

BETTER PLANNING TO PREVENT CRIME — VIA THE BUREAUCRACY

By W. Clifford*

Director, Australian Institute of Criminology. Address to the Tenth Annual Conference of the Australian Crime Prevention Council, Hobart, Tasmania, 17 August 1979.

The Bureaucratic Burden

"Bureaucracy" starts out with a distinct disadvantage. It is an ugly, hybrid, word — an illicit union of French and Greek — of which H. W. Fowler in his Dictionary of Modern English Usage complains and I quote:

"The formation is so barbarous that all attempt at self-respect in pronunciation may perhaps as well be abandoned."

But, quite apart from its literal bastardy or its phonetic inelegance, the very concept of officialdom which this word represents is cumbrous, graceless and entirely unimaginative. Little wonder that we use it far more often for insult than inspiration.

Planning is different. Planning is something decisive, creative even uplifting. Some have argued that since plans are rarely fully realised it is a kind of utopianism. In trying to control our destiny we are playing God. Maybe so, but this is a vice with more than a dash of virtue. It gives us expectation and direction, there is a positive nuance about planning. We get the impression of a community actually doing something for itself, looking forward, trying to improve . . . and this impression persists whether or not the blueprints are ever effectively translated into projects.

Compared with the hope of planning, bureaucracy descends like a millstone, around the public conscience, an obese monument to human inertia, a reliable if dubious testimony to man's remarkable and quite extraordinary capacity to weave himself consistently into a tangled web of routines, technicalities and procedures from which eventually he cannot escape — even when he knows that he is strangling his own initiative and courting his own destruction.

Of course, all this is commonplace, everyone knows what is wrong and there are frequent attempts to clean up and streamline bureaucracy. Unfortunately, attempts to make a clean sweep always seem to end up with the sweepers forming yet another controlling department or agency which convolutes, even more, the mesh it was supposed to clear. These cleaners or controllers eventually need more staff than the numbers they expect to make redundant — and, imperceptibly, the direction moves from those with the professional skills to those with the purse. Have you noticed how the very people who should be axed seem to end up wielding the axe — with seats on the committee originally intended to eject them! The procedures and constraints become ever more restrictive and confounded as, over any period of years a complex range of vested interests, administrative, executive and professional, take root and then thrive on all the subdivisions and fragmentations of authority: and the product is the effective separation of responsibility from financial control which thereby successfully prevents any blame or liability from ever being unequivocally attached. Entrenched interests are cushioned, specialisation intensifies in formalities, job descriptions and a variety of new interests in management, organisation and methods, quality control, training and welfare, all of which develop to fatten the monster on a diet of increased taxation.

Now this is not a fulmination against our system alone.

Students of English law can trace it in the crippling technicalities of the Common Law which obliged the creation of Courts of Equity in the 17th Century. The United States has reached a level of bureaucracy which we can only imagine. Over ten years ago a college of social work seeking accreditation had to deal with some ten pounds weight of questionnaires: and in some developing countries the government as the employer of last resort is grossly overburdened with lowly paid staff forced to invent their own work. The United Nations itself has become a classical model of how to institutionalise failures to provide more jobs at other people's expense. In religion, the rites and regulations have often overwhelmed the principles and precepts and modern academia threatens to subside into a trough of incestuous administration. Even communist systems are bedevilled by bureaucracy as any scrutiny of their publications will show.

Not surprisingly then, we find ourselves constantly fighting this mammoth growth of routines which seem ultimately to stifle the original objectives — to convert ends to means, to reduce goals to grooves and to sacrifice the most essential principles to the daily trivia of procedures. It sometimes seems impossible to get anything done without heaving the system bodily out of the way or at least sending a few rockets roaring along the official channels. That is why a politician who seeks to streamline the public service always finds public sympathy. Unfortunately, the bureaucratic pathways are themselves paved with reformist intentions.

Regarded in this way, it is possible to sympathise with Mao Tse Tung's "Cultural Revolution" which was designed to prevent his country settling down benignly into the kind of bureaucratic dictatorship which, he saw, had already overtaken the thrust of the Russian revolution. China, after all, had had many more centuries than the West of rule by official mandarins. They had had one of the world's earliest bureaucracies. However, the Chinese experience is important in demonstrating that anarchy is no antidote for entrenched administration. An oppressive control of all traffic is not relieved by abandoning all the rules. This way another form of madness lies — we not only throw out the baby with the bathwater: abandoning all rules means throwing out the bath as well!

