

## **COMMUNITY-BASED CRIME PREVENTION: PROSPECTS AND THREATS**

VESNA STEFANOVSKA

Faculty of security-Skopje, University "St. Kliment Ohridski" – Bitola

E-mail: vstefanovska77@gmail.com

### **Abstract**

Community-based prevention is one of the approaches to crime prevention that incorporates situational and social elements and it has theoretical background in several theories of crime. It arises due to the fact that the state can not cope and prevent crime alone without help, support and active participation of the community. In addition, because crime occurs in a community, it became local problem, whose social causes are also rooted in the community. That means that community has responsibility to prevent crime and to secure safety of its citizens. However, until this approach touches the real concerns of citizens and tries to explain and understand crime in a wider social context, we can not expect some positive results. Otherwise, certain situational prevention measures which are often criticized that are inconsistent with certain human rights (eg the right to free movement or the right to privacy) initiate the debate for the effectiveness and treats of that approach. That means that despite the idea to create social order through the mechanisms of situational control, (which can be effective), we cannot ignore the important ethical questions about the methods used for crime prevention as the ultimate goal.

Taking into account the previous, this article open up questions related to the prospects and threats of community-based crime prevention, emphasizes its roots, theoretical backgrounds and current models and interventions.

**Key words:** crime prevention, community, safety, social prevention, situational prevention

### **1. Introduction: objectives and limits of community-based prevention**

Many different interpretations and understandings within expert and scientific community can be found regarding the scopes of acting of community-based crime prevention approach. Therefore, in order to determine the essence of that approach, we will go through the questions: what are the goals of community-based prevention, what are the main activities and interventions and who are the stakeholders of such activities?

Community based Prevention endeavour to create safe places to live and to change the conditions in neighbourhoods that produce crimes and disorders, victimization and insecurity. The aim is to increase the social connection between the citizens and to remove and mitigate criminal factors in the community. According to the subject and focus of interest, it can be directed to certain situational factors i.e. the place (as physical space) and to the citizens. In the first case, the focus is to improve the control and surveillance, to reduce the opportunities for committing crimes, and to increase public confidence in its capacities, while in the second case, the preventive measures are directed to promote active citizenship, to provide assistance and support to vulnerable groups, and to improve social connections with other factors of socialization in the community, such as school, leisure, neighbourhood etc. This is in line with the concept of "*sustainable communities*" which means to be properly designed, sensitive to the needs and problems of citizens and to enhance their facilities and resources necessary for quality of life of citizens (Johnstone, 2007: 158).

Community-based Prevention covers all criminal and risk factors that exist in the community, whether related to the citizens, the general local conditions (economic, political, educational and cultural) or to the physical space (it's urban and architectural design). In that sense, there are a number of preventive measures, such as: activities designed to develop local capacities,<sup>28</sup> monitoring programs in the neighbourhood (neighbourhood watch programs), multi-agency cooperation and partnerships, urban planning and physical design activities, programs for reintegration of young offenders, community policing concept and so on. The listed activities include elements based on both, situational approach, as well as social approach. The former entails elements aimed at reducing the risk and other social factors that generate antisocial and criminal behaviour.

In regards with the stakeholders who are entitled to undertake preventive measures, common feature is that the appearance and the essence of community-based prevention is related to activities undertaken by citizens, schools, businesses, civil society organizations in partnership with local authorities and the police. It covers practices, not only from the public, but also from the civil society and the private sector, as well. If we consider the main approaches to the prevention of crime (developmental prevention, situational prevention and rehabilitative programs for crime offenders), than, we can recognize that the community-based prevention encompasses all of them with main focus on active citizenship and active participation of other local actors.

