MONDAY 13TH AUGUST 1979

MORNING SESSION:

From the programme:

"At this first session we shall be looking at the aims and objectives of the week and assessing the problem areas."

CHAIRMAN: His Honour Judge Kingsley Newman, Senior Judge, South Australian Juvenile Court.

9.30-10.15 am **Conference Aims & Objectives**
Mr Peter Loof, Assistant Secretary, Attorney-General's Department, Canberra.

10.15-10.45 am **Children at Risk**
Dr. Eric Cunningham-Dax, Psychiatrist, Co-ordinator Mental Health (1969 to 1978), Tasmania.

11.15-12.15 pm Group Discussions.

12.15- 1.00 pm Plenary Session.

COMMENTS ON THE MORNING'S PROCEEDINGS:

This was a successful morning with many of the objectives achieved. The papers of Mr Loof and Dr. Dax balanced each other well, and not only set an outline of the week's work, but immediately stimulated discussion on major issues which were then continually raised throughout the week.

It became clear that the delegates took up with enthusiasm the speakers' requests for planning at primary preventative level, and interesting ideas emerged from the work of the discussion groups. There was, even at this stage of the week, strong emphasis on the role of education in primary prevention, and some preliminary discussion on the need and possibilities of state planning bodies for crime prevention.

AUSTRALIAN CRIME PREVENTION COUNCIL

Tenth National Conference, Hobart 13-17 August 1979.

Crime Prevention Planning and Research — The Pursuit of Practical Aims and Objectives

By P. R. Loof*

I am pleased to have the opportunity, in this opening address, of setting the stage for the Tenth National Conference of the Australian Crime Prevention Council. The reasons are not hard to find. First, the membership of the Council embraces all those who have a direct or indirect interest in the prevention of crime and the Council represents, in a unique way, the welding of a criminal justice "non-system" into an organic whole. Secondly, the theme of this conference provides a rare opportunity not only to assess current progress in the field, but to discuss longer-term objectives.

My task in this session is to outline the aims and objectives of the conference. The organising committee has directed our attention to a number of areas of importance to long-term crime prevention planning. Particular attention has been directed to the aspect of community involvement. The organising committee has expressed the hope that the discussion will focus on practical objectives in these long term strategies, rather than theoretical concepts. The committee's emphasis has been on what can be done by both bureaucracies and by the community to include crime-inhibiting factors in certain programs. Our attention is turned particularly to three areas — urban planning, neighbourhood police and educational planning to assist in the social adjustment of children. The program places some emphasis on "populations at risk", that is to say, the potentially delinquent group. Perhaps I could re-state the conference objectives shortly as follows — we are concerned with the topic of long-term crime prevention and criminal justice planning. We will be looking at the role of both bureaucracies and the community and the underlying focus of attention will be on the achievement of practical and comprehensive objectives.

I propose to explore briefly what is involved in the concepts of crime prevention and criminal justice planning and to focus on two basic needs — the need for research and the need for comprehensive planning. Research needs to be conducted to provide planners and policy-makers with more efficient data and produce options and models that can be tried and tested in practice. Planners and policy-makers need in turn to find ways of effectively utilising research material and introducing systematic and comprehensive planning into the development of crime prevention programs (including programs utilising community resources) and into the organisation and improvement of the criminal justice system. In both areas of research and planning it is important that an emphasis should be placed on practical objectives.

What, then, do we mean by the concepts of crime prevention planning and criminal justice planning? The former concept incorporates the latter but adopts broader perspectives. Let me provide some practical examples of what is involved in the broader perspectives of crime prevention planning. In the development of new urban estates, some elements may be crime-generating and some crime-inhibiting. If so, we should try to isolate these elements and make appropriate adjustments at the planning stage. In the development of educational programs for children during their formative years, some programs may exacerbate the problems of the mal-adjusted or delinquent child and others may assist in his social adjustment. If so, we should design and put into effect programs that will assist these children during the vital years when their patterns of future behaviour are being formed.

During the period of rapid economic, social and cultural development that has occurred in so many countries since the Second World War, there has also occurred a rapid

increase in the incidence of crime. The relationship between the increase in crime and the increase in development is something that has been observed and commented upon. Gradually the concept has emerged that there should be collaboration between criminal justice agencies and agencies responsible for social and economic planning so that the crime-generating aspects of developmental schemes can be taken into account at the planning stage. The principle was accepted at the Fourth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (1970) that crime prevention planning should be an integral and essential part of planning for national development. However the question how to translate the principle into reality is a problem that is faced by all those involved in the development of more efficient means of preventing and controlling crime.

