevention and the neighbourhood approach, because they create a framework for human action and hence for deviancy: infrastructure, social structure, and situational conditions. This approach has been criticized for potentially contributing to the "stigmatization" of certain districts. Some local authorities have thus been unwilling to contribute towards activities aimed at creating "socially integrative cities",[21] which seek to bring together various activities aimed at improving living conditions in local neighbourhoods. However, the fact that problems are distributed unevenly among city districts is undeniable. Areas with the highest rates of criminality are also often disadvantaged in terms of community infrastructure in the areas of social welfare, health, and education.

The data gathered and methods developed for regional, small-scale analysis of various forms of crime offer great potential for the structuring of police work. This applies to both preventive and enforcement measures, but particularly to general (social) pedagogical and socio-spatial measures. The collation of data from departments of social services, health, education, and police is one key means of ensuring that they work together to develop solutions.

In many localities, the idea of "neighbourhood management" continues to be pursued and expanded so as to take advantage of benefits of prevention for neighbourhoods and communities. This reflects the findings of modern criminology, which has analysed connections between the socio-structural features of space and levels of crime and criminals and finds that clustering of unfavourable factors leads to deviancy and crime. The police alone, whether through prevention or enforcement measures, cannot effectively and sustainably bring about the tangible changes that are needed. Prevention cannot be the responsibility of the police and justice departments alone. Crime prevention is only possible through co-operation between the departments

---

21   Cf. *The Socially Integrative City in NRW*, at: http://www.soziale-stadt.nrw.de/index_en.php.

responsible for police, justice, social affairs, children, youth, health, the environment, planning and public works, transport, and education.

Crime Mapping

The idea of analysing the geographical distribution of crime is nothing new. Current German practices in the computerized graphical representation of crime data, however, go far beyond the "crime mapping" systems widely used in the US, in particular, but also in the UK, which are largely intended for use by the public.[22] The analysis of data at a local level and on a small scale is seen as offering great potential for the fine-tuning of police activities – not just prevention and enforcement, but also (social) pedagogical and socio-spatial measures.

Experts in police science have discussed the possibility of using "hot-spot mapping" to improve the deployment of police resources.[23] Such deployment plans have been criticized for concentrating excessively on police data. The focus should be broadened. Amalgamating data from the areas of social policy, health, schools, and law enforcement can provide insights that are relevant to both crime prevention and law enforcement. Multi-agency approaches of this kind are considered to be particularly effective and efficient means of performing crime analysis and crime prevention[24] when their results are discussed by the participating institutions, as this enables deep expertise gained from practical experience to be better applied to decision making.

The combination of intelligence-led policing (ILP), problem-oriented policing (POP) und community policing is also being discussed as a promising means of combining location-specific or situation-specific prevention with successful law enforcement. In concrete terms, this means that the information gathered by the police (e.g. the information that was used to charge someone with a crime, as well as the results of crime-scene investigations and witness statements) should be evaluated as rapidly as possible, problem-solving approaches need to be developed, and these need to be implemented by means of community policing. The police in The Hague have developed the concepts of "hot crimes" (crimes that are causing a great deal of damage/suffering at a given point in time), "hot shots" (particularly active recidivists and/or multiple offenders), "hot victims" (individuals who have suffered particularly as a result of crime), and "hot groups" (gangs, criminal or-

---

22 For Los Angeles, see: http://www.lapdonline.org/crime_mapping_and_compstat; for England, Wales, and Northern Ireland and London, respectively, see: http://www.police.uk and http://maps.met.police.uk.

23 Cf. Rachael Reece-Smith/Stuart Kirby, Exploring the VLI, for Identifying Priority Neighborhoods, in the Context of Multi-Agency Community Safety Initiatives, in: *Policing* 1/2013, pp. 42-52; Spencer Chainey/Jerry Ratcliffe, *GIS and Crime Mapping*, Chichester 2005.

24 Cf. Reece-Smith/Kirby, cited above (Note 23), p. 51.

ganizations)[25] and believe that crime can be reduced by combining the approaches mentioned above – provided that the participation of citizens is properly organized and fine-tuned, as this is considered vital to success.

Consequently, recent studies in criminal geography have concentrated on the analysis of relationships between socio-structural features of space and levels of crime and criminality. Research in the field of socio-ecology research confirms that the accumulation of unfavourable factors produces deviancy and crime. In districts with high concentrations of poverty, delinquency levels are also high, particularly among teenagers.