## **2. Why community-based crime prevention?**

Increased crime, the failure of the rehabilitation model and the crisis in the criminal justice system in the 70's produce new considerations for responding to crime. The state realizes that cannot be responsible for crime prevention alone and it introduces new strategies for extension of responsibility (Kemshall, 2008: 132). These strategies involve delegation of preventive func-

---

<sup>28</sup> When we talk about capacities of the community, we encompass its infrastructure, housing, education, leisure, children protection, environment maintenance, transport and development of civil society organizations (Richardson and Mumford, 2009: 263).

tions from the state level to the private sector and civil society, and especially to the local community. So, the policy of crime control in the 80s and 90s go beyond the criminal justice system and builds a new criminal policy based on partnership and cooperation between the state, private and civil sector. Thus, the state is gradually withdrawing from the responsibility for the prevention and sets new goal: improving the quality of life in communities which means identifying their needs, problems and priorities. To achieve that goal, multiagency partnerships and the pluralisation within the local policing are seen as the most effective means in the system of crime control (Hughes & Edwards, 2005: 20). Their tasks are to build internal mechanism for control within the communities in order to deal with the local problems and to spread responsibility for crime prevention outside of the criminal justice system. In fact, the expansion of prevention from a narrow focus only on crime occurrence and criminal opportunities is a reflection of the wider framework and social context in which crime is located. In this regard, in most European countries, crime prevention has been replaced with alternative terms such as *community safety*, *urban security* and the like. Crucial for institutionalization of such new policies are forming local partnerships or local security networks (Crawford, 2013). They lower the crime control from central to lower local levels (but still under the state control). Thus, the new social control includes measures to increase the safety of communities, with special focus on high-risk and problem areas.

Some of the reasons for development of local policies are located within (1) the local nature of the crime, (2) the gradual breakdown of community values, and (3) in the process of its re-activation. An additional contribution has the activities of the international community, primarily through the United Nations Congresses on crime prevention and the treatment of offenders.

Regarding the *local nature of crime*, we can note that the crime problem is complex and the crime control, if concentrates only at the offender and his responsibility exert partial and limited results in crime reduction. Namely, crime does not produce just harm to particular victim. It creates a sense of insecurity, fear, and disrupts social order and harmony. Crime gets extended and local dimension and is considered as a local problem that threatens the security of citizens. Therefore, prevention involves removal and mitigation of the causes and risk factors which are rooted in the community. For example, one of the risk factor is the socio-economic and demographic structure of the local citizens, because their individual characteristics, such as age, family, work and material status, previous convictions and a propensity for antisocial behaviours may increase risk of crime. Also, due to the cultural diversity in the community, some citizens who have not equal opportunities to participate in cultural, economic or social life may create opposite cultures that lead to sub-cultural deviant and other negative behaviours. Other negative factors are the existence of certain places in the community with high risk of crime and with frequent violations of law and order, which reduce the informal social control, on the other side (Sherman, 1997).

So, in addition to dealing with the consequences of crime, a significant approach in understanding the crime is turning to his micro-social factors that are complex and need to be analyzed, both nationally and locally. Parental neglect, limited educational opportunities and lack of support from the community, in conjunction with other risk factors cause social disorganization, which is the basis for development of crime. Hence, prevention must include interventions designed

to change social conditions, institutions and relationships and to improve the mechanisms of informal social control.

In a wider social context, it is connected with the urban safety, because in a 21<sup>st</sup> century, most of the population lives in cities. We can say that 21<sup>st</sup> century is the century of cities, urban life and fast, heavy traffic, migration and mass communications. Inevitable social processes of industrialization, urbanization and migration increase the density of the population and thus narrow the space for movement. In parallel are running processes of decay and redefinition of the social values of community and connectedness of citizens. So, we raise the question: *can we talk about community, unity, solidarity and social justice in the 21st century?* Basically, the new style of life, displacement of working hours and absence from home, weak the informal social control and produce disintegration of communities in the sense of alienation of citizens, loss of sense of community, breaking the traditional ties and segregation. It causes feelings of fear and insecurity among citizens and gated communities. As it comes to breakdown of informal social networks and loss of control by social institutions, so it comes to escalation of antisocial behaviour. Strong signs of neglect of the physical environment, underdeveloped local economy and closed homes have contributed to demoralisation and isolation among people (Richardson and Mumford, 2009: 269).