Criminal justice planning is a narrower concept. It is an extremely important part of the broader concept but is concerned largely with planning within the criminal justice system itself, including the need for systematic and comprehensive planning of police, courts and corrections and the means of coping with the fragmentation which characterises the management of the criminal justice system.

Research

Before examining planning aspects in greater detail, I propose to advert to the underlying pre-requisite for effective and informed action in this field — the need for research to provide basic data to assist in the determination of police and the need for criminal justice personnel and the general public to be better informed in this whole field of endeavour. It is very appropriate that I should refer at this Tenth Conference to the address made in 1965 to the Council's Third Conference, also in Hobart, by the late Sir John Barry. The address made by Sir John at that conference marked, in fact, the beginning of involvement, at the Commonwealth level, in the organisation of research and training in the criminal sciences. In his address, Sir John advocated the establishment of an Australian Institute of Criminal and Penal Science funded, maintained and administered by the Commonwealth of Australia. He proposed two main functions for the Institute, first, research into crime and second, the training of criminal justice personnel.

Sir John Barry's proposal received wide support. It was strongly supported by this Council. The Commonwealth Government proceeded to explore the feasibility of the concept but much had to be done before the ideal could be translated into practical reality. The notion of Commonwealth involvement in the area of crime, as such, was novel. In Australia, the States have the responsibility for the administration of the general criminal law. Clearly, any proposal for an Institute in the Australian context needed to be considered as an exercise in co-operative federalism.

The gestation period of the Institute may best be described in terms of events and concepts. As to events, the first step taken was to seek a report on the proposal from the Australian delegation to the Third United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders held in Stockholm in 1965. The Australian delegation was led by the late Mr Justice J. H. McClemens, a former President of this Council. In 1966 an interdepartmental committee was set up at the federal level to study the details of the proposal. Consultations were held with New Zealand in 1967. An experimental seminar or conference of senior criminal justice personnel of the Commonwealth, the States and New Zealand was held in February 1968. A detailed scheme involving facilities for training and research was submitted to the States in October 1968. Negotiations with the States including a specially convened Ministerial conference, were held between October 1968 until February 1971, when the

Criminology Research Bill was introduced into the federal Parliament. Overseas developments were carefully studied, particularly the work of the United Nations which, at the Fourth Congress, had undertaken a specific study of the organisation of research for policy development in social defence. New Zealand maintained an interest in the proposed training facilities but decided not to join the scheme for the funding of research.

In relation to concepts, the following basic needs were seen as having crucial importance — the need for a systematic and rational approach to the organisation of research, the need for a practical orientation in the conduct of research and the need for links to be forged between those engaged in research and those responsible for policy information.

It was recognised that no attempt had hitherto been made to co-ordinate research in Australia in a systematic and rational way on the national level, with the objective of assisting relevant Departments in their task of determining the policies that should be adopted to combat crime. It was also recognised that impetus needed to be given to the development of basic data on a uniform and national basis that would be adequate for the needs of rational planning. The need for a rational approach is well illustrated in the following extract from the report of Mr Justice McClemens that I have already referred to —

> "We need to know which of our prevention and treatment methods work with which categories of offenders: we need to build up prevention and treatment nosologies of offenders. Australian conditions are ideal for the development of such knowledge, probably better than in any other country: relatively similar population structures and social conditions between the States, yet substantially different sentencing and correctional practice, and increasingly different crime and delinquency prevention practices. The experiment continues daily but there is no organisation which observes it with hint of scientific precision or reports upon it so that all may gain . . . In industry such an evaluative approach under the name of quality control is regarded as essential to efficiency; it should not be neglected in a field which also has important national economic and social consequences."

From the outset an emphasis was placed on the need for "applied" research — the need for practical solutions to practical problems and the need to develop priorities for research designed to bring practical results in areas of greatest need.

The need to forge links between research and administration and provide a proper balance between governmental and non-governmental research were also seen as important objectives. Account was taken of the existence of what the Fourth United Nations Congress described as the "mutual scepticism" between policy-makers and researchers and the need for the development of improved communication and understanding between these two areas. It was recognised that worthwhile research was often neglected by policy-makers and that at the same time the theoretical framework and technical language used by many researchers provided impediments to the implementation by policy-makers of research. It was thought that policy-makers needed to make increasing attempts to become familiar with the language and methods of researchers. On the other hand, researchers needed to seek a better understanding of the problems of administrators and the limitations of their resources. Researchers also needed to take policy considerations into account, where possible, and present the results of their research in a manner likely to be of assistance to those concerned with its implementation.