There can be no planning to prevent crime therefore if we cannot implement it through the existing bureaucracy — however much we may deplore the machinery we have. In both England and Japan crippling bureaucracies were kept workable for a long time by an "old boy" network of relationships which cut corners when necessary. In terms of crime we can interest bureaucracies in planning if we consider ways of recasting bureaucratic roles imaginatively. The work against corruption, or the use of ombudsmen to protect individual rights, as well as the opening of public files to private inspection, can make the bureaucracies more defensive and even more rigidly rule-bound because caution will increase and they will not dare to use discretion in ways that might be misinterpreted. Planning to prevent crime, therefore, means rethinking bureaucratic systems to avoid them becoming so ossified by appeals, procedures, extended legal aid, inquiries and commissions. These can be carried to

such extremes that nothing can work until there is a liberating court decision. If the United States is any guide, the worst and weakest form of bureaucracy is that which is so subjected to the courts that judges become the real administrators. In some instances judges have decided whether there should be one or two tablets of soap in the prisoners' showers and have held the search of a pram to be a violation of the infant's human rights. There is as much virtue in separating the executive from the judiciary as there is in separating the judiciary from the executive.

Bureaucracy in the Criminal Justice System

The criminal justice system itself has certainly not escaped bureaucracy and it tends to become rigidified in ways which we have dangerously begun to regard as sacrosanct. Better planning, therefore, means examining from time to time the ways in which the criminal justice system is itself creating the problems which it seeks to solve. It is by now a hackneyed contention and one which I am sure has not escaped you this week, that our law making actually creates the crime and our law enforcement helps to create the criminals: but there is no doubt that we have far too much law making in any country at this time. On the other hand, those who deplore it in one particular area or department, seem to be busy encouraging it in others, so that, as we seek to decriminalise some things, we are rapidly criminalising others. At this rate we may one day get laws against law making and guess what — a new department will have been added.

Again we all know what is wrong, but putting it right is another matter. To begin with, it would appear necessary to direct a virtual gale of fresh air through our established legal drafting procedures. Codes are really too important to be left wholly to legal codifiers — especially when they are penal codes. The back room boys of our parliaments have, by legal clauses, fashioned society more effectively than many of our most famous reformers — and the subtleties of this actual process are still largely unexplored by those not actually engaged in the work. I have seen very little in the way of publications on the process of lawmaking and its implications at different levels of government and social life. But just as the Americans used to think that a problem would go away if you threw enough money at it, we seem convinced that a problem will disappear if we throw enough law at it — even old laws.

Looking at a legal opinion the other day, I came across a classical example of a modern law into which sections of an Act of the mid 19th Century had been lifted bodily to give us "new" legislation. There are always "convenient" passages or "regular" penalties which have a tendency to swing from statute to statute. In planning terms unimaginative legal drafting can defeat the most enlightened programmes. We all know how modern developments are enforced by new statutes which provide for all kinds of penalties if certain actions are not taken — once again giving us unnecessary problems in crime which might have been dealt with better administratively. But parliamentarians are no longer in control of legislation. They are submerged in a white ocean of paper, forced to be selective and obliged to specialise. Nor are the parliamentarians the only ones to blame. In our own sphere of criminal justice, we tour the world looking for ideas and sometimes we tend to snatch at schemes from other countries and even to enact them untried, simply because they appear to have an overseas stamp of approval. Trying to change the system is one of the generators of bureaucratic growth — if we are not very careful. So what can we do which is practical? The first step has already been taken by the establishment of law reform commissions — but I would venture to suggest that these have a great deal of work still to

do on the tidying up of existing legislation, much could be done to concentrate the expanding volumes of statutes. For the future, no penal clause should be inserted without public advertisement of the intention and a period allowed for reaction. An exception could be made for emergency legislation, but this would concentrate both public and legislative attention on the proposed changes.

Change upon change gradually adds to the weight of legislation and to the oppressive weight of our criminal justice bureaucracy. In these days of closed shops, we are all concerned with the precise extension of occupational privilege, but there are all kinds of restrictive practices to protect professional positions throughout the criminal justice system; lawyers, judges, doctors, academics, as well as police and correctional workers, would really find it extremely difficult to adjust to radically altered systems. They may want change, but they are handicapped by positions of privilege, seniority, job descriptions, conditions of tenure and the need to survive in the scramble for income advantage during a time of inflation. So change can only be change if it protects vested interests — and this is how the monster grows.