Such negative and pessimistic conditions open up debate and alarm to return the old features of the communities: to care and to solve local problems by its own capacities, to increase citizen participation and to accept and reintegrate offenders and victims of crime. The reactivation of community means a change of awareness among citizens that security and solving local problems are a common concern and responsibility. It stems from the assumption that increased social cohesion and closer relations between citizens, reduce the possibility *to turn on a wrong road* and to enter a, so called, *criminal circle*. Also, the findings show that police and criminal justice system cannot reduce and prevent crime and its causes and consequences as they have limited knowledge, competencies, capacities and resources. Therefore, control of crime move down from the centre to lower local level and develops other principles such as extended responsibility in crime prevention and privatization of criminal justice response. So, the crime prevention gets local focus and it promotes the experiences, attitudes and priorities of all citizens living in a community (Hancock & Matthews, 2001: 10). These reforms receive increasing expression because the community has a responsibility to provide security to its citizens, to protect the victim from secondary victimization and offender from revenge, to create appropriate conditions for their reintegration and to provide public education on peaceful conflict resolution (McCold, 1996: 92-93).

### ***2.1. Theoretical background of community-based prevention***

Community-based prevention is based on several criminological theories of crime: theory of social control, theory of social disorganization, early ecological theories and theory of broken windows.

According to *Social control theory* (Hirshi, 1969) four mechanisms should be accomplished for effective interaction between the individual and his social environment. They are: *attachment*

and *commitment* to the family and to the community, *participation* in social life within the community and *faith* in the social values promoted and accepted within the community. If these factors (attachment, commitment, involvement and belief) are less developed among individuals, then, the possibility for development and manifestation of delinquent behaviour is increasing. Therefore, the preventive strategy for crime reduction should be directed to re-establish ties and relations between the individual and his community (referred to Krivokapic, 2002).

*Theory of criminal embeddedness* has resulted as a product of street crime research (Hagan, 1991) in the nineties of the last century in the United States. According to the data, street crime is a product of the limited opportunities for minorities in America (mainly Afro-Americans) for their legitimate inclusion in the labour market (limited jobs for these categories of citizens), which increase the process of residential segregation (territorial separation and formation of special locations and areas which are predominantly inhabited by groups of particular ethnic or national origin). Second negative feature for minorities are limited educational opportunities that cannot meet the growing need and demand for higher education. Therefore, those who live in marginalized communities are involved in deviant drug trafficking, prostitution, gambling or other illegal activities that are available at the black labour market. In fact, according to the theory of criminal embeddedness, changes in the economy and social structure in the community are related and affect the life cycles of individuals who, due to a number of factors are brought into a state of criminal confinement.

*Broken window theory* was developed by Wilson and Kelling in 1982, which was later accepted as a key part of policing strategies on crime prevention in the United States. This concept means that when a broken window has been left to fix, it is a sign that no one cares about it and causes opportunities for more broken windows in the surrounding area. In other words, small damages (such as broken window) lead to more serious damages if nobody takes care of the previous ones. So, physical disruption of neighbourhood and social disorder on the streets increases the fear of crime and draws citizens from the streets. This situation reduces the informal social control, which creates opportunities for committing serious crimes. For example, a study of fear of crime conducted in Portland, Oregon indicates that  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the respondents cross to the other side of the street when they see a group of violent juveniles or do not go to places where young people gather, listen to loud music and drink alcohol. Those findings suggest that often, fear of crime is higher in areas and places where there are frequent disruptions of order and deviant behaviours. Namely, the fear reduces free movement on the street i.e. people fear to leave their homes that weakens social connections among them. Therefore, the basic thesis is that social disorganization and marginalization of the community problems attract a more serious crime. Those places that are not monitored and are deserted become *suitable opportunities* for drug trafficking, prostitution, car theft, violence, vandalism, graffiti and similar deviant behaviours.