In addition, a balance between governmental and non-governmental research was sought. It was recognised that research conducted on a purely governmental basis might not be sufficiently objective or critical and that at the same time the non-governmental approach might tend to over-simplify or ignore administrative problems and be insufficiently apprised of the implications involved in the carrying of responsibilities for changes in policy. In the result, the view was taken that governmental sponsorship and control of research in this field was necessary because governments were responsible for law enforcement, the administration of relevant Government departments and for the development of policy to deal with crime. At the same time, it was recognised that both governmental and non-governmental approaches were necessary and that a close liaison between the two areas would be essential.

In order to meet these objectives, the following principles were evolved to establish a basis for a viable approach to co-operative federalism in this area — the need for a national approach to supplement action taken at the State level, the need for a governmental institute to assist governmental departments (rather than a university institute), the need for State co-operation and involvement in the scheme and the need for a State voice in the administration of the affairs of the bodies proposed to be established.

The scheme proposed, therefore, was that the Australian Institute of Criminology should be set up, not as a unit within a federal governmental department, but as a governmental instrumentality enjoying a separate identity. The Institute would be funded entirely by the Commonwealth and would be engaged in research that needed to be conducted at the national level on a governmental basis. At the same time, it was sought to utilize existing resources in universities and government departments, where there were experts in many fields whose services would be available for specific projects.

A fund, called the Criminology Research Fund, consisting of contributions from both the Commonwealth and the States, was proposed to finance these projects. A Commonwealth-State body called the Criminology Research Council was proposed to administer the Fund. The Council would, for that purpose, determine the relative importance and urgency of projects for which the expenditure of funds might be authorised. The Institute of Criminology would be given the function of acting as secretariat for the Council. The Criminology Research Council would consist of six State representatives and one Commonwealth representative and the Institute would be managed by a Board of Management consisting of three Commonwealth and three State representatives. The three State representatives would be appointed by the Criminology Research Council. The three Commonwealth representatives would include the Chairman who would have a casting vote as well as a deliberative vote.

The scheme thus recognised the need for a national approach which took into account the national and international significance of the problem, including the increased incidence of crime and social and economic costs of crime, the need for a systematic and practical approach, the need for co-ordination, and the desirability of avoiding the waste of resources involved in the duplication of effort among the States. The proposals recognised that a governmental institute was needed to represent governmental interests and enable control of research to be exercised to ensure that priorities in research were observed which would be most likely to bring practical results in areas of greatest need. The proposals sought to achieve a balance between governmental and non-governmental research by establishing a scheme for funding university research, setting up an Institute designed to attract academic staff and

providing for governmental representation on the controlling bodies. The scheme sought to achieve the objective of forging links between administrators and researchers by providing opportunities for a dialogue to be developed between the two and an opportunity for criminologists and administrators to be brought together in working relationships. In addition a framework was provided within which arrangements could be made for access by researchers to source material in Government departments and through which other forms of collaboration could be developed, such as action-research projects involving participation by both academic personnel and administrators.

The proposals also provided for an appropriate level of State involvement, which was seen as vital to the success of the scheme. It recognised the desirability of State financial involvement and the need for State consultation and for a State voice in the administration of the bodies proposed to be established. The States would have a majority of votes on the Council. While the Commonwealth would retain ultimate control of the Institute because of its financial responsibilities for that body, State responsibilities for the administration of the criminal law and control of relevant source material would be recognised by providing for strong State representation on the Institute's Board of Management.

This is not the occasion to trace the work and operation of the Institute and the Council since its establishment, but it might simply be said that the arrangements have proved to be a highly successful exercise in co-operative federalism. The arrangements will be of value in developing other levels of co-operation between the Commonwealth and the States in the field of crime prevention and control, such as perhaps in the area of comprehensive planning, and provide a useful example of co-operation that can be adapted with advantage to other fields of Commonwealth-State endeavour.