In planning the criminal justice services, we are our own worst enemies — if only because the criminal justice services do not want to be a system. The Courts in particular have objections to being linked with the executive services like the police or corrections in the single objective of reducing crime. How can they do justice, they argue, if they have to consider the realities of police work and the overcrowding in the prisons. They should be able to try and sentence impartially, without such mundane administrative considerations. But this is only true if we have unlimited resources: otherwise justice within the four walls of the court can become rank injustice in its administration. Similarly, there are rigidities built into the police system which obscure the planning need for a radical reorganisation of all our policing policies in order to cope with modern forms of crime which already outstrip our traditional services. Here union policies are involved and a good deal of rethinking is necessary in the best interest of the police themselves. They may lose a lot by defending traditional boundaries that have already been outflanked. Already private security, narcotics, corporate affairs, commissions and a variety of other law enforcement agencies are arising alongside the official police. This unplanned growth and overlapping will extend and may eventually defy any attempt to bring order to the forces of order.

Corrections is in the worst situation of all. I am really tired of public figures making political and professional capital by all kinds of unqualified statements and declarations on the prisons. It is too complicated a situation for any absolute statements. The position differs in the States and even between institutions. There are few people qualified to make comparisons across countries and it is easy to polarise the different interests.

The layman is confused and torn between the safety of his family and his desire to be human and reasonable. Instead of driving to extremes, we should be trying to develop a system of acceptable accreditation and to find solutions to a situation which will remain unsatisfactory until we have far more resources than are now available for prisons. Corrections are caught in the cross fire of the modern division between social control and human rights. Corrections have to walk a tight rope stretched taut on human emotions and deep feelings about diametrically opposed human and social values. This flows partly from a greater distribution of education, having faced us for the first time in history with mass democracy. It has never happened before and the existing services are clearly not geared to deal with this new form of corrections

under the camera. So, those who can get out of the hot seats do so. Those who can't defend their own privileges against those of the prisoners and there is a polarisation which only force or authority will resolve. We are moving in a dangerous direction.

Therefore, planning begins within our own criminal justice services. We need a lot more cross-fertilisation, more linkages between the educational courses for sociologists, economists, planners, lawyers, police and corrections, more sharing of experiences, more co-ordination and even some political and public relations exposure to prepare the officers for their new roles, new responsibilities and the ordeals ahead. None of this will be possible if in our bureaucracy we are all busy defending our own ruts.

Above all, this means a new look at education, at qualifications, at opportunities for training and promotion, at the restrictions presently imposed by professional boundaries and at the rationale for the total process of crime prevention. All services need to be brought together in criminal justice training and research. The judicial and executive functions can and should be kept separate but each needs to know enough about the other's work to make his own meaningful.

The task ahead of us, within the criminal justice system, is indeed huge and daunting. We need nothing less than a new orientation of criminal justice — a new, flexible, professional and scientific image for the older ponderous services so long geared to the past rather than the future. The need for transformation becomes clearer every day — and we need it if we are not to enter the technological space age still replete with wigs, batons and shackles.

Bureaucracy Outside Criminal Justice

For years now we have been calling for crime prevention to become a part of our national and regional planning — for there to be crime-impact studies in the same sense as we have environmental impact studies. They are at least as important if the natural amenities we hope to enjoy are not to become new jungles of insecurity. But how do we get this message across to those with power to give crime prevention the importance it undoubtedly deserves.

It would be comforting to believe that the need for crime prevention would be underlined by growing crime itself, that the seriousness of developing crime, would itself provide the incentive. It would be gratifying to feel that parks the public are too afraid to use, mindless vandalism, or the concentrations of problem groups of the population in certain housing areas, would make regional or town planners go back to their drafts to see whether, at least, some of the human behaviour problems we are facing were not partially related to their own earlier decisions on the shape of the immediate environment. It would be reassuring to feel that Treasuries, Finance Ministries, Economic and Social Planners, were beginning to look at the rise of the virtually uncontrollable financial manipulations and the corporate and transnational despoilings of the consumers for the clues which would help them devise future prophylactics — instead of just wringing their hands afterwards at the way their good intentions have been corrupted. It would be heartening to believe that new technologies or extended credit schemes were being created and formulated in such a way that the public would be saved the burden of being the ultimate paymaster for all the defalcations which are encouraged by the increased opportunities for fraud and the diversion of profits. So many of these new schemes and progressive enterprises are devised as if man were perfect: and they seem to incorporate a shrug of the shoulders as a reaction to the discovery that he is not perfect — a shrug only

entertainable on the confidence that such costs can be carried over in higher prices to a docile public.