## ***2.2. Crime prevention and urban safety***

In addition to community safety, due to the stronger growth of cities and the increase in

urban crime, in the last decade of 20th century, the issue of urban safety is increasingly considered. In fact, it is the same concept, but greater emphasis is placed on the city, urban living and urban crime that produce greater insecurity. So we can talk about a city (urban areas) as a set, not only of several territorial communities, but also as a unity of different social groups whose members are from same ethnic, national or cultural background. As highlighted at the 10 UN Congress on Crime Prevention and Treatment of Offenders, held in Vienna in 2000, the 21st century is the century of the city with the rapid growth of mega cities. The estimate is that the global urban population is larger than the entire world population in 1960. Not only the majority of the population in the 21st century lives in cities, but the number of mega cities with a population of over 10 million is increasing.<sup>29</sup>

The growth of cities, migration and urbanization have caused serious problems: problems with population density, pollution, reduction of informal social control, the increase of fear and insecurity among citizens, restrictions of educational opportunities for certain groups, cultural conflict, processes of exclusion and segregation. They hamper the harmonious development of cities and especially endanger public spaces in cities as public good that can be used equally and unlimited by all citizens. In the cities, commercial and private spaces are growing and, as a result of their occupation, the public spaces free for use are limited, which encourage divisions, social exclusion and polarization among citizens. Private spaces remain reserved for a group of users, while public spaces for ordinary citizens who cannot pay the services of private recreational and other sports and entertainment centres. Therefore the question: *why some cities are safer than others?* is not easy to answer because the answer depends on detailed analysis of the socio-economic and political situation, the environment and the mentality of the citizens. Common problems such as poverty, unemployment, large social differences in cities, the military situation in certain regions, the general dissatisfaction of citizens in society and alienation in large cities create conditions for insecurity. Besides these, the everyday routine activities of citizens in urban environment represent also sources and reasons related to the safety of other users in the area (Danilovic-Hristic, 2014: 20). In such conditions, crime and victimization is increased, and urban security, which receives, international dimension, becomes a priority topic of many international and political debates. As part of those debates, great emphasises is put on *city development approach* which distinguishes the role of local authorities and the involvement of citizens and other civil organizations in specific preventive actions.

### ***2.3. Approaches and programmes in crime prevention***

Community-based prevention has focus on both, physical environment safety and citizen's safety (to improve relations in the neighbourhood, to reduce risk factors associated with the citizens and to encourage their participation in preventive activities). It can be achieved though ac-

---

<sup>29</sup> United Nations, Tenth UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, Vienna, 10-17 April 2000, Effective crime prevention: keeping pace with new developments, working paper prepared by the Secretariat (A/conf.187/7).

tivities designed to change certain physical features of the environment in order to remove barriers for natural surveillance and to reduce opportunities for committing criminal acts. Besides physical design, crime prevention means an increase of informal social control through neighbourhood watch programs, and mobilization of community resources and local capacity for recreation, sports, education etc.

### *Developing partnerships in crime prevention*

Many programs for community crime prevention are based on partnership, which means building collaboration between several organizations. They are mostly created as a collective response to specific problems identified in the community. While in the 70s and 80s, we have talked about multi-agency, cross-agency and coordinated or collective approach to crime prevention, in the 90s the term *partnership in prevention* has become a key term in the areas of public safety and in the field of urban policy (Gilling, 1999). They reflect a new dispersed and pluralistic nature of crime control, and although there is no single definition, partnerships represent cooperative relationship between two or more organizations (Rosenbaum, 2002: 172). So, in the 80s new schemes for surveillance in the neighbourhood have begun to establish, altogether with advisory councils to local authorities, inter-agency committees and other local councils. With their foundation, the state has extended the responsibility for crime prevention and has reallocated on a lower community level.