Criminal Justice Planning

I now turn to the areas of criminal justice and crime prevention planning. I have said that the narrower concept of criminal justice planning is concerned largely with planning within the criminal justice system itself, including the need for systematic and comprehensive planning of the police, courts and corrections, and the means of coping with the fragmentation which characterises the management of the criminal justice systme. I do not propose to deal comprehensively with planning techniques and their adaptation to Australian requirements. Other speakers will address you in more detail on many of the aspects. My objectives will be achieved if I provide an introduction and some broad perspectives and dimensions of the subject.

It may be useful to ask what we mean by the concept of ''planning'' in this context. Train (former head of the Home Office Crime Policy Planning Unit) has defined ''policy planning'' as the identification of issues, the definition of objectives, and the analysis of ways of achieving them. Manor and Sheffer state that it is the job of the planner to ''amend policy and decision-making methods so that they increase clarity; eschew incoherence, uncertainty, arbitrariness, piece-meal approaches, ignorance, non-consultation with relevant parties; optimize; maintain commitment; adopt action''.

In the context of the large funding program in the United States and the formidable problems of co-ordination of agencies in 55 States and Territories, Ewing (LEAA Director of Planning and Evaluation) suggests that comprehensive planning for the criminal justice system involves four major tasks at a minimum — intensive analysis of the crime problem and of the capacity of the criminal justice system for coping with it; analysis of the programs of criminal justice agencies to determine their impact on other agencies;

construction of a plan which takes account as far as possible of the impact on other agencies; and establishment of a mechanism to provide feedback on implementation, monitoring and evaluation, to permit the use of results in successive future plans.

In the present context, a useful approach would be to refer to "planning" as a process of problem analysis, followed by goal setting, followed by specific strategies or programs for goal achievement, followed by constant monitoring and evaluation to determine the extent to which programs are meeting stated goals, and to provide feedback of success or failure to further improve the planning process. The concept of planning in this context would also include the process of co-ordination.

An examination of relevant planning activity in the United States of America, the United Kingdom and Sweden would be fruitful. In the United States, the effort to bring about improvements in the performance of the criminal justice system and to reduce crime has rested heavily on the proposition that comprehensive planning must precede any successful initiatives aimed at achieving these ends. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in its report in 1967 made recommendations for the development of criminal justice planning on both the federal and State levels. It envisaged the establishment of criminal justice planning agencies involving the police, courts and corrections in all the States and the use of federally funded grants-in-aid to support innovative State and local programs to reduce crime. The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, which followed this report, created the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. This Act was supplemented by the Crime Control Act of 1973. Criminal Justice planning agencies have been established in each of the States and funds are made available by LEAA on the basis of annual comprehensive plans submitted by the agencies. The agencies are administered by boards whose members represent State and local criminal justice agencies, citizen groups and non-criminal justice public agencies. Regional and local planning units have also been established and applications for project funds move through the units to the agencies. The objective is for the agencies to develop comprehensive plans covering all aspects of criminal administration: law enforcement, corrections, courts and prosecution, citizen action and crime prevention.

By the end of 1975, 500 regional planning units had been created and in 1977, about 2,000 persons were involved in this work as criminal justice planners. LEAA has encouraged State and local planning through guidelines, training courses, technical assistance, information systems, the analysis and dissemination of data and the development of goals and standards (such as the 1973 reports of the LEAA appointed National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals). Gibbons and his co-authors in "Criminal Justice Planning" have said that LEAA has provided the push for the development of comprehensive planning on the State level, which would probably not have come about without the effort of the agency.

The American experience has identified at least three major planning 'models' through which criminal justice planners have been undertaking their tasks: the blueprinting of master planning models, the research model and the incrementalist, or process model. It is the last of these which has obtained the most support. It recognises the impracticability of a grand, all-embracing plan to bind the entire criminal justice system for a considerable period of time. It also recognises that governments cannot wait until research has settled all the issues. As Ewing points out,

incrementalism involves immediate initiation of a planning process which is designed to produce successively better approximations of rational plans over time. The plans produced using this model are acknowledged to be incomplete. However, they are designed to improve steadily by means of a continuous process of feedback on the results of the plan's implementation.

The question may be asked "how successful have the United States efforts to develop nationwide justice planning been?". Gibbons and his co-authors suggest that federal involvement has not yet resulted in the development of mature, sophisticated justice planning. They suggest that planning efforts at the national, State and local levels have been frustrated by the intrusion of local politics and agency self-interests into decision making and expenditure of funds. The authors ask whether comprehensive planning is incompatible with the narrow interests involved in the competition for power and influence characteristic of any political system. However, despite the complex and difficult obstacles that have plagued efforts in the United States to bring about increased co-ordination, the authors advocate sustained attention to the creation of a more positive climate and the focusing of attention on the need for open communication, sustained dialogue and efforts to identify and reduce value conflicts.

