



Deutscher Präventionstag –
der Jahreskongress seit 1995

Report for the 19th German Congress of Crime Prevention

Wiebke Steffen

From: Marc Coester and Erich Marks (Eds.):
International Perspectives of Crime Prevention 7
Contributions from the 8th Annual International Forum 2014
within the German Congress on Crime Prevention
Forum Verlag Godesberg GmbH 2015

978-3-942865-38-8 (Printausgabe)
978-3-942865-39-5 (eBook)

Wiebke Steffen

**Report for the 19th German Congress of Crime Prevention
May 12-13, 2014 in Karlsruhe**

Prevention requires practice, policy, and science

Crime prevention requires prevention practice, prevention policy, and prevention science

Wiebke Steffen

Heiligenberg (Baden) / Munich

Content

Preamble

- 0 Summary and conclusions
- 1 Crime prevention
 - 1.1 Definition, goals, positive and risky aspects
 - 1.2 Development of crime prevention: the origin of a new field of action and policy
 - 1.3 Summary and conclusions
- 2 Prevention practice
 - 2.1 Development and status
 - 2.1.1 Dominance of communal / local level
 - 2.1.2 Protagonists of crime prevention: police, children's and youth organizations, schools, penal law, and criminal justice
 - 2.1.2.1 The police
 - 2.1.2.2 Children's and youth organizations
 - 2.1.2.3 Schools
 - 2.1.2.4 Penal law and criminal justice
 - 2.2 Communal crime prevention
 - 2.3 Summary and conclusions
- 3 Prevention policy
 - 3.1 Crime prevention as goal of criminal policy
 - 3.1.1 Criminal policy: scientifically founded or "flying blind"?
 - 3.1.2 Criminal policy: on the way to a preventive state?
 - 3.1.3 Criminal policy in the media society
 - 3.1.4 Summary and conclusions
 - 3.2 Levels of prevention policy
 - 3.2.1 Prevention policy on local / communal level
 - 3.2.2 Prevention policy on state level
 - 3.2.3 Prevention policy on federal level
 - 3.2.4 Prevention policy on international and global level
 - 3.3 Summary and conclusions
- 4 Prevention science
 - 4.1 On the state of criminology in Germany

- 4.2 Application-oriented criminological research: opportunities and risks
- 4.3 Prevention science and prevention practice
 - 4.3.1 Documentation and databases
 - 4.3.2 Quality assurance, implementation, and evaluation
 - 4.3.3 Qualification, training, and continuing education
- 4.4 Summary and conclusions
- 5 Crime prevention requires prevention practice, prevention policy, and prevention science
 - 5.1 The German Congress of Crime Prevention (DPT)
 - 5.2 DPT – Institute for applied prevention research (dpt-i)
 - 5.3 Summary and conclusions
- Literature

Preamble

In the last quarter of a century, crime prevention has been developed and established in Germany in many ways: in the meantime, a new field of action and policy has been created.

As a consequence of this development, the familiar original prevention protagonists (police and justice system) are now supported by additional protagonists such as schools, children's and youth organizations, and civil society organizations. Cooperation commissions have been instituted at all levels – local, regional, national, international – in order to live up to the understanding of crime prevention as a social responsibility which requires cooperation between protagonists and institutions.

The drivers of this development are the numerous programs and projects of the respective specialized practices, i.e. the organized practice of governmental and non-governmental instances and institutions. However, crime prevention not only requires practice if it is to establish and develop.

Crime prevention also requires prevention policy, especially a wide socio-political consensus that crime should be primarily counteracted with preventive strategies and concepts. A consensus that creates the necessary (legal) framework and provides the needed personnel and financial resources.

Crime prevention also urgently needs prevention science as a supplier of the theoretical and empirical foundations, as consultant in the planning, implementation, and spread of preventive programs, and for the verification of projects for their practical suitability and effectiveness.

In crime prevention, practice, policy, and science are the central work areas. For this reason, the 19th German Congress of Crime Prevention has moved its tasks in and for crime prevention into focus with the demand “prevention requires practice, policy, and science”. The Report on the emphasis topic “crime prevention requires prevention practice, prevention policy, and prevention science” poses the following questions for the three areas of work:

- whether and how they have implemented their tasks in and for crime prevention, i.e. how crime prevention has developed in practice, what support it receives from the policy side, and what contributions science has made,
- what challenges had to and have to be overcome considering the individual not always (easily) reconcilable action objectives and action logic in the three areas of work, whether there are indications that they are cooperating in the implementation of their responsibilities for crime prevention and possibly even have profited from each other,

- what conclusions can be drawn and what requirements made in order to further develop, establish, and systematize crime prevention with the three areas of work.

0

Summary and conclusions

In the last quarter century, crime prevention has been established and developed in many ways in Germany.¹ In the meantime, this task has created a new field of action and policy at the level of municipalities, states, and the federation. Crime prevention as the active cooperation of many social forces and disciplines with the goal of preventing crimes requires practice, policy, and science. These are its central areas of work which each must contribute its own performance for crime prevention and should act in relation to each other and in cooperation as much as possible.

Definition and goals of crime prevention

Crime prevention is an alternative, non-punitive response to the challenge of preventing crime as a social phenomenon or as an individual event, reducing it, or minimizing its consequences.

Compared to repression, prevention takes precedence in terms of content and timing: the negative impact of the crime and the victim's suffering are avoided, it is more effective, material and immaterial costs are lower.

Crime prevention also has risky aspects, e.g. due to the tendency to blur the boundaries of crime and prevention terms and forward shift preventive actions.

For this reason, crime prevention should be understood in its narrow sense:

Only those strategies, measures, and projects should be considered crime prevention which have as goal the direct or indirect prevention / reduction of crime and from which one can reasonably expect that they are targeted towards preventing / reducing crime with a reasonable and plausible connection – either on the basis of convincing empirical evidence or based on plausible assumptions.

Generally supportive measures of social or universal prevention are indispensable and the responsibility of many policy areas but must be understood and used as what they are, namely social policy and not crime policy / crime prevention.

Crime prevention specified in this way is a general social responsibility which must be fulfilled and implemented in a networked and interdisciplinary cooperation spanning departments and institutions at several levels: at the local / communal level, state

¹ A decisive date with signal function for the development and implementation of crime prevention even outside of police and justice in the states and municipalities was the year 1990: the foundation of the first crime prevention State Council, the „Council for crime prevention in Schleswig-Holstein“ based on Scandinavian role models.

level, federal level, and the international / global level. It requires specialized knowledge and should be evidence-based.

Central areas of work in the field of action and policy “crime prevention” are thus prevention practice, prevention policy, and prevention science. Areas of work which must each make its own contribution to crime prevention and should act in relation to each other and in cooperation as much as possible.

Prevention practice

With its numerous programs and projects, the organized crime preventing specialized practice of governmental and non-governmental institutions was and is without a doubt the driver of development in the area of crime prevention. The focus of crime prevention programs and projects was and is on the communal / local level. It makes sense to influence and prevent crime and fear of crime in those places where they arise and are enabled.

The most important protagonists of prevention practice are the police, children’s and youth organizations, schools, and – with reservations - penal law and/or the justice system. In the meantime, the police as first responder and probably still most important protagonist of crime prevention sees itself as one protagonist in local problem resolution processes. Children’s and youth organizations hesitated for a long time to deal with delinquency but in the meantime pedagogical crime prevention has established itself. Schools also fulfill their role in the area of crime prevention as part of their information and education responsibilities through a variety of prevention and intervention programs. Crime prevention is also the subject of penal law and the justice system, but their preventive effects are limited to what is possible within the framework of crime repression – and it has been shown that these effects are very small.

The concept of communal crime prevention has had an extremely positive effect on the development of crime prevention. Since the start of the 1990s, cooperation and communication networks have arisen in many German cities and municipalities between communal administration and policy, police, justice, schools, associations, churches, economy, social institutions, children’s and youth organizations, and other protagonists.

Summary and conclusions

Communal crime prevention provides some of the most pressing indicators and evidence to what extent crime prevention requires practice, policy, and science:

It requires practice for “on-site work”. However, practitioners should be specially selected for this task and receive training and education which meets today’s requirements for professionalism and competence. For this, science must develop and provide corresponding training and educational programs.

It requires policy, both on the communal and the state level. Nothing can be achieved without policy support, at least not anything effective and sustainable.

It needs science to provide the theoretical and empirical basis of prevention work, consulting and supervision for the implementation and evaluation of projects, for the development of training and education programs, for the development and maintenance of databases and information systems.

Even though it has been around for a long time and developing continuously, the practice of communal crime prevention still has a lot of potential for optimization. However, since this concept still is “a just plain common sense idea”, everything should be tried to realize this idea for the long term.

Prevention policy

While crime prevention is considered an important goal of criminal policy, the increased orientation of policy towards crime prevention and its sustained development which is demanded by science and practice has not taken place to a sufficient degree. This is at least true for criminal policy at the federal level, i.e. for policy which is responsible for penal law, i.e. repression – and thus really also for prevention, which precedes repression in both time and content. However, at the federal level, crime policy not only sticks with its criminal-law reaction patterns, it has even enhanced them. The trend towards a control-oriented preventive penal law supports the prevention state, into which Germany has been turning for a few years now.

This criminal policy is deaf to theoretical and empirical knowledge which criminology and other scientific disciplines have developed a long time ago and provided to policy makers because this knowledge goes against the trends of criminal policy as it is practiced today. Empirical criminology and other scientific disciplines have never produced as much knowledge as today – and have never had as little influence on criminal policy as today. Even the two *Periodical Security Reports* commissioned by and submitted to the federal government had and have practically no impact on criminal policy in Germany – its political convictions are apparently impervious even to the best knowledge available. We can certainly not speak of evidence-based criminal policy at the federal level.

This is underlined by the fact that, until now, the federal level has not exhibited any will to support crime prevention by installing a “National Center for Crime Prevention” with sufficient organizational, personnel, and financial equipment. The foundation Deutsches Forum für Kriminalprävention [German Forum for Crime Prevention] (DFK) is unable to even begin to meet its goals and core responsibilities and has remained alive only thanks to the commitment of its participants.

While the local / communal levels and the state levels are bound to federal criminal policy in terms of penal law and penal law practice², it still looks better here in terms of policy support for crime prevention. For communal crime prevention this can be seen in the – often applied – demand “prevention is the responsibility of the mayor”. At the state level, this can be seen by the initiation and implementation of prevention-oriented programs and in particular the installation of state prevention councils and comparable commissions which not only have the responsibility consulting for crime prevention policy but also strengthen and support communal crime prevention.

Summary and conclusions

In view of an overall favorable development of crime, the municipalities and states should not ease up on their crime prevention efforts but at least keep them at the same level if not increase them. In this sense, all levels should (again and again) create a wide social consensus in terms of facing crime primarily with preventive strategies and concepts.

At the local level, the concept of communal crime prevention definitely has a future and should be implemented and developed (in an area-covering manner), for instance in the direction of a communal security policy, institutionalized for instance in an “Office for crime prevention”.

Due to the tight budget restrictions in many communities, financial support is urgently needed, also so that the other actors at the communal level can continue their outstanding and indispensable work in crime prevention and possibly even expand it further.

State prevention councils should be installed in all states and suitably equipped with organization, personnel, and finances. The integration of councils into the government and not a ministry should also be studied, as should the creation of an “Office for crime prevention” at the state level. One should strive for the development of crime prevention into a systematic prevention strategy and/or prevention policy.

At the federal level it is urgently necessary to create a “National Center for Crime Prevention” with sufficient organizational, personnel, and financial resources, possibly by expanding the foundation Deutsches Forum für Kriminalprävention (DFK) into such a center and integrating the Kriminologische Zentralstelle [Central Criminological Office] (KrimZ). This center should also not be connected to a ministry but to the Federal Chancellery.

Even if the crime policy impact of the two previous Periodical Security Reports (PSR) were hardly noticeable, the creation of – actually – Periodical Security Reports based on a legal regulation or decision of the German Bundestag is urgently necessary. These reports should be compiled by an interdisciplinary scientific commission on a regular basis, for instance once in every legislative period.

² In the meantime, only the penal system has become the responsibility of the states.

It should be checked at all levels whether 5% of the current expenses for crime response – by police, justice, and penal system – should better be invested into effective crime prevention.

Prevention science

Crime prevention should be based on evidence, i.e. on the basis of theoretical and empirical scientific insights. Prevention practice and prevention policy thus require science and research.

The fact that prevention policy looks different in reality, at least on the federal level, has already been discussed. At the communal and state levels, policy makers appear to be more open to evidence. In the meantime, this is also the case for prevention practice.

This is not lastly due to science having performed numerous “services” for practice and having increasingly and systematically supported prevention practice.

This not only provides prevention practice with the necessary theoretical and empirical scientific insights, but the planning, implementation, and effect of prevention measures and programs (implementation and evaluation) is scientifically monitored and verified. In particular the evaluation of projects has become much more frequent and standard in the meantime and implementation research is gaining in significance.

Evaluation should be a core goal of prevention policy, in particular in form of lasting regulatory impact assessment, evaluation of the usefulness of a law, and monitoring of the parameters originally targeted by the law. Not just in terms of legislative activities but especially also for practical prevention policy up to the level of cities and municipalities.

The time that research takes in general can become a problem. Practice and policy want to – must – act as quickly as possible in order to remedy recognized problems. But science needs time to be able to make well-founded statements about effects or lack thereof. It is likely as difficult in prevention practice as in prevention policy to perform empirical studies and collect data before a prevention measure has started and/or a law passed.

Problems could arise from the current position of criminology as relevant reference science: while Germany has a highly developed theoretical and empirical science of criminology, it is apparently seriously endangered due “structural depletion”. A lot of criminological research takes place outside of the criminology of law schools and is significantly dispersed over various scientific disciplines. However, this also means that criminological questions enjoy widespread scientific interest.

Summary and conclusions

Many scientific disciplines are and have been involved in developing the knowledge about what works and what doesn't, what makes sense for of crime prevention and what doesn't; however, at the center there was always criminology whose existence is at risk at German Universities. Something similar applies to neighboring disciplines.

Since this could have effects on crime prevention, Universities should intensify the instruction in particular in sociological and juristic faculties and bundle, coordinate, and thus promote the diverse criminological activities by developing interdisciplinary Central Criminological Offices.

We welcome the 2012 foundation of the endowment chair "Crime prevention and risk management". In order to give crime prevention the necessary weight in the research spectrum of criminology and other disciplines, it is necessary that this Chair should be financed past 2017 and be made permanent.

But in particular, the close association between criminology and penal law should be dissolved and criminology established as an independent social science. A well-positioned criminology department is a necessary (if not sufficient) prerequisite for the implementation of the requirement for interdisciplinary prevention science.

Crime prevention requires prevention practice, prevention policy, and prevention science

The German Congress of Crime Prevention (DPT) is probably the best example for how far the demand that crime prevention requires prevention practice, prevention policy, and prevention science has already become a reality. This can be seen not only in its development from very humble beginnings – 1995 in Lübeck with 168 registered congress participants and a very manageable program of this "work conference" to the last 18th DPT 2013 in Bielefeld with almost 2,000 congress participants from 17 specified work areas, a comprehensive program (169 speakers for presentations and project spots), informational booths, special exhibits, etc.

The evaluation results (of DPT evaluated since the 13th DPT) find: "Overall, the evaluation results show that the 18th German Congress of Crime Prevention can be considered a successful event. Almost 92% of the surveyed visitors thought that the 18th German Congress of Crime Prevention was very good or good." The German Congress of Crime Prevention has without a question developed into an important forum for the discourse between practice, science, and policy in the field of crime prevention.

In 2013 another field of work started with the "DPT institute for applied prevention research" (dpt-i) in order to strengthen this development and develop it systematically. An important task of this institute could be to develop a systematic strategy for crime prevention to handle their tasks for crime prevention and the demands and challenges

for these areas of work based on the findings on performance and deficits of the areas of prevention practice, prevention policy, and prevention science.

1

Crime prevention

In the last quarter of a century, crime prevention has been developed and established in Germany in many ways: in the meantime, a new field of action and policy has been created at the municipal, state, and federal level. As the active cooperation of many social forces and disciplines with the goal of preventing crime, crime prevention requires practice, policy, and science: these are its central areas of work which must make their own contributions for crime prevention and should act in relation to each other and in cooperation as much as possible.

Prevention practice with its numerous protagonists, the governmental and non-governmental instances and institutions with its many programs and projects, was and is the driving force of the development of crime prevention. However, without the support of the prevention policy, this “engine” may easily run out of steam. Crime prevention needs “fuel”, especially a wide socio-political consensus that crime should be primarily counteracted with preventive strategies and concepts. Such a consensus is the prerequisite for creating the required (legal) framework conditions for prevention practice and providing the necessary personnel and financial resources. Prevention policy will only achieve this (at least in the long term) if prevention practice is evidence-based and has an effect (“success”). That means that crime prevention urgently needs the prevention science as a supplier of the theoretical and empirical foundations, as consultant in the planning, implementation, and spread of preventive programs, and for the verification of projects for their practical suitability and effectiveness.

It would be optimal for crime prevention if its three areas of work would not only provide these contributions but also work together in this process. However, this cooperation is still “in its infancy” (Marks 2014) – and this not lastly because crime prevention has not been systematically planned and implemented at either the communal, state, or federal level in the sense of a prevention strategy or even a prevention policy but has instead more or less “grown organically”.

In addition, the three areas of work each have their own action objectives and action logic which generally makes cooperation difficult. Even within the respective areas of work, the network that overarches cooperation, protagonists, department, and disciplines is not easy to create.

In the following, we will discuss the three areas of work in crime prevention, based on available knowledge

- whether and how they have implemented their tasks in and for crime prevention, i.e. how crime prevention has developed in practice, what support it receives from the politics side, and what contributions science has made,
- what challenges had to and have to be overcome to balance the individual and not always (easily) reconcilable action objectives and action logic, what indications there are of whether and how they have cooperated and profited from each other in the implementation of their responsibilities for crime prevention,
- which conclusions should be drawn and what requirements made in order to further develop and establish crime prevention with and through these three areas of work.

First, however, we specify what understanding of crime prevention this discussion is based on.

1.1

Definition, goals, positive and risky aspects³

Crime prevention includes all governmental and private efforts, programs and measures which use to prevent, reduce, or alleviate the consequences of crime as a social phenomenon or as an individual event.⁴

In general, crime prevention deals with the development / strengthening of protective factors and the elimination / reduction of risk factors.

Crime prevention is an alternative, non-punitive response to the challenge of preventing or at least reducing crime and the fear of crime. Crime prevention is thus not part of the criminal justice system but basically another “pillar” in the area of crime control, next to the pillars police, justice, and penal system. Crime preventive action does not assume already perpetrated crimes but attempts to prevent crimes from happening in the first place (Welsh/Farrington 2012, 128; Waller 2011, 2013).

In terms of perpetrators, situations, and victims, it is still usual to distinguish between primary, secondary, and tertiary crime prevention (PSR 2006, 667 et seq.; Schwind 2013, Section 1 marginal note 42, each with further evidence).

This distinction should be forgone since it leads to misunderstandings which do not help the idea of crime prevention (Steffen 2013 b, pp. 492 et seq.):

³ The following explanations are based on the meaning of crime prevention used in the previous expert opinions for the German Congress of Crime Prevention.

⁴ According to the definition in the „Guidelines for Police Crime Prevention“ 1998 (see Steffen 2013 b, footnote 12).

- This structural model imposes a hierarchy, a valuation of the prevention areas: primary is better than secondary and for tertiary it is already (almost) too late anyway. But in fact, all three areas have their own meaning and content.
- On the other hand, this differentiation leads to the incorrect conclusion that “primary prevention” has something to do with the age of the subjects, that it is crime prevention directed at children and maybe adolescents.⁵ However, this is not at all the case.

More meaningful and clearer is the distinction between universal or social prevention, between selective or situative crime prevention and indicated crime prevention.⁶

Universal or social (“primary”) prevention

targets the general public and/or overall groups with general supportive, non-occasion-related programs and measures without the need for specific risk factors in these groups.

Without the need for “specific suspicions”, consistent social, work, youth, family, economic, education, and cultural policies are supposed to create optimal conditions to prevent deviant behavior and crime in the first place. Universal prevention is the responsibility of many protagonists and institutions, from family and schools all the way to youth support, community, and politics, but less frequently police and justice system.

Due to its very unspecific “universal” orientation, it is debated whether social prevention should even be labeled and understood as *crime prevention* – even if there is no doubt that socialization and education, individual and social life conditions etc. have a significant impact on the development of crime. But it is not possible to find direct connections between such “global framework conditions” and crime.⁷ In order to counteract the risk of blurring crime and prevention terminology and focusing more on preventive action, crime is not the suitable frame of reference for strategies of universal prevention.⁸

⁵ Feltes addresses this (mis)understanding when he describes the withdrawal of the police in North Rhine-Westphalia from primary prevention which occurred because children generally are not the target group of police measures for the prevention of juvenile crime (2012, 36).

⁶ See also Steffen 2011, 102 et seq.; 2013 b, 492 et seq.; Work place 2007; Eisner/Ribeaud/Bittel 2006.

⁷ This „universal orientation“ of primary prevention is also the decisive reason why primary prevention measures are almost inaccessible to targeted impact research despite the fact that they unquestionably have an effect (Bannenber/Rössner 2002, 5).

⁸ Michael Walter summarized this in 2004 in a presentation given at the 26th German Youth Court Day in Leipzig: „The idea of crime prevention may be connected with almost everything and is unbounded in this respect. If one were to look at all of our living conditions, installations, and relationships from a crime prevention perspective this would signify a terrible degree of human impoverishment. Education even in the Kindergarten stage no doubt has preventive components. When viewed like this, almost everything is part of crime prevention.“

The label „crime prevention“ almost always imposes a connotation which suggests that the target group is

Measures of universal prevention, such as the restoration of social justice through the reduction of income, education, and integration disparity with the goal of equal economic, political, social and cultural participation of all population segments are indispensable but must be understood and used as what they are, namely as *social policy* and not as criminal policy and/or crime prevention,⁹ even if they can without a doubt have a crime preventive effect. But this is not their objective, and certainly not their primary objective, and for this reason they should not be instrumentalized for the purpose of crime prevention – especially since this does not live up to the significance of these measures.

Especially since the protection of social state from the different social risks can help counteract (the increase of) crime and fear of crime, especially because crime prevention work can only be successful if it is embedded in a fair social policy – life circumstance policy¹⁰ - one must clearly distinguish between social preventive and crime prevention strategies, programs, and measures, at least as far as this is possible: because there are always overlaps and mix-ups, at least the terminology should be clear.¹¹

Selective or situational (“secondary”) crime prevention,

like universal prevention, it wants to prevent crimes before they happen but has a more specific approach by focusing on risk situations and attempting to influence potentially delinquent persons and criminogenic situations. Selective prevention targets specific sub-groups, individuals, or situations which are characterized by greater exposure to risk factors and thus are subject to increased perpetrator and victimization risk (“persons at risk as perpetrators and victims”) and/or, in situations, are at risk because crime can occur (“opportunities for crime”).

Selective crime prevention directly or indirectly aims at preventing and reducing crime and fear of crime and/or improving the safety situation and feeling of safety.

It tries to remove personal and social deficits as possible causes of crime, reducing opportunities for crime, and increasing the risk of discovery (Steffen 2013 b, 494).

at least potentially prone to criminal behavior. This unavoidably creates a risk of stigmatization (Holthusen/Hoops 2012, 27; Steffen 2006 a, 1151)

⁹ Problematic socio-political developments – key words: preventive government, safety society - which may be associated with blurring the term of prevention, with mixing criminal policy and social policy, were discussed in detail in the Report for the 17th German Congress of Crime Prevention (Steffen 2013 a); see also Chapter 3.1.2 below.

¹⁰ For this reason, too, „an orientation on empirical and/or expert descriptions, analyses, and assessments on the life situations of their target groups has become increasingly important for policy in the last decades“ (Pluto et al. 2014, 7).

¹¹ Kahl (2012, 26) sees things differently, asking that the field of action of crime prevention should not be further narrowed but in fact expanded / liberated and this also in terms of terminology.

The important aspects here are

- help and support for persons in special problematic situations (through help in family and education etc.),
- increasing the effort required to commit a crime and the risk of being caught as well as reducing the benefit of the crime by changing the structure of crime opportunities correspondingly¹², and 3.1.2 below.
- the reduction of crime-promoting situations, also by providing corresponding information and training to potential victims.

Indicated (“tertiary”) prevention

begins after crimes have already been committed. Suitable measures, if necessary special therapy, is supposed to prevent recidivism as effectively as possible; this includes support in finding employment and reintegration of the offenders (PSR 2006, 668).

Indicated prevention also includes programs and measures for situations in which crimes have occurred with greater frequency (“crime hot spots”).

(Governmental) control and intervention measures are supposed to counteract crimes and re-socialize persons with criminal tendencies with the goal of preventing and/or reducing further delinquency and crimes, reducing the crime rate, and reducing the victimization risk of the population (Steffen 2013 b, 495).

Indicated crime prevention also includes help for victims of crimes with the goal of preventing repeated victimization and especially secondary victimization due to reactions of the instances and the social environment.