Unfortunately, we cannot be so reassured, gratified or heartened because experience shows that the eventual discovery of more serious crime seems only to lead back by a kind of conditioned reflex to harsher laws, heavier penalties and to the pouring of more funds into the older styles of criminal justice as if we were still not aware that the "system" we have is falling far behind transnational sophisticated and highly organised crime. Such discoveries of serious crime, instead of stimulating the imagination, seem to attract new funds for law enforcement hardware and technical equipment as if these and not community building and social support were the real safeguards of public safety. And crime prevention still finds no place in future economic, social, regional and local planning.

So, even when we have converted planners and criminal justice administrators to the new, wider, more extensive concepts of planning to prevent crime, they always ask:

"How are we to get the message through the bureaucracy?"

and this is as much a plea in developing as it is in developed countries.

Perhaps the first and last step is to somehow get the message across to the public for at least two good reasons. First, it is the public which has the elective muscle and the ultimate capacity to influence both legislators and the bureaucrats. Second, it is finally to the public we all have to turn to make crime prevention more effective. It is public toleration of crime and co-operation with the authorities which really decides not only how much crime we have but also how much of it will be discovered and prosecuted. Getting the message across means persuading the media to give as much coverage to the real long term possibilities of making the community safer by better planning as it now devotes to the dramatic instances of individual crimes. It means getting the message to churches, professional organisations and political parties. It means bringing it more effectively into our education system.

Of course, this is familiar territory. Most meetings on crime prevention past and present have eventually wound up on the note of community support for the criminal justice services. In fact, these appeals for public support have grown all the louder as these same services have grown, bureaucratized and as a result separated themselves from the communities they have needed. More pertinent to our present concern with planning, these calls for community support have coincided with economic, social and physical planning decisions which made communities in the sense of integrated neighbourhoods more and more difficult to survive. So the specialist became isolated by his own professionalism and the public became more vulnerable as it atomised in ever more crowded cities.

So, if our appeal for community support has actually failed up to now it is not only because of the media or the divisions in a value disintegrated society. It is also because our own criminal justice approach to better planning has been far less dramatic, imaginative and newsworthy than it might have been. What might have been achieved is evident by comparing criminal justice experience with the more successful campaigns to achieve public backing for things like population control or environmental protection — two themes which have really far less impact on the daily life of citizens than the incidence of crime. Could it be that we have been too preoccupied with law and morals so that we have never sufficiently emphasised the costs?

Both the public and the legislators it elects can be moved by the rising costs of a bureaucracy: but the costs of crime

are greater by far. Looked at purely economically, crime is a great hole in the national economic bucket. It has drained off — and continues to drain off — more income and economic benefits than we have ever been prepared to admit. Indeed it is no exaggeration to suggest that the national deficit of \$3,000 million or \$4,000 million could be largely reduced if only we could show more savings by crime prevention. To continue devoting expensive national resources to “more of the same” in an effort to deal with crime is not only an obscurantist way to approach the next century. It is no less than a criminal waste of scarce resources — a flogging of the dead horse of unimaginative control whilst we neglect the real sources of crime and all the opportunities of a more creative programme. Because — and this is the message that has to be conveyed — crime prevention properly conceived is no negative, defensive shield for the **status quo**. It is nothing less than a national mobilisation of all the skills and initiatives at our disposal for building not merely a safer but also a more fulfilling, satisfying, productive and caring society. And we have to demonstrate that this can be done.

A second target for the promotion of effective crime prevention planning is the legislators themselves. Let none of them imagine that there are no votes in crime prevention. It has been a political platform in national elections across the world. The sad thing to date is that this quite vital issue has usually been displaced onto the narrower and more divisive ground of restoring or strengthening “law and order”. However, it may be expressed this obviously appeals more to older than to younger people. It has therefore been easier to represent it as a bald sclerotic struggle to protect the establishment against necessary change. Regression and progression have been opposed. Yet, strangely enough during the lives of those governments most committed to law and order the funds expended have coincided with actual declines in the police detection rates and increases in crime which have bloated the amounts spent on private security demonstrating, it would seem, a singular lack of public confidence in the measures being taken. On the other hand when governments of the opposite inclination are in office similar crime rises prevent them reducing most of the traditional votes for law enforcement and their latent if not open distrust of the regular law and order services have generated a lower morale — similarly increasing the shift to self help and private security. So that these conflicts on law and order have probably benefited no-one. Instead criminal justice has become a political football.