### *Approach and objectives of the local partnership in crime prevention*

Mainly, the development of partnerships is a result of the thesis that strategies for crime prevention depend more on informal rather than on the formal social control. This means that the main aim of the partnership should be the strengthening of informal control (Homel, 1994, Kemshall, 2008). They have the potential to create stronger and more participatory civil society and are seen as a solution to the failure of the state control and its monopoly to deal with crime. Therefore, instead of crime control to be the responsibility only of the criminal justice system, a new vision for an expanded and pluralistic nature of criminal policy emerges (Garland, 2001 stated in Hughes & McLaughlin, 2003: 5). The need for such an approach lies first in the fact that the information related to crime can be obtained from many sources and secondly, because the criminal justice system has limited capacity and resources, and neither can address community problems alone, nor can offer unique solutions for them.

So, the main concern in the 70s related to crime control, was that there is not enough cooperation between the criminal justice system and agencies of informal social control, on a local level. Therefore, preventive partnerships shift the crime control from the state to the community (Kemshall, 2008: 127), and it becomes the responsibility of individuals, communities and commercial institutions. They are oriented towards solving problems and, according to the nature of the problem, offer certain situational measures or social responses to crime. Thus, partnerships have

a greater understanding of local problems (Crawford, 2007) and acknowledge that, as the causes are multifactor, the response needs multi-agency approach which requires enhanced and expanded responsibility. Additionally, their significance lays in the fact that they address the causes of the problems and may encourage cooperation between the criminal justice system and public institutions and civil society. In this regard, the police are often part of the partnerships and their participation is growing considering the new innovative community policing approach. Some of them are, for example, educational programs aimed at reducing drug abuse in schools, such as: Drug Resistance Education Program (DARE) or Community responses to Drug Abuse Program (CRDA), Comprehensive Communities Programs and etc. (Rosenbaum, 2002: 181-182).

### *Programs for Surveillance and monitoring*

Monitoring programs are widespread in the US and in England and Wales and they are based on common interests and needs for maintaining security in the neighbourhood. Their primary goal is natural and informal supervision and control of the behaviour of people at risk, of outsiders and of undesirable people in a certain areas. They include several activities: public education, citizen patrols, measures to identify ownership, environmental protection etc. in order to strengthen the communication between neighbours and to reduce their fear and sense of insecurity.

In terms of crime, studies about effectiveness of certain programs show positive results in property offenses reduction in the community, but not for violent crimes since they often occur between people who know each other. In such cases the offenders are not seen as outsiders and undesirable persons in the neighbourhood. The experience of the implemented programs also shows that if the offenders see that the community is well organized and takes preventive activities for community safety, then, they displace their planned criminal activities in communities that lack or have limited mechanisms of informal control.

In terms of the forms of surveillance and monitoring in the communities, most recognizable are Neighbourhood watch schemes. These schemes result from the movement for greater citizen involvement in crime prevention in the US in the 60s and 70s. First Monitoring Programme was established in 1973 in a small area in Seattle, while in England and Wales in 1982. A report by the British Crime Survey in 2000 found that about six million households are involved in approximately 155,000 programs (schemes) for observation, while in the US, about 41% of citizens live in communities that implement such programs. In fact, the citizens of the community carry out patrol activities or observe space and if notice any suspicions or other illegal behaviour or activities; they can report them to the competent authorities. Therefore, their contribution to the prevention of crime is based on several assumptions: on *visible observation*, by patrolling or by placing signs of ownership which can threaten and deter potential offenders to commit a crime (Bennett, Holloway, 2008: 10) and on *easier and faster flow of information* (which are associated with deviant and criminal phenomena in the community) by citizens to the police. Although monitoring programs seek to increase the ability of the community to control crime, to create greater connectivity be-



tween citizens and life free from fear, however stated objectives are contradictory in nature. Namely, both, the control and the mistrust of people, which are essential elements of the above programs, instead to bring citizens more familiar, they make bigger distance among them.