Positive aspects of crime prevention

Especially the following considerations speak for crime prevention:¹³

- avoiding effects of crime and suffering of victim:
crime prevention is more humane than crime repression. This not only applies to the perpetrator side in terms of punishment but in particular also to the victim side. It makes more sense to prevent crimes from every happening than to have to pursue them subsequently at great expense. In addition to material and physical damage, crimes often lead to severe psychological consequences for the victims. No matter how successful criminal prosecution is, it cannot repair or even reverse damage already done.

¹² Heinz 1998, 31 et seq.: „Secondary prevention through changes to the structures of crime opportunities ... is the method of choice under the consideration of proportionality.“

¹³ DVJJ 2007, 5; see also Waller 2011, 2013 and Heinz 1998, 18 et seq., 2005, 9.

- Greater effectiveness:
Crime prevention-oriented action can reduce potential conflicts and opportunities for crime, reduce fears, improve communication, defuse disintegrating situations. Criminal prosecution always comes too late: individual and social problems which are expressed by crimes have already occurred. In addition, the criminal justice repertoire has only very limited crime-reducing effects.
- Lower cost:
Where crime prevention is effective, it usually also pays in terms of the personnel and financial resources that are used. Investment in effective prevention means fewer victims, fewer damage, lower costs for tax payers, and the reduction of the work load for police, justice, and penal system.

Risky aspects of crime prevention

However, crime prevention also has risky aspects. Crime prevention has an effect¹⁴ – and thus may also have risks and side-effects. It is not automatically good for the mere reason that it wants to prevent bad things from happening (see Steffen 2012 a, 108 et seq.):

- Prevention is based on the assumption that it is able to recognize risks and preempt them through action in the present. However, the future depends on many things, knowledge is still somewhat uncertain, and prevention in this sense *action based on suspicion*. This carries the risk the present is restricted for fear that things may develop in the worst possible manner (Ohder 2010, 16).
- Crime prevention tends to *blur the terms of crime and prevention and to shift the preventive action forward*: in case of failure prevention was simply too late, one should have acted earlier and possibly more intensely (Holthusen et. al. 2011, 23).
- There is the danger that the idea of prevention could be used as *blank check to legitimize* just about any measure as long as it is labeled “prevention” (11th Children’s and Youth Report 2002, 243).
- Just like repressive measures, preventive measures are always *interventions*, can have a stigmatizing effect, and must therefore meet certain requirements and a verification for negative side-effects and consequences (Ohder 2010, 17).
- When completely normal projects, like youth work, are performed with the goal of “crime prevention” – even if only to get financing for them - then not only

¹⁴ In the words of the State Councilman for Crime Prevention Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania (LfK): „Prevention works – provided that certain conditions are met. This includes e.g. its overall social approach, its factuality, and its sustainability. Both long-term practical experience and scientific studies show that ... prevention work has a decisive impact on the actual and the subjectively perceived development of crime ... In the last 17 years, Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania has become noticeably safer and prevention work has made a significant contribution to this.“ (impulse. Business report of LfK 2010/2011, 5).

can civilian situations be reinterpreted into criminal situations and a whole generation, namely the young adults, be stigmatized as (potentially) “criminal” or “violent”,¹⁵ but the *social policy itself* may also become “*criminalized*”, i.e. social policy issues be processed like crime policy issues (Steffen 2012 a, 100 et seq.).

- Crime prevention may promote a “*safety hysteria*”: crime prevention provides a further perspective on crime in addition to repression and this may overemphasize the problem and lead to “safety hysteria” (Ostendorf 2005; see also Sessar 2011).
- Crime prevention is based on the *logic of suspicion* – this contradicts the presumption of innocence and is deficit- and not resource-oriented from a pedagogical perspective. In addition, this logic of suspicion again presents the significant risk of stigmatizing persons (Holthusen et.al. 2011, 24).
- Crime prevention has its place where something is supposed to be prevented which would have a certain likelihood of occurring without corresponding measures and which would be connected with significant damage. Crime prevention should be viewed with skepticism in terms of *processes and developments to be created where not the failure to prevent but a lack of suitable support could lead to a negative outcome* (Ohder 2010). The use of the term prevention in itself imbues the affected persons with the connotation of a possible negative development. It would be better to use the terms “support” or “aid”, in particular if these concepts – corresponding to the tendency for shifting actions ahead – are used very early on (Holthusen et. al. 2011, 23).

Prevention is an operation fraught with assumptions and ambivalence (Holthusen et. al. 2011, 25). For this reason, one should definitely take precautions against the trend for blurring and shifting of preventive action and understand crime prevention in a narrow sense:

Only those strategies, measures, and projects should be considered as crime preventive that directly or indirectly prevent / reduce crime and from which one can reasonably expect that they are targeted towards preventing / reducing crime with a reasonable and plausible connection – either on the basis of convincing empirical evidence or based on plausible assumptions.¹⁶

This requirement for “tightening” the prevention idea is rarely met by universal crime prevention, but is generally met by selective and indicated crime prevention.

¹⁵ A good example for this are the numerous projects and programs established in the meantime for supporting life and behavior skills which are forced on entire school classes under the label „preventing violence“ - thus being placed under the suspicion of having criminal or violent tendencies, completely independently of their actual conduct.

¹⁶ This definition corresponds to the definition used in the work place 2007, 17 et seq. and in the previous Reports for the German Congress of Crime Prevention.

Apart from that, one should avoid taking over standardized programs without verifying their necessity and suitability first. Rather, crime prevention programs, projects, and measures should take into account the local, social, and cultural conditions and contexts of crime, be based on a thorough analysis of problems and causes on site, be implemented carefully, and of course be evaluated for their effectiveness. All this should happen in close cooperation of the areas of work of practice and science, supported by politics.

1.2

Development of crime prevention: the origin of a new field of action and policy

“Crime prevention as the sum of precautions and measures used to prevent the occurrence of crime and to prevent recidivism in case a crime does occur has a long tradition as idea and commitment, but only a short history as practical reality ... Until recently, the significance of crime prevention has always been emphasized for criminal policy and practice, but the specific implementation has been somewhat neglected” (PSR 2001, 470 and 455).

“When looking ... at the development of the current ‘landscape’ of prevention of delinquency and crime, including the prevention and/or at least effective reduction of all kinds of risks which may contribute to deviant behavior, then one can fix the targeted discussions and plans for the ‘start’ of current crime prevention movement that slowly spread all over Germany to the period between 1970 and 1980.” (Kerner 2012, 38).¹⁷

However, a clear “prevention pioneering spirit” only arose in the 1990s:¹⁸ the first state prevention councils in Germany are founded – Schleswig- Holstein (1990), Hesse (1992), Lower Saxony (1995); already in 1988 the first permanent work group for interdisciplinary prevention efforts had convened in the City of Neumünster, named “Council for crime prevention” since 1992 – the beginning of communal crime prevention as a (new) general social responsibility; in 1995, the Federal Ministry for Justice created the first expert department “Prevention” in a Ministry in Germany and the

¹⁷ Kerner mainly lists the different activities of the police, such as police programs for drug prevention, the special volume of the BKA research series from 1986 „Systematic crime prevention – with practical examples“ or the BKA Annual Conference 1987 on the general topic „Crime prevention as a general social responsibility.“ Already in 1975, the BKA held its annual conference on the topic of „Police and prevention“.

Since 1970, all federal states have participated in the „Criminal police prevention program (KPVP)“; in 1972, a decision of the permanent Konferenz der Innenminister und –senatoren der Länder (IMK) [Conference of Interior Ministers and Senators of the States] installed a project management for the KPVP, also in order to place it on a firm financial basis. The PSR 2001, 458 et seq. explains in this connection: „The newer German discussion about crime prevention was started in a work meeting of the Federal Office of Criminal Investigation in November 1975. Event though not much happened in practice afterwards in terms of institutions and organization, a statement was made to turn the motto ‚crime prevention is the noblest task of the police‘ (which until then was really not more than a platitude) into a factually changed reality of police work for the long term“.

¹⁸ See Marks 2013, 129.

Bundeskriminalamt (BKA) [Federal Office of Criminal Investigation] starts with the “Infopool Prevention”, a collection of recommended projects from the area of crime prevention; in 1997, the Deutsches Jugendinstitut [German Youth Institute] installs the still existing Office for Children’s and Juvenile Crime Prevention and the police restructures its prevention-related commission work: the Kriminalpolizeilichen Vorbeugungsprogramm (KPVP) [Criminal Police Prevention Program] becomes today’s Programm Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention (ProPK) [Program for Police Crime Prevention]; in 1995, the first German Congress of Crime Prevention is convened, in 1999, the legally independent “Association of Shareholders of the German Congress of Crime Prevention” is founded; in 2001, the foundation Deutsches Forum für Kriminalprävention (DFK) [German Forum for Crime Prevention] is founded.

In the meantime, crime prevention as a new field of action and policy (Kahl 2013, 39) has formed as the active cooperation of many social forces from practice, policy, and science with the goal of preventing crime.¹⁹ “Crime prevention develops strategies to keep the crime load as low as possible. Its significance and value for criminal policy and practice are undisputed in the meantime” (PSR 2006, 665).

Today it is not disputed that “crime prevention attacks long before penal legislation, penal law, (police-based) criminal prosecution, criminal justice, sentencing, and implementation (enforcement and execution with alternatives) and/or goes far beyond them” (PSR 2001, 456). “In terms of criminal policy, the guiding principle ‘pre-
cedence of prevention over repression’ is therefore not disputed” (Heinz 1998, 18).

Also undisputed, if by no means completely implemented everywhere, is the following understanding of crime prevention:

- crime prevention is considered as a **general social responsibility** which involves not only police and justice but (see above) many social forces from practice, policy, and science.²⁰

This is because the causes of crime cannot be remedied merely by means of police and penal law. This can already be seen in the variety of these causes but also from the experiences made with the limited effect of penal law measures on behavior and behavioral changes,²¹ as well as the theoretical considerations and practical insights into the causes of fear of crime: A majority of the factors recognized and shown to be causes of the occurrence of crime and fear of crime, cannot be influenced at all by the means of penal law or at best to a very (too) limited degree. Here, – and not only

¹⁹ According to the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony.

²⁰ „Preventive behavior modification is not particular to penal law, but a common characteristic of all social norm systems and institutions that aim at socialization“ (Kunz 2011 Section 24 marginal note 3). See also the brochure of the DVJJ 2007 „Together with distributed roles“.

²¹ Since criminal prosecution always comes too late, see above.

here – prevention is clearly superior to repression, comes first, and has precedence in terms of content (Heinz 1998, 19 et seq.; Steffen 2013 b, 487).²²

- Crime prevention is a task that must be performed and implemented at **several levels**: at the local / communal level, state level, federal level, and the international / global level.

According to the principle of subsidiarity,²³ crime prevention should primarily be the responsibility of citizens, then of public collectives such as municipalities, cities, and districts, and only then of states and federation (Marks 2014).

- The understanding of crime prevention as a general social responsibility leads to the conclusion that it should be performed in a **networked cooperation involving institutions and protagonists**. This is not only true for communication and cooperation networks at the communal level but for instance also for state prevention councils.²⁴
- Crime prevention requires **specialized knowledge**: the demands on those who (are supposed to) implement crime prevention programs and measures to practice have increased. This also in view of the fact that crime prevention meanwhile has become a “market” which is also subject to economic interests. This is not only true for the manufacturers and retailers of preventive safety technology but also for providers of behavior-oriented prevention programs and concepts:

Many of these programs cost money, e.g. for training operators (“trainer”) and/or for materials. The local prevention protagonists must be capable of assessing the “value” of these programs for the goals and intended targets of their prevention enterprises.²⁵

In the meantime, the training is not only “protagonist-internally” but trans-regional training possibilities are also offered – and used! - for instance the “Beccaria qualification program crime prevention” of the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony since 2008 or the Master’s program “Preventive social work with emphasis on criminology & crime prevention” at the Ostfalia University for Applied Sciences in Wolfenbüttel since the winter semester 2011 (see Chap. 4.3).

²² See also Heinz 1998, 17 et seq.

²³ According to the principle of subsidiarity, tasks, actions, and solutions should be performed as far as possible by small units in a self-directed and responsible manner. Only when this is not possible, should successively larger groups, public collectives, or higher levels of an organization support and take over the responsibilities and actions in a subsidiary fashion (Marks 2014)

²⁴ For instance, the State Prevention Council (SPC) Lower Saxony comprises of the following members: communal prevention commissions; statewide active NGOs; ministries, state representatives, and subordinate agencies; scientific institutions.

²⁵ Supported not only by a corresponding qualification but also by databases such as the „Green List for Prevention“.

- Crime prevention should be **evidence-based**: i.e. based on theoretical and empirical scientific insights, as well as in terms of the assessment of its planning, implementation, and effectiveness (implementation and evaluation).²⁶ This not only makes demands on the “acquisition readiness” of the practical side but also the “provision performance” of science.

1.3

Summary and conclusions

Crime prevention has been developed and established in many ways in Germany in the last 25 years: in the meantime, a new field of action and policy has arisen which needs practice, politics and science and creates (new) challenges for them.

Large parts of this development occurred somewhat unplanned and accidental. One essential reason for this is that the cooperation between the three areas of work in crime prevention – practice, politics and science – occurred (if at all) also somewhat unplanned and accidental and was by no means developed systematically.

However, crime prevention requires a structured and intensive cooperation in its three areas of work. Which challenges arise and what demands must be imposed will be discussed in the following using the findings concerning the actual status in practice, politics and science.

2

Prevention practice

2.1

Development and status

With its numerous programs and projects, the organized crime preventing specialized practice of governmental and non-governmental institutions was and is without a doubt the driver of development in the area of crime prevention – also towards more cooperation, networking, and professionalism.

Crime prevention was initiated and developed by the practical side before policy and science also started participating.

²⁶ Already in 2006, the 2nd PSR considers the necessity to focus more on an important basic aspect in the development of crime prevention in Germany, i.e. the evaluation of crime preventive initiatives and programs in view of their actual impact, to be mostly accepted in the meantime (2006, 670, 676). Newer research shows that prevention programs should focus especially on systematic implementation (Foundation German forum for crime prevention 2013 b, 32). The „Beccaria quality initiative“ of the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony includes not only the Beccaria qualification program but also the Beccaria standards, requirements and stipulations for the quality of planning, implementation and evaluation of crime prevention programs and projects (www.beccaria.de; Marks 2014).

2.1.1

Dominance of communal / local level

The focus of crime prevention programs and projects was and is on the communal / local level. Its dominance not only fulfills the principle of subsidiarity (see footnote 23) but also derives from the insight that crime in all its forms is basically a local phenomenon: many of the socio-cultural, scientific, and infrastructure factors relevant to the criminal act are clearly local. About 70% of the offenses registered by the police are perpetrated in the local residential community of the perpetrators and/or victims, i.e. where the perpetrators are socialized and the victims (unintentionally) co-create opportunities for crime. Social control also has clearly local relations – notwithstanding the nationalization of the communal police departments that already occurred years ago and an already trans-regionally unified (federal) justice system (Steffen 2006 a, 1145; PSR 2006, 670). Children’s and youth organizations are communal responsibilities anyway; the same is true for many school systems.²⁷

Apart from that, the story is not only about crime but also about the fear of crime, not just safety but also the feeling of safety – and this is affected mainly by local conditions, in particular those in the close surroundings: “In the meantime, in Germany empirical research on situations and behaviors in public that trigger fear of crime has also repeatedly confirmed the finding that citizens attach their worries to signs of disorder, decay, and neglect (partially focused on space, partly on buildings, partly on groups of persons). This finding is very important to the future design of practical crime prevention which takes the concerns and needs of citizens seriously” (PSR 2001, 461).²⁸

It thus makes sense to influence and prevent crime and fear of crime in the place in which it arises and is enabled and to do so with joint responsibility of citizens of the respective community and their communal and governmental institutions, in an interdisciplinary and institutionalized form (Steffen 2013 b, 488).

2.1.2

Protagonists of crime prevention: police, children’s and youth organizations, schools, penal law, and criminal justice

Many protagonists and institutions are committed to the field of crime prevention, which becomes clear in the composition of the crime prevention commissions. The most important ones, like e.g. children’s and youth organizations, which themselves represent several governmental and non-governmental organizations are probably those described in the following.

²⁷ PSR 2001, 470: „The weight of local initiatives is appropriate to the problem if large portions of crime which citizens encounter in their everyday life occur in the immediate vicinity of perpetrators and victims.“

²⁸ For fear of crime, its triggers, and its extent see also the explanations in the Report for the 17th DPT 2012, Steffen 2012 a, 97 et seq.).

2.1.2.1

The Police

The first – and probably still the most important – protagonists of crime prevention are the police:²⁹ Since the “defense against dangers to life, limb, health and property of the people ... which according to the current general constitutional view is the core responsibility of the government ... it is to a certain extent in the nature of the thing that the police participated in the more recent developments (crime prevention) the quickest and most visible to the outside in various ways. The police was also exposed to corresponding pressure from expectations of the population, being basically the only guarantor of internal security and thus for measures for crime prevention” (PSR 2001, 459).³⁰

This “pressure of expectations” was intensified by practical and theoretical insights on the adverse effects on the feeling of safety of the population and the practical policing and criminal policy reactions to them. In Germany, the “alternative approaches in terms of formal and informal social control from the USA” (PSR 2001, 460) were being discussed since roughly the start of the 1990s, in connection with demands for a “police force that is close to its citizens and commonwealth-oriented”,³¹ which works “closely together with other institutions, associations, and individual citizens (or groups) in order to create effective crime prevention together and maintain it long term” (PSR 2001, 460).

In November 1997, the *Police crime prevention commission for states and federation (KPK)*³² developed the template “Communal safety and order partnership – the adaptation of community policing for Germany”. The commission feels that such “commu-

²⁹ „The high significance of crime prevention in the spectrum of police responsibilities is not only the result of the outstanding importance of protection from crime for the population, but also of the insight that it makes more sense not to let crimes arise in the first place than to have to prosecute them later at great cost. In addition to material and physical damage, crimes often lead to severe psychological consequences for the victims. Criminal prosecution, no matter how successful, cannot make up for this“ (Guidelines Police Crime Prevention 1998).

³⁰ However, this position of the police also results in a very specific problem: its responsibility for both prevention and repression definitely makes the cooperation with other protagonists of crime prevention more difficult, for instance with social work. See e.g. DVJJ 2007, 16 et seq.

³¹ This being the – most common - German term for the concept of „community policing“. This concept is by no means just an „import“ of foreign ideas and procedures but also the „revival“ of a traditional principle of German police work that has often fallen into disrepute: ensuring safety and order. Its core elements include the consequent inclusion of citizen interests in short, medium, and long-term police plans and current policing actions; the expectation of citizens and in particular their feeling of safety become the focus of police work (Steffen 2006 b, 120 et seq.). More details on „police work in Germany that is close to its citizens and commonwealth-oriented“ Steffen 1995; Steffen 2002 and Steffen 2006 b.

³² This commission is made up of one representative each of the respective centers for crime prevention in the 16 state police agencies, the Federal Office of Criminal Investigation, the German University for Police, and the Federal Police. It is responsible for all police-relevant topics and responsibilities in the area of crime prevention which requires coordination between the police departments of the states and in the federation.

nal safety and order partnerships” could integrate the many individual developments towards police work that is close to citizens into a targeted overall concept (Steffen 2006 b, 119 et seq.).

In February 1998, the Permanent conference of interior ministers and senators (IMK) passed the concept “Partnership for more safety in our cities and communities”. Among other things, the security work is supposed to orient itself more on the specific needs of citizens and support the installation of communal prevention councils and security partnerships.

In October 1998, the AK II (Work group interior security of the IMK) approved the “*Guidelines for police crime prevention*” which have applied since then in unchanged form and have also entered into the Polizeidienstvorschrift [Police Service Regulations] (PDV) 100 which is the basis for the police’s perception of responsibilities. The text states among other things: “A sustainable strategy of crime prevention must take into account the variety of causes. This requires an overarching, integrated overall concept. Crime prevention is thus a general social responsibility for which not only the police but also in particular policy, other governmental and non-governmental agencies, the economy, the media, and the population themselves bear responsibility and to which they must make their own specific contributions ... At the communal level, crime prevention can be performed especially effectively with targeted project work since crime occurs and is experienced mainly locally. For this, all locally relevant prevention carriers ... should be included. One goal is to network the respective projects and measures and increasingly institutionalize citizen participation. The institution of communal prevention councils and/or security and order partnerships can contribute to this.”

This development shows especially one thing: The police no longer sees itself as “basically the only guarantor of internal security and thus for measures for crime prevention” because police (and penal law) measures alone do not suffice to reduce or even prevent crime and fear of crime effectively. The understanding of crime prevention as social, especially local, responsibility also changes the self-understanding of the police: the police as protagonist in local problem solution processes gives up its professional security monopoly (Steffen 2006 b, 122).

Ziercke 1997 comments: In the development process of communal crime prevention, the police will continue to play an important role. But it must redefine the limits of police-based prevention. “It must say goodbye to a self-understanding that overloads the police. It is not the police who stand at the center of crime prevention but the institutions and involved citizens at the communal level. Police crime prevention must consciously network, coordinate, and partner with other departments at the communal level ...” (1998, 283).

While this appears to have somewhat succeeded at the communal level³³, there is obviously still clear need for action at the state and especially at the federal level. In 2011 the Commission for Police Crime Prevention (see footnote 32) comments in a statement on the “Conditions for successful police crime prevention”: “The Police Crime Prevention of the States and the Federation will ... tackle general social fields of action and prevention topics ... The police is unable to perform such comprehensive prevention work alone, both legally or in actuality... Prevention themes that are interdisciplinary or even lie outside of the scope of police responsibility must preferentially strive for cooperation with the originally responsible prevention protagonists. They should take on their role in the general social prevention work independently and if necessary only with the participation (of the police).”³⁴

The development of police crime prevention towards more cooperation becomes clear, but also towards the integration of crime prevention knowledge that was generated through interdisciplinary work to that of the Police Crime Prevention of the States and the Federation (ProPK), the “pivot” of federation-wide prevention work.³⁵ For more than 40 years, this program has been pursuing the goal of educating population, multipliers, media, and other prevention carriers concerning manifestations of crime and possibilities to prevent it. Among other things, this happens through crime prevention-related press releases and PR work and the development and publication of media, measures, and concepts which support local police departments in their prevention work (www.polizei-beratung.de).

It was a long road until police crime prevention could be anchored as systematically as in the 1997 program Police Crime Prevention,³⁶ but also until the police no longer saw

³³ In this vein, the state prevention councils of Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, Lower Saxony, and Schleswig-Holstein commented in their joint „advertising brochure“ for the installation of communal prevention councils on the topic of how a communal prevention council should be structured to be functional: „You can’t do it without the police – the police is able to bring so much technical competence and personnel support (prevention consultants) to the local prevention work. It is best able to assess actual local crime levels and suggest effective prevention proposals. Police officers should be part of any prevention council. However, the police can only be **one** driver in communal crime prevention.“

³⁴ For this reason, the Police Crime Prevention of the States and the Federation has always promoted the installation of a National Commission for Crime Prevention and consequently also always supported the Foundation German Forum for Crime Prevention (DFK) (see Chap. 3.2.3).

³⁵ See the program Police Crime Prevention (publ.)(2013): Commission for Police Crime Prevention of the States and the Federation. Annual Report 2012. Stuttgart.
The ProPK also clarifies the high level of networking of the police in federation and the states. The Department of the Interior is the only department that has an identified „prevention thread“ with the Police Crime Prevention of the States and the Federation.

³⁶ The first consulting offices for protection against break-ins and theft were already established in 1921 in Berlin in addition to a whole series of other communal and regional prevention activities. The idea of education in prevention only became really methodical in 1964 with the work of the Bavarian Criminal Agency. Other federal states then also picked up this idea and the Criminal Police Prevention Program (KPVP) was instituted, the predecessor of today’s ProPK. After 1970 all federal states were represented in it. The slogan „Advice from the criminal police“ became a program for decades.
Over time the responsibilities increased; a financing agreement between the states and the federation

and understood itself as “lone fighter” in matters of prevention and instead viewed and took advantage of cooperation as a success factor in police crime prevention:

Since many crime prevention services can only be understood and approached on an interdisciplinary basis, experts and cooperation partners from other disciplines and areas have become an indispensable and integral part of the prevention work of the program.³⁷ The successfully tested cooperation forms include: subject-related cooperation, technical exchanges, cooperation in the area of PR, technical assessment and expertise of police prevention enterprises, cooperation at the local level (Jerke 2013)

2.1.2.2

Children’s and youth organizations³⁸

Another central protagonist in the field of action of crime prevention are the children’s and youth organizations whose contributions have become significantly more important over the last few years and decades: On the one hand, the prevention of crime in childhood and youth form a central area of crime prevention and the public debate concerning children’s and youth delinquency was “sometimes quite fierce” in the 1990s (PSR 2001, 466).³⁹ On the other hand, the insight has established itself in the institutions that strategies should be mainly pedagogical for the prevention of children’s and juvenile crime.

“Children and juveniles at risk of being picked up for illegal activities or who have already been picked up should be prevented from possible future crimes using educational means” (Holthusen/Hoops 2012, 23).

placed the KPVP – and today the ProPK - on a secure financial basis. In 1997, the KPVP was changed from the ground up and anchored as ProPK in its current organizational structure. Since then, the Central Office coordinates all federation-wide activities of police crime prevention within the police and in cooperation with non-police prevention carriers (Source: see footnote 35).