In their long-term research project, Weisburd et al.[26] focused on "micro communities", which they define as "street segments". They were able to demonstrate that half of all crimes were committed in only five or six per cent of street segments in the city they had chosen as a subject. These crime hot spots are not all located in the same neighbourhood, and there are major differences between the various affected segments. Vital details and insights are lost whenever one focuses on large units such as neighbourhoods and towns. Weisburd et al. also identify a large number of both risk factors and protective factors, which can be used to develop preventive strategies. Their message was: Look at the streets, lanes, and public squares that are particularly troubled by criminality; do not make comparisons at the level of municipality or district. Only this allows us to get close to the causes of crime and thus to develop effective strategies for prevention.[27] Ultimately, Weisburd et al. want to combine what has been called "hot-spot policing" with effective methods of crime prevention. The fact that this has to concentrate largely on social aspects of public life should come as no surprise, but is bad news for those who call for "more of the same" (Paul Watzlawick) in the fight against crime. More prosecutions, new and tougher laws, more law enforcement, more police or police with greater powers – all are bound to fail. The challenge is to make effective and appropriate use of the available resources. This is called "smart policing"[28] and consists in developing strategies that are effective, efficient, and economical.

---

25 Cf. Peter Versteegh/Theo Van Der Plas/Hans Nieuwstraten, The Best of Three Worlds: more effective policing by a problem-oriented approach of hot crimes, hot spots, hot shots, and hot groups, in: *Police Practice and Research: An International Journal* 1/2013, pp. 66-81, here: pp. 71ff.

26 David Weisburd/Elisabeth R. Groff/Sue-Ming Yang, *The Criminology of Place. Street Segments and Our Understanding of the Crime Problem*, New York 2012.

27 Cf. Rüdiger Wulf/Joachim Obergfell-Fuchs, Prävention an Orten. Kriminologische Grundlagen und kriminalpräventive Ansätze [Location-Specific Prevention. Criminological Foundations and Approaches to Crime Prevention], in: Klaus Boers/Thomas Feltes/Jörg Kinzig/Lawrence W. Sherman/Franz Streng/Gerson Trüg (eds), *Kriminologie – Kriminalpolitik – Strafrecht. Festschrift für Hans-Jürgen Kerner zum 70. Geburtstag* [Criminology – Crime Policy – Penal Law. Festschrift for Hans-Jürgen Kerner on the occasion of his 70th Birthday], Tübingen 2013.

28 Cf. the website of the Smart Policing Initiative at: http://www.smartpolicinginitiative.com.

Social Solidarity as a Preventive Factor

During the search for factors that could reduce both crime and the fear of crime, the concept of "collective efficacy" has been coined. This describes a form of social capital, one feature of which is a willingness to intervene on noticing the presence of a suspicious individual in the neighbourhood. Other features of collective efficacy include a willingness to take responsibility for the behaviour of young people in a community and to provide "reciprocal social support" to others – i.e. to help them – when they are in difficulties. The neighbourhood as a whole should be a "helpful place" and should be perceived as such. Residents need to intervene (within the legally permissible limits), which requires the strengthening of the informal means of social control, which are more capable of reducing crime rates than formal ones (police, courts).

The concept of "social cohesion" is also used in this context. It describes the cohesiveness among members of a group in which there is mutual trust and solidarity. Social cohesion is said to exist where people know and trust each other and share common values. It is therefore a key precondition for resilience. Research has shown that urban areas with a high degree of social cohesion have lower crime rates than areas where there is little social solidarity. Urban areas whose residents develop their power of collective or common action and are ready and willing to assume responsibility are not only more secure in the sense of having lower crime rates, their residents are also less likely to feel insecure. The inhabitants of such areas are able to meet internal and external dangers with greater vitality and to generate powers of self-healing when they suffer exceptional misfortune. Strengthening social cohesion is seen as a holistic approach to preventing crime. The central, overriding goal is to develop strategies that will strengthen the social cohesion of a community so that the community can act to meet dangers without external assistance while building up the power to self-heal and support its members.

In general, there are good indications that "problem-oriented policing" and "evidence-based policing"[29] can be successful when properly prepared. In attempting to evaluate such measures, however, it is important to consider what counts as evidence of how and whether police measures are "effective". The question of how the necessary data is to be gathered and evaluated also needs to be part of the process from the beginning. It is also important to raise awareness of the significance of such measures so as to enable more intensive examination of the policing process than has tended to be the case. The police's expectations of their own actions should also be re-examined and, if necessary, modified. "Good-practice models" should be developed and translated into practice. As long as this is not carried out systematically,

---

29   Karen Bullock/Nick Tilley, Police Reform: the Prospects for Evidence Based Policing and Crime Reduction, in: *Policing: An International Journal of policy and Practice*, pp. 381-387.

we can do no more than "grope around in the dark". And while we may indeed achieve some high-profile "successes", their reality and sustainability are usually highly questionable. Genuine successes are only achieved when they can be replicated, in other words, when cause and effect can be defined.