### **3. Threats and challenges to community based prevention**

There are several remarks and threats in terms of effectiveness and positive impact of community-based prevention. Mainly, they refer to the (1) problem of understanding of the concept and boundaries of the community, (2) the increased emphasis on situational approach, (3) motivation of citizens to participate in preventive activities, (4) inefficient functioning of the partnerships and (5) the increased fears of citizens resulting from the application of certain prevention programs.

One of the biggest challenges of community-based prevention is problem of understanding what we understand under community, because communities in the 21st century are so de-territorialized that the feeling of belonging, interaction and joint neighbourhood are fading which, in turn reinforce alienation and separation among citizens. Now, citizens instead of building long-term and strong friendships, establish short-term relationships based on momentary interests. In such circumstances of division and fragmentation of communities, prevention is difficult to sustain. It is possible, but only in community understood perfectly, when the spirit of unity, social cohesion and social integration of citizens flourish, when citizens first think about their communities, and then for them and when, if someone broke and deviate from the road, the community immediately initiate mechanisms of informal social control. However, in the 21st century, we ask the question: whether the community can be defined as a social group of any size whose members reside in one location, share one government and has a common cultural and historical heritage (McCold, 1996). In modern, urban, pluralistic societies, the community is often a problem and cause of crime, not a solution (Persak, 2009: 112-113).

Another remark of community-based prevention is placing greater emphasis on situational versus social approach to problems response. Its primary objective is to cause visible changes in the physical environment than significant social improvements and changes in the social living conditions. Such priorities instead to "release" the root causes of disorder and crime, they can cause even greater "suppression" of disorganized communities. This means that measures of surveillance and control put aside the real problems and deal only with physical protection and decrease of the sense of fear that is often a result of external influences and threats. Such marginalization of the problems and putting aside (under the carpet), on the one and increasing security, on the other side, are contradictory goals, because instead to decrease, they increase the fear. For example, placing stickers or signs at homes and certain objects that signify that the area around them is under surveillance or that crime is a problem in that area can increase the feeling of insecurity among the citizens. To support this, the survey of 14 cities in England and Wales (2005) shows that the cameras do not improve the feeling of security among the people, except when they know that a certain area is under video surveillance. Other research shows that

those who are aware of the existence of video cameras are more concerned about crime situation. So, situational and security measures, although aim to reduce crime and to increase safety, often fail to realize that goal (Whattam, 2011: 37).

In terms of the partnerships, main comment is that the concept is contradictory and ambiguous. On the one hand, they put a priority on cooperation and on the other hand, their focus is limited and is about reducing crime and breaches of public order, which does not tackle the other social problems of common interest (Crawford, stated in Edwards & Hughes, 2009: 67). Also, partnerships are faced with the problem of un-representativeness of the most groups within the wider community (Crawford, 1994: 509). For example, the views of the representatives who are part of partnerships may have no connection with the views of the majority of citizens who do not participate in decision making processes. Such division and favouring one versus other opinions can lead to exclusion of certain groups and to marginalization of their needs and problems. Therefore, we need strategies for greater integration of young people at risk, for mobilization of families, schools and other civil and public organizations in the community. Through their participation and expression of opinions and needs, we can touch more closely the causes of crime which seek appropriate social responses and solutions (Gilling, 1999: 140-141). So, if they expect to address causes of local problems, then, on the agenda of joint partnerships should be frequently raised questions about such themes.

Related to citizens' participation, the practice shows that citizens are not very motivated to participate in preventive activities. The main obstacles can be found in cultural and language barriers, fear of revenge, the sense of hopelessness and distrust of the criminal justice system. These obstacles are particularly emphasized in communities that have a high crime rate. In addition, those who participate do not represent the whole community, because the community, the characteristics of the population, are increasingly heterogeneous rather than homogeneous (Rosenbaum, 2002: 189). For example, in many urban areas with high crime live people from different ethnic, social, religious, cultural and ethnic groups (Crawford, 1998: 245). Because of such social and other divisions of the population in certain areas, there is no cohesion between members and, as a result there is no requirements and need for certain preventive activities. One example which shows that community-based prevention does not touch the real problems is the fact that many security measures and surveillance are applied in areas with low crime rates and where risks to jeopardize the security are minimal. This means that prevention activities are often undertaken in areas with homogeneous composition of the population and with no real need for protection. Therefore, the main problem associated with prevention at the local level is the difficulty to mobilize and activate citizens unmotivated and to establish strategies for reducing crime in high risk areas (Hancock & Matthews, 2001: 15).