³⁷ The cooperation partners listed in the „Annual Report 2012“ (see above footnote 36) over five pages are not only impressive in terms of numbers but also in terms of the expertise represented in its institutions.

³⁸ The children’s and youth organizations has communal responsibility and is responsible for all children and juveniles, in particular also those who are impeded in their development or grow up in conditions that are not very supportive. The design and selection of services are negotiated by local public and free carriers of youth support in consideration of the subsidiarity principle. This leads to a large, sometimes very large variety of offered services, also for the area of crime prevention (Holthusen/Hoops 2012, 25).

³⁹ The 11th Children’s and Youth Report (2002), Chapter B. X is dedicated to the topic „Public attention: delinquency – violence – right-wing extremism“ and makes the following introductory observation: „The public discussion, especially in media and politics, concerning children and juveniles in the last few years was strongly defined by the focus on the topics of delinquency, violence, and right-wing extremism and the question how to react to this ... the focus of the public attention on the problematic behaviors and attitudes of children and juveniles has not infrequently led to the living situations and problems of the noticed children and juveniles being lost out of sight... On the other hand there is the risk that an undifferentiated image of violent and/or right-wing youth is assumed, which does not correspond to the reality of life for the majority of young people“ (2002, 231 et seq.).

This educational orientation applies to all protagonists of the children's and juvenile crime prevention up to penal law for minors (Section 2 para 1 JGG), but especially to children's and youth aid organizations which are in charge of supporting children and juveniles in their development to an independent and socialized personality, protecting them from dangers to their wellbeing, and contributing to positive living conditions (Section 1 SGB VIII).

Prevention is considered one of the structural principles of children's and youth organizations since children's and youth aid groups don't merely react to impairments and damage that have already occurred but are intent on deflecting risks and dangers early on (Holthusen/Schäfer 2007, 134 et seq.; Holthusen/Hoops 2012, 25).⁴⁰

In accordance with the task and the resulting perspective of children's and youth organizations, delinquency is understood in dependence on the living situations and problems of the children and juveniles and the embedded age-typical challenges (11th Children's and Youth Report 2002, 231). Delinquency is a risk to the wellbeing of children and juveniles and thus a challenge for children's and youth organizations, for "growing up in public responsibility".

However, the 11th Children's and Youth Report in 2002 still refers to a "blind spot in the expert discussion of children's and youth organizations": within the children's and youth organizations, "the discussion concerning the treatment of delinquency is not very well developed". Delinquency of children and juveniles is not only a problem for police, justice, and interior policy; it is also a "pedagogical problem that cannot be solved by turning the perpetrators into victims of their circumstances. One has to remember that delinquency of children and juveniles provokes pedagogical responses that have more to do with education, social control, intervention, boundaries, and norm clarification ... Not to refuse crime prevention is the response of children's and youth organizations, but to search for factually solid descriptions of the problems and proportional responses at all levels ... in the debate with all involved parties in the interest of children and juveniles" (2002, 238 et seq.).

However, at the same time, the report also warns of the "absolutely problematic far-reaching expectations of children's and youth organizations in terms of their crime prevention function and responsibility." Even the "careless talk of primary crime prevention as responsibility of children's and youth organizations all too easily leads to children and juveniles being viewed as possible perpetrators ... However, such a general suspicion cannot be justified empirically and contradicts all principles of pedagogical practice which is not based on a deficit diagnosis – no matter how uncertain and extended into the future – but begins with the resources, interest, and living conditions

⁴⁰ See generally the contribution by Holthusen/Schäfer 2007 for strategies in the prevention of violence in children's and youth organizations.

... for the sake of supposedly effective prevention children's and youth organizations cannot give up the one tenet which is of central significance even in penal law until proven otherwise: the presumption of innocence. Whosoever exposes their target group to the general suspicion that they could commit crimes at some point and lays out his actions accordingly suspends the general presumption of innocence." When assuming a public responsibility for raising children and juveniles, "young people may not be subjected to a generalized suspicion of deficit. Rather, the focus should lie on supporting and promoting them in the form of structural measures."

In the area of primary crime prevention, children's and youth organizations could ideally make contributions. Children's and youth organizations faced challenges more in the area of secondary and tertiary prevention, but here, too, it should not rely solely on "public problem definitions but is asked to recognize risk potential based on their own factually justified criteria and to become active accordingly."

Children's and youth organizations have provided these responses in the meantime:⁴¹ "Pedagogical crime prevention has established itself in the last two decades – especially in project-like organizational forms but also in regular practices."⁴² Many approaches and concepts have arisen during this process. "Challenges lie in ensuring the structure of the services on a permanent basis and also expanding it to full coverage so that depending on local need, the necessary approaches are available as regular services ... Central challenges can be found especially in the expansion of target-group-specific approaches ... We also detect a significant need in terms of (potential) victims."

There are also structural challenges in terms of cooperation. In particular for regular services, the continued development of the cooperation is a central wish. "The co-operation of children's and youth organizations, schools, police, justice, and possibly further protagonists is ... required not only on a case-related basis but also structurally – in consideration and acknowledgment of the respective different action logics and social duties."

From a specialized policy perspective, the in some respect unconsidered, almost inflationary use of the term prevention is worrisome. Another specialized policy challenge lies in the validation of the effectiveness of pedagogical prevention strategies. On particular, the hardly formalized pedagogical practice settings of youth aid pose as yet unsolved problems for the evaluation practice.

In the interest of the affected children and juveniles, children's and youth organizations in crime prevention are challenged always to reinject the pedagogical perspec-

⁴¹ See Holthusen/Hoops 2012, 26 et seq.

⁴² The regular services of children's and youth organizations include for instance the general social services, juvenile aid in criminal proceedings / juvenile legal support agency, the juvenile penal system, and probation service (Holthusen/Hoops 2012, 24).

tive into the expert discourse so that it does not lose weight compared to security policy considerations. In their everyday cooperation and communication with the other institutions, children's and youth organizations must follow "their professional, pedagogical standards which go far beyond the defense against danger and prevention / reduction of delinquency. This is exactly what makes children's and youth organizations a special protagonist with emphasized importance compared to the other institutions of crime prevention."

The Office for Children's and Juvenile Crime Prevention at the Deutsches Jugendinstitut [German Youth Institute] (DJI) has a significant share in establishing children's and youth organizations as protagonists in crime prevention. Since 1997, the Office which is supported by the Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women, and Youth (BMFSFJ) has been accompanying the developments in the area of crime prevention and informs practice, policy, media, and research about concepts and action strategies of the Office for Children's and Juvenile Crime Prevention.

With their own evaluation studies and empirical research projects, the Office establishes itself as a new project type of the DJI, in which continuous counseling of policy and specialized practice are joined with science (Holthusen/Glaser 2013).⁴³

2.1.2.3

Schools

The demand of the institution school to participate in the fight against violence and violent tendencies among children and juveniles is nothing new.⁴⁴ In particular in the first half of the 1990s there was a virtual "boom" in research and prevention on the topic of "violence at school" which, however, already clearly lost steam in the second half. In the meantime the discussion has become more factual, but flames up again once in a while, especially when there are incidents of spectacular violence (e.g. "running amok") at schools (Steffen 2012 b, 83 et seq.; Hanke 2007, 104).

This factualization has also been aided by the fact that the responsibility and significance of schools for crime prevention is not primarily due to there being lots of crime at schools, in particular violent crime. On the contrary: in contrast to the public perception caused by corresponding media reports of an "increase in violence at schools", all empirical evidence shows that there was no general increase in (physical)

⁴³ When at the end of the 1990s „juvenile right-wing extremism“ came into the sights of politics, at first the Office for Children's and Juvenile Crime Prevention was supposed to deal with this topic, as well. However, since the phenomena „delinquency in childhood and adolescence“ and „right-wing extremism and xenophobia“ apart from small overlaps are very different in terms of how they arise, spread, and their social treatment (see also 11th Children's and Youth Report), a second Office for „right-wing extremism and xenophobia – juvenile policy and pedagogical challenges“ also supported by the BMFSFJ will be created in 2000 in the DJI branch Halle (Saale) (Holthusen/Glaser 2013, 71 et seq.).

⁴⁴ See also Schubarth 2010, 9 et seq., 57 et seq., on extent, manifestations, and causes of „violence and mobbing at schools“ and the possibilities for prevention and intervention.

violence and/or increasing brutalization in the last few years. In fact, the incident numbers appear to be decreasing instead – and this despite an increased awareness of school violence and an increased readiness to report such incidents (Steffen 2012 a, 85): “Criminal behavior occurs relatively rarely in this area of life” (Melzer 2013).⁴⁵

Crime prevention at schools is thus mainly directed towards (violent) crime on and by young people in general and by no means only at offenses that actually occur in the “crime scene school”:

Students should be reached via schools, teachers, and legal guardians with measures and concepts of crime prevention.⁴⁶

The responsibility and significance of the schools very fundamentally arise from their educational mission and also from the fact that the majority of strategies of crime prevention developed over the last few years can be identified as pedagogical strategies. This orientation not only considers the fact that crime prevention for children and juveniles deals with adolescents, but also that the widely held conviction that deviance in childhood and adolescence can be treated preferentially with education, learning, and acquisition of competence. This means that especially persons with pedagogical training are needed to take on their responsibilities in crime prevention (as well) (Steffen 2008, 259; Office 2007, 281). And you can find these people not only in children’s and youth aid but also in schools.

On the other hand, the significance of schools for crime prevention also comes from the fact that schools are the place at which the main target group of crime prevention, i.e. children and juveniles, can be found reliably and where they can also be generally reached for preventive measures and programs (Steffen 2012 b, 86).

For this reason other protagonists of crime prevention were - and are - preventively active at schools.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ For instance, the data of the HBSC studies „Health Behavior in School-aged Children“ 2002, 2006, and 2010 – one of the few longitudinal studies – indicate a clearly positive trend for mobbing and violence at schools in Germany. From 2002 to 2010 the share of perpetrators and perpetrator-victims decreases substantially and the share of persons not involved increases. There is a time delay for children with lower family wealth (Melzer et al. 2012, 76). Fuchs et al. had already found in chronological analyses from 1994 over 1999 to 2004 that the incidence of violence at schools was generally decreasing. According to Schubarth (2010, 59) the share for „perpetrators“ and for „victims“ is ca. 5%; the great majority of students appear neither as „perpetrators“ nor as „victims“.

⁴⁶ See also the decision of Ministry of Culture conference (KMK) at their 298. plenary session on May 23/24, 2002 in Eisenach „Support schools – strengthen education – expand violence prevention“ (www.kmk.org; press release 2002).

⁴⁷ We would like to mention in particular the police which was committed in schools beyond traffic education, initially especially with programs for drug prevention. However, here they were often the only protagonists who were given the responsibility according to the slogan: the policeman was here and gave a presentation, so we don’t need to do anything else. This has thoroughly changed in the meantime: the police participates in crime prevention classes or corresponding actions only upon request of the schools and in close cooperation with the teachers. In addition, the promotion of positive social behavior cannot be

Schools should also – according to *Schubarth* (2010, 14) – “not feel shy in accepting the cooperation services of other institutions which also carry responsibility for the development of children and juveniles and to do so in time and not only when the child ‘has already turned the wrong way’. There are good beginnings of cooperation e.g. with youth aid, police, or in the communal context.”⁴⁸

In the meantime a large number of school programs for prevention and intervention were developed and used: violence-specific and non-specific programs, programs for all students, and programs for students of various age groups, programs for noticed students, programs for teachers and for parents.⁴⁹ “The services include a confusing number of prevention and intervention programs. Scientists, journalists, publishers, clubs, and foundations appear as providers; not rarely, economic interests are connected with this. The respective interests and responsibilities or costs that arise with use, e.g. purchase of materials or training for protagonists, should be considered during the selection process. But the final deciding factor should be whether the available program is suitable for the specific situation at the respective schools” (Melzer et. al. 2011, 201).

Since the target group of students “have generally not (yet) been noticed for criminal activities” (see above), the “responsibilities of prevention ... are mainly at a universal level” (Melzer 2013). Thus, the warning that the 11th Children’s and Youth Report issued for children’s and youth organizations in terms of the effects of “careless talk of primary crime prevention as responsibility of children’s and youth organizations” (see above) also applies to schools. Here, too, only measures and programs of selective and indicated prevention should be described as crime prevention and used correspondingly. “General supportive measures” such as the promotion of social or communicative competence, moral development, handling of media etc. are no doubt important and sensible, but should not be referred to as crime prevention measures (see above).

achieved by one-time (police) activities but only by sustained and especially by occasion-related action. The police cannot do this and is also not responsible for this (Steffen/Hepp 2007, 185).

Another protagonist is school social work which offers young people social / pedagogical help as part of youth aid which supports their school and professional training, integration into the work world, and their social integration (SGB VIII Section 13 para 1). While school social work has been practiced for more than 30 years, there are only few empirical studies on the effectiveness of this measure; the question of the impact of school social work on violence in schools has also only been treated marginally (Hermann/Jantzer 2012, 207).

⁴⁸ After all, the core business of schools remains education, not social work or therapy, though many schools perform great social-educational work, not in addition to class but especially in class. The social learning processes of students should be appreciated as much as the results in the different subjects. Both are inseparable since education and upbringing form a dialectic unit.

⁴⁹ See overview and descriptions in Melzer et al. 2011, 201 et seq.; Schubarth 2010.

The continuing education of teachers currently forms the „central strategy of the protagonists“ to strengthen violence prevention at schools on the different levels of action. The large number of education offers also indicates a lack of fundamental qualification of teachers for everyday school life. Continuing education attempts to make up for things that were not sufficiently considered in the primary education. „In addition to methodical skills for the implementation of prevention of violence projects, teachers require basic qualifications which allow them, in addition to their education mission, to meet their no less important upbringing mission“ (Hanke 2007, 125).

Possibly more important than programs and measures directed at students, teachers, and parents are measures that are directed at the institution of schools itself. A specific approach for crime prevention at schools results from the determination according to which socially problematic behaviors are partly caused by the internal design of the schools and their pedagogical orientation. One can state that such behaviors do not simply ‘flow into schools’ from the outside but are partly caused by the internal design of the schools and their pedagogical orientation. “One can deduce from this finding that the development and improvement of various aspects of school culture can make a sensible contribution to the prevention of violence... (there) has to be a two-fold strategy .. which is directed at optimizing school and teaching culture, improving class climate, and thus also student sensitivities” (Melzer 2013).

Following and realizing this “two-fold strategy” still appears to be a (not yet mastered) challenge for schools as protagonist in crime prevention.⁵⁰

2.1.2.4

Penal law and criminal justice

Crime prevention is always a subject of penal law. Still, according to PSR 2006, it is still not self-evident in Germany that penal prevention should be treated in connection with crime prevention. “Penal law is often equated with repression and thus differentiated from prevention. However, this polarization of prevention and repression is a thing of the past, at the latest since penal law has also committed to the goal of prevention. Juvenile penal law focuses on prevention from the start;⁵¹ at the latest since the penal law reform in 1969, general penal law is no longer merely obligated to compensating guilt, the punishment of injustice, but also serves for the preventive protection of legal rights” (PSR 2006, 684).⁵²

However, the preventive effects of penal law are limited. This can already be seen in the understanding of crime prevention on which this Report is based, namely as an alternative, non-punitive response to the challenge of preventing crime (see above). Under the aspect of this understanding of crime prevention, penal law and criminal

⁵⁰ Already in 1990, the final Report of the Commission on Violence found: „Effective prevention must address the design of the institution school itself and its embedding in the social environment since schools play an important role in causing school violence.“ The path to a violence-free school culture goes over three intermediate goals: student and teacher responsibility for their school must be strengthened; frustration which schools generate in their students as part of its social selection function must be reduced through targeted support in case of performance deficits; schools must remember their education mission, the upbringing aspect and conveying social norms must become more prominent again compared to the transfer of knowledge, teachers must be better prepared in their training for their formative role (Schwind/Baumann (publ.) 1990, 150 et seq.).
See also Uhle 2012 for significance of school development for prevention of violence.

⁵¹ See also contributions on juvenile criminal law and juvenile penal system in Office 2007.

⁵² For justification of penal law from and according to its social utility and prevention as description of striving for socially useful effects of penal law see also Kunz 2011, Section 24 marginal note 1.

justice could not have been counted among the protagonists of crime prevention. That this is nonetheless the case is not lastly due to how limited in particular the deterrent and resocializing effects ascribed to penal law are – and how little sense a criminal policy thus makes which is especially focused on punishment for preventing or at least reducing crime (see chap. 3.1).

However, the limited effects also come from the generally repressive character of penal law. Actual crime prevention aims at removing personal and social deficits as possible causes of crime and/or creating protective factors and thus signals endangered persons (but also those who have already become perpetrators and victims) that society is taking care of them, that it has not given up on them or excluded them, but that they are part of it, are integrated and included and/or that everything is being done to achieve this. In contrast, penal law is by necessity repressive and its measures generally work to exclude (Steffen 2011, 105).

Positive preventive effects can therefore “only be achieved within the framework of what is possible with repression. In this respect, positive effects are mere side-effects of the *per se* negative threat and practice of sanctions primarily aimed at deterrence. The basically repressive orientation of penal law permits the promotion of socially constructive concerns only to the extent to which the repression purpose which is included in the medium of punishment is not undermined” (Kunz 2011, Section 24 marginal note 5).

The prevention effects intended for penal law can be distinguished by whether they are directed at the general public or the persons recorded by penal law and whether they pursue positive or negative purposes (Kunz 2011, Section 24 marginal note 3):

- In the area of *universal* (primary) crime prevention, penal law has the goal of positive general prevention and/or norm clarification: criminal prosecution and sanctions are intended to confirm (clarify) penal law norms in the population and reinforce the legal compliance of the population (PSR 2006, 685).
- *Selective* (secondary) crime prevention pursues the goal of negative general prevention: potential perpetrators are supposed to be deterred from committing crimes by the threat of punishment, criminal prosecution, punishment, enforcement, and penal system – in brief: the fear of punishment.

However, “negative and positive general prevention cannot be cleanly separated because the trust in the ability of legal order to enforce its goals partly depends on the deterrent effect of penal law” (Kunz 2011, Section 25 marginal note 1).

- Addressees of *indicated* (tertiary) crime prevention are those who have already committed offenses. Penal law uses positive special prevention (“rehabilitation”) and/or negative special prevention (deterrence of individual, securing the perpetrator) to minimize or completely preclude the recidivism probability of the perpetrator.

Whether and to what extent penal law has the postulated general and/or special preventive effects is hotly disputed and only partly verified by empirical studies.⁵³ The prevention effects claimed by penal law can generally be verified empirically since these are postulated effects which may or may not occur (Kunz 2011, Section 24 marginal note 2).⁵⁴

In terms of the general preventive effect assumptions, empirical verification is limited by at least two problems: “On the one hand, measurable effects are always triggered by compound effects of different moral-forming norm systems and socialization instances, so that the general preventive effects specifically of penal law cannot be tested in isolation.

Penal law forms a sub-section of social control whose general preventive effect can only be studied in toto” (Kunz 2011, Section 25 marginal note 4).⁵⁵

On the other hand, all available empirical studies on this topic refer to societies in which there are penal law and penal law sanctions. “A comparative system verification of the general preventive superiority of a society with penal law compared to one without penal law is thus not possible” (Kunz 2011, Section 25 marginal note 5).⁵⁶

In terms of the expected effect “special prevention” - mostly defined as legal probation⁵⁷ - the problem for special preventive effect research under methodical aspects, as for all evaluation research, also lies in empirically proving that the measured success, non-recidivism, is actually an effect of the sanction.

Despite these methodical difficulties, success evaluation is urgently necessary for both penal law practice⁵⁸ and criminal policy (see chap. 3). This includes not only general and special preventive effect research, but for instance also population surveys concerning the wish for sanctions. However, today’s “secure knowledge based

⁵³ See for basics Schöch 1985 and the first results of the meta analysis of empirical deterrence studies by Dölling et al. 2006.

⁵⁴ Anders Sessar (2011), for whom the dogma of penal law general prevention is not intended to be empirical but normative and thus defies factual study.

⁵⁵ „This means that - at least at the moment - there is no empirical evidence for assuming a ‚moral forming force‘ of penal law“ (PSR 2006, 686).

⁵⁶ In this context, the PSR (2006, 686) points out the „variety of individual examples“ which „shows that brief and/or temporary collapses of penal law sanctions led to an enormous increase in crime.“

⁵⁷ But legal probation, i.e. the absence of new penal law registrations within a certain period of observation, is a problematic criterion since it usually only refers to official figures and does not study the reasons for success or failure (PSR 2006, 686; Kunz 2011, Section 26 marginal note 2 et seq.).

⁵⁸ As Kunz aptly explains: „Penal law practitioners assume the basic preventive utility of penal law... However, it is a professional distortion to conclude from the need of healing an illness that the currently available medicine is suitable. The duty of the penal law practice to apply legally available sanctions is not a sufficient argument for the preventive suitability of the sanctions. It does not harm the ethos of medicine to test the applied medication critically for its therapeutic effects, to study harmful side effects, and develop new treatments“ (2011, Section 25 marginal note 18).

on research” already contradicts the expectations and approaches of penal law policy and criminal justice.

For instance, the deterrent effect (negative general prevention) of threat, imposition, or enforcement of penalties is somewhat low; the idea of deterrence is not supported empirically. There is also no indication to believe that tightening penal law would have a positive effect on norm awareness.⁵⁹ Nonetheless, it is important for maintaining public trust in the government and thus preserving the government monopoly of violence that the government reacts appropriately to the violation of legal rights, i.e. to crime (PSR 2006, 665 et seq.).

Clear disapproval of the offense by society makes the greatest contribution to people acting in compliance with the law. The population expects a sign of discreditation of the committed violation of law and thus a confirmation of the validity claim of the values expressed in the penal norm.

Usually, not the formal punishment is expected, but a symbolic disapproval of the deed, accompanied by restitutive measures to restore the legal order (Kunz 2011, Section 25 marginal note 6 and 12).

In terms of possible special preventive effects of punishment one can first note that there were no comprehensive newer secondary analyses of effect research on punishment and measures of improvement and assurance of general penal law ... therefore in general a conclusion already made in 1981 remains valid: “According to today’s state of international research, there is no empirical basis for the expectation that tightening threatened or performed punishments can influence crime rates (PSR 2006, 688 et seq.).⁶⁰

However, these findings are contradicted by the activities of the legislation in the direction of punishment by enhancing the threatened sanctions (raising of maximum and minimum sentences, expansion of securing measures), the expansion of the penal scope (making more acts illegal), and reduction of the legal position of a defendant in the penal process (Kunz 2013 b, 113).⁶¹ For this reason the implementation of the

⁵⁹ Any punishment which clarifies the norm violation and does not trivialize it is suitable to meet the general preventive responsibility of penal law (Schöch 1985, 1104) and Schöch 1995, 82: „There is .. such a thing as the general preventive power of our penal laws ... But it is a valuable commodity which we should use sparingly. We must beware of wasting this valuable resource through an overkill of punishment.“

⁶⁰ Also Kunz (2011, Section 26 marginal note 23 et seq.): „Under a careful interpretation, the available findings overall argue that a reduction of recidivism probability cannot be expected from harsher sanctions, in particular unsuspended prison sentences. This supports the assumption of a general exchangeability of sanctions without special losses in preventive effect.“

⁶¹ According to Kunz, the German Criminal Code (without ancillary laws) was changed about one hundred times since 1990. A trend towards a control-oriented prevention penal law can be noticed which refers to any danger to society, intervenes in a precautionary manner, and uses quasi secret service evidence (2013 b, 121; see chap. 3.1.1).

call for a penal law policy and practice guided by scientifically tested information represents one of the greatest challenges for the “prevention protagonists” penal law and criminal justice.

2.2

Communal crime prevention

Communal crime prevention was largely responsible for the “prevention spirit of departure” in the 1990s: Since the beginning of the 1990s, “under the banner of ‘communal crime prevention’, new communication and cooperation networks arose in almost all German cities between police, communal administration and policy, justice, economy, social services, free carriers, and other protagonists in order to prevent everyday crime and ensure public order in inner city areas which wanted to assume their share of responsibility for ensuring internal security and removing the causes of crime. At the moment there are ca. 1650 federation-wide prevention commissions ... i.e. associations at the communal level which attempt to bring all decision makers to the table and bundle activities” (PSR 2001, 462).⁶² Due to the “dynamics of the development”, the 2nd PSR assumes that “at the moment there are probably about 2,000 prevention projects” (2006, 672).⁶³

The development of communal crime prevention in Germany reads – read? – like a success story (Steffen 2004, 2005) – and indeed, communal crime prevention is, as Heinz explained at the 9th German Congress of Crime Prevention in Stuttgart⁶⁴, “from a criminological and scientific perspective ... an idea that is just plain common sense. The insight into the limited effectiveness of repressive strategies and the precedence of prevention over repression appears to have established itself in the local work.”⁶⁵

However, Heinz continues: “Of course, deficits cannot be overlooked. The available information about who does what where with what objectives and carriers is spotty ...

⁶² The 1st PSR comments on the reasons for the installation of communal commissions: „The possibilities and competences to influence the specific creation factors (of crime) are thus mainly found at the local level. For this reason crime prevention can only be successful if it is understood as general social responsibility and in particular includes local initiatives in addition to police action“ (PSR 2001, 460; see also above 2.1.1).