Ewing acknowledges the gaps in achievement, but points out that the planning process has drawn citizens, elected officials, and criminal justice officials together, often for the first time. Further, he points out that State planning agencies have been influential in the development and recommendation of changes in the laws governing the criminal justice system, have increased their role in budget review and analysis and have achieved status as agencies with expert knowledge to be consulted on a wide range of criminal justice issues. Finally he states that, while the agencies have not been able to overcome the fragmentation of management which characterizes the criminal justice system, they have begun to deal with fragmentation through a variety of mechanisms, including a more sophisticated and appropriate approach to planning, as well as intensive efforts to build inter-jurisdictional co-operation.

In the United Kingdom, an important development was the establishment in January 1974 of the Crime Policy Planning Organization in the Home Office. The Organization was set up to co-ordinate and develop policy in the fields of the prevention of crime, the administration of criminal justice and the treatment of offenders. The Organization is serviced by the Crime Policy Planning Unit which has been given the specific and sole function of looking at the criminal justice system as a whole and is relieved of the need to respond to the demands of the moment. A Crime Policy Steering Committee meets once every six months to oversight the organization's progress and program of work. A Crime Policy Planning Committee meets each month to consider papers generated by the Unit. Examples of this work include the allocation of criminal justice resources, the relation between research and criminal policy, the development of a more strategic approach to criminal policy, studies of ways of improving the presentation of financial information about the criminal justice system and the development of forecasting in the criminal justice area. These studies led to an examination of the development of corporate planning techniques which were seen as providing a framework of planning activity that could be adapted to the needs of parts of the Home Office concerned with the criminal justice system.

The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention was set up in 1973. The Council is a governmental advisory agency of the Ministry of Justice. The Government appoints the

Council's Board, which includes politicians from all parties, Under-Secretaries of State in the Ministries of Justice, Health and Social Affairs and Education, and representatives of labour, management, local government, insurance companies and criminological research. The rationale for such a diverse membership and for the wider perspectives of the Council is stated as follows in a recent publication of the Council —

'Criminal policy today is characterized by a certain pessimism regarding the possibilities of controlling crime through the judicial system and by traditional methods. The creation of the NCCP underscores the fact that everyone bears a responsibility for the present and future development of crime in society'.

The Council's functions include those of following and analysing trends in crime and producing forecasts of trends, supporting and initiating research and development work on the causes and prevention of crime, and evaluating and disseminating the results of such work, co-ordinating research and development projects in the field of criminal policy, and assisting in the framing of criminal policy by means of investigatory studies and initiatives.

The Council takes a broad approach to its functions and co-ordinates its own work with similar efforts by others, such as schools and social welfare authorities. The Council gathers information on research results and other proposals that may result in concrete decisions and criminal policy initiatives. Its criminal policy work is focussed primarily on areas where the Council believes it can achieve results. The Council's efforts have a two-fold goal, to support research and to make sure the results become known and can be used in criminal policy work. The Council sets up working groups, consisting of representatives of authorities affected by the particular matters under consideration. Liaison officers are appointed within relevant agencies to facilitate the exchange of information and ideas from and to the Council. To date, working groups have considered such topics as measures for protection against crime, co-operation between social welfare authorities, schools and the police, crime prevention measures relating to children, re-adjustment assistance to offenders and criminal policy. The Council publishes research reports and also submits proposals arising from the reports to the Government or the relevant agency for consideration.

Crime Prevention Planning

In relation to the wider perspectives involved in crime prevention planning, I shall refer to two areas that have particular relevance to the program of this Conference. The first is the area of urban planning and development. In developing town planning schemes, there are opportunities to take into account social and environmental aspects that are relevant to crime prevention. Factors that are relevant are recreational and educational facilities, optimum size and layout, association with industrial development, localisation of support facilities such as vocational guidance, mental health and employment agencies, involvement of community participation in local planning, development of opportunities for socialisation and social cohesion and the pursuit of plans designed to make the commission of crime more difficult and more conspicuous. The study by Oscar Newman "In Defensible Space" is an example of the new dimensions that have recently been postulated. The study asserts that housing design, especially the design of high-density apartment blocks, can be modified in a number of ways to make it easier for residents to keep shared areas under surveillance, engender a sense of "territoriality" and encourage residents to police their own areas. It is important that studies of this kind should be examined closely and acted on where relevant.