Prevention of crime through forms of intervention and control of behaviour is often directed to defend the community from the actions of the offenders, who are seen primarily as outsiders, not as neighbours or members of certain communities. They are "the others" that endanger the security and, thus the security becomes a target and object of attack from outside. In this sense, the importance of the role of citizens in preventive activities is seen as making control and

maintaining the public order. By doing so, it reinforces the responsibility of those who can control and exclude others (Guilling, 2007: 195). Because of such understanding of the problems, community safety often fails to address the forms of crime that involve family relationships, child abuse, abuse of work, abuse of power and other violent crimes (Crawford, 1998: 245). Although preventive programs based on community are aimed at reducing fear and increasing social connections among people, however, increased monitoring, supervision and control of behaviour increases rather than reduce fear and isolation.

#### **4. Conclusions**

Community-based prevention is an approach to crime prevention that incorporates situational and social elements and it has theoretical background in several theories of crime. It arises due to the fact that the state alone can not cope and prevent crime without help, support and active participation of the community. In addition, because crime is occurring in a community, it became local problem, whose social causes are also rooted in the community. That means that community has responsibility to prevent crime and to secure safety of its citizens. However, until this approach touches the real concerns of citizens and tries to explain and understand crime in a wider social context, we can expect some positive results. Otherwise, certain situational prevention measures which are often criticized that are inconsistent with certain human rights (eg the right to free movement or the right to privacy) initiate the debate for its effectiveness and treats. That means that despite the idea to create order through the mechanisms of situational control, which can be effective, cannot be ignored the important ethical questions about the methods used for crime prevention as the ultimate goal (Tilley, 2005: 5). While these methods can reduce crime, they create other negative consequences for citizens, at the same time: increased concern for personal safety, separation, closed societies, increased suspicion of potential perpetrators and limited access to certain locations that are subject to massive property. Such system represents a system of controlled living (Shapland, 2000).

Although the community safety is the most important value and human need, more important is how it is protected. Community safety does not need to increase xenophobia and intolerance. It cannot even accept the opinion that in order to prevent crime and in the efforts to increase security, we should balance between individual freedom, autonomy and human rights, on one and the values of security, on the other hand. Therefore, it should not be allowed balance and compromises on detriment of freedom and basic human rights (Persak, 2009: 116). Similarly Garland, argues that the new penal policies have no strategy for progressive social change and do not care to overcome social divisions. They are policies who ménage with dangerousness and risks and which strive to shift the burden of social control to individuals, organizations and surveillance measures that do not have enough resources to achieve those goals (Lea, 2002: 164).