However, Kunz considers the culture of fear and discrediting experts to be the drivers of communal crime prevention as general social responsibility. This is „not directly about crime prevention and dealing with fears triggered by crime, but about achieving these concerns by means of (the detour of) a redesign of the living conditions in communities and regions oriented towards the goal of crime prevention“ (2011, Section 31 marginal note 10).

⁶³ Schreiber counts 960 (2007). See also Steffen 2009, 55.

⁶⁴ This DPT had the main topic „Communal crime prevention“; see Bannenberg et al. 2005.

⁶⁵ As background of the new concept for creating security and order in cities, Frevel (2012, 215) lists: changed crime situations and order problems, changed demands and evaluations of the feeling of security of the population, modified self-understanding of the institutions involved in producing security, and new concepts of government involvement and administration as expressed in the terms ‚citizen community‘, ‚citizen-oriented police work‘, and ‚activating government‘. See also Steffen 2005 and the contributions on the cover topic „Urban security – social city“ in the Forum Crime Prevention 4/2013.

The required fundamental discussion concerning goals, means, and especially limits of (not only communal) crime prevention and concerning the relationship of crime prevention to social policy is still in its infancy. Documentation of the experiences – positive and negative – are the exception, program or results evaluation mainly remain a demand” (2005, 9).

The need has been recognized to “coordinate the activities of the various public instances which are directly or indirectly involved in crime prevention in its widest sense, to utilize synergy effects, and prevent parallel work”. However, the “gap between demands and reality could not be bigger.”

One of the criticisms is that communal crime prevention is too police-oriented, mainly focused on agencies and institutions, and cooperation and a sense of community of citizens are not promoted enough.

At the same time there is the risk, in particular at time of tight budgets, of “criminalizing social policy”: The magic word “prevention” appears to open doors and – especially – budgets, the relationship between general social policy and special criminal policy becomes questionable and uncertain; as a consequence this also affects the determination of what is a crime prevention project as opposed to a general social policy measure, e.g. youth support.

And finally: how do we know that we not only want to do the right thing but are also actually doing the right thing if systematic effect research that satisfies methodical standards is the exception? (Heinz 2005, 22 et seq.).

What results do we find ten years later - also in terms of the claim of the commissions Communal Crime Prevention of realizing a “three pillar approach”: local orientation, interdisciplinary networking, citizen participation (Steffen 2005, 157)⁶⁶

- The “mood of departure” of the 1990s seems to have disappeared. At least in the last few years there have been hardly any new foundations and several of the “old” commissions no longer exist. However: there is no recent overview⁶⁷ of number, composition, goals, or projects of communal commissions. This is in part because there is no uniform prevention idea or a clear, binding recording criteria – commission does not equal commission – or even continuous documentation.
- But one can assume that only a few commissions do justice to the variety of criminogenic genesis conditions and the development of corresponding preventive measures also by joining the greatest possible number of relevant carriers

⁶⁶ Kober/Kahl (2012, 12) mention these fundamental structural principles: interdisciplinary cooperation approach, citizen participation / public, „mayoral duties“.

⁶⁷ Recently Schreiber 2007 did this work.

of formal and informal control – and that the coordination and networking is successful (Kober/ Kahl 2012, 13 et seq.)

- Only very few commissions have managed to realize the claim to *citizen participation* and integrate “normal” citizens without “official office” and function – i.e. “function-less” citizens. However, citizen participation is actually considered to be the “new thing”, the identifying characteristic of the commissions, also because it corresponds to the principles of citizen community and citizen society: citizens should have a direct influence (crime prevention) on matters that affect them directly (in this case crime). However, in reality there have been only a few exceptional cases in which the claim was realized turning citizens from affected persons into protagonists for crime control, to make their participation in and their responsibility for the state of security of their community possible and enforce it (Steffen 2009, 54 et seq.).

One of the few newer studies on the internal design of the commissions⁶⁸ comes up with the following results:

- The degree of institutionalization of crime prevention commissions varies greatly and the composition of protagonists is very heterogeneous. The founding protagonists determined the joint work with their specific perspectives and interpretations of the problem and looked for suitable colleagues.
- The commissions lived from the commitment of its members; in most of these cooperations this commitment level is very high. But: the more the commissions were dominated by the committed individuals, the more devastating would be the effect of that person leaving. Such an exit would endanger the commission-internal cooperation and could possibly end the entire cooperation.
- The majority of the commission members can be classified as case workers. This means that the commissions have lots of technical competence but little decision-making competence.
- We can note various knowledge and qualification deficits, in particular in basic prevention training.
- There are clear deficits in PR work even though this is a stated goal of the commissions. Reaching the citizenry and wide-spread education about the topic are therefore difficult.
- The commissions generally did not perform scientifically well-founded evaluations but acted on unsystematically processed feedback and subjective impressions.

⁶⁸ During the project „Cooperative security policy in cities – KoSiPol“, supported from 2010 to 2012 by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research, empirical case studies on crime preventive cooperations were conducted in 16 German communities in four fields of action: domestic violence, juveniles as perpetrators and victims, drugs and addiction, and policing presence; see Frevel (publ.) 2012; Frevel/Miesner 2012; van den Brink 2012; John/Schulze 2012.

- The citizen perspective remains an outsider; the problem perception and processing of crime is done almost exclusively from the protagonist perspective.

Conclusion of study:

In connection with the concept of voluntary cooperation, the equality of partners, and the goal of consensus this leads to a cooperation which in many cases remains at the phenomenon level but does not answer basic questions about the problem, the cooperation, and the goals. On top of this, the actually existing and rather well developed systematics of crime prevention is rarely absorbed and exemplary approaches are not systematically used.

“Despite its many years of existence and continuous development the practice of cooperative security policy offers still a lot of potential for optimization” (Frevel/Miesner 2012, 219). But: this concept of cooperative local security policy has prospects. In the words of the scientists involved in KoSiPol (Frevel 2012, 39): They are convinced “that

- this form is sensible,
- it has to be qualitatively developed,
- existing weaknesses in the organization and process design of commissions can be overcome,
- the protagonists must be recruited in a targeted manner and qualified for the cooperation,
- a development of the concept is necessary,
- the information exchange between the commissions has been rudimentary up to now and should be supported, e.g. by state prevention councils or the Foundation German Forum for Crime Prevention”.⁶⁹

Communal crime prevention in Germany thus faces a few challenges if it is actually – successfully, effectively and sustainably – to be realized.

However, since it is still an “idea of just plain common sense” and the cooperation of the security and order agencies, social services of communities and free carriers, health services, and many other institutions is considered a form of complexity management which one can no longer do without (Frevel/Kober 2012, 337), every attempt should be made to realize this idea in a sustainable manner, for instance by implementing the following five (most important) structural principles:⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Especially since the „Infopool prevention“ of the Federal Office of Criminal Investigation and the „Information system for prevention on the net – PräViS“ developed with the guidance of the German Forum for Crime Prevention have both ended their services.

⁷⁰ See also the very instructive „Guideline for communal practice“ by Kober/Kahl 2012: Impulses for communal prevention management. Insights and recommendations on organization and work of crime preven-

1st structural principle: inter-departmental networking

The interdisciplinary approach, the appearance of several institutions and groups as initiators and responsible carriers, and the networking of their activities are decisive and characteristic for the commissions of communal crime prevention. Along the many factors influencing crime and crime prevention make communal crime prevention a cross-sectional responsibility, requiring a wide spectrum of professional experts to manage.

Members of a crime prevention commission should thus be representatives of city administration, communal offices, police and justice, and of socially active civil institutions of the community, from economy, media etc.

The specific responsibility of these representatives in the commission is to recognize the existing fields of activity in their crime prevention significance and to make the existing resources more efficient and effective through networking. This means that there are no new responsibilities that the protagonists will face but “only” new interpretations of existing responsibilities – but this is actually often a lot more difficult than it sounds or than the protagonists expected.

In addition, due to the very different logic of action and independence of the involved protagonists, networking represents a challenge that should not be underestimated.

For this reason it should always be checked whether and to what extent the networking and interdisciplinary work actually succeeds. A proven approach is the institution of a work group of the commission which is only responsible for performing and verifying the task “interdisciplinary networking”.

2nd structural principle: citizen participation – creating public relations through citizen participation

Prevention at the communal level requires citizen involvement – otherwise it runs the risk of giving up what actually triggered it: the idea of creating an environment worth living in together in a community (Kober/Kahl 2012, 26).

As a role model this idea is mainly uncontroversial, however, as we have shown, in practical commission work it can be implemented only in exceptions: up to now only a few commissions have managed to integrate “normal” citizens without “official” office and function, i.e. “function-free citizens”.⁷¹

Disregarding for a moment the question whether “function-free” citizens would have any interest in working in the commissions, i.e. whether one could even find enough citizens, it contradicts the organization and working methods of commissions to integ-

tion commissions at the communal level“ and the results and conclusions in Frevel (Publ.) 2012.

⁷¹ For „ambivalences connected to the integration of citizens“ see also Kober/Kahl 2012, 16 et seq.

rate function-free citizens – even if they are not very formalized as usual in communal crime prevention.

Commissions can only work in a meaningful manner if its members are responsible to another governmental or non-governmental institution, i.e. if they are members of such an institution and are sent to the commission in order to represent the insights and interests of their institution. In return, these representatives should then carry the content and results of the consulting and project work of the commission back to their institutions and implement them in order to act as multipliers of institutionalized crime prevention for the “function-free” citizens – e.g. its association members. However, this still happens too rarely, too accidental, not systematic enough.

Beyond this, cooperation is possible and sensible for “function-free” citizens who are nonetheless willing to commit to crime prevention on the local (community or neighborhood) level for projects and measures that are specific, occasion-based, and directly affect them. Based on the needs and the high competence of the citizens for matters which affect their immediate environment, they may participate in specific, short-term, action-oriented measures which go beyond crime prevention and might follow communal strategies especially in “neighborhoods with special need for renewal” – read: social hot spots – (see also Frevel et al. 2009 and Kahl/Kober 2009).

3rd structural principle: local problem analysis

A necessary, indispensable condition for a successful prevention strategy – including and especially at the communal level – is the most comprehensive possible inventory analysis of local framework conditions.

Ideal would be a criminological regional analysis which not only draws the “crime map” of a community but also its “social map”.

Only based on such a – solid – basis of data and insights a “communal prevention strategy can be developed, which can be used to recognize need for action and cover it effectively by networking existing or creating needed resources” (Kober/Kahl 2012, 34).

4th structural principle: verification of success of implemented measures

Based on the results of the local problem analysis, a plan should be created which is oriented on verifiable criteria and fixed in writing and contains the measures to be used to resolve the problem.

In addition, the implementation of this plan should be monitored and checked, also in terms of efficiency, i.e. a so-called process evaluation should be performed (“are we achieving that which we had intended?”)

Finally, it would be ideal to evaluate the results for effectiveness, the effectiveness of the measures and programs in terms of the degree of achieving objectives, any negative side-effects (e.g. displacement effects), and in terms of the sustainability of the achieved effects.

5th structural principle: prevention is a top management affair

The management of the crime prevention commission by the mayor of the community and the participation of high-ranking representatives of the communal offices and the community/city council underline the status of the commission and make the implementation of recommendations and decisions easier.

The principle of “top management affair” also includes that the commission has a legally defined and secured status, is clearly legitimized – e.g. by the community/city council, has clear competences, precise and goal-oriented contents, and has sufficient financial and personnel resources, e.g. in an office.

“Prevention is a top management affair” especially means that this commission would be doomed to failure without communal policy support and legitimation. According to *Frevel/Kober*, there is almost no legal doubt that commissions are entitled to act cooperatively in security policy. Police and communal administration worked on the basis of democratically founded responsibilities and are subject to political control. But such a constellation is still not uncontroversial if there is no accountability to communal commissions, i.e. city councils or district councils: “If ... the commissions act in a field of security and order that is so important to communal politics, it appears problematic to exclude the participation of politics” (2012, 344).

Communal crime prevention must become part of the community development policy and further developed in the direction of a communal security policy, designed as a communal cross-sectional responsibility, and democratically legitimized, with clear political goals and networked, interdisciplinary, and integrative procedures (Steffen 2005, 166). The proposal by *Waller* should be studied to institute an Office for Crime Prevention also at the local level and to spend 5% of “law and order” expenditures on prevention, another 2% for training and data systems which are needed to maintain this reform (2011, 235 et seq.).

2.3

Summary and conclusions

Communal crime prevention provides some of the most pressing indicators and evidence to what extent crime prevention requires practice, policy, and science:

- It requires practice for “on-site work”. However, practitioners should be specially selected for this task and receive training and education which meets today’s requirements for professionalism and competence – for this, science must develop and provide corresponding training and educational programs.

- It requires policy, both on the communal and the state level. Nothing can be achieved without policy support, at least nothing effective and sustainable.
- It needs science to provide the theoretical and empirical basis of prevention work, consulting and supervision for the implementation and evaluation of projects, for the development of training and continuing education programs, for the development and maintenance of databases and information systems.

3

Prevention policy

3.1

Crime prevention as goal of criminal policy

“Criminal policy means the totality of all governmental and non-governmental measures intended to protect society and individual citizens by means of prevention and fighting against crime” (Schwind 2013, Section 1 marginal note 37).⁷² The corresponding activities refer not only to the purely repressive areas such as administration of justice and penal system but especially – interdisciplinary - to the use of non-penal law preventive measures which the serve crime-relevant protection of society (Schwind 2013, Section 1 marginal note 33 et seq.).

Crime prevention as prevention of and protection against crimes has “always counted - in a general sense - ... as an important goal of legal policy, in particular criminal policy.” But this does not mean “that theory and practice have always tried to direct laws, measures, institutions, and organizational precautions specifically to prevention ... Instead, things generally remained with very general considerations and confessions of convictions” (PSR 2001, 455 et seq.).

Heinz therefore believes that a “course correction of criminal policy is overdue. A stronger alignment with and a sustained development of crime prevention is necessary. A criminal policy which merely uses penal law means according to the motto ‘more of the same’ is a ‘recipe for disaster’. The question can therefore no longer be whether there will be a course correction. In view of the precedence of prevention over and its superiority to repression, there is no lack of insight, just a problem with implementation” (1998, 17).

This begs for the follow-up question whether this course correction has happened over the last few years: has the conviction also taken hold in criminal policy in the meantime that crime should be countered especially with prevention concepts – meaning concepts of a non-punitive nature? I.e. the conviction which is mostly undisputed in practice, as described above, with the exception of the protagonists of penal law and criminal justice.

⁷² There is no uniform definition of what criminal policy is supposed to mean but in the meantime this wider sense of crime prevention has come to dominate (Kriminologie-Lexikon ONLINE [Dictionary of criminology], Article on „Criminal policy“).

Has criminal policy at the different levels - local/communal, state, and federal - managed to create a wide social consensus to the effect that crime should be primarily encountered with preventive strategies and concepts, has it created the necessary legal framework conditions for this and provided the necessary resources?

And does criminal policy also understand crime prevention the same way as practice does or does it look at it mainly repressive; are we talking about prevention through repression, not just averting danger but more about taking precautions against danger; under the aspect of fighting risks, does a suspicion-free prevention as governmental means of control outrank the previous suspicion-dependent prevention (Sessar 2011) – is criminal policy on the way to a security society and prevention state?

Is criminal policy rational, can it be legitimized by social ethics and is it oriented on the results of scientific research – or is it rather emotional or even populist, can it be (increasingly) manipulated by media and opinion polls?⁷³

3.1.1

Criminal policy: scientifically founded or “flying blind”?⁷⁴

To start with the last question: a rational criminal and penal law policy is not possible without a solid empirical foundation, so Heinz (2006, 241). Schwind quotes the “old master of criminological thinking”, Franz von Liszt (1841-1919) who emphasized that the “fight against crime presupposes the knowledge of crime”, a sentence which refers primarily to prevention measures (2013, Section 1 marginal note 40) and again Liszt, every criminal policy-maker remains a “dilettante if he lacks a firm scientific foundation which he can only gain from the most minute and exhaustive knowledge of the facts.”⁷⁵

The federal government – i.e. the criminal policy – shares this view, at least in its statement for the 1st PSR: “There must be a sufficient level of insight into extent, structure, and development of crime on the one hand and into criminal prosecution, enforcement, and penal system on the other hand in order to be able to successfully design criminal and penal law policy measures and verify its impacts” (2001, 599).⁷⁶

This (theoretical and empirical) knowledge “of crime, crimes, perpetrators, victims, and the different governmental and private, informal and formal reaction and preven-

⁷³ See also Schwind 2013, Section 1 marginal note 33 et seq.

⁷⁴ „Criminal policy flying blind“ was the title of a conference at the Friedrich-Ebert Foundation on May 7, 2012 in Berlin and thus employed a „popular saying“ by Wolfgang Heinz (see also Hilgendorf/ Rengier 2012, 7).

⁷⁵ Quote from Schwind/Steinilper 2014, 593.

⁷⁶ With the publication of the 1st PSR, the federal government had „started down a path in official crime reporting which was equally new and promising for both the representation and assessment of internal security as well as the crime policy discussion“ (Heinz 2003).

tion forms” was developed a long time ago by criminology as the relevant reference science⁷⁷ but also by other scientific disciplines and provided to criminal, social, and communal policy. The Freiburg Memorandum “On the situation of criminology in Germany” states:⁷⁸ “Empirical knowledge has become indispensable for crime prevention, criminal prosecution, enforcement, and penal system together with all associated measures of assessment, therapy, and rehabilitation, in order to continually improve the protection of citizens with rational means and their trust in the function of the penal law.

This includes identifying limits beyond which this functionality becomes questionable. The legislation of the federation and the states in their different forms may utilize the existing findings of these criminological sciences to develop modern criminal and social policy.”

But do they do that? According to the Freiburg Memorandum, this knowledge “is also used when they want to ensure a sufficient scientific justification and evaluation of their respective responsibilities”.⁷⁹ Kunz on the other hand laments the “deafness of official criminal policy to empirical findings”, results from empirical criminological research stood “in opposition to the trends of criminal policy practiced today. The recommendations to be derived from the research for a ‘rational’ policy are hardly followed in reality. On the contrary, the impression is growing that official criminal policy is deaf to ‘evidence-based’ statements concerning great risks of error in individual prognoses, the risk of overestimating criminal danger, the doubts concerning the effect of general deterrence, the fact that harder sanctions are not preferable in terms of special prevention, and the generally somewhat de-socializing effect of prison sentences⁸⁰ and instead follows the overly dramatic crime campaigns by mass

⁷⁷ As social-scientific integration science, criminology combines approaches from e.g. psychiatry, neurobiology, psychology, and social pedagogics, jurisprudence, sociology, political science, economy, and historical science (Freiburg Memorandum 2012).

⁷⁸ The „Freiburg Memorandum“ is the result of a conference in June 2012, with 60 participating scientists engaged in teaching or research of criminology and related disciplines.

⁷⁹ However, since the „Freiburg Memorandum“ wants to draw attention to the „decreasing significance of criminology, in particular at German Universities“ and „advertises“ for an improvement of this situation, maybe this willingness of policy to acknowledge criminological findings and implement them into political actions is viewed in a too positive light.

⁸⁰ This is already stated in the insights of the 2nd PSR: „Contrary to a wide-spread belief, the current state of criminological research considers the deterrent effect (negative general prevention) of threat, sentence, or enforcement of penalties to be rather small. In the area of minor to moderate crime it is generally true that the amount and severity of the punishment have no measurable significance. Only the perceived risk of discovery is somewhat relevant – however only for a series of minor offenses. Until now, there is also no indication to believe that harsher penal law would have a positive effect on norm awareness ... In terms of the special preventive effect of penalties, there is no empirical evidence that – for comparable offense and perpetrator groups – the recidivism rate after a conviction is lower than after a suspension of the proceedings (diversion). If differences were observed - in comparable groups - the recidivism rates were lower after diversion. There is no evidence for negative effects of diversion compared to formal sanctions. In the area of minor to moderate crime, different sanctions do not have a differentiating effect on legal probation; indeed, the sanctions can mostly be exchanged with no measurable impact on recidivism rates.

media and many politicians which call for harder punishments... It is simply absurd that empirical criminology has never before had as much knowledge at its disposal as today and that it has less influence on criminal policy than ever” (2011, Section 30 marginal note 23).

The question also recently posed by Heinz “What should legislators want to know?”⁸¹ gives more cause to suspect a “criminal policy flying blind” than a “rational criminal policy”.⁸²

3.1.2

Criminal policy: on the way to a preventive state?

There is certainly no sign of any “overdue course correction of criminal policy” (see above) as already demanded by Heinz in 1998. Criminal policy continues to use penal law means according to the motto “more of the same”. And this is meant literally: not only is criminal policy sticking to its penal law reaction patterns, it is actually making them more severe: “In the areas of non-domestic violence and sexual delinquency, ‘criminal liability gaps’ are being filled quickly and completely and corrections are made according to the motto “more of the same”. The German Criminal Code (without ancillary laws) was changed about one hundred times since 1990... In the heat of a public influenced by the mass media, sexual delinquency has finally become the driver of criminal policy (Kunz 2013 b, 121).⁸³

If there is a trend, then it is that the recidivism rate for comparable offenses and perpetrator groups is higher after harsher sanctions. In particular, until today there is no group of criminal perpetrators for which there is empirical evidence – in special preventive terms – of a superiority of juvenile detention or (unconditional) juvenile penalties compared to an ambulant reaction“ (2006, 665 et seq.).

See also the recently published findings of the recidivism study „Legal probation after penal law sanctions 2007 to 2010 and 2004 to 2010“ (www.bmj.de/DE/Ministerium/Strafrecht/Kriminologie/Kriminalpraevention/_doc/Rueckfallstatistik_doc.html?nn=1470118) and Albrecht (2013 b) on recidivism statistics in international comparison. Also Spiess 2012 and Kury 2013.

⁸¹ Heinz posed this question in connection with the „never-ending story of the reform of German crime statistics“. In particular Heinz has always pointed out the need of reform of crime statistics, especially the need of a progress statistic and emphasizes that the statistical conditions for a scientific criminal policy had deficits and that current, comprehensive, and reliable data are a necessary (though not a sufficient) condition for a rational criminal policy. However, this has achieved little to nothing with the responsible federal legislator, criminal policy (Heinz 2013).

⁸² See also Schwind (2000) concerning acceptance of scientific findings by criminal policy „Has the (anti) violence commission worked in vain?“

⁸³ Which is highlighted again in the discussion concerning child pornography.

The dictionary of criminology ONLINE states the following in the article on criminal policy: „There is no disagreement with the necessity to create legal liability conditions, threaten effective sanctions, and enforce them in a capable procedure. As much as this need exists, it is also known that penal law only deters if legal violations are uncovered and sanctioned. But it is exactly this aspect which the policy neglects... Instead of improving the quality of the criminal prosecution and making sensible investments into prevention, the legislator hectically creates penal regulations and intervention authorities. He disregards the role and the possibilities of penal law.“

Kunz recognizes a “trend towards a control-oriented prevention penal law ... which refers to any social danger, intervenes preemptively, and uses quasi secret service evidence methods for this purpose... A legislation which functions for the culture of fear strives to work through the assumed punishment expectations of the population as preventively as possible” (2013 b, 121).

This is the road to a prevention state which Germany has been traveling for a few years now.⁸⁴ This is the development to which the statement refers that crime prevention has become the dominating paradigm of our time and in criminal policy:

Towards prevention through repression. In Germany, this aspect is traditionally popular, as can be seen in numerous new statutory offenses, reduced conditions for criminal liability, increased punishments, and repressive regulations in risk defense and police rights of the state (Steffen 2006, 1150).

In order to do justice to the security thinking in the prevention state,⁸⁵ it no longer appears to be sufficient if police and the other instances of criminal prosecution only ensure reliable basic protection from criminal risks. In the meantime it has become a public responsibility to recognize mere threats and alleviate them, to assuage the fear of crime, and strengthen the feeling of security – and no longer just to prevent and/or prosecute crime. This creates the risk of the rise of a prevention state: a state which, in order to minimize security risks, subjects its citizens to (massive) distrust and monitoring measures that are not based on any specific suspicion. In such a prevention state, every citizen is not only potentially dangerous – and must therefore submit to corresponding verifications which then determine that he is not dangerous after all but also endangered – and thus the target and object of risk prevention by means of in principle unlimited and undefined prevention measures. Such a development does not meet the principles of a state governed by law nor does it reduce fear of crime or strengthen the feeling of safety. On the contrary: if crime has to be prevented everywhere - even only a putative risk - this can also mean for the individual that he should expect crime everywhere and can no longer feel safe anywhere (Steffen 2013 a, 106 et seq.).

This trend to “control-oriented prevention penal law” cannot, as often claimed by the politicians responsible for this, refer to an increased desire for punishment in the population.

⁸⁴ See Steffen 2006a; he discusses at length the problem of a security society and prevention state in the Report for the 17th German Congress of Crime Prevention (Steffen 2013 a, 105 et seq.). See also Ostendorf (2005), for whom not only crime prevention is important. The reaction to crime by means of penal law is also still being expanded. These approaches emphasize an increasing security interest in our society. Apparently the security needs are also manufactured. Media demand security, politicians promise it. „This leads to obvious amplification effects. One can speak of publicistic-political amplification cycles that heat up things.“

⁸⁵ For Heinz (1998, 19), the susceptibility to disruption of modern communities requires prevention. The risk society of the present is oriented towards taking precautions against risks in order to recognize and prevent possible risk potentials and sources of danger ahead of time.