What we need now is to develop the issue not merely of law and order but of planning a better, safer more satisfying society on non-party lines. There should surely be both votes and political kudos for all in reducing the social and economic costs of crime. Properly expressed, this can be a theme to unite not only young and old but all the divided sections of our society. To be successful however, the campaign must be strictly impartial encompassing the prevention of respectable crime as well as that which more conventionally crowds the courts. It has to be a national effort to transform and elevate the traditional criminal justice services to a new, highly respected leadership status considering the human rights of victims and offenders alike and placing crime in its true economic and social perspective. The design has to be modern and research oriented, capable of reflecting the aspirations of people of all ages, ranks and stations, well equipped and with a capacity not only to control present crime but to forestall the more organised, scientific and technological crimes of the future. It must be a model to incorporate planners in criminal justice, as well as criminal justice personnel in planning. This is to say no more than that both sides to the law and order argument must become more

realistic and turned around to meet the obvious challenge of the future.

The Private Sector

It would be a mistake to believe that bureaucratic inertia is a preserve of governments. There are administrative structures in some of the larger foundations and major industries which vie with the public service for the bureaucratic label. So far in crime prevention these enterprises have used self help engaging their own security departments or contracting with private security firms outside for a variety of protective services. However internally effective such services may be, they are no substitute for crime prevention planning and larger firms are still very vulnerable both to the development of crime in the larger community and to the activities of unscrupulous enterprises within the industry itself. How can they benefit from and contribute to better planning?

Taking first the criminal justice system itself. There exists a unique model for public/private co-operation in the N.C.C.D. of the United States — the National Council in Crime and Delinquency. This body is non-governmental. It is largely funded by industry and commerce, although it also received government grants. It is well endowed by public and private funds and has its own secretariat with branch offices all over the country. At every level of state and city, these councils bring together public and private knowledge to reduce the incidence of crime. It engages in research and public education. Once again, it should be possible for Australia to use the pattern of co-operation in the Australian Institute of Criminology, duplicated at state level to bring private industry, the banks and the unions, into effective co-operation to improve the machinery of crime prevention. It could even be a future joint enterprise of the Institute and the Crime Prevention Council. In fact, it will be no good unless we make it a truly Australian initiative. I have already criticised our tendency to rely too slavishly on the West.

Into this same pattern of voluntary private industry and commerce, official coalition could be fed the power of the unions. In the United Kingdom, Japan, Singapore, the United States and a number of Scandinavian countries, the unions have made substantial contributions to developments in prison industries and work finding schemes for probationers. They have also been involved in similar projects in Australia, though to a lesser extent than elsewhere. There is no reason why they should not and could not provide additional community strength to the kind of amalgamation of interests which is outlined here.

However, if there is to be such enterprise, the programmes need to be worked out clearly ahead and there will be need for government funding in Australia of a small task force to prepare the ground carefully and to itemise the kinds of projects which could be undertaken by local councils.

The Problem in Education

Few people can under-estimate today the significant role education plays in the shaping of our society. Yet the crime which concerns us is percolating into the schools and affecting the socialisation process itself. Allowing for the possible overreach of law enforcement and the need for diversionary programmes to avoid using the weight of criminal justice, it is still clear that there is a risk population needing urgent attention and that children are already stretched on the rack of community value conflicts, not always resolved by teacher-parent associations — a confusion which tends to flower as students reach the tertiary level.

All of this is tied up with the failure of socialisation in the family. We drift further from the basic family ideal to the

support of purely individual rights, regardless of consequences and we are often told that this is a good progressive move to a new and more liberal age. Are we really so ignorant of the fact that both Russia and the Kibbutzim of Israel have fully experimented with the ideal of a society with none of the traditional family ties — and they have gone back to the traditional family not for sentimental or moral reasons but because of its sheer practicability. Abortions in Russia are free — except for students — who are expected to treat with more respect the community investment in their futures. Now these are societies which once approached the old fashioned family concept with all the scorn that we have about us today. They learned not by theory but in practice.