The second area is that of education. I have already observed that, in the development of educational programs for children during their formative years, some programs may exacerbate the problems of the mal-adjusted or delinquent child and others may assist in his social adjustment. At the other end of the scale, it will be relevant to develop curricula and training in technical skills suited to the practical needs of young persons entering the work force. It will also be relevant to develop special educational programs in crime-prone areas and for "drop-outs". The case for forging links between crime prevention and educational planning is strong. Young persons form a high proportion of offenders and the behavioural patterns of young persons can often be detected at an early stage. Educationalists are among the first to encounter and deal with mal-adjusted and delinquent persons. Moreover, educationalists are concerned with these persons while their patterns of future behaviour are being formed. There is therefore a close relationship between the subject of crime prevention and the subject of education so far as it is concerned with those persons. The provision of education that is appropriate to those persons will be important, not only in relation to the planning of educational programs and the completeness of the educational process in relation to those persons, but also in relation to the prevention of crime. The areas of urban and educational planning and the subject of delinquency will be dealt with in more detail by subsequent speakers.

An extensive coverage of the sectors and concepts involved in the broader aspects of crime prevention planning is to be found in the United Nations publication "Social Defence Policies in relation to Development Planning" (1970) prepared for the Fourth United Nations Congress by Mr William Clifford when he was a member of the United Nations Secretariat. This coverage has been expanded in other publications, including Mr Clifford's recent book "Planning Crime Prevention". In these publications, it is acknowledged that the formulation of programs for crime prevention provides formidable problems because of the uncertainty as to the factors which are causative or the remedies which are effective. It is pointed out that in planning, crime prevention is a relatively new sector and that in the first stages it will be necessary to proceed on assumptions that are reasonable and likely to be valid, such as for example the relationship between the socialisation of children and their later behaviour and the relationship between recidivism and the certainty of detection. The publications suggest that Commissions or Committees of experts are required at national and regional levels to advise on the crime implications of national policies, plans and programs. These bodies would consist of representatives from broader interests as well as those concerned with narrower interests directly related to crime, and would be vested with co-ordination functions.

Australian developments

Two fundamental requirements may be identified in the processes I have described. First, the need for the formulation of comprehensive plans and goals and the establishment of guidelines and planning models. Second, the need for the establishment of formal administrative machinery to promote the planning process on a systematic and rational basis, co-ordinate all relevant agencies and provide a means of dealing with the fragmentation that characterises the criminal justice system. Both of these concepts need to be taken into account in the development of comprehensive planning in Australia.

In Australia, an interest in crime prevention planning developed from the Fourth United Nations Congress in 1970. The Australian delegation to the Congress recommended in its report that consideration be given to the establishment of Consultative Committees, consisting of criminologists and

representatives of government departments responsible for criminal justice, social and economic planning, educational and health, voluntary associations and other bodies to advise on crime prevention aspects of economic, social and developmental planning. The delegation considered that, in this way, advice on the criminal justice system and its operation and questions of prevention could be given to planners and others designing social action. These recommendations were conveyed to the States at Prime Minister-Premier level and were considered by the Governments of a number of States. In Western Australia, a State Consultative Council was established in 1973, pursuant to those recommendations, with approval of the State Government. This Council consisted of representatives from the fields of criminal justice, education, health, welfare, housing and town planning, industrial development, environment protection, community recreation, decentralisation, and voluntary agencies. A number of initiatives of social welfare and educational interest resulted involving participation by the local community. Unfortunately insufficient guidelines were available to assist the Council in establishing links with crime prevention in the relevant areas and the Council gradually became defunct.

The Western Australian experience emphasised both the need for guidelines and the usefulness of formal administrative machinery and led me in 1974 to suggest the adaptation of the community development scheme approach in the development of local community participation in the formulation and implementation of programs of crime prevention. I also suggested at that time that consideration be given to the establishment of a National Commission to stimulate activity in crime prevention. I had in mind that the Commission's functions would include those of establishing committees at the regional and local level, allocating funds to support crime prevention activities, and providing advice on comprehensive planning in this area. The objective was to provide a basis for a systematic approach to crime prevention generally and activity at the local level in particular.