For instance Reuband, in his inventory of federation-wide surveys on the question of increasing punitive tendencies in the population, reaches the following overall conclusion: “All in all, the empirical findings contradict a punitive trend”. As before, education and resocialization are still considered to be important functions of punishment. Despite the idea that criminals are not being treated harshly enough, there is no shift towards a plea for harder punishment. On the contrary: the demand that stricter laws are needed has decreased in popularity among German citizens in the period between 1998 and 2006. In terms of the attitude towards the death penalty, the extent of the approval has significantly decreased over the years; in the meantime the opposition is in the majority (2010, 143 et seq.).

This also corresponds with the results from population surveys concerning demand for sanctions which is quoted by Kunz. In Europe there is a clear preference for community work as opposed to prison sentences; in Germany, even non-punitive reactions – at least for property offenses – are clearly preferred to punishment. Even among victims the expected punishment often only has a supplementary significance and is limited to rather mild, pedagogically sensible reactions.⁸⁶

In general no formal punishment is expected but a symbolic disapproval of the crime, accompanied by restitutive measures to restore legal order. The population expects a sign of discreditation of the committed violation of law and thus a confirmation of the validity claim of the values expressed in the penal norm. (Kunz 2011, Section 25 marginal notes 11, 12).⁸⁷

Penal law practice also does not show an increased punitive trend. In his careful and comprehensive analysis of data from criminal justice (until 2008), Heinz reaches the following conclusion: The “thesis of the ‘new lust for punishment’ (cannot be) empirically confirmed for the German sanction practice based on the aggregated data of criminal justice statistics ... According to this data, the thesis of the increasing punitive trend in the German sanction practice is a myth that corresponds to the zeitgeist but is not empirically supported. It is correct that there is an increasing punitive trend limited to certain, quantitatively very small, groups of criminal perpetrators and offenses, which now also seems to be decreasing again. This is the group of perpetrators that are classified as especially ‘dangerous’ and perpetrators of violent crimes. But no significant changes can be found for the overwhelming majority of informally or formally sanctioned perpetrators.” That German justice has mainly not succumbed to the punitive trend is due to the law system itself: “Where judges and attorneys are elected, where the influence of lay judges is great, the influence of public opinion is greater than in a system with professional, tenured independent decision-makers...” (2011, 27).

⁸⁶ So also the findings on „Punitive and compensation wishes“ and/or for „compensation“ of victims in the Report for the 18th German Congress of Crime Prevention (Steffen 2013 d).

⁸⁷ For this reason, according to Kunz, the wide-spread practice of attorney generals to suspend investigations for opportunistic reasons without consequence or discreetly by imposing conditions, is questionably in terms of general prevention (2011, Section 25 marginal note 12).

3.1.3

Criminal policy in the media society

While there is no increasing punitive trend among the population and in criminal justice, this is not true for the treatment of the topic crime by politicians and definitely not for the presentation of crime in the mass media. They “clearly reflect an increased trend towards dramatization and thus increased punitive tendencies” (Kunz 2011, Section 30 marginal note 17).

In the reporting of the media, crime and in particular violent crime play a great role - and this reporting is (and not just since now) “in no way a correct representation of social reality”.⁸⁸ The consequences of such one-sided information often focused on spectacular individual cases can be significant if one assumes (and according to empirical findings on this topic one may assume) that media use can have an effect on the perception of crime, need for punishment, and criminal policy.⁸⁹

And the so-called political-publicistic amplification cycle⁹⁰ is one of the reasons why (violent) crime is viewed as a comprehensive problem and everyday threat.⁹¹

- In accordance with the attention rules of the media, reports often selectively cover attention-grabbing, brutal, and shocking individual cases, especially of “juvenile violence” and regularly note an increase in this violence and growing brutalization.
- This triggers (criminal) policy activities which appear to be forced reactions to the public discussion triggered by this dramatizing perspective: “If the media report greatly increasing numbers and if the public debate is also defined by spectacular severe crimes, then policy is under significant pressure to raise the legal penalties and make the procedural rules for the implementation of criminal proceedings stricter.”⁹²
- These political activities again ensure that the same topic again becomes a topic for media due to political reporting.

Security needs can thus be “manufactured”: security is demanded by the media, promised by politicians (Ostendorf 2005). For Kunz, the agenda of practical crime policy in the media society is prescribed by social expectations which are formed and formulated by the mass media (2011, Section 23 marginal note 4).

⁸⁸ Lamnek 1990, 174. See also Schubarth 2001 and Heinz 2007.

⁸⁹ See also e.g. Pfeiffer et al. 2004.

⁹⁰ Scheerer 1978, 223.

⁹¹ However, this political-publicistic amplification cycle is not just well positioned in terms of the perception of and reaction to violent crime, but also, for instance, in victim protection legislation. Recently, the effectiveness of this cycle became clear in the discussion of „sexual abuse of children in institutions and at home“. The „wave of outrage“ led to a new „Law to strengthen the rights of the victims of sexual abuse (StORMG)“.

⁹² Pfeiffer et al. 2004, 415.

This is because “practical criminal policy, like any other branch of politics, must justify its actions. It does not simply act but is dependent on communicating its activities, interpret it in an understandable manner, and try to gain public approval for it. This communication with the public is filtered through the mass media ... The peculiarity of the crime topic to address everyone on an emotional level and at the same time exceed their individual horizon of perception, suggests a simplifying and dramatizing presentation of problems and solutions. Practical criminal policy must come to an arrangement with this media simplification and intensification of their field of activity. The problems it tackles are defined by media processing of social problem perceptions. The crime political need for action and time pressure are defined by ideas which are the result of opinions influenced by media. The acceptance of crime policy interventions is significantly defined by how media report it” (Kunz 2011, Section 23, marginal note 4).

This significance of the media for policy is also an opportunity for criminology and other sciences: If the relevant sciences can manage to bring their findings and the resulting requirements into the media, they could also find an open ear in politics.

Not only scientists with great communication skills and the talent to “sell their products” are needed, but also good science journalism interested in criminal policy questions.⁹³

3.1.4

Summary and conclusions

Criminal policy – at least in terms of its actions with Germany-wide consequences – appears to not only primarily understand crime prevention as repressive but also to turn a deaf ear to scientific-criminological findings and resulting requirements.⁹⁴ This includes the fact that criminal policy only rarely evaluates laws.⁹⁵ For instance, it

⁹³ 20 years ago the finding that „the self-representation of criminology and the representation of its approaches and results are in a poor state“ resulted in the attempt to start a dialog with the media concerning criminological insights – in vain. The daily newspaper, which we thought had accepted, delayed publication of the contributions available in 1994 and then slowly pulled out. In 1996 the contributions were then published in Issue 4 of „Kriminologisches Journal“ [Criminological Journal].

⁹⁴ Criminal policy at the communal level is, in contrast, much more willing to accept and implement criminological findings, as our previous explanations on prevention practice, in particular for communal crime prevention, have shown. At the state level there is also a comparatively greater willingness to implement criminological findings (p. 3.2.2).

⁹⁵ Becker disagrees. She recognizes an increasing interest in criminal policy in the evaluation of laws. Criminology could present itself as a competent contact person for this. However: „The answers would have to correspond to the practical requirements of the policy, without accepting a loosening of scientific criteria. A certain problem is posed by the time needed to conduct serious scientific evaluations.“ At the legislative level it is often difficult to perform empirical studies before a law is passed. „The awareness of the circumstance that law may not always have only the intended effects or perhaps not have the intended effect at all is increasingly expressed by announcements of an evaluation of the law after it becomes effective“ (2012, 207, 210).

was determined for victim protection legislation that there were no evaluations of the reform measures whatsoever, nor were there insights concerning what victims need and want.⁹⁶

The problem is not that criminal politicians do not see the need to put their concepts and legislation on a scientific basis and evaluate them. For instance in their preface to the 2nd PSR the then Federal Minister of the Interior Schäuble and former Federal Justice Minister Zypries wrote:

“In order to develop effective concepts to fight crime, policy needs a reliable, regularly updated record of the crime situation which goes beyond the mere analysis of crime statistics and criminal prosecution statistics. For this reason, for the first time in 2001, the federal government has submitted the 1st Periodical Security Report (1st PSR) as a founding work to serve for the systematic, wide-spread processing and analysis of existing data material under criminological, sociological, legal science, and statistical aspects. From the outset, this 1st PSR was planned as the start of regular reporting and was intended as verification in suitable intervals in order to adjust governmental reaction patterns to fit to changing crime situations. About five years after the publications of the initial report, the federal government now presents an updated analysis in the 2nd PSR.”

These two reports are still the only ones to date – and they had practically no effect on criminal policy in Germany – at least no visible effect (Hahlen 2012, 122). In order to at least improve the opportunities for criminal policy to make its decisions on an empirically-scientific basis and thus legitimize them, regular security reports should be created. Either on a legal basis, as applicable for instance to the Children’s and Youth Report to be submitted once every legislative period, or based on decisions of the Deutschen Bundestag, as in the case of the Family Report, the Report on the Elderly, or the Poverty and Prosperity Report.⁹⁷

3.2

Levels of prevention policy

Like prevention practice, prevention policy is also a task which is performed on several levels: at the local/communal level, state level, federal level, and international/global level.

⁹⁶ See the „Bielefeld Declaration“ of the 18th German Congress of Crime Prevention and the Prevention News from March 22, 2014.

⁹⁷ „An orientation on empirical and/or expert descriptions, analyses, and assessments on the life situations of their target groups has become increasingly important for policy over the last decades. Such reports serve both as a factual-technical foundation of political decisions as well as for legitimation. This development can be observed supra-nationally, nationally, and at the level of the federal states and communities. This is true for many fields of policy and also for youth policy (Pluto et. al. 2014, 7).

And, just for prevention practice, the local level is the most important among the levels of political responsibility: “Preventive criminal policy (should) include all policy fields ... which can make a contribution to preventing crimes ... the design and strengthening of local relationships is absolutely essential... The possibilities and competences for influencing specific creation factors (of crime) are ... mainly to be found at the local level” (PSR 2001, 459 et seq.)

3.2.1

Prevention policy on local/communal level

The significance of the policy for crime prevention at the communal level already becomes clear in the well-known claim: “Crime prevention is the duty of the mayor”.

“The communal heads in administration and policy must make prevention their own; otherwise the work has no chance! ... As part of the mandate for action of the different protagonists

... different interfaces arise with the city or community which require joint and coordinated action. If the head of the administration does not support the work of the prevention council, the necessary cooperation of the administration is naturally much more difficult. Add to this that volunteers or part-timers are much more likely to join if they feel that they are supported by the leadership of the communal” (Müller 2004).

The “Advertising letter” of the state prevention councils Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, Lower Saxony, and Schleswig-Holstein “10 GOOD REASONS WHY and HOW communal prevention councils should be installed” states: “Mayor at the top – The mayor should have a firm grip on the management of communal crime prevention. He himself should take the initiative and chair the communal prevention council and ensure with all of his authority that the administration participates... The work of a prevention council around the administration or even against the administration is doomed to failure from the outset.”

“Mayors at the top” stand for the significance of crime prevention in their community, give the commissions respect and legitimacy, thus motivating other communal institutions and organizations to cooperate, and facilitating the implementation of proposals of the crime prevention commissions in an interdisciplinary manner in the different departments of the administration (see also Kober/Kahl 2012, 28).

The inventory by Schreiber in the winter of 2005/2006 for local prevention commissions in Germany shows that mayors participate in more than two thirds of all commissions. This means that in many, especially smaller, communities, the requirement “mayors at the top” is fulfilled. However, this is no guarantee for successful commission work: the assessment of the effectiveness of the commission is no better when the mayor is committed to the commission, nor does their participation appear

to have a positive impact on the activity of the commissions. “The often postulated assumption that the presence of the mayor generally has a positive impact on prevention work must then be considered in a more differentiated manner” (Schreiber 2007, 44).

In view of the problems mentioned above (Chap. 2.2) and/or – put more positively – the abundance of parameters for success and design which the commissions must manage, it is not really surprising if this one albeit important factor “mayors at the top” turns out not to be that decisive.⁹⁸

However, it may be decisive what kind of support the communal commissions receive from the respective state policy.⁹⁹ An expression of such support is the institution of central commissions which primarily serve the function of providing crime prevention policy field consulting, i.e. supporting the communal level through advice and expertise in questions of institutionalization, process organization, and the design of the content (Kober/Kahl 2012, 30): The institution of state prevention councils and comparable commissions.¹⁰⁰

The example of the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony (SPC) shows what support the state level can contribute to the communal level.¹⁰¹

The State Prevention Council sees itself as the “Lower Saxony competence center for crime prevention” and considers strengthening communal crime prevention to be its most important objective. Its department “communal crime prevention” coordinates all activities towards this end. This includes in particular:

⁹⁸ In the view of the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony, however, the association to the administration has been especially effective for the ca. 200 communal commissions of the state.

⁹⁹ In some states, legal regulations were passed to provide the communal crime prevention with the necessary legal framework. For instance, in 2000 in Hessen, Section 1 Para. 6 of the Hessen Law on Public Safety and Order was supplemented. It is stated in Clause 3: „The danger prevention agencies and police agencies are to form joint work groups as part of danger prevention (crime prevention councils); these are to accept persons and institutions from various areas and fields of responsibility which can contribute to crime prevention.“ (www.landespraeventionsrat.hessen.de).

¹⁰⁰ More details in Chap. 3.2.2

Concerning the situation in Schleswig-Holstein, Ziercke already stated in 1997: „The Initiative (for communal crime prevention) had to come mainly from central instances in the states. This was the only way to achieve the goal of establishing a state-wide network of communal crime prevention councils relatively quickly. In this respect, these state councils were an interface and control element all in one for the communities... In addition to the function of an information collection and control instance, a central state instance also provides a forum for mayors to be able to exchange information specific to crime prevention. Regional conferences on crime prevention with many interested mayors and participating institutions are such a forum!“ (1998, 282)

See for instance also the „Joint framework agreement of the Ministry of the Interior Baden-Württemberg with the city, district, and community conference for the intensification of the information exchange, implementation of joint periodical analyses of the local security situation, and coordination of communal crime prevention by the lower administration agencies“ from 14.9.2004 (printed in Bannenberg et al. (Publ.)(2005), 251-255.

¹⁰¹ The following information comes from the web site of the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony: www.lpr.niedersachsen.de.

At the moment there are 188 communal prevention commissions as members in the SPC.

- preparation and post-processing of content for consulting processes for communal prevention commissions (also in coordination with other department of the SPC)
- planning and organization of SPC events
- implementation of guideline for promotion of crime prevention projects
- preparation of education events on applicable topics of communal prevention work in cooperation with the department Beccaria quality initiative.

Since 2002, as part of its support program (new guideline since September 2012), the State Prevention Council has been granting contributions for crime prevention projects at the communal level.¹⁰² Since December 2011, the support focus lies on spreading the method “CTC - Communities That Care”. This method has the goal of supporting communities in making their prevention activities in the area of social development of children and juveniles more targeted, more effective, and to make its success verifiable. The State Prevention Council tested the transferability of the method that was pioneered in the US during the model trial “SPIN – Social Prevention In Networks” from 2009 to 2012 with positive results, making it available to communities in Lower Saxony since 2013.¹⁰³

In the meantime, the State Prevention Council “has found significant qualitative changes in everyday work. Bandwidth, range, and complexity of the topics have been greater and more diverse since the creation of the first commissions in Lower Saxony at the beginning of the 90s. Add to this an increasing acceptance and perception of the work of communal prevention commissions in the public.”

Another positive aspect is also the evaluation of the support services of the State Prevention Council by its “customers”, the communal prevention commissions. A study with the goal to gain insights over which way the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony can optimally support communal prevention commissions came to the following conclusion: “The results of the study in terms of the assessment of the overall services and the role of the State Prevention Council allow the conclusion that its activities and services significantly contribute to the strength of communal crime prevention.” However, despite the large service range of the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony, there is still room to be even better” (Müller 2010).

The concept of communal crime prevention could also receive political support from the German-European Forum for Urban Security (Deutsch-Europäische Forum für Urbane Sicherheit e.V. - DEFUS), the German forum in the European Forum for Urban Security (EFUS; see Chap. 3.3.3).

¹⁰² In accordance with the support guideline, all recipients of contributions are obligated to allow verification of the measures supported by the State Prevention Council by a University or other suitable institution.

¹⁰³ More detailed information can be found at www.ctc-info.de; see also Groeger-Roth 2012.

DEFUS was founded May 10, 2010 during the 15th German Congress of Crime Prevention in Berlin; at the moment, eight cities,¹⁰⁴ the German Congress of Crime Prevention, and the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony are members. The goal of DEFUS is cooperation in the improvement of public security in the areas of crime prevention and fight against crime, traffic safety, and the intensification of communal crime prevention. The membership in DEFUS offers an exchange of information and experiences in security questions, support of a social climate which gives crime prevention a high status, and networking of agencies, bodies, and organizations whose responsibilities include the improvement of public safety (www.defus.org).¹⁰⁵

Maybe with the help of DEFUS, the commissions of communal crime prevention will succeed not only in improving and solidifying communal preventive work but also in developing an independent and long-term concept for communal criminal policy, clarifying what distinguishes their work from traditional projects and measures of social and situation-based prevention (Steffen 2005, 158).

3.2.2

Prevention policy at the state level

If crime prevention, in order to be successful, has to be embedded in an “offensive life situation policy” (see Chap. 1.1) then the states are important action levels for prevention policy. In the federal system of the Federal Republic of Germany, “state matters” (fields of action of the respective state policy) are (mainly) the areas of internal security (e.g. responsibilities, organization, and authorities of the police), penal system, media (press and broadcasting law), education and cultural support, public health and care infrastructure, and administration.

An important responsibility of the states is that for their communities (the states pass communal constitutions and help financially weaker communities as part of communal financial balancing).¹⁰⁶

One way to clarify the significance of crime prevention at the state level is the institution of state prevention councils. In the meantime, state prevention councils, whose si-

¹⁰⁴ Augsburg, Düsseldorf, Göttingen, Heidelberg, Leer, Mannheim, Munich, and Stuttgart.

¹⁰⁵ The registered non-profit association DEFUS has its headquarters and business offices in Hanover in connection to the offices of the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony and the German Conference on Crime Prevention.

Such inter-communal networks are underdeveloped in Germany. Especially compared to the high degree of networking of the important partner of the police in the federation and the states in the area of crime prevention there is a need to catch up in the area of communal security (Marks/Schairer 2010). Since 2001, the „City network for security, tolerance, and non-violence“ is an inter-communal network which now includes 17 German cities and the Foundation German Forum for Crime Prevention (DFK) as members (www.kriminalpraevention.de).

¹⁰⁶ See also „Information concerning political education No. 318/2013: Federalism in Germany“, issued by the „Federal Center for Political Education“ (bpb).

gnificance for communal crime prevention has already been discussed, exist in almost all states. Only Bavaria and Hamburg still have not yet installed such commissions; in Thüringen, the State Prevention Council no longer exists but there may soon be one in Baden-Württemberg (here, there is currently only an inter-disciplinary commission at the inter-ministry level with the “Project office communal crime prevention – KKP”). For the most part, the state prevention councils are associated with the Ministries of the Interior; in Hessen, the State Prevention Council was a part of the Ministry of Justice from the beginning, in Lower Saxony and in North Rhine-Westphalia it has been for a few years; in Berlin the “Berlin Commission against Violence” is associated with several senate departments, in Saarland with the “State institute for preventive action” established in 2009 (Steffen 2013, 489). The state prevention councils are also mainly associated with one department; the demand “prevention is a top management affair” however would require a connection to the government.

State prevention councils are consulting organs of the respective state government, mesh state action with civil-social involvement, and are “mediators” between policy, prevention, and science. Again the example of the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony (www.lpr.niedersachsen.de; Marks 2014).

The composition and activities of the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony (SPC), which sees itself as the competence center for crime prevention in Lower Saxony, clarify the understanding of crime prevention as the active cooperation of many social forces with the goal of preventing crimes.

The Lower Saxony state government founded the SPC per cabinet decision in 1995 in order to support communities in their prevention work, network experts all over Lower Saxony together, and promote the attitude of general social prevention.

The State Prevention Council is an independent consulting organ of the state government with the general objective of reducing crime and improving the subjective feeling of safety of citizens in Lower Saxony.

The offices of the State Prevention Council have been part of the Ministry of Justice since 2000. The full-time team develops concepts and coordinates measures which are necessary to achieve the objectives. In doing so, it coordinates with the chair of the State Prevention Council who represents the approximately 270 members of the State Prevention Council. In addition to the ca. 200 communal prevention commissions, the members include NGOs that are active state-wide, ministries, state representatives, and subordinate agencies and scientific institutions.

The work of the State Prevention Council includes a wide range of responsibilities, projects, cooperations, and events which are classified in seven focus areas: communal crime prevention, tailored prevention,

CTC in Lower Saxony, prevention of violence and protection of victim, prevention of right-wing extremism, Beccaria quality initiative, cooperations in Lower Saxony, national and international networks.

The State Prevention Council organizes events for the exchange of practice-relevant information and experiences for the area of crime prevention. This includes: The Lower Saxony Congress for Crime Prevention (Niedersächsische Präventionstag = NPT), the regional conferences for crime prevention, the event series “Conflict Management Congress” and “Take responsibility in the North”, the annual special conference discusses domestic violence.

The services of the State Prevention Council for its members include the circular, databases, publications, schedules, prevention links, web sites of the State Prevention Council.

The current projects and focus areas of the State Prevention Council mainly grew pragmatically and were (still) not based on an overall political strategy for state-wide preventive action, an interdisciplinary prevention plan. The cooperation between the central areas of work of prevention – prevention policy, prevention practice, prevention research – is still in its infancy and has not yet been systematically developed (Marks 2014).

In addition to the state prevention councils as the “institutionalized evidence” for the significance which crime prevention has in state policy, there are of course further initiatives and actions of the states in this area. After all, crime prevention is very attractive as an action concept for policy: policy can use prevention to make clear that it no longer merely responds to problems after they have occurred,¹⁰⁷ but acts in a future- and action-oriented manner (Holthusen/Hoops 2012, 24, 27). In addition, these programs that are usually interdisciplinary clarify the trend to prevention policy.

For example two initiatives from North Rhine-Westphalia: In the summer of 2008, the State Parliament North Rhine-Westphalia used the enquete commission “Prevention” to “develop proposals for an effective prevention policy in North Rhine-Westphalia” – as a reaction to the murder of an inmate in the correctional facility in Siegburg. The remarkable report¹⁰⁸ with a focus on “recognition and removal of structural risk factors for juvenile delinquency (primary and secondary prevention)” and “optimized design of existing and conception of new measures for punishment and education of juvenile delinquents” became the foundation of many developments in state policy (State Parliament North Rhine-Westphalia 2010).

¹⁰⁷ As is typically the case in the area of repression, when legal penalties are raised after attention-grabbing crimes and/or procedural rules are made stricter (see above 3.1).

¹⁰⁸ Notable also in terms of the integration and consideration of practice and science by numerous hearings, expert opinions, and expert discussions.

These include the project “Turn the corner” of the Ministry of the Interior and Communal Affairs North Rhine-Westphalia, which has been installed in eight police agencies as model projects since 2011 and wants to prevent at-risk children and juveniles from becoming criminals. For this purpose, pedagogical experts of free carriers of children’s and youth organizations cooperate with the police in the “Family Team”.

The project is scientifically guided by the Institute for Psychology of the Christian-Albrecht-University in Kiel.¹⁰⁹

3.2.3

Prevention policy at the federal level

Compared to the development of crime prevention at the communal and state level, the policy at the federal level has acted with some reservation, especially in terms of the institutionalization of crime prevention in a national commission. This corresponds to the “reservation” of criminal policy discussed above in considering (at least partially) theoretically and empirically founded scientific-criminological insights in their decisions.

While Germany is no longer “a developing nation in terms of crime prevention” as Ziercke still had to note in 1997 at the 3rd German Congress of Crime Prevention, it still has not developed very far, in particular at the national level, and not at all when compared to our European neighbors.

After all, in June 2001 the German Forum for Crime Prevention (Deutsches Forum für Kriminalprävention = DFK) was instituted as a private foundation after two years of development with the ambitious goal of promoting crime prevention in all aspects as a national service and information instance for German, European, and international cooperation.¹¹⁰

The goals and core responsibilities of the DFK are:

- Promotion of crime prevention in all aspects, utilization of prevention possibilities to the greatest possible extent, integration of all social forces by
- networking and cooperation; connection of government and non-governmental instances and carriers of responsibility; competence orientation

¹⁰⁹ See also contribution by Beckmann/Pohlmann/Unkrig at the 17th German Congress of Crime Prevention and that of Borncarriers/Pohlmann at the 18th German Congress of Crime Prevention and www.mik.nrw.de/themen-aufgaben/schutz-sicherheit/projekt-kurve-kriegen/grundkonzept.html.

Other states have also passed programs against juvenile crime and/or violence with a focus on prevention; for instance in Hamburg „Action against juvenile violence“ (www.handeln-gegen-jugendviolence.hamburg.de) or Bremen „Stop juvenile violence“ (www.kriminalpraevention.bremen.de).