## References

- Bennett, T., Holloway, K., Farrington, D.** (2008) Effectiveness of Neighborhood watch in reducing crime, Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention, Stockholm.
- Crawford, A. & Traynoer, P.** (2012) "From community-based strategies to early interventions with young people", *Social Crime Prevention in late Modern Europe. A Comparative Perspectives*, Brussels: VUM Press.
- Crawford, A.** (1994) The Partnership Approach to Community Crime Prevention: Corporatism at the Local level, *Social & Legal Studies* (3), p.p. 497 – 519.
- Crawford, A.** (1998) "Community Safety and the Quest for Security: holding Back the Dynamics of Social exclusion", *Policy Studies*, 19 (314), p.p. 237 – 253.
- Crawford, A.** (2007) "Crime prevention and community safety", *Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, Oxford University Press.
- Crawford, A.** (2007) Comparative models of crime prevention and delivery: their genesis, influence and development, CRIMPREV Assessing Deviance N.16, Crime and Prevention in Europe, Camping Design, EU.
- Crawford, A.** (2013) "Public Safety and Private Security: Are they Reconcilable?", Researchgate
- Danilovic Hristic, N.** (2014) "Urbana bezbednost i prevencija ulicnok kriminala kao predulsovi za razvoj zdrave zajednice", *Acta hist. med. stom. pharm. med, vet* 33 (1), p.p. 16 – 30.
- Edwards, A. & Hughes, G.** (2009) "The preventive turn and the promotion of safer communities in England and Wales: political inventiveness and governmental instabilities", Crawford, A. (ed.) *Crime Prevention Policies in Comparative perspective*, London: Willan publishing Ltd, p.p. 62 – 85.
- Edwards, A., Hughes, G. & Lord, N.** (2014) "Crime prevention and public safety in Europe, Challenges for comparative criminology", p.p. 368 – 384.
- Garland, D.** (2007) "Beyond the culture of control", *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 7 (2), Routledge, Taylor and Francis, p.p. 160 – 189.
- Gilling, D.** (2007) "The socialization of crime control? A critique of New Labour's social approach to crime control", *Social justice and criminal justice*, Centre for crime and justice studies, Kings College London, p.p. 186 – 201.
- Homel, P.** (2009) Lessons for Canadian crime prevention from recent international experience. *Institute for the Prevention of Crime (IPC) Review* (3), p.p. 13 – 39.
- Hughes, G. & Edwards, A.** (2005) "Crime prevention in context", *Handbook of Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, Routledge, p.p. 14 – 34.
- Hughes, G. & McLaughlin, E.** (2003) "Towards a New Paradigm of Sovereign Power? Community Governance, Preventative Safety and the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership", *British Society of Criminology* (6), p.p. 1 – 14.

- Johnstone, C.** (2007) "Regeneration through discipline: Sustainable communities, liveability and the penalization of marginality", *Social justice and criminal justice*, Centre for crime and justice studies, Kings College London, p.p.157 - 169.
- Kanduc, Z.** (2009) "On Various Aspects of Prevention in the Post-Modern Society", *Crime Policy, Crime Control and Crime Prevention - Slovenian Perspectives*, Research Gate, p.p.59 - 96.
- Kemshall, H.** (2003) *Understanding risk in criminal justice*, Open University Press.
- Lea, J.** (2002). *Crime and modernity*, SAGE Publications
- McCold, P.** (1996) "Restorative Justice and the role of community", *Restorative justice: International Perspectives*, Criminal Justice Press, Monsey, NY, Criminal Justice Press, USA, p.p.92 - 93.
- McLaughlin, E.** (2007) *The New Policing*, SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Persak, N.** (2009). "Contemporary Crime Prevention: Some popular Myths and Conceptual Contradictions", *Crime Policy, Crime Control and Crime Prevention - Slovenian Perspectives*, Research Gate, p.p. 97-120.
- Ричардсон, Л. и Мамфорд, К.** (2009) „Заедница, соседство и социјална инфраструктура“, *Социјално исклучување, Академски Печат* (превод од *Understanding social exclusion*, Oxford University Press), 262 - 290.
- Rosenbaum P. Dennis** (2002) "Evaluating Multi-Agency Anti-Crime Partnerships: Theory, Design, and Measurement Issues", *Crime Prevention studies* (14), p.p.171 - 225.
- Shapland, J.** (2000) "Reducing Crime: Implications for Criminology Present and Criminology's Futures", *British Society of Criminology, Selected Proceedings* 3.
- Sherman W. Lawrence** (1997) "Communities and crime prevention (3)" *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising?* Report to the U.S. Congress. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Justice.
- Tilley, N.** (2005) Introduction: thinking realistically about crime prevention, *Handbook of Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, Routledge, p.p. 3 - 12.
- Whattam, S.** (2011) "Situational Crime Prevention: Modern society's "Trojan Horse", *Internet Journal of Criminology*.