Since 1975, when Mr Clifford took up his post as Director of the Australian Institute of Criminology, a number of seminars have been conducted by the Institute on the subject of planning, including two in the Albury-Wodonga region, one in Geelong, and two international training courses. In conducting these courses, the Institute has collaborated with such bodies as the Albury-Wodonga Development Corporation, the Barwon Regional Planning Authority, the Victorian Department of Community Welfare Services, the Royal Institute of Planners, the National Capital Development Commission, the Victorian Branch of this Council, the Australian Development Assistance Bureau and the United Nations Secretariat. In addition, the Queensland Branch of this Council recently conducted a highly successful planning seminar. These courses recognise the long-term advantages of educational processes in promoting a wider appreciation of the need for systematic planning.

In 1978, Mr Clifford raised for consideration the proposal that each State should establish a Crime Commission to be concerned with crime prevention and criminal justice planning. The commission would identify future problems, examine the need for efficiency in dealing with existing crime, evaluate current investments in criminal justice services, monitor overseas research and feedback information for improved administration, consider ways to improve standards of performance, and develop effective co-ordination machinery. He pointed out that we needed to be planning now to deal with new forms and dimensions of crimes and to develop interrelationships between police, prisons and those concerned with economic and social planning. The commission would include representatives from criminal justice agencies,

education, health, social welfare, criminologists, economic and social planners, voluntary agencies and the general public. The commission would meet quarterly and would direct a small working unit of experts. He pointed out that effective co-ordination between different ministries might be forthcoming if funds were available for joint projects.

At the international level, Australia has pressed strongly for the development of practical guidelines and the utilization of formal administrative machinery to assist in the development of rational and comprehensive planning for the prevention of crime. At the preparatory meetings for the Sixth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, and at meetings of the United Nations Committee on Crime Prevention and Control, Australia has suggested that Statements of Principles and Guidelines should be formulated on these matters for the assistance of administrators and policy makers. The Statements would deal with planning concepts and techniques, with a practical, rather than a theoretical, orientation. They would also encompass programs designed to reduce the opportunities for crime and to make its commission more conspicuous. The Statements would provide goals to assist in the monitoring of progress in this field at the international level. Also referred to was the need for crime prevention planning concepts to be developed within, and as part of, the urban and education sectors, including, importantly, the curricula of academic faculties relevant to those sectors. In addition, the importance of utilizing formal administrative machinery was emphasised, including such processes as the community development scheme to stimulate community resources at the local level in the development and implementation of crime prevention programs.

Conclusion
The question may be asked "what future directions should be taken in Australia to promote systematic and co-ordinated planning in this field?". Developments in this area will need, I suggest, to take into account current policies on financial restraint in Government expenditure. In this context, the development of rational and systematic planning in the field of criminal justice will assume increasing importance as a means of assisting in the proper management of current expenditure, avoiding duplication and waste and ensuring that available resources are deployed to the maximum advantage.

If the establishment of commissions to promote crime prevention planning is not feasible at the present time, a start could nonetheless be made by utilising existing resources at the State and national levels, including the resources of relevant Departments and planning and co-ordinating bodies such as the Victorian State Co-ordination Council. The resources of the Australian Institute of Criminology and the Criminology Research Council could be utilised, as appropriate, and developments in the United Kingdom and Sweden, in particular, could be taken into account.

On this basis, consideration could be given to the establishment of State Criminal Justice Planning Committees. The committees would consist of representatives from departments concerned with criminal justice, urban development, education, social welfare and related areas, and representatives from the community. If such a committee was thought to be too unwieldly, representatives from non-criminal justice sectors could be co-opted for specific purposes where the occasion demanded. Alternatively, existing State planning committees could be utilised more intensively by forming sub-committees to be concerned with criminal justice planning. A National Criminal Justice Planning Committee could also be considered, utilising or based on existing

machinery, to enable consultation to take place on the promotion of rational and systematic planning in this field. All of these developments could be initiated in the context of existing resources at little cost.

To enable planning committees to be efficiently serviced, it would be desirable to vest in appropriate bodies at the State and national levels responsibility for initiating background papers and proposals. As in the United Kingdom, there is a need for units to be established, which would be relieved of responsibility for day to day pressures and which would perform a policy planning role in relation to the criminal justice system as a whole.

REFERENCES

Clifford, W. **Planning Crime Prevention**, Lexington Books, Lexington (1976).

Crime Prevention Planning: Proceedings of the United Nations Interregional Training Courses on Crime Prevention Planning, Sydney, Australia, 1975.