¹¹⁰ See also the motto of the foundation (www.kriminalpraevention.de).

Based on a decision of the Conference of the Ministers of the Interior (IMK) don November 21, 1997, the DFK has become a „daughter“ of the interior departments with correspondingly clear personnel participation by the police in the development staff and today’s offices.

- bundling; promotion of synergies and interdisciplinary approaches
- transfer of knowledge; collection and distribution of scientific and best-practice insights (national and international)
- PR work; raising awareness of the public at large and promotion of willingness of all social forces to participate.

Foundation organs are the curatorship with a total of 61 members¹¹¹ and the board. The offices are at the foundation headquarters in Bonn; the team of the offices included seven persons as of May 31, 2013;

Five of which were “borrowed” from police departments of the states. Also for personnel reasons – not to mention the completely inadequate financial basis - the DFK is not able to even begin to cover its “goals and core responsibilities”; it mainly concentrates on the prevention of violence in its work. In addition, the DFK publishes the quarterly magazine “Forum Crime Prevention”.

In view of the significance of general social crime prevention at the federal level, it is more than regrettable that the even initially “tender plant” DFK just cannot manage to grow both in terms of finances and personnel – and has remained operable only thanks to the commitment of the “participants in front and behind the scenes” (Kerner 2012, 43).¹¹²

In the meantime there is a proposal to install a National Center for Crime Prevention in which the DFK and also the Central Criminological Office¹¹³ “would participate in a suitable role”. This proposal was made by the consortium “Crime and Security” in the “Dialog on Germany’s future”. In the view of the consortium it should receive

¹¹¹ Five federal departments, the federal states, representatives of economy and of associations, the labor unions, the major religious communities, the communal top associations.

The presidency in the curatorship changes between the Federal Ministries of the Interior and of Justice; further departments are represented in the curatorship but do not participate in the DFK with personnel or content. Another omission is the lack of connection to the Chancellor’s Office, which would have made the interdisciplinary, general social mission of the DFK at least (more) visible.

¹¹² Details about institution, problems, and opportunities of the DFK Kerner 2012; also the interim report by Kahl 2011.

The equipment and support the DFK received did not even come close to what Ziercke 1997 demanded for the „Federal Prevention Commission“ which had already been passed by the Work Group II of the Conference of the Ministers of the Interior: „I am convinced that Germany must get serious about this model of a Federal Prevention Commission. The assessment of the security situation ... makes this clear. We especially may not limit ourselves to only the area of communal crime prevention. We must also recognize that trans-regional and international crime has its roots and effects at the communal level and it is not sufficient to put all your chips on just communal prevention but also to consider the national prevention possibilities“ (1998, 289).

¹¹³ The Central Criminological Office (Kriminologische Zentralstelle e.V. = KrimZ) is the central research and documentation organization of the Federation and the states for the area of criminal justice. It has been working in Wiesbaden since 1986. The KrimZ regularly organizes specialized conferences on current topics of criminal policy, documents research results, and performs its own practice-related research projects (www.krimz.de).

“high priority”. The National Center for Crime Prevention as an interdisciplinary center should develop empirically founded knowledge for an evidence-based prevention and control of crime and to prepare them in an action-oriented manner for policy makers (Dialog on Germany’s future 2011/2012, 92 et seq.).

Whether this proposal will be realized is more than questionable – especially in view of the few statements which are made on crime prevention in the Coalition Agreement between CDU, CSU, and SPD “Shaping Germany’s Future”. The term alone hardly appears (e.g. in connection with the “prevention of extremism”) and even then only provides unspecific declarations of intent, “commonplaces without detailed content, mere programmatic platitudes”, which neither harm nor benefit anyone (Kreuzer 2013).¹¹⁴

For instance: “Children’s and youth organizations should be developed on a well-founded empirical foundation¹¹⁵ in a carefully structured process into an inclusive, efficient, and permanently capable support system ... We need strong youth agencies and a functioning partnership with free youth aid ... We will ... pursue social space-oriented and preventive approaches” (p. 99). or: “We want to better protect children and juveniles and people with disabilities from violence, in particular sexual violence” (p. 100) ... “We understand youth policy as a central policy field which is primarily designed locally by states and communities. In order to realize our youth policy goals, we need a strong coalition for youth with a new interdisciplinary youth policy which has an eye on the concerns of all young people” (p. 101) and finally under the heading “Effective criminal prosecution and effective measures for risk protection”: “We want to prevent at-risk children and juveniles from slipping into criminal careers through early joint action by criminal prosecution agencies and children’s and youth organizations. If a young person commits an offense, punishment should be swift” (p. 146).

It becomes more specific – and possibly more consequential - when an expert commission is to be used, e.g. in the declaration of intent: “We want to design general criminal proceedings and juvenile criminal proceedings to be more effective and practical while preserving the principles of a state ruled by law. An expert commission will develop proposals until the middle of this legislative period” (p. 146).

It would have been desirable if statements had been made in terms of children’s and youth organizations as to how their programs and measures would be financed in view of the often very tight resources. Because “children’s and youth support, as opposed to

¹¹⁴ See also the analysis of the Coalition Agreement between CDU, CSU, and FDP of the 17th legislative period by Becker under the aspect of expectations of criminal policy from criminology (2013, 207 et seq.).

¹¹⁵ At least, in every legislative period an expert commission presents a very comprehensive „Children’s and Youth Report“ which is a „report on the living situation of young people and the services of the children’s and youth organizations in Germany“ – it can hardly be more empirically and scientific founded. In 2013, the 14th Children’s and Youth Report was created as a comprehensive report as is only usual in every third legislative period; the last comprehensive report was submitted in 2002.

police and justice, is financed by the communities which in some regions in Germany are in such bad financial shape that budgetary supervision concepts are part of everyday life, e.g. in North Rhine-Westphalia” (Holthusen/Hoops 2012, 24).

It would have also been desirable – especially in view of what was just said on the topic “national prevention commission” – if the German Forum for Crime Prevention had been mentioned which “would be a suitable partner (in addition to others) to specify a few projects and implement them cooperatively” (Kahl 2013, 2).

3.2.4

Prevention policy on the international and global level

International and global institutions are becoming increasingly significant for the design of crime prevention at the different action levels. We should mention in particular the agreements and institutions at the European level, but also the United Nations or the World Health Organization.

The European Crime Prevention Network (www.eucpn.org)¹¹⁶

Already in 1987, the Minister Committee of the European Council, in a final report of the expert commission on the organization of crime prevention for the member states, issues the recommendation for a three-level crime prevention at the local/communal, regional, and national level (Ziercke 1998, 286).

In October 1999, the European Council (in its meeting in Tampere/Finland) decides on “strategies and measures to intensify crime prevention” as part of the larger initiative with the goal of developing the EU into a “union of freedom, security, and justice”.

In May 2000, the Ministers of Justice and the Interior of the EU in Lisbon welcomed the strengthening of crime prevention in a joint statement. It is emphasized that this strengthening at the European level occurs in front of the background of national prevention programs, since effective crime prevention necessarily presupposes the integration of all local social forces (PSR 2001, 472).

In implementation of the decision of Tampere, on May 28, 2001, the European Crime Prevention Network – EUCPN is founded by an EU Council decision¹¹⁷ with the goal to promote measures of crime prevention in all member states. EUCPN provides a forum for the exchange of proven practices for the prevention of crime, in particular everyday crime. The network consists of one nominated “national representative”

¹¹⁶ See for historic development of crime prevention at the European level PSR 2001, 471 et seq. and EUCPN 2013.

¹¹⁷ On November 30, 2009 the foundation decision was suspended and replaced by a new Council decision. See EUCPN 2013 and Wijckmans 2013 for goals, responsibilities, and activities of EUCPN; current for structure, activities, and results also Kahl 2014.

from each of the EU member states, their respective deputies,¹¹⁸ and further experts for crime prevention, including practitioners and scientists. They form the so-called contact points of the network. Germany is represented by the Federal Ministries of the Interior and of Justice and by the German Forum for Crime Prevention (DFK) as a contact point.

The EUCPN issues a newsletter and the semi-annual “European Crime Prevention Monitor”, holds conferences, and presents the annual European Crime Prevention Award which is awarded during a “Best Practice Conference”.

EFUS: European Forum for Urban Security (<http://efus.eu>)¹¹⁹

EFUS, the European Forum for Urban Security, is a city network of more than 300 European communities and regions from 17 countries which was founded in 1987. It serves for the exchange of experiences and expertise on all questions of urban security and crime prevention.

The responsibility and goal of the network is to strengthen preventive activities and policies. In addition, it is his wish to promote the role of communal administrations in this area at the national and European level. For this, a close cooperation between administrations and prevention commissions at the local, national, European, and international level is created. EFUS works on all important questions of communal crime prevention. The fundamental principles of the Forum include respect of human rights in the implementation of security and prevention policies.

EFUS is a registered association according to French law and has offices in Paris, Brussels, and Budapest. Members of the Forum are communal, regional, and national administrations. The condition for acceptance as a member is the existence of a local alliance for local security or the intent to use such a commission. Further members are NGOs and universities active in crime prevention.¹²⁰

UNODC: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC; www.unodc.org) leads the world-wide fight against illegal drug trade and international crimes and is also responsible for the implementation of the program of the United Nations for the fight against terrorism. The UNODC was founded in 1997 and has about 500 employees world-wide. The headquarters of UNODC are in Vienna and there are 20 branch offices and connection offices in New York and Brussels. The responsibilities of UNODC also include the areas “crime prevention and criminal justice reform” and “drug pre-

¹¹⁸ These „national representatives“ form the directorate which is supported by a secretariat. The chair in the directorate changes with the EU presidency.

¹¹⁹ See Marks/Schairer 2010 for the following.

¹²⁰ See the EFUS Manifesto by Aubervilliers and Saint-Denis (Fontanille 2013) for the „European visions for the future of prevention“.

vention and health”. As part of its direct cooperation with the governments and non-governmental organizations, the field workers develop and implement drug, control, and prevention programs which are tailored to the specific needs of the respective states (www.unvienna.org/unov/de/unodc.html).

The central guideline organ of the UN in the area of crime is the Commission on Crime prevention and Criminal Justice – CCPCJ. It was founded in 1991 as the expert commission of the Economic and Social Council and also defines the political prescriptions for the practical work of UNODC in the area of the fight against crime. The Commission is also responsible for the preparation and supplementary decisions of the World Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. The 12th UN World Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice took place in 2010 in Brazil. The 13th World Congress will take place in 2015 in Qatar (www.wie-io.diplo.de).¹²¹

The World Health Organization - (WHO; www.who.int) is a special organization of the United Nations located in Geneva. It was founded in 1948 and has about 200 members. Its goal is the realization of the best possible health level for all humans. The constitution of the WHO defines health as “a state of complete physical, mental, and social wellbeing which is not just characterized by the absence of illness or disability”.

Since violence destroys the lives of millions in the whole world, but is preventable, prevention of violence is also a topic of the WHO. For instance, its *Violence Prevention Alliance* (www.preventviolence.info), a network of WHO member states, non-governmental and communal organizations, and private, international, and inter-governmental organizations, developed an action plan for a “Global campaign prevention of violence 2012 – 2020” as well as corresponding materials for this.¹²²

The International Center for the Prevention of Crime - ICPC

The International Center for the Prevention of Crime¹²³ was founded in 1994 in Montreal/Canada.¹²⁴ ICPC is the only international, non-governmental organization which is solely focused on crime prevention and communal security. ICPC supports national and local governments in fulfilling these responsibilities. ICPC has international members such as states, regions, and cities, UN organizations (e.g. UNODC and UN Habitat) and NGOs. ICPC supports the exchange of knowledge and experiences in the

¹²¹ See also Stolpe 2009 and the comprehensive analysis „Blue Criminology. The power of United Nation’s ideas to counter crime globally“ by the „European Institute for Crime prevention and Control - HEUNI“ in Helsinki associated with the UN (Redo 2012).

¹²² „Violence prevention. the evidence“ appeared in 2010. At the 15th and 17th German Congress of Crime Prevention, Alexander Butchart of the WHO presented „Ensuring security and fundamental rights in urban settings“ and/or „Preventing violence: an overview“.

¹²³ For the following see Marks 2011 and www.crime-prevention-intl.org.

¹²⁴ At the Initiative of the French mayor Gilbert Bonnemaïson, who also founded the European Forum for Internal Security (EFUS).

entire area of international crime prevention, bundles, analyzes, and processes innovative practices for crime prevention. ICPC offers technical support and training in order to support practitioners in their work; it organizes seminars, colloquia, and meetings at the national and international level and participates in a number of projects with technical expertise or support. Every two years, the ICPC publishes an international report on crime prevention and communal security, lastly in 2012.¹²⁵

3.3

Summary and conclusions

At the communal and the state level, crime prevention is definitely an identified and supported goal of criminal policy. However, not with the same intensity and consistency in all communities and states. In some places they seem to “run out of steam” and there is probably “room for improvement” everywhere. Especially in view of the overall favorable crime development, the crime prevention efforts should not decrease but kept at least at a constant level if not increased. After everything we know about the effects of prevention and repression, prevention appears clearly superior to repression – not to mention the fact that no crime also means no victim and no damage.

At the communal level, the concept of communal crime prevention definitely has prospects and should be implemented and developed (in an area-covering manner), for instance in the direction of a communal security policy, institutionalized for instance in an “Office for Crime Prevention”.

The “Fundamental discussion of goals, means, and limits of communal crime prevention” demanded by Heinz already in 1997 could help realize this. Because “only if we are aware of the limits of what prevention can achieve, will we be able – within these limits – to use the resources sensibly and effectively; only if we document the experiences – positive and negative alike - and make them available to critical inspection, will we learn and be able to use the (by no means exhausted) possibilities of prevention even better” (1998, 30).

Due to the tight budget restrictions in many communities, financial support is urgently needed, also so that the other protagonists of crime prevention at the communal level (e.g. children’s and youth organizations and (most) schools can continue their outstanding and indispensable work in crime prevention and possibly even expand it further.

It is not satisfactory that the commission and project landscape is so confusing and non-transparent. After ten years it is about time to compile the local prevention commissions in Germany, their composition, their activities etc. At the moment only a few state prevention councils have this information. It would be desirable to develop a commission and project database.

¹²⁵ „The 2012 International Report on Crime Prevention and Community Safety“; the summary of this report is available for download in German.

At the state level, the state prevention councils have an important function, in particular as consulting organs of the state governments and the local commissions and institutions. State prevention councils (or comparable commissions) should be installed in all states and equipped with suitable organization, personnel, and finances and connected to the governments. It would make sense to supplement them with “Offices for crime prevention”.

There is a significant need for action for crime prevention at the federal level, even if many crime prevention-relevant responsibilities fall into the competence areas of the states in the federal system of the Federal Republic of Germany. But only if the Federation becomes active is there a real chance that the preference of prevention over repression will establish itself in federal policy and that penal law will not be expended into a more “control-oriented prevention penal law” and that new crime definitions and harsher sanctions will be demanded.

It is urgently necessary to create a “National Center for Crime Prevention” with connection to the Federal Chancellor’s Office, possibly even by expanding the Foundation German Forum for Crime Prevention (DFK) to such a Center and integrating the Central Criminological Office (KrimZ).¹²⁶ Whether and how the Police Crime Prevention of the States and the Federation can be involved should be checked.

Even if the experiences with the crime policy effect of the previous PSR were not very satisfactory, the creation of – actually – Periodical Security Reports based on a legal regulation or a decision of the Deutscher Bundestag¹²⁷ is urgently needed.

These reports should be compiled by an interdisciplinary scientific commission on a regular basis, for instance once in every legislative period.

One should discuss whether a prevention law could define the primary responsibility of crime prevention in its rule-of-law limits, clear responsibilities be defined, the multitude of governmental and non-governmental institutions recruited and obligated to cooperation for effective crime prevention.

It should be checked for all levels whether the proposal by Waller, to invest 5% of the current budget for the reaction to crime – police, justice, and penal system – into effective crime prevention (another 3% into services and rights for the victims of crimes) could be realized – because an investment into proven prevention measures will pay off in a lower number of crimes and lower costs for tax payers (Waller 2013).

¹²⁶ The role model for organization, responsibility, and equipment could be the Federal Center for Health Education (BZgA), an upper federal agency in the offices of the Federal Ministry for Health (www.bzga.de).

¹²⁷ As printed matter of the Deutscher Bundestag, such Periodical Security Reports at least have the chance that they could be debated in the parliament and acknowledged by the media (Hahlen 2012, 120). How policy consulting can be successful could be seen for more than 50 years in the work of the German Youth Institute (Deutsches Jugendinstitut - DJI) one of the largest German social-scientific research institutes for children, juveniles, and families at the interface between science, policy, and practice (see also Mielenz 2013).“

4

Prevention science

Crime prevention should be based on evidence, i.e. on the basis of theoretical and empirical scientific insights (see above Chapter 1.2). Prevention practice and prevention policy thus need science and research.

The following can be noted for prevention practice in view of the information up to this point: “The significance of a scientific-empirical foundation of projects and programs for (crime) prevention has continuously gained in significance over the last two decades” (Marks 2013, 140).¹²⁸

For prevention policy as part of criminal policy, the “deafness of the official criminal policy to empirical findings” was lamented – at least in terms of the federal level. At the communal and state level one can find “an open ear”.

So the question arises whether science and research have developed the required empirical knowledge and can be provided in a way that “suits” policy and practice. The already quoted “Freiburg Memorandum” remarks that the theoretical and empirical knowledge of crime, offenses, perpetrators, and victims and the different governmental and non-governmental, formal and informal reactions and prevention forms have been developed a long time ago by criminology as the relevant interdisciplinary reference science and provided to criminal, social, and communal policy.

4.1

On the state of criminology in Germany

The conference “On the situation of criminology in Germany”, held in June 2012 at the Max-Planck Institute for foreign and international penal law in Freiburg and from which the “Freiburg Memorandum” originated, comes to a sobering conclusion: Germany has a highly developed theoretical and empirical criminological science which is, however, at significant rest due to “structural depletion.” Criminology is slowly dying through a gradual, almost universal reduction of its personnel and material resources which is not based on any specific political decision. Its scientific reputation is by no means in doubt. Its research results are not suspect and its international success is accepted. The reduction is creeping, as though a science is simply being drained.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ See e.g. Koop, who laments „too little specific university research“ for the penal system – with the consequence that the penal system has developed its own criminological services in order to cover the demand for well-founded insights e.g. on the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of treatment measures (2013, 202 et seq.).

Holthusen/Hoops are more skeptical about crime prevention in children’s and youth organizations. The topic of evaluation has been a demand for many years which up to now has hardly been met. The problem in evaluation research is especially the often weakly formalized pedagogical practice settings of youth aid (2012, 27).

¹²⁹ From the preface of Klaus Sessar to Albrecht et. al. 2013. Out of 40 law schools, criminology was no lon-

Albrecht (2013, 73 et seq.) arrives at these conclusions: while criminology has established itself as an independent social science in North America.¹³⁰ German criminology is almost exclusively connected to law schools – “The fate of German criminology is that of a still ongoing connection to penal law” (Sessar 2011) - but here, too, there have been significant losses. For instance, of the projects with criminologically relevant questions supported by the German Research Association (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft = DFG), only about 8% are implemented by the criminology housed in universities. All others are implemented by other disciplines such as the general social sciences, historical sciences, forensic psychiatry/psychology, political science, ethnology, economy etc. Criminological research studies also largely take place outside of criminology in law schools and “are significantly spread over different scientific disciplines, which also indicated that criminological questions enjoy wide-spread scientific interest.”

Criminology is not only being reduced at law schools but also in psychological and sociological institutes in German universities where it had “always been somewhat marginal: after their retirement, almost all criminologically active sociologists have been replaced by successors who no longer engaged specifically in criminological research and “slash sociologies” such as “social control” or “sociology of deviance” were “also no longer visible at sociological institutes with a few exceptions” (see also Reuband 2013, 140).¹³¹ The training of police, penal system, and social work at specialized colleges and/or the German University of the Police regularly represents criminology.

Conclusion: “The withdrawal or limitation to penal law also results in a significance reduction in terms of content, in particular theoretical content, which can be seen in the fact that university criminology hardly participates in various research developments and new questions. New research fields which once took a central role in criminology are now already mainly replaced by other disciplines ... The lack of criminology becomes especially clear in questions of security and security research” (Albrecht 2013, 77 et seq.).

In view of “security as one of the central social challenges of our time” around which “new complex topics such as the research field ‘security risk prevention’” formed, Sessar (2011) also demands the development and opening of criminology: “The prevailing scientific view of penal laws and crime policy is that it is the genuine responsibility of criminology which cannot be handled by other social sciences; in addition,

ger present at all in 11, i.e. one quarter. 6 faculty chairs are expressly reserved for criminology, 22 faculty chairs next to penal law and other related areas also for criminology.

¹³⁰ See also Schneider 2010, 475.

¹³¹ Based on a survey conducted mid 2012 among legal, social, and behavioral science faculties and institutes, Boers/Seddig also reach the conclusion that one can „only partially speak of an institutional basis for modern criminology at German Universities“ (2013, 124).

there is the observation of security policy and prevention policy to the extent they are connected with crime and the fear of crime ... Opening criminology would also mean a stronger connection with other science branches in order to tackle more complex research topics and thus participate in social theory discourses.”

Since criminology is a social and behavioral scientific and thus especially empirical discipline, Boers/Seddig also demand a “clearly enhanced institutionalization of criminological research and teaching at social and behavioral scientific university institutions.” This strengthening of criminology must “lead to an equal, at the core professorial cooperation in which all disciplines contribute their respective competences ... There are a few outstanding long-term examples for such interdisciplinary cooperation in Germany¹³² as well as current interest from reknown sociologists and psychologists in original criminological research questions” (2013, 124 et seq.).

The endowment chair “Crime Prevention and Risk Management” which was instituted at the University Tübingen in 2012 under the sponsorship of the Foundation German Forum for Crime Prevention and with the approval of the German Bundestag was called a “kick-off for a completely new culture of crime prevention”. It was taken over by Rita Haverkamp on October 1, 2013.¹³³ The unique in this form faculty chair in Germany is expected to develop sustainable methods for better crime fighting and creating effective strategies for the prevention of violence and crime. However, the faculty chair is only financed until 2017 and is again located at a law school.¹³⁴

4.2

Application-oriented criminological research: opportunities and risks¹³⁵

Criminology as a social and behavioral scientific and thus especially empirical discipline not only performs scientific autonomous basic research (we “cannot emphasize too urgently that science requires a certain independence and freedom to grow and blossom”, Kerner 2013, 183) but also application-oriented research, especially in the connection of policy and practical consulting and practical research discussed here. However, this is not disputed within science due to the possible danger of a loss of autonomy for criminology and/or criminological research.

¹³² For instance the Institute for Conflict and Violence Research of the University Bielefeld; the Max-Planck Institute for Foreign and International Penal Law in Freiburg; or the Criminological Research Institute Lower Saxony. By the way, the commemorative publication for the 70th birthday of its long-term director Christian Pfeiffer has the title „Criminology is social science“!

¹³³ The endowment chair was initiated by the shooting spree of Winnenden, after which politicians all over Germany and in Baden-Württemberg spoke in favor of investing more money into research on strategic crime prevention in Germany.

¹³⁴ www.uni-tuebingen.de; newsletter Uni Tübingen current No. 1/2013 and 4/2013.

¹³⁵ Thus the title of an essay by Kerner 2013.

Kunz views criminology “in its usual ‘modern’ version as lying in the force field between scientific autonomy and practical application: it is the science of discovering the causes for crime in the service of governmental crime control. The application fields which it opens and the insight interest which it follows are partly defined by governmental criminal policy” (2011, § 23 marginal note 1).

“The impression arises that criminology is mainly a kind of Think Tank for government-supported development of crime policy ideas and concepts.¹³⁶ As fruitful as this may be and as much as this may contribute to the social and political significance of the field, as great is the risk that this may cloud the self-view of criminology as science, which must struggle against the exploitation interest mostly dictated by current policy and in this sense demand autonomy” (Kunz 2011, Section 23 marginal note 3).¹³⁷

Kerner (2013, 194 et seq.), in his “Plea for a diverse criminological science with foundation and application orientation” cannot completely exclude this theoretically possible risk of loss of autonomy even for the formally free university research and for basic research; however, the risk increases with increasing practice-orientation in the area of applied criminology. Risks to autonomy of independent research would have to be sought preferentially at the level of research support and might have to be questioned. “Compared to other sciences, in criminology it does not play a fundamentally different role (but possibly an amplifying role due to the specific responsibilities and structures) that the field of ‘crime and crime control’ is defined especially by order and security and the maintenance of the instances obligated to governmental legal order and their correspondingly socialized training...In any case, one should say goodbye to the notion of always being “heard” in a substantial sense, let alone in first position, within this tangle of forces, interests, and pressures or that being heard will translate into swift action which correspond to one’s own position.”¹³⁸

Schöch summarizes the discussion of the “application of criminological research” as follows: applied criminology, in addition to basic research, which is also conducted intensively in Germany, is acknowledged as a wide and legitimate field of work in criminological research (2013, 210).

¹³⁶ In view of the „deafness“ of criminal policy to criminological insights (see above) lamented by Kunz, this statement must be at least questioned.