Some of our deepest problems began when education ceased to be essentially a preparation for life and became an end in itself. So we are now, in the developed nations, suffering a profound structural dislocation, characterised by inflation and youth unemployment — a type of dislocation once limited to developing countries where education frequently alienated young people from the employment opportunities and helped to feed a young army of unemployed which no possible restructuring of the economic system could absorb, short of mobilisation by a dictatorship on one side or the other. As vested professional teaching and administrative interests found deeper roots in education itself, it became impossible to shift the direction without total revolution. Unfortunately, this sometimes happened and with no joy at all to either the educators or the young unemployed. This disjointing of education and economics is a phenomenon I have lived through in any number of countries during the last twenty years. Now I find it creeping up on Australia but it is no simple crime issue and requires planning of a high order, at the highest levels, to eliminate. Nevertheless though, too large a problem to be dealt with here in the crime prevention educational context alone, it is certainly pertinent to our discussion and needs to be used to give perspective. Let me add that I do not subscribe to the idea of a direct relationship between unemployment and crime — or between poverty and crime. Such relationships have never been established by research. In fact, much of the evidence is in the other direction. Moreover, it is unjust to stigmatise people, poor or unemployed, as being more criminal than others. However, this is not to question the fact that real need amongst the unemployed and the poor, as well as the weight of unproductive time can have its effect on some who will become involved in crime. More important, however, than the level of incomes for crime are the disparities which appear in our communities between those who have and those who have not — and the situation is not relieved by the apparently beautiful life of the successful which is always before us on the television screens, in glossy magazines, or described by the paperbacks, pornographic and otherwise.

This economic/educational/structural dislocation apart, some forms of planning are needed to resolve the problems of what to teach and even the teaching methods — because even the experts disagree; and we are all prone to appeal to personal experience which may now be grossly outdated. We can assume that programmes designed to realise the best in human potential will have a prior claim. But whereas we could once assume that developing the best in human potential meant, *inter alia*, conformity with social laws and mores, that is no longer the case. For those who would radically change society have sometimes penetrated the schools, exacerbating the confusion of real values. Teachers today have the unenviable task of drawing the line between training for conformity and training for the challenge of change. Since they will usually wish to avoid being labelled as obscurantists.

they may prefer the more open, less committed, approach. Or they may remain neutral, giving all too little guidance for fear of being stigmatised. In any event, teachers realise that value training, not firmly backed up by the behaviour of the society outside, is unlikely to be very effective.

There are however, ways in which the shadow can at least be made three dimensional, and one way out of the dilemma of conflicting value training which the Australian Institute of Criminology has already fostered is the promotion of law training and criminology training in a simple way in the schools. Here at least the issues are exposed and since children are rapidly losing their adolescence in our society, it is as well to prepare them early for the responsibilities ahead.

At the same time we cannot ignore the family transformation going on with such a high proportion of children being born of parents not married or having only one parent. As this proportion increases children at school need more direct individual counselling to cope with the world around them. Many of them need a great deal more care and affection than they have had. Problems of behaviour need to be identified early and referred for special attention. This may be the best form of diversion from the criminal justice system.

Another factor in this equation is the future reduction of the 15-25 year old age group if zero population growth continues. This is the most vulnerable age group for crime by young people. Vacant capacity in the schools and universities could then be taken up by adults and particularly the older people. Education at the older age ranges could greatly enhance the quality of our society if properly handled. Here again this will be possible only if work and leisure time are effectively planned.

Finally under education, reference should once again be made to the need for a recasting of the professional education of those who are going into the criminal justice field. Basic courses for criminological planning should be a feature of all courses for planners and for lawyers, social workers and police officers. Planning should be fed into administrative and executive courses for planning and at the Australian Institute of Criminology we are busy providing the material for such new forms of crime prevention education.

Urban and Regional Planning

A great deal has been written about the possible correlation of town lay-out and building types with certain forms of crime. Here in Australia we are already moving into practice. This was done most particularly by the seminars at Albury-Wodonga and Geelong and a very successful day seminar was promoted by the Australian Crime Prevention Council at Brisbane in 1978. Earlier there had been a week-end conference on crime prevention planning held by the World Council of Churches here in Hobart. The Institute used some of this experience in holding a Crime Prevention Planning Course for overseas participants at the Institute earlier this year and teams of these foreign participants were sent out to development areas where they not only did studies of their own but were often instrumental in bringing together local planners and criminal justice personnel for the first time. The proceedings of this course will be published soon and will provide further material which can be used in courses at the state level. The Institute paid to bring representatives from the States to take part in this special course which it held for the Australian Development Assistance Bureau.