Ewing, B. **Criminal Justice Planning: An Assessment**, Criminal Justice Review 2 (1976), p. 121.

Gibbons, D., Thimm, J., Yospe, F., Blake, G., **Criminal Justice Planning: An Introduction**, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey (1977).

Home Office Working Paper, A Review of Criminal Justice Policy 1976, H.M.S.O., London (1977).

Manor, Y., Sheffer, G. **Can Planning be Salvaged**, Public Administration, Vol. 55 (1977).

Moriarty, M.J. **The Criminal Justice System**, in Council of Europe Conference on Criminal Policy, Strasbourg, 1975.

Moriarty, M.J. **The Policy-Making Process: How it is seen from the Home Office** in Penal Policy-Making in England, Cambridge, 1977.

Sallman, P. **Criminal Justice: A Systems Approach**, A. & N.Z. J. of Crim., Vol. 11, No. 4 (Dec. 1978).

The National Council for Crime Prevention, Sweden: a pamphlet published by Council in January 1979.

Train, C., **The Development of Criminal Policy Planning in the Home Office**, Public Administration, Vol. 55 (1977), p. 373.

Wickwar, H., **The Place of Criminal Justice in Developmental Planning**, New York University Press, N.Y. (1977).

---

*First Assistant Secretary, Attorney-General's Department, Canberra; Chairman, Board of Management of Australian Institute of Criminology.

CHILDREN AT RISK

By Dr Eric Cunningham-Dax

I have taken "children at risk" as being those who are liable to be involved in delinquency and crime, and I plan to consider ways in which they are susceptible to the hazards of modern living.

Therefore, a few of the many factors associated with delinquency and crime are first discussed, especially as they relate to modern living.

Two interrelated subjects are then selected for further examination. These are: first the ways in which underprivileged children are at risk in a middle class community and secondly, the learning difficulties and handicaps which result from cultural retardation, these we have called "social learning problems". It will be shown that the children with these handicaps form the large majority of those at risk, if their numbers are measured by the frequency of their appearance in the correctional services.

There have been two main methods by which delinquents and criminals have been investigated towards discovering the causative factors leading to their antisocial behaviour. These are by prospective or retrospective studies.

Three of the most important prospective investigations in which a number of individuals have been followed from childhood onwards have been by the Gluecks and by Robbins in the U.S.A. and by West in Cambridge; whilst the British Delinquency Study of 1964 and the National Childrens Bureau Survey have been reported by Douglas and by Wedge and Prosser.

Two well-known sets of retrospective observations were made by Healy and Bronner and also by Stott, but these are now out of date. They traced the characteristic backgrounds of delinquents to identify common factors in their early lives.

But whatever the studies that are undertaken, a number of measurable variables have to be chosen so they may be correlated with the different classified varieties of delinquency and crime. (In passing, it is of interest that West investigated 151 such factors.)

However, many of them are difficult both to define and to quantify, even in such comparatively simple examples as "broken homes" and "child neglect".

Moreover in crime and delinquency, the number of convictions differ considerably from the number of offences both from one social class to another, and in quality and quantity.

Many enquiries have shown that delinquents and also recidivists frequently come from a background of disadvantaged childhood and they have in common a poor self image.

The families tend to be large, the housing substandard and overcrowding is common. Poverty is frequent, often because there is difficulty in managing money, much of which is spent impulsively and on drinking, smoking and gambling. Many have intelligence levels no higher than low-average or of borderline retardation, and often they are semi-literate.

There is poor parental behaviour, child neglect, absent parents, the father often being in prison, or away from home looking for work, or having a de facto relationship. In the homes there is alcoholism, quarrelling and violence, and uncertain discipline. These occurrences result in the children being insecure and apprehensive.

It is then hardly surprising that other associated characteristics are described such as antisocial behaviour, illegitimacy, resentment of authority, delinquency in the siblings, scholastic under-achievement, ill health and malnutrition.

The large majority of the male members of the family will achieve no higher level of employment than unskilled occupations which are often casual.

These families are frequently known to the police who are called in to settle their domestic difficulties, to the housing departments, to social welfare and to many more of the social services.

In a study in which we compared the background of current prison recidivists, who had been three times or more in prison, with members of known problem families we verified most of these findings.

Three-fifths of the recidivists came from families with five or more siblings, about half had been Wards of the State, two-thirds were of dull-average intelligence and 93 per cent had