¹³⁷ Maier (quoted by Schöch 2013, 211) points out the possibility that the crime policy ‘customers’ may influence the methodical implementation of data collection or the interpretation of the results. This is an accusation which was often levied at so-called „state criminologists“ (see also Mischkowitz 2013 and Schwind/Steinhilper 2014, 593 et seq.).
For Kunz, application-oriented criminology is still „designed to serve the instances for affirmative support of the criminal justice system. Potential topics which are critical of the instances, such as police violence, are avoided by established research“ (2013 b, 106).

¹³⁸ In this connection Kerner points to the criticism „head wind“ which for instance was levied by scientists against scientists – criminologists – who participated in the violence commission or the two Periodical Security Reports of the federal government. However, a wide-ranging public discussion also did not occur in this case (2013, 197 et seq.).

The “significant role” (Schöch 2013, 217) of applied criminology and its reference sciences becomes clear for instance in the documentation (conference transcripts) of the biannual meetings of the Criminological Society, the scientific association of German, Austrian, and Swiss criminologists.¹³⁹ In his analysis of five conference transcripts (appeared between 2004 and 2013), Schöch reaches the conclusion that displays “the significance of applied criminology”: Of a total of 195 presentations, he estimates that 79 concern application-oriented empirical-criminological studies, e.g. about crime prevention and prognosis, about treatment and therapy research, about evaluation, or victimization and victim protection (2013, 218 et seq.).

4.3

Prevention science and prevention practice

“Application-oriented criminology” together with its reference disciplines is standing by to support practice in the implementation of the demands for evidence-based crime prevention. To provide practice thus with the necessary theoretical and empirical scientific insights and to scientifically accompany and monitor the planning, implementation, and effects of prevention measures and programs (implementation and evaluation).¹⁴⁰

The willingness in practice to employ scientific insights and support when planning, implementing, and evaluating projects has clearly increased compared to the beginning years in the 1990s. This also has to do with science having provided corresponding “services”, increasingly systematic forms of support for prevention practice.

¹³⁹ „The central responsibility of the Criminological Society (Kriminologische Gesellschaft - KrimG) is

- to support the experience-scientific research of crime, criminal perpetrators, and victims of crime and governmental and social reactions (Section 2 of the statutes)
- and to make the insights available to the practice, in particular in the areas of social work, police, and justice, but also to the public
- and thus make a contribution to crime prevention ...

The conferences serve the goal of bundling the results (which are no longer manageable for individuals, in particular practitioners) of interdisciplinary and international criminology concerning the current topics and thus stimulating wide-spread discussion among experts“ (www.krimg.de).

The last, 13th, scientific conference of KrimG took place in September 2013 on the topic of „Risks of the security society. Security, risk, and criminal policy“.

¹⁴⁰ The 1st PSR still had to find: „A special deficit in Germany is the still completely insufficient use of research capacities for process evaluation and effect evaluation of the different preventive approaches and initiatives“ (PSR 2001, 470).

The 2nd PSR also complained about the same deficit: „The precise analysis of the consequences of prevention measures through accompanying research is .. indispensable for clarifying to what extent the desired effects are achieved and/or what undesirable additional effects occur.

However, such evaluation research has been hardly performed in Germany up to this point“ (PSR 2006, 668).

4.3.1

Documentation and databases

The documentation of crime prevention measures and projects and the development of databases was in its infancy, e.g. the collection of information on national and international prevention protagonists, activities, projects, and models, the Infopool Prevention at the Bundeskriminalamt (PSR 2001, 467) or of PräViS, the Prevention Information System.¹⁴¹ Since its inception in 1986, the Central Criminological Office (KrimZ) has been working on the computer-aided literature documentation KrimLit which is, however, only available to a limited group of users. In contrast, freely available on the net is KrimDok, an expert bibliography for criminology at the University Tübingen; as part of the expert information service Criminology, KrimDok is to be comprehensively expanded and transferred to a comfortable search engine technology.

Other federal databases are:¹⁴²

- “DPT-Map”, the search engine of the German Congress of Crime Prevention. It can be used for targeted searches for projects, measures, institutions, and persons from the field of crime prevention.
- “Prävention im Überblick” (Prevention Overview) PRÄVÜ is provided on the internet site of the German Forums for Crime Prevention and bundles information on German prevention.
- Databases of the Deutsches Jugendinstitut (DJI), for instance “EXE project: strategies and concepts of external evaluation in children’s and youth organizations”;
- “PrevNet – network for addiction and health”.
- “Prevention network against right-wing extremism”.

¹⁴¹ The development of this Infopool was started in 1995; it has been continuously expanded, recently also included traffic safety work, but was then – after a complete revision and expansion – taken off the net in June 2013. It received too little acceptance and resonance.

PräViS, developed under the guidance of the German Forum for Crime Prevention together with prevention commissions and state criminal agencies in order to provide information about corresponding institutions, projects, commissions, work groups, etc. in connection with violence and crime prevention, has also been suspended.

¹⁴² Source: www.lpr.niedersachsen.de.

English language information about the questions „What helps“, „What harms“, „Based on what evidence“ is for instance provided by the Campbell Collaboration, which was founded in 1999 as an international network of social scientists with the goal to provide proof of the effectiveness of social intervention through systematic studies and meta-analyses and best practice projects. The focus of the content of the Campbell Collaboration lies in the areas of education, crime, justice, and public welfare. In addition, it also focuses on methodological questions (www.campbellcollaboration.org).

The Office of Justice Programs of the National Institute of Justice (USA) houses crimesolution.gov. This program offers information on „review-rated“ research on the effectiveness of programs and practices (www.crimesolutions.gov).

In addition, there are databases at the level of a few states for the commissions on communal crime prevention, such as the “Prevention atlas North Rhine-Westphalia” and the “Prevention atlas Hessen” or the state-wide project database NIMAP in Lower Saxony.

4.3.2

Quality assurance, implementation, and evaluation

For the area of planning, implementation, and evaluation of crime prevention programs and projects, a “work aid for evaluation” was compiled in 2003 “for police officers ... who plan or implement prevention projects” (published by the Police Crime Prevention of the States and the Federation). In 2009 it was thoroughly revised as “Work aid for planning, implementation, and evaluation of crime prevention programs and projects”, republished, and now addresses a wider audience of “persons with responsibility and planners in the area of crime fighting and traffic security. It not only addresses experts in the police but also from other institutions that are active in this area of responsibility.”

The “Beccaria standards for quality assurance of crime prevention projects, issued in 2005 by the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony as part of its “Beccaria quality initiative”, addressed all “developers, protagonists, and other responsibility carriers in crime prevention” from the beginning.¹⁴³ The Beccaria standards include specifications and requirements for the quality of planning, implementation, and evaluation of crime prevention programs and projects. It refers to the following seven main phases of a project:

1. problem description
2. analysis of genesis conditions of the problem
3. specification of prevention goals, project goals, and target groups
4. specification of measures to achieve goals
5. project conception and project implementation
6. verification of implementation and achievement of goals of the project (evaluation)
7. final conclusions and documentation

What progress has been made in terms of the quality of prevention projects and in particular in terms of their evaluation,¹⁴⁴ is shown in the “Green List for Preventi-

¹⁴³ Because: „quality criteria for the planning, implementation, and evaluation of crime prevention projects hardly exist. The national and Europe-wide exchange information for this group of topics is also still in its infancy“ (www.beccaria-standards.net).

¹⁴⁴ Even though the „Green List“ points out that, in the international comparison, Germany only produces few high-quality evaluation studies which show which programs are really effective. And this warning by Heinz also has its justification: „Crime prevention projects should ... not enter the trap of making their justification dependent on empirical evidence of their effect; penal law does not do this either“ (1998, 54).

on – CTC database of recommended prevention programs” which was developed by the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony as part of the CTC model project (see above).

This Germany-wide unique online database on evaluated prevention programs is publicly accessible. In addition to the quality of the effectiveness evaluation and the concept quality, the database also offers an overview of recommended prevention approaches in the areas of family, schools, children/juveniles, and neighborhoods based on plausible criteria (www.gruene-liste.de; Groeger-Roth/Hasenpusch 2011).¹⁴⁵ As the “Green List for Prevention” has seen a lot of demand from practice beyond CTC, an expansion is planned to include additional areas and an expansion of the evaluation system to include aspects of the implementation quality of programs (Marks 2014).¹⁴⁶

It has almost become matter of course that crime prevention projects are planned, implemented, and evaluated with scientific support. The process evaluation alone, but even more so the effectiveness evaluation, are methodically complex enterprises which would not succeed without a scientific background (Görgen 2013).

In addition to evaluation, implementation research has become more significant in the recent past: an applied science which asks the question how evidence-based practices can be implemented with high quality over wide areas. Apparently this requires a proactive management and support; manuals or one-time training courses do not seem to be sufficient to train competent personnel. However, the effectiveness of a program can be increased two and threefold through good implementation (see the dpt-i blog dated 12.03.2014 “Implementation is key!”)¹⁴⁷

4.3.3

Qualification, training, and continuing education

The previous information have made one thing clear: crime prevention requires specialized knowledge; the demands on those who (are supposed to) implement crime prevention programs and measures in practice have increased.¹⁴⁸ Here, too, science is asked to provide practice with corresponding options – and practice is asked to use these options.

¹⁴⁵ In view of „not recommended“ approaches, there are considerations whether also to offer a „Red List Prevention“ (Bühler/Groeger-Roth 2013).

¹⁴⁶ The expert council of the Foundation German Forum for Crime Prevention developed a „quality criteria catalog for the selection and implementation of effective programs“ in connection with the guideline „Development support and prevention of violence for young people“ (As of: 16.04.2013 – „work in progress“). It serves to determine the quality of prevention and intervention measures or programs; it can thus be used as a basis for decisions on the selection, use, and support of measures (Foundation DFK 2013).

¹⁴⁷ The above quoted „Impulses“ and the „Quality criteria catalog“ of the DFK expert council also point to the significance of implementation.

¹⁴⁸ The qualification requirements have not only increased in terms of crime prevention, but also in other – all? – professional areas: Examples for this are for instance today’s requirements for educators or the „Academy training wave in the police“ (Schwind 2013, Section 1 marginal note 30b).

In addition to “protagonist-internal” training and continuing education¹⁴⁹ there is the “Beccaria qualification program” which ends with the certificate “Specialist for crime prevention”, the Master’s degree

“Preventive social work with a focus on criminology and crime prevention” at the Ostfalia University for Applied Sciences, and a few Master’s degrees in criminology.¹⁵⁰

Since 2008, the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony has offered an annual “Beccaria qualification program for crime prevention” and trains persons who are active in crime prevention. The training consists of four modules: criminology, crime prevention, project management, and project supervision. The content is scientifically founded and at the same time application-oriented. The participants are then qualified to evaluate criminological theories and empirical studies critically, develop and implement prevention projects using the latest scientific insights and data, and apply methods of project management.

The course is designed to be parallel to work, lasts one year, and every module includes two weekends. After completing all four modules, the certificate “Specialist for crime prevention” is awarded. At the moment there are more than 120 specialists.

The program was evaluated externally for the first time in 2012 and awarded the “Milestone in crime prevention” award in 2013 (www.beccaria-qualitaetsinitiative.de; see also Meyer 2008 and 2010; Marks 2014).

In the winter semester 2011, the Ostfalia University for Applied Sciences (faculty of social work) in Wolfenbüttel started the consecutive Master’s degree “Preventive social work with emphasis on criminology and crime prevention”. The concept for the major comes from the “Beccaria project: Training and continuing education in crime prevention” of the State Prevention Council Lower Saxony. The course is designed as full-time major (standard study period four semesters) and suitable for students who acquired their technical and professional qualifications through a major in social work and/or comparable majors and possibly have already been exposed to practical work (www.master-kriminalpraevention.de; see also Meyer 2012; Marks 2014).¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁹ Corresponding options can be found – even though there is plenty of room for growth – at technical colleges for social work or – for the police – at the technical colleges for public administration and the police education institutions. For instance the technical college for public administration

NRW in its „Module manual for Bachelor’s degree PVD 2012“ identifies the module „crime analysis and police crime prevention“. At the German College for Police, the “subject area 13: criminology and interdisciplinary crime prevention“ has been installed, which not only offers events in the area of „criminology/crime prevention“ as part of the annual training program but also is responsible for several modules in the curriculum of the Master’s degree „Public administration – police management“; this includes the module „Crime – phenomenon and intervention“ which also includes „crime prevention as general social responsibility“.

¹⁵⁰ See the corresponding contributions from Albrecht et. al. (Publ.)(2013).

¹⁵¹ The vision is an additional work-parallel education course „Crime prevention“ for everyone who wants to study in parallel with their work; it combines didactically sensible live presentations and virtual learning based on new

4.4

Summary and conclusions

Crime prevention should be based on evidence, i.e. on the basis of theoretical and empirical scientific insights. Prevention practice and prevention policy thus require science and research.

The fact the prevention policy looks different in reality, at least on the federal level, has already been discussed. At the communal and state levels, policy makers appear to be more open to evidence. In the meantime, this is also the case for prevention practice.

This is not lastly due to science having performed numerous “services” for practice and has increasingly and systematically supported prevention practice. For instance through documentation and the development of databases for commissions and projects, in the meantime also by creating a database for recommended prevention projects; through the development of standards for the area of planning, implementation, and evaluation of crime prevention programs and projects; through the conception and implementation of qualification programs, training and continuing education programs, and courses for the area of crime prevention.

Prevention practice is not only provided with the necessary theoretical and empirical scientific insights, but the planning, implementation, and effect of prevention measures and programs (implementation and evaluation) is scientifically monitored and verified. In particular evaluation has become a lot more matter of course in the meantime – for supported projects it is generally an obligation - and implementation research is gaining in significance.

Evaluation should be a core goal of prevention policy, in particular in the form of lasting regulatory impact assessment, evaluation of the usefulness of a law, and monitoring of the parameters originally targeted by the law. Not just in terms of legislative activities but especially also for practical prevention policy up to the level of cities and municipalities (Becker 2012, 209 et seq.).

The time which research takes in general can become a problem. Practice and policy want to – must – act as quickly as possible in order to remedy recognized problems. But science needs time to be able to make well-founded statements about effects or lack thereof.

It is likely as difficult in prevention practice as in prevention policy to perform empirical studies and collect data before a prevention measure has started and/or a law passed. However, in the meantime prevention science has created a large stock of

knowledge about what works or does not work, what makes sense in criminal policy and what doesn't – you just have to ask.

Another problem could be that research is generally performed with open-ended results, but policy and practice would like confirmation that what they are doing is correct.

Fundamental problems could arise from the current position of criminology as relevant reference science: While Germany has a highly developed theoretical and empirical science of criminology, it is apparently seriously endangered due to “structural depletion”. Criminology is not only being reduced at law schools but also at institutes of psychology and sociology. A lot of criminological research takes place outside of the criminology of law schools and is significantly dispersed over various scientific disciplines. However, this also means that criminological questions enjoy widespread scientific interest.

Still, teaching should be intensified at the Universities, in particular in sociological and law schools, and the diverse criminological activities bundled, coordinated, and thus promoted through the development of interdisciplinary Central Criminological Offices (see “Freiburg Memorandum”).

However, the close association between criminology and penal law should be dissolved and criminology established as an independent social science. A well-positioned criminology department is a necessary (if not sufficient) prerequisite for the implementation of the requirement for interdisciplinary prevention science.

We welcome the 2012 foundation (for an initial 5 years) of the endowment chair “Crime prevention and risk management” at the University Tübingen, under the sponsorship of the Foundation German Forum for Crime Prevention. In order to give crime prevention the necessary weight in the research spectrum of criminology and other disciplines, it is necessary to demand that this Chair be financed past 2017 and be made permanent.

A chance for criminology and other sciences is the significance of the **media** for policy: If the relevant sciences can manage to bring their findings and the resulting demands into the media, they might then also be able to find a (more) open ear in policy. Not only scientists with great communication skills and the talent to “sell their products” are needed, but also good science journalism interested in criminal policy questions.

5

Crime prevention requires prevention practice, prevention policy, and prevention science

5.1

The German Congress of Crime Prevention (DPT)¹⁵²

There is probably no better example to illustrate this year's main topic of the DPT, "Prevention requires practice, policy, and science", and to show whether and how far this demand has become reality than the DPT itself.

Founded in 1995 as a national annual congress especially for the field of crime prevention, its goal was from the beginning to represent and strengthen crime prevention in an interdisciplinary and inter-departmental manner and in a wide social framework. By and by, the German Congress of Crime Prevention also opened for institutions, projects, methods, questions, and insights from other areas of work in prevention.

The Congress turns in particular to responsibility carriers in prevention from agencies, communities, cities, and districts, health care system, youth aid, justice, churches, media, politics, police, prevention commissions, projects, schools, sports, associations and societies, science etc. - i.e. practice, policy, and science!

The German Congress of Crime Prevention, as an annual national congress, wants to

- convey and exchange current and fundamental questions in different areas of work of prevention and its effectiveness,
- bring partners in prevention together,
- be a forum for practice and make an exchange of experiences possible,
- make international connections, help in the exchange of information, and discuss implementation strategies,
- develop and issue recommendations to practice, policy, administration, and science.

In the meantime, the German Congress of Crime Prevention is the largest European congress especially for the field of crime prevention and related prevention areas. It thrives on the good cooperation of many people and institutions. The annual congresses take place over two days in different cities and are segmented into the central areas plenary events (opening and closing plenary), presentations and project spots, the exhibition that accompanies the congress, and the prevention workshop. The participants are mainly full-time workers in prevention and, for the most part, engaged in the practical implementation of measures and programs. They work in administration,

¹⁵² www.praeventionstag.de; and Marks 2013.

management, or direction as well as in research. The largest number of members comes from the police, followed by the areas of social work, community, NGOs, state and federal agencies, science, justice, economy, schools, medicine, and sports.

The German Congress of Crime Prevention presents itself on the internet as an information and documentation platform, since 2010 also with the search-portal “dpt-map”, which provides targeted searches for projects, measures, institutions, and persons from the entire field of crime prevention and related prevention areas.

The internet documentation includes all abstracts and text, film, and presentation documents of the previous German Congresses of Crime Prevention.

Since July 2011, the German Congress of Crime Prevention has been publishing the daily Prevention News, which provides information about prevention events and documents from the areas of prevention practice, research, and policy. Like the German Congress of Crime Prevention itself, the Prevention News is thus an excellent example for how far the demand “Prevention requires practice, policy, and science” has already become a reality.

5.2

The DPT institute for applied prevention research (dpt-i)¹⁵³

In order to strengthen the development of the German Congress of Crime Prevention into a forum for the discourse between practice, policy, and science and develop it systematically, another work area of the German Congress of Crime Prevention started in 2013, the DPT Institute for Applied Prevention Research (dpt-i).

Prevention research is understood as a multi-disciplinary approach which integrates the knowledge, methods, and standards of various scientific disciplines and departments, including sociology, psychology, education science, biology, medicine, political science, legal science, economy, criminology, and victimology.

For the dpt-i, prevention research includes¹⁵⁴ the scientific study of

- social distributions and frequencies of events and conditions to be prevented, such as crime, violence, addiction, physical and mental illness, insecurity situations etc.
- causes and genesis conditions of these events and situations,

¹⁵³ www.praeventionstag.de/nano.cms/dpt-institut and Marks 2013, 140 et seq.

¹⁵⁴ In reference to the understanding of the international „Society for Prevention Research” (SPR) and the „European Society for Prevention Research” (EUSPR). The Mission Statement of the SPR states: „The Society for Prevention Research is an organization dedicated to advancing scientific investigation on the etiology and prevention of social, physical and mental health, and academic problems and on the translation of that information to promote health and wellbeing“ (www.preventionresearch.org and www.euspr.org).

- development, guidance, and evaluation of effective interventions for the prevention of these events and situations, and
- support of a wide-spread implementation of verified interventions under “real world” conditions.

In order to achieve its goals, prevention research depends on multi-disciplinary cooperation and a partnership with prevention practice and prevention policy. The dpt-i thus understands its role as an active supporter of partnerships between research, practice, and policy.

The dpt-i sees its general responsibilities especially in

- the implementation of its own research projects with the perspective of the practical application of research results,
- cooperation with other scientific institutions to implement research projects with practical relevance,
- deepening the dialog between science, policy, administration, associations, and civil society concerning the results of prevention research with the goal of a greater reliance on knowledge in the entire field of prevention,
- consultation of the German Congress of Crime Prevention and its partner organizations concerning the results and the status of prevention research.

5.3

Summary and conclusions

The German Congress of Crime Prevention (DPT) is probably the best example for how far the demand that crime prevention requires prevention practice, prevention policy, and prevention science has already become a reality. This cannot only be seen in its development from really humble beginnings – 1995 in Lübeck with 168 registered congress participants and a very reasonable program of this “work conference” - up to the last, the 18th DPT 2013 in Bielefeld with almost 2,000 congress participants from 17 identified work areas, an extensive program (169 speakers for presentations and project pots alone), information booths, special exhibits etc. The evaluation results (DPT is evaluated since the 13th DPT) find: “In total, the evaluation results show that the 18th German Congress of Crime Prevention can be called an successful event.

Almost 92% of the surveyed visitors thought that the 18th German Congress of Crime Prevention was very good or good.” The German Congress of Crime Prevention has without a question developed into an important forum for the discourse between practice, science, and policy in the field of crime prevention.

In 2013 another field of work started with the “DPT institute for applied prevention research” (dpt-i) in order to strengthen this development and develop it systemati-

cally. An important task of this institute could be developing a systematic strategy for crime prevention based on the findings on performance and deficits of the areas of prevention practice, prevention policy, and prevention science as well as on the demands and challenges.

Literature

- Albrecht, Hans-Jörg (2013): On the situation of criminology in Germany – An introduction. Mschr- Krim 96. Volume - Issue 2/3 2013, pp. 73-80.
- Albrecht, Hans-Jörg (2013 b): Recidivism statistics in international comparison. MschrKrim 96. Volume - Issue 5 – 2013, pp. 400-410.
- Albrecht, Hans-Jörg et. al. (publ.)(2013): On the situation of criminology in Germany. Contributions of the conference from June 28 - 30, 2012 at the Max-Planck Institute for foreign and international penal law, Freiburg i. Br. MschrKrim 96. Volume - Issue 2/3 – 2013.
- Albrecht, Hans-Jörg et. al. (Publ.)(2012): Freiburg Memorandum. On the situation of criminology in Germany. Also reprinted in MschrKrim 95. Volume - Issue 6 – 2012, pp. 385-391.
- Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention [Office for Children's and Juvenile Crime Prevention] (Publ.)(2007): Strategies of violence prevention in children and adolescents. An interim result in six fields of action. Munich.
- Bannenberg, Britta et. al. (Publ.)(2005): Communal crime prevention. Selected contributions of the 9th German Congress of Crime Prevention. May 17-18, 2004 in Stuttgart. Godesberg.
- Bannenberg, Britta/Rössner, Dieter (2002): Effect research in crime prevention. Forum Crime Prevention 1/2002, pp. 5-8.
- Becker, Monika (2013): Questions to criminology ... from the perspective of criminal policy. MschrKrim 96. Volume - Issue 2/3 2013, pp. 207-211.
- Report on living situation of young people and the services of the children's and youth organizations in Germany – 11th Children's and Youth Report – with statement by the federal government. Deutscher Bundestag. 14th legislative period. Printed material 14/8181 dated 04.02.2002.
- Boers, Klaus/Seddig, Daniel (2013): Criminological research and teaching at German Universities in 2012. MschrKrim 96. Volume - Issue 2/3 2013, pp. 115-126.
- Boers, Klaus et. al. (Publ.)(2013): Criminology – criminal policy – penal law. Commemorative publication on the 70th birthday of Hans-Jürgen Kerner. Mohr Siebeck Tübingen.
- Bühler, Anneke/Groeger-Roth; Frederick (2013): Do we need a “Red list prevention”? What is not recommended in prevention? In: Kerner, Hans-Jürgen/Marks, Erich (Publ.): Internet documentation of the German Congress of Crime Prevention. Hanover 2013 (www.praeventionstag.de/Dokumentation.cms/2361).
- Federal Ministry of the Interior/Federal Ministry of Justice (Publ.)(2006): Second PSR [Periodical security report]. Berlin.
- Federal Ministry of the Interior/Federal Ministry of Justice (Publ.)(2001): Second PSR. Berlin.