Again, the Royal Australian Institute of Planners (Canberra Branch) has held one evening session at the Institute and published in its journal the paper which I then gave. We are now in the process of setting up a study group with the Federal Police and the National Capital Development Commission to see what more can be done about physical

planning, land use and crime in the Canberra Area. We hope to conduct more ambitious projects in Brisbane and Adelaide in the next year or two.

Conclusions

The Australian Crime Prevention Council has asked specifically that this Conference should be practical. It is necessary therefore to sum up. Suggested here for immediate implementation are the following:

- (a) The setting up of State Crime Commissions to organise and develop the planning necessary to prevent future crime. Details are available in the Australian Institute of Criminology Newsletter. An elaboration of this is the use of the existing Criminology Research Council pattern to provide national co-ordination for such work. This could be done within existing budgets but would be more successful with a small fund to initiate co-ordinated projects.
 - (b) The development of courses of basic training in crime prevention planning at the university level — fed into all present courses for economic and social planners as well as social scientists including criminologists. In addition, similar courses provided at the higher executive and administrative levels of our courts, police and correctional services.
- The Australian Institute of Criminology is busy not only on courses and field work but on publications which will provide teaching materials for such courses.

- (c) The conversion of the Australian Crime Prevention Council into a wider body with private industry and commerce to foster local crime prevention projects assisted by a task force which will first elaborate the projects for the council to develop.
- (d) The reform of our legal drafting to concentrate the present body of criminal law and provide for the advertisement of any newly projected penal clauses.
- (e) The mounting of a public educational programme on the possibilities of crime prevention planning.
- (f) The promotion of the idea of crime prevention planning with legislators stressing the costs of present crime and the importance of getting better value for present expenditure.
- (g) The conversion of senior public servants to the importance of promoting crime prevention by the use of funds for co-ordination and co-ordinated projects. The promotion of the model of the Criminology Research Council as a pattern for future federal interstate co-operation in this field.
- (h) The promotion of legal and criminology teaching in the schools.
- (i) The extension of counselling in the schools with a view to identifying the individual children with problems.
- (j) The preparation of schools for wider use in society as the number of younger people decline.

SEATOURS



GOURMET CRUISES

*"AN ULTIMATE
LUXURY CRUISER"*

- SEATED DINING UP TO 32 PEOPLE
- TOP INTERNATIONAL CUISINE
- FULL BAR FACILITIES
- EXCLUSIVE CHARTER

M.S.B. LICENCE TO CARRY 36 PERSONS



233 8827

AN IDEAL WAY TO HIGHLIGHT THAT SPECIAL BUSINESS CONFERENCE, ENTERTAIN YOUR FRIENDS, CELEBRATE YOUR BIRTHDAY OR WEDDING

50 PITT ST., SYDNEY AFTER HOURS: 81 1875

Kindly sponsored by

BESTOBELL CONTRACTING SERVICES

Specialists in:

Design Procurement & Application of Acoustic and Thermal Insulation, Fire Protection & Removal of Asbestos

32 HEALEY RD, DANDENONG SOUTH 3175

PHONE: (03) 793 5044

Shell Salisbury Auto Care

- Automotive Air-conditioning.
- Repco Cool-drive supplied and fitted.
- Service and repairs on all air-conditioned units.
- Gas check and fill while you wait.
- Complete service, \$34.50, Air-conditioning.

Ask about our Guaranteed Service plan.

2 WATERLOO CNR. ROAD, SALISBURY, S.A. 5108

Telephone (08) 258 1627

SAACC Approved Auto Repairer

HAKEA

Cleaning Service



"We Keep the Look You Paid For!"

Deep Soil Extractions, Thorough Gentle Cleaning Beautifies Carpet Pile, Moisture Controlled, a Safe Process for Longer Carpet Life, Commercial and Domestic.

Upholstery Cleaner for Lounge Suites.

HAKEA CLEANING SERVICE

39 Beagle Circuit, Nhulunbuy, NT 5797
Phone: (089) 87 1728