- Dialog on Germany's future. Results report of expert dialog of Federal Chancellor 2011/2012. Publ. from press and information office of the federal government. Berlin.
- Dölling, Dieter et. al. (2006): Meta-analysis of empirical deterrent studies. Study approach and first empirical findings. Darmstadt discussion papers in economics, No. 170 (<http://hdl.handle.net/10419/32076>).
- DVJJ – Deutsche Vereinigung für Jugendgerichte und Jugendgerichtshilfen [German Association for Youth Courts and Youth Court Aid] (Publ.)(2007): Together with distributed roles. Position on youth crime prevention. Hanover.
- Eisner, Manuel/Ribeaud, Denis/Bittel, Stéphanie (2006): Prevention of youth violence. Paths to an evidence-based prevention policy. Publ. by the Confedera-
te Commission for Foreigners EKA. Bern-Wabern.
- 11th Children's and Youth Report, see Report on living situation of young people ...
- Entorf, Horst (2013): Criminology, economy, and economy of crime: common contents, different approaches. MschrKrim 96. Volume - Issue 2/3 2013, pp. 164-171.
- EUCPN – European Crime Prevention Network (2013): Crime prevention activities at the EU, national and local level. Thematic Paper No. 4. EUCPN Secre-
tariat. Brussels.
- Feltes, Thomas (2012): The role of police in crime prevention. ZJJ 1, pp. 35-39.
- Fontanille, Elsa (2013): European visions on the future of prevention. Forum Crime Prevention 1/2013, pp. 64-66.
- Freiburg Memorandum (2012) see Albrecht, Hans-Jörg et. al. (Publ.)(2012)
- Frevel, Bernhard (Publ.)(2012): Fields of action of local security policy. Networks, policy design, and perspectives. Frankfurt.
- Frevel, Bernhard/Kober, Marcus (2012): Perspectives of cooperative security policy. In: Frevel, Bernhard (Publ.)(2012), pp. 337-358.
- Frevel, Bernhard/Miesner, Christian (2012): The research project cooperative security policy in cities – KoSiPol. In: E. Marks/W. Steffen (Publ.)(2012), pp. 215-219.
- Frevel, Bernhard et. al. (2009): Citizen involvement in communal crime prevention: Contributions from current research (Part I) on concept and reality. In: E. Marks/W. Steffen (Publ.) (2009), pp. 143-160.
- Fuchs, Marek et. al. (2005): Violence in schools 1994 – 1999 – 2004. Wiesbaden.
- Görgen, Thomas (2013): Field of tension science and practice: Where is crime prevention going? 3rd Symposium – German sponsorship award Crime Pre-
vention. Bielefeld (unpublished manuscript; a brief excerpt can be found in Forum Crime Prevention 3/2013, p. 41).
- Groeger-Roth, Frederick (2012): "Communities That Care – CTC" in practice. Results and experiences from the model trial SPIN in Lower Saxony. Forum Crime Prevention 3/2012, pp. 2-6.
- Groeger-Roth, Frederick/Hasenpusch, Burkhard (2011): The "Green List for Preven-

- tion” – a look at effective and promising prevention programs. *Forum Crime Prevention* 4/2011, pp. 52-58.
- Hahlen, Johann (2012): Policy consulting – an experience report from both sides with a look at the two Periodical Security Reports. In: Hilgendorf, Eric/Rengier, Rudolf (Publ.)(2012), pp. 109- 123.
- Hanke, Ottmar (2007): Strategies of prevention of violence at schools. In: Office (Publ.)(2007), pp. 104-130.
- Heinz, Wolfgang (2013): What legislators should want to know? or: For what subjects should legislators have current and reliable information from crime and penal law statistics? In: Boers, Klaus et. al. (Publ.)(2013), p. 345-357.
- Heinz, Wolfgang (2011): New lust for punishment in justice – reality or myth? *NK* 1/2011, pp. 14-27.
- Heinz, Wolfgang (2007): “cause for concern”, “dramatic” ... Some current data for classification and assessment of crime policy discussion. *ZJJ* 1/07, pp. 65-72.
- Heinz, Wolfgang (2006): On the status of unreported crime research in Germany. In: Commemorative publication on the 65th birthday of Helmut Kury, p. 241-263.
- Heinz, Wolfgang (2005): Communal crime prevention from a scientific point of view. In: Bannenberg, Britta et. al. (Publ.)(2005), pp. 9-30.
- Heinz, Wolfgang (2003): The contribution of the “1st PSR” to crime prevention. In: Kerner, H.-J./Marks, E. (Publ.): Internet documentation German Congress of Crime Prevention. Hanover.
- Heinz, Wolfgang (1998): Crime prevention. Comments on an overdue course correction in criminal policy. In: Kerner, Hans-Jürgen et. al. (Publ.)(1998), pp. 17-59.
- Hermann, Dieter/Jantzer, Vanessa (2012): School social work – crime prevention effects and improvement possibilities. In: E. Marks/W. Steffen (Publ.)(2012), pp. 207-229.
- Hilgendorf, Eric/Rengier, Rudolf (Publ.)(2012): Commemorative publication on the 70th birthday of Wolfgang Heinz. Baden-Baden.
- Holthusen, Bernd/Glaser, Michaela (2013): Office positions as new project type of DJI. *DJI Impulses – 50 years of DJI.* 2/2013, 71 -72
- Holthusen, Bernd/Hoops, Sabrina (2012): Crime prevention in childhood and adolescence. On role, contribution, and significance of children’s and youth organizations. *ZJJ* 1/2012, pp. 23-28.
- Holthusen, Bernd et. al. (2011): On the need for professional and reflective prevention. *DJI Impulses* 2.2011, pp. 22-25.
- Holthusen, Bernd/Schäfer, Heiner (2007): Strategies for the prevention of violence in children’s and youth aid for young people. In: Office (Publ.)(2007), 131-168.
- Jasch, Michael (2003): Communal crime prevention in crisis. *M SchrKrim*, 86th Volume, Issue 6/2003, pp. 411-420.

- Jerke, Viktoria: Success factor cooperation in police crime prevention. *Forum Crime Prevention* 4/2013, 40-41.
- John, Tobias/Schulze, Verena (2012): Cooperative security policy in cities (KoSi-Pol). Report on research project. *Forum Crime Prevention* 3/2012, pp. 4-6.
- Kahl, Wolfgang (2014): European network for crime prevention (EUCPN). *Forum Crime Prevention* 1/2014, pp. 36-37.
- Kahl, Wolfgang (2013): Editorial for *Forum Crime Prevention* 4/2013, pp. 2-3.
- Kahl, Wolfgang (2013 a): 19th German Congress for Crime Prevention. May 12-13, 2014 in Karlsruhe. *Forum Crime Prevention* 4/2013, pp. 39.
- Kahl, Wolfgang (2012): "Good social policy is the best criminal policy" and prevents the road to a surveillance society – On the (mis)understanding of the prevention idea. *Forum Crime Prevention* 2/2012, pp. 26-27.
- Kahl, Wolfgang (2011): 10 years of DFK – interim report on the road "to a better tomorrow". *Forum Crime Prevention* 3/2011, pp. 4-6.
- Kahl, Wolfgang/Kober, Marcus (2009): Citizen involvement in communal crime prevention: Contributions from current research (Part 2) On the possibilities for development. In: E. Marks/W. Steffen (Publ.)(2009), pp. 161-170.
- Koop, Gerd (2013): Questions to criminology ... from the perspective of the penal system. *MschrKrim* 96th Volume - Issue 2/3 2013, pp. 202-206.
- Kerner, Hans-Jürgen (2013): Application-oriented criminological research: opportunities and risks. *MschrKrim* 96th Volume - Issue 2/3 2013, pp. 184-201.
- Kerner, Hans-Jürgen (2012): 10 years Foundation German Forum for Crime Prevention (DFK). Congratulatory words of a companion, with review of historical development of prevention in legislation and practice. In: Annual report 2011 of the Foundation German Forum for Crime Prevention. Bonn, pp. 28-44.
- Kerner, Hans-Jürgen et. al. (Publ.)(1998): The development of crime prevention in Germany. At the same time documentation of the 3rd German Congress of Crime Prevention in Bonn on May 5-7, 1997. Godesberg.
- Coalition agreement between CDU, CSU, and SPD: Shaping Germany's future. 18th legislative period.
- Kober, Marcus/Kahl, Wolfgang (2012): Impulses for communal prevention management. Insights and recommendations for the organization and work of crime prevention commissions at the communal level. Foundation German Forum for Crime Prevention (DFK)(Publ.), 2nd completely revised edition 2012. Bonn
- Koop, Gerd (2013): Questions to criminology ... from the perspective of the penal system. *MschrKrim* 96th Volume - Issue 2/3 – 2013, pp. 202-206.
- Kreuzer, Arthur (2013): Commonplaces, populist but also sensible projects. The criminal policy program of the coalition agreement – a critical review. Guest contribution for the Gießener Allgemeine dated 4.12.2013.
- Kunz, Karl-Ludwig (2013 a): Historical foundation of criminology in Germany

- and its development to an independent scientific discipline. MschrKrim 96th Volume - Issue 2/3 2013, pp. 81-114.
- Kunz, Karl-Ludwig (2013 b): On the concept “punitive” and its development in international comparison. In: Klaus Boers et. al. (Publ.)(2013), pp. 113-125.
- Kunz, Karl-Ludwig (2011): Criminology. 6th, completely revised and updated edition. Haupt Verlag Bern et. al.
- Kury, Helmut (2013): More punishment - less crime: do (harsher) punishments work?
In: Kerner, Hans- Jürgen/Marks, Erich (Publ.): Internet documentation of the German Congress of Crime Prevention. Hanover 2013 (www.praeventions-tag.de/Dokumentation.cms/2339).
- Lamnek, Siegfried (1990): The problem of crime reporting in the mass media. MschrKrim 73th Volume, Issue 3 – 1990, pp. 163-176.
- State parliament North Rhine-Westphalia (2010): Report of the enquete commission to develop proposals for an effective prevention policy in North Rhine-Westphalia. Düsseldorf,
- State Council for crime prevention Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania (LfK)(Publ.) (2011): impulse. prevention works. Business report of LfK 2010/2011. Schwerin.
- State Council for crime prevention Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania (LfK)(Publ.) (o.J.): impulse. EUROs for prevention. The support program of the State Council for crime prevention. Schwerin.
- State Council for crime prevention Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania (LfK)(Publ.) (o.J.): 10 GOOD REASONS. Why and how communal prevention councils should be installed. Schwerin.
- Lösel, Friedrich (2013): Criminology and psychology – development and status with special reference to Germany. MschrKrim 96th Volume - Issue 2/3 2013, pp. 153-163.
- Marks, Erich (2014): On some crime prevention developments between 1978 and 2013. In: Dirk Baier/Thomas Mößle (Publ.)(2014): Criminology is a social science. Commemorative publication on the 70th birthday of Christian Pfeifer. Baden-Baden, pp. 443-466.
- Marks, Erich (2013): The German Congress of Crime Prevention – an interim report 1993-2013. In: Boers, Klaus et. al. (Publ.)(2013), pp. 128-142.
- Marks, Erich (2011): The International Center for Crime Prevention ICPC. In: Kerner, Hans-Jürgen/Marks, Erich (Publ.): Internet documentation of the German Congress of Crime Prevention. Hanover (www.praeventionstag.de/Dokumentation.cms/1671).
- Marks, Erich/Schairer, Martin (2010): New German-European Forum for Urban Security (DEFUS). In: Kerner, H.-J./Marks, E. (Publ.): Internet documentation of the German Congress of Crime Prevention. Hanover 2010, www.praeventionstag.de/Dokumentation.cms/1030.

- Marks, Erich/Steffen, Wiebke (Publ.)(2013): Living safely in cities and the countryside. Selected contributions of the 17th German Congress of Crime Prevention 2012. Forum Verlag Godesberg.
- Marks, Erich/Steffen, Wiebke (Publ.)(2012): Education – prevention – future. Selected contributions of the 15th German Congress of Crime Prevention 2010. Godesberg.
- Marks, Erich/Steffen, Wiebke (Publ.)(2011): Living (in) solidarity – ensuring diversity. Selected contributions of the 14th German Congress of Crime Prevention 2009. Godesberg.
- Marks, Erich/Steffen, Wiebke (Publ.)(2009): Involved citizens – safe society. Selected contributions of the 13th German Congress of Crime Prevention 2008. Godesberg.
- Melzer, Wolfgang (2013): Crime prevention at schools – between individual projects and school development (Presentation 18th DPT, Bielefeld 2013, in print).
- Melzer, Wolfgang et al. (2012): Bullying and violence at schools. Development trends from 2002 to 2010. *Healthcare system* 2012; 74 (Suppl 1), pp. 76-83.
- Melzer, Wolfgang/Schubarth, Wilfried/Ehninger, Frank (2011): Prevention of violence and school development. 2nd, revised edition. Bad Heilbrunn.
- Melzer, Wolfgang/Schwind, Hans-Dieter (Publ.)(2004): Prevention of violence in school. Foundations – practical models – perspectives. Documentation of the 15th Mainz Victim Forum 2003. Mainz writings on situation of crime victims. Volume 38. Baden-Baden.
- Meyer, Anja (2012): Professionalism through qualification: New Master's degree "Preventive social work with emphasis on criminology & crime prevention". *Forum Crime Prevention* 1/2012, pp. 2-3.
- Meyer, Anja (2019): Quality through competence. The Beccaria qualification program. In: Kerner, Hans-Jürgen/Marks, Erich (Publ.): Internet documentation of the German Congress of Crime Prevention. Hanover 2010 (www.praeventionstag.de/Dokumentation.cms/1031).
- Meyer, Anja (2008): Qualification in crime prevention. *ZJJ* 3/2008, pp. 368-370.
- Mielenz, Ingrid (2013): The DJI between science and practice – possibilities and limits of policy consulting. *DJI Impulses – 50 years of DJI*. 2/2013, pp. 78-79.
- Mischkowitz, Robert (2013): Questions to criminology ... from the perspective of the police. *MschKrim* 96th Volume - Issue 2/3 2013, pp. 212-221.
- Müller, Thomas (2010): Requirements for an optimal support of communal prevention commissions. In: Kerner, H.-J./Marks, E. (Publ.): Internet documentation of the German Congress of Crime Prevention. Hanover 2010, www.praeventionstag.de/Dokumentation.cms/1110
- Müller, Thomas (2004): Communal prevention commissions in Lower Saxony (http://www.lpr.niedersachsen.de/Landespraeventionsrat/Module/Publikationen/Dokumente/20050606_2_F87.pdf).
- Ohder, Claudius (2010): A look back to the future. In: Evaluation and quality deve-

- lopment in violence and crime prevention. Documentation of the 10th Berlin prevention congress 2009. Berlin. pp. 14-20.
- Ostendorf, Heribert (2005): Critical reflections on crime prevention. Hanover (www.dvjj.de; Conference: Prevention at any cost?).
- Ostendorf, Heribert (2002): Opportunities and risks of crime prevention. In: Berliner Forum Crime Prevention. Special edition 5. Documentation of the 2nd Berlin Prevention Congress on October 10, 2001. Berlin, pp. 16-24.
- Pfeiffer, Christian et. al. (2004): The media, evil and us. MschrKrim 87th Volume: Issue 6/2004, pp. 425-435.
- Pluto, Liane/van Santen, Eric/Seckinger, Mike (2014): Life situations of juveniles as starting point of communal policy design. An expert opinion on participation-oriented survey of youth policy needs. DJI Deutsches Jugendinstitut. Munich.
- Program Police Crime Prevention of the States and the Federation (Publ.)(2012): Annual report 2012. Commission for Police Crime Prevention of the States and the Federation. Stuttgart.
- Program Police Crime Prevention of the States and the Federation (Publ.)(2009): Quality assurance in police work. Work aid for planning, implementation, and assessment of projects. Stuttgart.
- PSR (2006): Second PSR see Federal Ministry of the Interior/Federal Ministry of Justice (Publ.)(2006)
- PSR (2001): First PSR see Federal Ministry of the Interior/Federal Ministry of Justice (Publ.)(2001)
- Redo, Slawomir Marek (2012): Blue Criminology. The power of United Nations ideas to counter crime globally. A monographic study. Helsinki.
- Renschmidt, Helmut (2013): Criminology and forensic children's and youth psychiatry: The significance of the developmental perspective. MschrKrim 96th Volume - Issue 2/3 2013, pp. 172-183.
- Reuband, Karl-Heinz (2013): Criminology and sociology. Position in scientific system and scientific public. MschrKrim 96th Volume - Issue 2/3 2013, pp. 140-152.
- Reuband, Karl-Heinz (2010): Dimensions of punitive measures and social change. NK 4/2010, pp. 143- 148.
- Scheerer, Sebastian (1978): The political-publicistic amplification cycle. On the influence of mass media in the process of penal law norm genesis. KrimJ 10, Issue 3, pp. 223-227.
- Schneider, Hans-Joachim (2010): European criminology at the start of the 21st century. Crime, criminology, and criminal policy in Europe. MschrKrim 93th Volume - Issue 6/2010, pp. 475-501.
- Schöch, Heinz (2013): Applied criminology. In: Boers et. al. (Publ.), pp. 207-220.
- Schöch, Heinz (1994): General prevention from a criminological perspective. In: The Attorney General of the State of Schleswig-Holstein (Publ.)(1994):

- What insights in the social sciences can penal law practice implement?
Educational event on September 29-30 in the Evangelical Academy Bad
Segeberg, pp. 76-83.
- Schöch, Heinz (1985): Empirical foundation of general prevention. In: Theo Vogler
et al. (Publ.)(1985): Commemorative publication on the 70th birthday of
Hans-Heinrich Jescheck. Berlin, pp.1081-1105.
- Schreiber, Verena (2007): Local prevention commissions in Germany. *Forum Hu-
man Geography* 2. Frankfurt.
- Schubarth, Wilfried (2010): Violence and bullying at schools. Possibilities of pre-
vention and intervention. Stuttgart.
- Schubarth, Wilfried (2001): Juvenile violence as economic topic in the media. *New
criminal policy* 3/2001, pp. 24-29.
- Schwind, Hans-Dieter (2013): *Criminology. A practice-oriented introduction with
examples*. 22nd, revised and updated edition. Criminology Heidelberg et. al.
- Schwind, Hans-Dieter (2000): Has the (anti) violence commission worked in vain?
Crime prevention 2/2000, 45-54.
- Schwind, Hans-Dieter/Baumann, Jürgen (Publ.)(1990): Causes, prevention, and
control of violence. Analyses and suggestions of the independent govern-
ment commission for the prevention of and fight against violence (Violence
Commission). Volume I. Final expert opinion and interim opinion of work
groups. Berlin.
- Schwind, Hans-Dieter/Steinhilper, Gernot (2014): Memories of the genesis of the
KFN. In: Baier, Dirk/Möble, Thomas (Publ.)(2014): *Criminology is a social
science*. Commemorative publication on the 70th birthday of Christian Pfeif-
fer. Baden-Baden, pp. 593-603.
- Sessar, Klaus (2011): Editorial: Thoughts on the future of criminology in Germany.
MschrKrim 94th Volume - Issue 5/2011, pp. I-V.
- Spiess, Gerhard (2012): Three test pieces for the assessment of juvenile penal law
diversion practice - a study using recidivism statistical findings. In: Hilgen-
dorf, Eric/Rengier, Rudolf (Publ.)(2012), pp. 287-305.
- Steffen, Wiebke (2013 a): Security as a basic need of humans and responsibility of
the government. Report for the 17th German Congress of Crime Prevention.
April 16 & 17, 2012 in Munich. In: E. Marks/W. Steffen (Publ.)(2013), pp.
47-119.
- Steffen, Wiebke (2013 b): Prevention is too important to be left just to the police.
Thoughts on the significance of police crime prevention in the context of
crime prevention as a general social responsibility. In: Boers, Klaus et al.
(Publ.)(2013), pp. 485-498.
- Steffen, Wiebke (2013 c): Communal crime prevention – an interim report. Presenta-
tion at the Seminar 8/2013 of the DHPol on 14.02.2013 (unpublished).

- Steffen, Wiebke (2012 a): Security as a basic need of humans and responsibility of the government. Report for the 17th German Congress of Crime Prevention, April 16 & 17, 2012 in Munich. In: E. Marks/W. Steffen (Publ.)(2012), pp. 47-119.
- Steffen, Wiebke (2012 b): Learning and living situation of children and juveniles as places of education and prevention of violence. Report for the 15th German Congress of Crime Prevention, May 10 & 11, 2010 in Berlin. In: E. Marks/W. Steffen (Publ.)(2012), pp. 39-104.
- Steffen, Wiebke (2012 c): Communal crime prevention in Germany – Comments on the successes and deficits, risks and side-effects (<http://www.kriminal-praevention.bremen.de/sixcms/media.php/13/01%20-%20Wiebke%20Steffen.pdf>).
- Steffen, Wiebke (2011): Modern societies and crime. The contribution of crime prevention to integration and solidarity. Report for the 14th German Congress of Crime Prevention June 8-9, 2009 Hanover. In: E. Marks/W. Steffen (Publ.)(2011), pp. 45-116.
- Steffen, Wiebke (2009): Involved citizens – safe society. Citizen involvement in crime prevention. Report for the 13th German Congress of Crime Prevention June 2-3, 2008 in Leipzig. In: E. Marks/W. Steffen (Publ.)(2009), pp. 25-72.
- Steffen, Wiebke (2006 a): Crime prevention in Germany: A success story? In: Feltes, Thomas et al. (Publ.)(2006): Criminal policy and its scientific foundations. Commemorative publication on the 70th birthday of Dr. Hans-Dieter Schwind. C.F.Müller Verlag Heidelberg, pp. 1141-1154.
- Steffen, Wiebke (2006 b): Police work close to citizens and community-oriented in Germany. In: Berg, Manfred et al. (Publ.)(2006): Penal law in the US and Germany. History and recent developments. Heidelberg, 117-128.
- Steffen, Wiebke (2005): Commissions of communal crime prevention – inventory and perspective. In: Bannenberg, Britta et. al. (Publ.)(2005), pp. 156-167.
- Steffen, Wiebke (2004): Communal crime prevention in Germany: A success story? Forum Crime Prevention 4/2004, pp. 18-21.
- Steffen, Wiebke (2002): Community policing or police work close to citizens: A new challenge? Forum Crime Prevention 1/2002, 11-13.
- Steffen, Wiebke (1995): Changes in the perception of police responsibility – Community orientation as a modern target perspective? In: 50 year of police education in Münster. Series of police leadership academy No. 3/4/1995, 107-122.
- Steffen, Wiebke/Hepp, Reinhold (2007): Strategies of police prevention of violence in childhood and adolescence. In: Office (Publ.)(2007), pp. 169-195.
- Foundation German Forum for Crime Prevention (Publ.)(2013): Development

- support and violence prevention for young people. Quality criteria catalog of the DFK expert panel for the selection and implementation of effective programs.
- Foundation German Forum for Crime Prevention (Publ.)(2013): Development support and violence prevention for young people. Impulses of the DFK expert panel for the selection and implementation of effective programs – a guideline for practice.
- Stolpe, Oliver (2009): An Overview of Crime Prevention at the International Level. In: Coester, Marc/ Marks, Erich /Eds.): International Perspectives of Crime prevention 3. Contributions from the 3rd Annual International Forum 2009. Godesberg, pp. 39-46.
- Uhle, Ria (2012): Changes, paradigm shifts, crises – prevention of violence in schools in change. In: E. Marks/W. Steffen (Publ.)(2012), pp. 301-313.
- van den Brinck, Henning (2012): A look behind the scenes of communal prevention commissions. Conference report on final symposium of research project “Cooperative security policy in cities” (KoSiPol). Forum Crime Prevention 4/2012, pp. 4-7.
- Waller, Irvin (2012): Balanced investments into proven crime prevention. *Kriminalistik* 7/2012, pp. 415-419.
- Waller, Irvin (2011): More law and order! Or rather less crime? Publ. at request of German Congress of Crime Prevention by Burkhard Hasenpusch and Erich Marks. Godesberg.
- Welsh, Brandon C./Farrington, David P. (2012): Science, politics, and crime prevention: Toward a new crime policy. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 40 (2012), pp. 128-133.
- Wijkmans, Belinda (2013): European Crime Prevention Network (EUCPN): Crime prevention activities on EU, national, and local level. In: Kerner, Hans-Jürgen/Marks, Erich (Publ.): Internet documentation of German Congress of Crime Prevention. Hanover 2012 (www.praeventionstag.de/Dokumentation.cms/2256).
- Ziercke, Jörg (1998): Requirements for a future-oriented, integrated social crime prevention – Need for a federal prevention commission. In: Kerner, Hans-Jürgen et al. (Publ.)(1998), pp. 281-292.

Content

Introduction	5
Lectures and Documents from the 8th Annual International Forum	
WIEBKE STEFFEN	
Report for the 19 th German Congress of Crime Prevention	9
ERICH MARKS	
The 19 th German Congress on Crime Prevention.....	99
CLAUDIA HEINZELMANN / DANIELA KÖNTOPP	
Prevention Work in Germany in the Face of the Exhibiton Accompanying the German Congress on Crime Prevention (GCOCP).....	109
FRANK BUCHHEIT	
Prevention connects! The Twinning-light Project ‘Strengthening Capacities of the Ministry of Interior for Crime Prevention’	135
JÖRG ZIERCKE	
Cybercrime - the darker side of the digital society	145
WOLFGANG KAHL	
Developmental support and violence prevention for young people: Prerequisites for success and sustainability.....	159
HARRIE JONKMAN	
What do we know and what can we achieve regarding prevention work for youths?	179
RITA HAVERKAMP	
Barometer of Security in Germany	185
KLAUS BEIER	
The German Dunkelfeld Project: Proactive Strategies to Prevent Child Sexual Abuse and the Use of Child Abusive Images	195
PETRA GUDER	
Child Friendly Justice – Wishful Thinking?!	201

DAVID STUCKI	
The Role of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) in the Current Reform Process	213
PATRICIA MARTIN	
From First Court Model to Model Court: The history of the Cook County Juvenile Court	219
RICHARD ROSS	
Juvenile in Justice.....	229
GERMAN CONGRESS ON CRIME PREVENTION AND CONGRESS PARTNERS	
Karlsruhe Declaration of the 19 th German Congress on Crime Prevention	243
Program of the 8th Annual International Forum	249
Authors	253